

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN, LITERARY CHARACTER,
HISTORICAL AND RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE,
OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of Divinity, New College
The University of Edinburgh

In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Richard Charles Henderson, B.A., B.D.
October, 1959



To My MOTHER

Without whose Testimony I may

Never have been led to

The Christ behind this study

and

To My WIFE

Without whose Encouragement the study

Which has issued in this Dissertation

Would never have been sustained

There are many to whom the author is indebted for the
furtherance of this work. Especially to be acknowledged are the
following persons: my parents, the Rev. Prof. J.S. Stewart, and
the Rev. B.A.S. Macdonald, for their encouragement and help; the
staff at the New College Library and Scottish National Library,
Edinburgh, for their patient assistance; and my friends, the
Rev. F.E. Johnston, B.A., Glasgow, and the Rev. W.J. Macdonald, B.A.,

PREFACE

With scores of volumes having been written on various aspects of the Pastoral Epistles, it may appear somewhat presumptuous to present this study with the claim that there is anything new to contribute. This work is presented, however, in the belief that there is a need to evaluate extensively the decisions of scholarship regarding the origin, literary character, historical and religious significance of the Pastoral Epistles. The present work is not a commentary nor an introduction. It does not seek to prove or disprove the authenticity of the Epistles. The investigation is limited to the reappraisal of once settled issues and attempts to cast new light upon persistent problems surrounding the Epistles. This writer is aware of certain considerations which have been handled far too briefly; while still others were regrettably omitted altogether (e.g. a discussion of worship). Because of the limitations of space an attempt has been made to confine the discussion to those issues which have been most under dispute.

There are many to whom the author is indebted for the furtherance of this task. Especially to be acknowledged are the following persons: my advisers, the Rev. Prof. J.S. Stewart, and the Rev. R.A.S. Barbour, for their encouragement and insight; the staffs at the New College Library and Scottish National Library, Edinburgh, for their patient assistance; and my friends, the Rev. W.P. Monteath, M.A., Glasgow, and the Rev. W.J. Gordon, B.D.,

S.T.M., for their instructive criticisms.

Textual sources for Scripture references include: H.B. Swete, The OT in Greek, Cambridge, 1925; E. Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece, London, 1952; and R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, Stuttgart, 1937. The text used for the Apostolic Fathers is that of K. Lake, The Apostolic Fathers, LCL, London, 1912; while unless otherwise acknowledged later citations have followed J.P. Migne, Patrologiae Graecae-Latinae.

The spelling and punctuation throughout this study, with the exception of direct quotations, follow the standard American usage. Finally, the author follows the trend in scholarship which considers the use of the abbreviation 'op. cit.' as a mark of pedantic affectation where a given author's name is mentioned in the footnote, and all references are to the same work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PREFACE	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	x
INTRODUCTION	1
ONE. LITERARY RELATIONSHIP OF THE PASTORALS	7
I. The Pastoral Epistles in Ancient Literature	8
A. Western Writers	8
1. Rome	
2. Gaul	
B. Eastern Writers	17
1. Asia Minor	
2. Syria	
C. North African Writers	30
D. Grecian Writer	32
E. Anonymous Writers	33
F. Versions and Canons	36
II. Ancient Literature in the Pastoral Epistles	45
A. Non-Canonical Sources	45
1. Hellenistic Literature	
2. Jewish Literature	
B. Canonical Sources	55
1. Old Testament	
2. New Testament	
TWO. LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PASTORALS	68
I. Vocabulary	69
A. Hapax Legomena	69

1.	Hapax Legomena and Statistical Analysis	
2.	Hapax Legomena and Subject	
3.	Hapax Legomena and Situation	
4.	Hapax Legomena Evaluated	
B.	Omission and Misuse of Characteristic Pauline Terms	83
1.	Variation in Meaning	
2.	Variation in Synonyms	
3.	Omission of Characteristic Terms	
C.	The Language of the Pastorals and of Paul Compared with that of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists	96
II.	Style	105
	Preliminary Investigation	
A.	Possible Formative Factors of Style	108
1.	Psychology of Age	
2.	Change of Circumstances	
3.	Amanuensis and the Ancient Art of Letter Writing	
4.	Editor	
5.	Addressees and Content	
B.	Comparison with the Accepted Pauline Epistles	116
1.	Pauline Particles, Prepositions, Pronouns, and the like	
2.	Known Style	
C.	Paul and Style Change	123
THREE.	THE ORIGIN OF THE PASTORALS	130
	Preliminary Investigation	
I.	Pseudepigraphical Theory	139
A.	Pseudepigraphy in History	140
1.	Definition of Terms	
2.	Scope of Pseudepigraphy in the Early Christian Literature	

3.	Characteristics of Early Christian Apocryphal Literature	
4.	Early Christian Writers' Attitude toward Pseudepigraphy	
B.	Pseudepigraphical Composition of the Pastorals	153
1.	Motive	
2.	Addressee, Number, and Sequence	
3.	Date and Place of Writing	
C.	Pseudepigraphical Content of the Pastorals	159
II.	Fragmentary Theory	165
A.	Fragmentary-Pseudepigraphy in History	166
1.	Method	
2.	Morals	
B.	The Problem of Compilation	175
1.	Motive	
2.	Division	
C.	Examination of the Fragments	180
III.	Traditional Theory	184
A.	Cumulative Problems	184
B.	The Hypothesis of the Second Roman Imprisonment	187
1.	The Case Against the Imprisonment	
2.	The Case For the Imprisonment	
FOUR.	ECCLESIASTICAL ORDER OF THE PASTORALS	198
I.	Instructions to Timothy and Titus	200
A.	Instructions to Timothy	200
1.	Instructions Relating to Church Members	
2.	Instructions Relating to the Ministry of Women	
3.	Instructions Relating to the Ministry of Men	

B.	Instructions to Titus	225
1.	Instructions Relating to the Congregation	
2.	Instructions Relating to the Ministry	
II.	The Relationship of the Instructions to Paul	230
A.	The Advanced Ecclesiastical Order	230
1.	Examination of the Order Scripturally	
2.	Examination of the Order of Non-Canonical Sources	
3.	Examination of Specific Arguments Against an Apostolic Date	
4.	Summary of Specific Arguments for an Apostolic Date	
B.	The UnPauline Stress on Organization	252
1.	Pauline Missionary Methods	
2.	Pauline Authority	
3.	Pauline Perspective	
FIVE.	RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PASTORALS	262
I.	Formalized Religious Expression	262
A.	Paul and Formalized Religious Expression	262
B.	Examination of Formalized Religious Expressions	273
1.	Phrases	
2.	Credal Statements	
3.	Hymns	
4.	Faithful Sayings	
II.	False Religious Expression	309
A.	False Religion Summarized	310
1.	Membership	
2.	Matter	
3.	Methods	
4.	Morality	
B.	False Religion Identified	315
1.	Gnosticism	
2.	Jewish-Christian	

3. Jewish-Gnostic-Christian Syncreticism

C. Paul and False Religion 329

CONCLUSIONS 334

APPENDICES

A. HAPAX LEGOMENA PER WESTCOTT AND HORT PAGE . . 337

B. PERCENTAGE OF PAULINE AND PASTORALS' HAPAX
LEGOMENA IN SECOND CENTURY ECCLESIASTICAL
WRITERS 338

C. PASTORALS' HAPAX LEGOMENA HAVING CLOSE
PAULINE COGNATES 339

D. PASTORALS' COMPOUND HAPAX LEGOMENA HAVING
CLOSE PAULINE COGNATES 339

E. PAULINE WORDS OMITTED WITH PASTORALS'
COGNATES 340

F. PAULINE SYNONYMS PRESENT IN PASTORALS 340

BIBLIOGRAPHY 341

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AF</u>	Apostolic Fathers
<u>AJT</u>	<u>American Journal of Theology</u>
<u>CQR</u>	<u>Church Quarterly Review</u>
<u>EQ</u>	<u>Evangelical Quarterly</u>
<u>ET</u>	<u>Expository Times</u>
<u>Exp</u>	<u>Expositor</u>
<u>HDAC</u>	Hastings' <u>Dictionary of the Apostolic Church</u>
<u>HDB</u>	Hastings' <u>Dictionary of the Bible</u>
H.E.	Historia Ecclesiastica of Eusebius
<u>HNT</u>	<u>Historical New Testament</u>
<u>HTR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<u>INT</u>	<u>Introduction to the New Testament</u>
<u>IOT</u>	<u>Introduction to the Old Testament</u>
<u>ISBE</u>	<u>International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>JR</u>	<u>Journal of Religion</u>
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LXX	Septuagint
MNTC	Moffatt's New Testament Commentary
NT	New Testament
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
OT	Old Testament
<u>PE</u>	<u>Pastoral Epistles</u>
<u>PPE</u>	Harrison's <u>Problem of the Pastoral Epistles</u>
<u>RHPR</u>	<u>Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses</u>
SBT	<u>Babylonian Talmud</u> , Socino Edition
<u>SJE</u>	Singer's <u>Jewish Encyclopedia</u>
<u>SJT</u>	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>
<u>TWBB</u>	Richardson's <u>Theological Word Book of the Bible</u>
<u>TWNT</u>	Kittel's <u>Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>
<u>ZATW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZNTW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZTK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>

INTRODUCTION

Since 1807, when Schleiermacher first raised doubts regarding the authenticity of I Timothy, the Pastorals¹ have been a perennial source of bewilderment to the critics. It may be presumed that the wealth of literature surrounding these Epistles and the continuous re-appraisal of their once settled issues are indications that there are questions which have not as yet been answered to the satisfaction of all. This fact is especially apparent when the course of criticism during the past 150 years has been sketched. The suspicion cast by Schleiermacher upon I Timothy was soon seen to be valid for the other Epistles as well. Hence Eichhorn (1812) and de Wette (1844) followed the lead of the second century heretics and rejected all three Epistles.²

Baur (1835) enhanced this negative criticism by the positive historical method in which he sought to interpret the Pastorals in terms of a second century rebuttal of gnosticism. Baur's pseudepigraphical approach became so widely accepted a position that in 1875 he concluded that "we need no longer fear any very

¹The name "Pastorals" or "Pastoral Epistles" was apparently first applied to the Letters to Timothy and Titus by P. Anton (of Halle) in 1726. For discussion of the designation's history, cf. P.N. Harrison, PPE, Oxford, 1921, pp. 13-16; and Lock, PE, ICC, Edinburgh, 1924, p. xiii.

²For discussion of 19th cen criticism, cf. J.E. Huther, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, tran D. Hunter, Edinburgh, 1881, pp. 55-58; B. Weiss, INT, tran A. Davidson, I, London, 1887, 413-19; and T. Zahn, INT, tran M. Jacobus et al, II, Edinburgh, 1909, 122ff. For an annotated bibliography of all pertinent works on the Pastorals, see, P.C. Spicq, Saint Paul Les Epitres Pastorales, Paris, 1947, pp. iii-xix.

decided reclamation when we appeal to those three Epistles in proof of the fact that there are forged Pauline letters in our canon."¹ Five years later, Holtzmann produced what is recognized as the most complete and decisive attack against the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals.

Many, however, although consenting to the problems surrounding the Epistles, have revised the conclusions of Baur and Holtzmann, and have followed the lead of Credner (1836) in discerning genuine Pauline fragments. Thus it is conceived that a devout Paulinist in the sub-apostolic period sought in this way to incorporate his master in the task of "safeguarding the common Christianity of the age in terms of the great Pauline tradition."² Yet, although P.N. Harrison with his book, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles (to be discussed in detail in Chapter 2), has made a distinguished advance of the fragmentary theory, the elaborate, and manifold attempts at dissection have met with but limited agreement.

Plagued with divisions regarding how the Pastorals ought to be incorporated into the Pauline life-span, many accurate scholars have yet contended for the Epistles' authenticity. Weary of the negations of the past, men like Lock, Meinertz, Schlatter, Jeremias, Michaelis, and Simpson, serve today as a "warning against the tacit assumption of some scholars that no

¹F.C. Baur, Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ. His Life and Work, tran A. Menzies, II, 2nd ed, Edinburgh, 1875, 98.

²M. Jones, The NT in the Twentieth Century, London, 1924, p. 280. For a history of the early fragmentary approach, cf. Zahn, INT, II, 122f.

scientific grounds remain for the traditional position."¹ Many of the problems besetting the Pastorals have arisen because these firmly entrenched sides of criticism have continued to state supposition as substantiated fact. When one attempts to view objectively the over-positive assertions of scholars regarding the Epistles' relationship to that obscure period of history presupposed by their author, he may find that "his task is to decide, not which of many theories is right, but which, on the whole, is the least improbable."²

An inquiry into the Pastorals' origin is necessary, not only because of the discrepancy of scholarship regarding the theories of authorship, but also because of the disagreement upon the importance of the subject. Schweitzer, for example, would see no need to establish the Pastorals' authenticity since they "neither enrich nor make clearer the picture of Paul's doctrine"³; while Findlay asserted that if the Epistles "are detached from the personality of St. Paul, their living purpose and meaning are gone."⁴ Deissmann claimed that the authenticity question was a "matter of indifference" to both the author's contemporaries and to posterity⁴; while Simpson

¹D. Guthrie, PE, London, 1957, pp. 15f. A Deissmann (Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, 2nd ed, London, 1926, p. 16) regards the authenticity as a "question upon which I have as yet reached no final conclusion."

²A.C. Deane, St. Paul and His Letters, London, 1942, p. 246.

³A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tran W. Montgomery, London, 1931, p. 43.

⁴G.G. Findlay, "Appendix on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus", The Apostle Paul, A. Sabatier, London, 1899, p. 348. (Hereafter designated "PE").

asserts that the Epistles must be as claimed or "they form no part of the Church's treasures" and "incur the taint of moral obliquity and deserve to be held in contempt."¹ Therefore, an inquiry into the problems surrounding the Pastorals is important.

Historically the inquiry is of value as well; for (as will be seen in Chapters 4 and 5) the Pastorals are vital authorities for a proper conception of the Apostolic Church. If the Epistles are, as so many claim, the documentary evidence for the foundation of the second century Catholic Church, then their significance is seen in their separation from the Apostles as the Church is found to be approximating more nearly to the conditions of our own churches.² But, if they are first century productions, then the Epistles form the vital transition to a more regulated ecclesiastical framework before the death of the missionary Apostle. That the Pastorals have a right to canonical status is not questioned; their preservation and position in the NT has been fully justified. Their intrinsic character meets the test of inspiration as they afford new concepts with every examination; while their own peculiar qualities of practical advice, ecclesiastical injunctions, and precise theological statements, have had a profound impact upon the

¹PE, London, 1954, p. 6.

²So, G.E. Phillips, The Transmission of the Faith, London, 1946, p. 47. Cf. E. von Dobschütz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church, tran G. Bremmer, ed W. Morrison, London, 1904, p. xxxvii; H. von Soden, The History of Early Christian Literature, tran J. Wilkinson, London, 1906, pp. 321f; and W. Barclay, The Epistles to Timothy and Titus, Glasgow, 1956, p. vii (hereafter designated PE).

Church.¹ But, until these Epistles can be satisfactorily dated, and therefore set into their own historical framework, important information regarding the founding of the Church is missing.

There are many additional questions which are dependent upon the satisfactory disposition of the problems engulfing the Pastorals. For example, acceptance or rejection of the Pastorals' authenticity will determine one's perspective of Paul. Was the Apostle's style static? Can it be computed mathematically? Was he interested in ecclesiastical organization? Therefore, when a person is reading the Pastorals, is he reading the final outpouring of the great Apostle? Or, is he reading the well-meant, sincere advice of the pseudo-Paul? Is a minister, when confronted with the varied objections to their authenticity, to read from the Pastorals and say: "Thus saith the words of the Apostle Paul..."? or, is he in all intellectual honesty to say: "Hear the words of the pseudepigraphist..."?² Hence, not only one's concept of Paul will be determined by the inquiry, but questions of canonicity, inspiration, preservation, external evidence, level of Biblical criticism, and the like, will likewise be affected.³ There appears, therefore, ample justifica-

¹Cf. E.F. Scott, PE, MNTC London, 1936, p. xv; Guthrie, PE, p. 9; and A.E. Burn, "PE", A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, ed C. Gore et al, London, 1934, pp. 573f.

²Cf. A. Plummer, PE, Expositor's Bible Series, ed W.R. Nicoll, 4th ed. London, 1894, p. 3; and A.M. Hunter, "The Pastorals", ET, LX (1948-9), 171.

³Cf. "The Authorship of the PE", CQR, LXIII (1906-7), esp 63ff; B. Weiss, "The Present Status of the Inquiry Concerning the Genuineness of the Pauline Epistles", AJT, I (1897), 392-403; and E.Y. Hincks, "The Authorship of the PE", JBL, XVI (1897), esp 97.

tion for this present investigation.

In seeking an answer to these and other questions, the literary and linguistic character of the Epistles will be discussed in the first two chapters; chapter three is devoted to the problem of origin; while chapters four and five are concerned with the historical, religious, and ecclesiastical implications of the Epistles.

the comp... based upon... employment of the Pastoral... lius concluded that "die Pastoralen... günstig"; while an investigation of the case evidence... Weiss to assert: "die Pastoralen... nur irgend einer der paulinischen... nach-apostolischer Zeit... critique of the ancients might be judged... of modern scholars, it must be remembered... and traditions which have new periods...

¹For a noteworthy caution on the process of literary in-
terpretation, see, W. Sanday and A.C. Cook, The Epistle to the
Romans, 100, 5th ed. Edinburgh, 1947, p. Lxxvii.

²Die Pastoralbriefe, Tübingen, 1901, p. 6. A. McGiffert
(A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, Edinburgh, 1897,
p. 391) regards the external testimony to the Pastorals' genuineness
as being "far weaker" than in the case of any of Paul's
other letters. Cf. A. Jülicher, NT, trans. J.F. Sart. London,
1904, p. 180.

³Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1907,
pp. 54ff. Several authors quote W. Salmon (ibid., 1880, London,
1894, p. 399): "If, therefore, the battle had to be fought solely
on the ground of external evidence the Pastoral epistles would
obtain a complete victory." So, G.V. Hindley, "P", p. 352; J.H.
James, The Genuineness and Authorship of the Ep., Boston, 1906,
p. 24; and G. Guthrie, ibid., pp. 141.

CHAPTER I

LITERARY RELATIONSHIP

Introduction

It is always difficult to evaluate literary indebtedness. To realize how delicate the problem is, one need only examine the completely opposite conclusions of competent scholars based upon identical facts.¹ After an investigation of the employment of the Pastorals by the Early Church writers, Dibelius concluded that "die äussere Bezeugung ist nicht allzu günstig"²; while an investigation of the same evidence led Weiss to assert: "Die Pastoralbriefe zeigen sich so früh wie nur irgend einer der paulinischen Briefe in der Literatur der nach-apostolischen Zeit bekannt und wirksam."³ Although the critique of the ancients might be judged as fallible as that of modern scholars, it must be remembered that they had records and traditions which have now perished, and their assent to

¹For a noteworthy caution on the problem of literary indebtedness, see, W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans, ICC, 5th ed, Edinburgh, 1945, p. lxxviii.

²Die Pastoralbriefe, Tübingen, 1931, p. 6. A. McGiffert (A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 399) regards the external testimony to the Pastorals' genuineness as being "far weaker" than in the case of any of Paul's other letters. Cf. A. Jülicher, INT, tran J.P. Ward, London, 1904, p. 180.

³Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1902, pp. 54ff. Several authors quote G. Salmon (INT, 7th ed, London, 1894, p. 399): "If, therefore, the battle had to be fought solely on the ground of external evidence the Pastoral Epistles would obtain a complete victory." So, G.G. Findlay, "PE", p. 352; J.D. James, The Genuineness and Authorship of the PE, London, 1906, p. 24; and D. Guthrie, PE, pp. 14f.

canonicity supplies corroborative, if not decisive, evidence.¹ A re-evaluation is essential, therefore, not in order to prove or disprove authenticity of the Pastorals, but to provide an indication of the reception of these Epistles by the ancient writers. It is the twofold purpose of this section to examine the indebtedness of the early Ecclesiastics to the Pastorals, as well as the conclusions drawn from this testimony by modern scholarship. The second section will be devoted to an examination of the literary indebtedness of the Pastorals' author.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES IN ANCIENT LITERATURE

WESTERN WRITERS

Rome

Clement. That epistle, μεγάλη τε καὶ θαυμασία, which Clement drew up ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τῆ Κορινθίων because of the στάσις² is the earliest witness of the Apostolic Fathers.³ Irenaeus

¹Archbishop Wake, The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers, London, 1899, p. 29: "...we must either say that the Church in those days were so little careful of what was taught in it as to allow such books to be publicly read in its congregations the doctrine whereof it did not approve or we must confess that the following pieces (writings of the Apostolic Fathers) are delivered to us, not only by the learned men of the first ages of the church, but by the whole body of the faithful, as containing the pure doctrine of Christ, and must be looked upon to have nothing in them but what was then thought worthy of all acceptance." Cf. M.C. Tenny, The NT. A Historical and Analytic Survey, London, 1954, p. 418.

²Eusebius, H.E. III, xvi.1.

³G. Edmundson (The Church in Rome in the First Century, London, 1913, p. 189) dates the Epistle in A.D. 70; while E.T. Merrill (Essays in Early Church History, 1924, p. 241) postulates a date between A.D. 140-154. However, the more widely accepted date is A.D. 96-97. Cf. J. Quasten, Patrology, I, Brussels, 1950, 49; J.B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to Philippians, 8th ed. London, 1888, pp. 168f; and W.L. Clarke, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, London, 1937, p. 13.

relates that Clement, the third of the Roman bishops "had seen the blessed Apostles and conversed with them and had the preaching of the Apostles still ringing in his ears and their tradition before his eyes."¹ The epistle's reception is evidenced by the statement of Eusebius that it was still being read publicly ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησίαις .² Although Clement quotes with pronounced exactness from the OT, however, his citations from the NT are loose, inexact, and greatly paraphrastic. "They intimate the original," observes Zunst, "but with very few exceptions do not admit of detailed observations."³ Since even Paul's accepted Epistles to the Roman and Corinthian churches are cited in the same manner, it would be precarious to argue from this style that Clement was unfamiliar with the Pastorals.⁴

Although the parallels are not of equal merit, the following are worthy of note.⁵

¹Haer III.iii.3 Cf. Eusebius, H.E. III.xv.1 Translation by Lightfoot, ibid.

²H.E. III.xvi.1 Cf. IV.xxiii.11.

³The Text of the Epistles, London, 1953, p. 217. Cf. The NT in the Apostolic Fathers, by a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, 1905, p. 37.

⁴For discussion of the silence of the Apostolic Fathers, see, C.L. Mitton, The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters, London, 1955, pp. 17f, 22f; J.B. Lightfoot, Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion, London, 1893, pp. 33f; and H.P. V. Nunn, "The Background of the Epistle of Clement of Rome", EQ, XVIII, no 1 (1946), 45.

⁵Several scholars have examined with care the literary associations between Clement and the Pastorals. Cf. J.D. White ("I and II Timothy and Titus", Expositor's Greek Testament, IV, London, 1910, 76f) who lists about twenty parallels; P.C. Spicq (p. xcvi) discovers twenty-five associations; and P.N. Harrison (PPE, esp. pp. 177ff) observes a common milieu.

II.7; cf., XXXIV.4.
ἔτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν.

XXIX.1. προσέλθωμεν
οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς,
ἀγνάς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας
αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.

Tit 3:1; cf., II.2:21; 3:1.
πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἔτοιμους εἶναι.

I 2:8. προσεύχεσθαι...
ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας χωρὶς ὀργῆς
καὶ διαλογισμοῦ.

Lightfoot has indicated that this last phrase was frequent among the ancients¹; but it is not without interest when viewed jointly with the other parallels.

LXI.2. σὺ γὰρ δέσποτα
ἐπουράνιε, βασιλεῦ τῶν αἰώνων.

I 1:17. τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων.

This phrase is peculiar to the Pastorals in the NT, and has led James² to intimate dependence; however, it is probable that both authors are using a common Jewish liturgical source.³

I.3. ἀγνῆ συνειδήσει
πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν παρηγγέλλετε,
στεργούσας καθηκόντως τοὺς ἄνδρας
ἑαυτῶν ἔν τε τῷ καμόνι τῆς ὑπο-
ταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας τὰ κατὰ τὸν
οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουρεῖν ἐδιδάσ-
κετε, πάνυ σωφρονούσας.

Tit 2:4,5. νέας φιλάνδρους
εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους, σώφρονας, ἀγνάς,
οἰκουρούς, ἀγαθὰς ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς
ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ
θεοῦ βλασφημηῆται.

The corresponding phrases, and similarity of contexts, make this parallel especially significant. The Oxford Society indicates that the use of οἰκουρεῖν, "cannot well be accounted for by chance, and makes it probable that the one writer is dependent on the other."⁴

¹The Apostolic Fathers, pt I, vol II, 2nd ed, London, 1890, 93. Cf. Athenag Suppl xiii; Galen de Antid ii.7. R.J. Knowling, The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, 3rd ed, London, 1911, p. 125: "...we are irresistibly reminded of I 2:8, although the phrase is admittedly used by many writers."

²Op. cit., pp. 13ff.

³Cf. Tobit 13.6,10; Ignatius Rom VI.1; Rev 15:3; J. Moffatt, INT, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 418; J.B. Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, pt I, vol II, 180.

⁴Op. cit., p. 51. Note that οἰκουρεῖν is a Pastorals' hapax legomenon.

XXXII.3. πάντες οὖν
ἔδοξάσθησαν...οὐ δι' αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν
ἔργων αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας
ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ
θελήματος αὐτοῦ.

Tit 3:5-7. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν
ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ
κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς...
κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

Note that the parallels are similar both linguistically and conceptually.

VII.3. ἴδωμεν...τί προσ-
δεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος
ἡμᾶς.

I 2:3; 5:4. τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ
ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν
Θεοῦ.

Other parallels of note: XLV.7 καθαροῖ συνειδήσει cf., II 1:3;

XXVI.1 πιστεως ἀγαθῆς , cf., Tit 2:10; I.1; XLVII.7 ὄνομα...

βλασφημηθῆναι , cf., I 6:1. For similarity of thought and context examine: I.3, cf., I 5:17 (rendering of honor to πρεσβυτέροις); XXXVII.1, cf. I 1:18 (Christian service paralleled to military); XLII.4, cf., I 3:10 (the testing of bishops and deacons).

Holtzmann's evaluation of the literary dependence is that any phrases which occur in Clement "scheinen zum guten Theil ganz zufällig," and any coincidences are due to the common church atmosphere,¹ The predisposition of Streeter is obvious when he concludes that since "1 Clement is the earlier document, it will be the editor of the Pastorals who is the borrower, of ideas as well as words."² One factor which may militate against these

¹Die Pastoralbriefe, Leipzig, 1880, p. 257. Yet, J.H. Bernard (PE, Cambridge Greek Testament, Cambridge, 1899, p. xix) observes that the coincidences "were too close to admit of any other hypothesis save that Clement wrote with the language and thoughts of the Pastorals in mind."

²The Primitive Church, London, 1929, p. 153. Yet, see Guthrie (PE, p. 12) who contends that such writers "approach the evidence from the standpoint of a definite presupposition, i.e. that the Pastorals belong to the second century and must therefore be later than Clement's letter."

determinations, is Clement's attitude toward the Church ministry. As will be seen in the fourth chapter, it is extremely difficult to place the Pastorals ecclesiastically between Clement and Ignatius. Therefore, if after examination of other aspects the evidence would point to a first century date for the Pastoral Letters, then there can be no objection to the Roman Bishop's dependence upon these Epistles. Hence final determination must be deferred.

Second Epistle of Clement. This earliest extant example of a Christian homily, of indeterminate origin, date, and destination,¹ indicates a certain familiarity with the Pastorals.

XX.5. Τῷ μόνῳ θεῷ ἁοράτῳ,
...αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
τῶν αἰώνων. Ἄμήν.

I 1:17. ἁοράτῳ μόνῳ θεῷ,
τιμῇ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.
Ἄμήν.

VIII.1,4. ἄγωνισώμεθα εἰδότες,
ὅτι...ὄ πάντες στεφανοῦνται, εἰ
μὴ οἱ πολλὰ κοπιᾶσαντες καὶ καλῶς
ἄγωνισάμενοι...ὁ τὸν φθαρτὸν ἄγωνια
ἄγωνιζόμενος, ἐὰν εὐρεθῆ φθείρων...
ἔξω βάλλεται τοῦ σταδίου.

II 2:4f; cf., I 4:10.
οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς
τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις, ἵνα τῷ στρατο-
λογήσῃ ἀρέσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλή-
τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως
ἄθλήσῃ.

Bernard has noted, in addition, that the language of paragraphs VI, VII, and VIII of the homily is reminiscent of 1 Timothy 6.²

¹Harnack (Chronologie, I, Leipzig, 1897, 438ff) follows the lead of Eusebius (H.E. IV.xxiii.10), and conjectures that the homily was from Soter (Bishop of Rome, A.D. 166-174). K. Lake (The Apostolic Fathers, I, LCL, 127), however, regards a date of A.D. 150 as being most usually accepted. Cf. Quasten, p. 54. Lightfoot (Apostolic Fathers, pt I, vol II, 201-8) suggests A.D. 120-140, and adds, that "as there is nothing in the work which militates against a still earlier date, so again it is impossible to affirm confidently that it might not have been written a few years later."

²PE, p. xix. Cf. esp. the injunction in VIII.6 with I 6:14; and Spicq, p. xcvi.

Verbal coincidences of note are: κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας (XVII.3; cf., Tit 2:12)¹; κοπιῶσαντες (VII.1; cf., I 4:10); φθειρών (VII.4; cf., II 2:5)²; κακοπαθεῖν (XIX; cf., II 1:8; 2:3,9; 4:5); and the use of ἐπιφάνεια (XI; cf., I 6:14; II 4:10)³.

Justin Martyr. Born at the turn of the first century to Greek parents in a Roman colony in Samaria, Justin became a Christian at Ephesus⁴ and traveled everywhere "ἐν φιλοσόφου σχήματι πρεσβεύων τὸν θεῖον λόγον."⁵ His literary efforts are marked by the use of more than seven hundred OT references, but they are perplexingly silent in respect to the canonical NT. Moffatt has observed that there are only two or three allusions in Justin Martyr to the Pastorals; but that "as the second century advances the evidences for the circulation of the Pastorals multiply."⁶ This inference that the Epistles were late in being accepted, must be countered, however, by Easton's observation that "the silence of Justin is no argument to the contrary, for even the acknowledged letters of Paul are rarely cited by him."⁷ Certainly Goodspeed is accurate in asserting that ~~at~~

¹This use of κοσμικὰς is peculiar to Titus. The word is not found in the LXX, and is used in Heb 9:1 in a varied sense.

²Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, pt I, vol II, 225: "The turn given to the image in φθειρών was perhaps suggested by II 2:5."

³This use as a designation for the Parousia of Christ, is peculiar to the Pastorals in the NT.

⁴Cf. G. Kruger, History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries, tran C.R. Gillett, London, 1897, pp. 106f.

⁵Eusebius, H.E. IV.xi.8.

⁶INT, p. 419.

⁷PE, London, 1948, p. 32.

at the time when Justin was making his defense, the champion of Paul was the heretic Marcion; "and to make much of Paul in the middle of the second century seemed like Supporting Marcion and his views."¹ Nevertheless there are several allusions of interest to the phraseology of the Pastoral Letters.

Dial 47. ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄμετρον τοῦ πλοῦτου αὐτοῦ τὸν μετανοοῦντα...ὡς δίκαιον...ἔχει.

Dial 7; cf., 25. τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν.

Dial 118. ὅτι κριτῆς ζῶντων καὶ νεκρῶν ἀπάντων αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἶπον ἐν πολλοῖς.

It is significant, that in each instance the phrase is one which might well have circulated freely in the early Church. Without literary dependence, however, the question arises with whom the phrases originated. If they found their origin with the Apostle, it is more readily seen how they would have so freely circulated.

Hegesippus. This writer, known only from citations in Eusebius,¹ may be summoned as both an Eastern and Western witness, for although he journeyed to Rome, he was a native of Palestine. The fragments, dating probably to A.D. 170, contain references to the ἑτεροδιδασκαλοὶ and to their ψευδώνυμον

Tit 3:4. ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς.

I 4:1. προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων.

II 4:1. Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

¹Formation of the NT, Chicago, 1926, p. 56.

²H.E. II.xxiii.3-18; III.xi; xii; xx.

γνώσειν ,¹ which are judged to be "unmistakable."²

Irenaeus. Because of his role as a traveler, disciple, and author, this witness is of peculiar value. As a bishop of Lyons and yet a native of Asia Minor (Smyrna region), he would be heir to the attitudes and traditions of different churches, including the Ephesian where Timothy was allegedly stationed when he received his Epistles. Such educative travel on the part of the bishop led F.N. Chase to conclude that Irenaeus' views "on such a matter as the Books of the New Testament, could not be divergent from those generally held."³ As a disciple of Polycarp (whose full life culminated in martyrdom in A.D. 155 at the age of 86), and as one whose own life extended from about A.D. 130-200, he would not have used the Pastorals so unquestioningly, if they had appeared within these limits.⁴

Three passages will suffice to illustrate how Irenaeus quotes by name from every chapter of the Pastorals except

¹ H.E. III.xxxii.2-8.

² Bernard, PE, p. xiv. Cf. H. Alford, The Greek Testament, III, Cambridge, 1865, 72. A.C. Hervey ("PE", The Pulpit Commentary, ed H. Spence, London, 1909, p. xxiii) regards this passage as a strong testimony to the authenticity of I Timothy, since Hegesippus is apparently acquainted with the predictive warnings included in that Epistle.

³"The History of the Canon of the NT", Criticism of the NT. St. Margaret's Lectures, London, 1902, p. 111. Cf. J.A. M'Clymont, The NT and Its Writers, London, 1893, p. 187.

⁴So Easton, PE, p. 32. Cf. James, pp. 5f; Plummer, pp. 294f. Bernard (PE, p. xvi) observes that Irenaeus is "appealing to the Epistle to Titus as written by St. Paul, against heretics, who would certainly have denied the authority of words quoted if they could have produced reasons for doing so,".

Titus 1.¹

Con Haer. ΠΡΟΟΙΜΙΟΝ 1.
ἐπεισάγουσι λόγους ψευδεῖς καὶ γενεα-
λογίας καταίας, αἵτινες ζητήσεις
μᾶλλον παρέχουσι, καθὼς ὁ Ἀπόστολος
φησὶν, ἢ οἰκοδομῆν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει.

I 1:4. μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις
καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, αἵτινες
ἐκζητήσεις παρέχουσιν μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκο-
νομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει.

Con Haer. III.iii.4.
ὡς καὶ Παῦλος ἔφησεν, "Αἰρετικὸν
ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν
νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι
ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος, καὶ
ἀμαρτάνει, ὧν ἀθροκατάκριτος."

Tit 3:10f. (direct
quotation)

Con Haer. III.xiv.1.
...Paulus manifestavit in
epistolis, dicens: (Demas me
dereliquit, et abiit Thessa-
lonicam, Crescens in Galatiam,
Titus in Dalmatiam; Lucas est
mecum solus).

II 4:9-11. Δημῶς γὰρ με
ἐγκατέλιπεν ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα, καὶ
ἐπορεύθη εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην, Κρήσης εἰς
Ταλατίαν, Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν, Λουκᾶς
ἐστὶν μόνος μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Gaul

Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons.² Since this
is a narrative relating the persecution which resulted in the
martyrdom of their bishop Ponthius, one would not expect to
find anything but incidental allusions to the Pastorals. Yet
according to Lightfoot, this letter betrays "unequivocal" know-
ledge of the Epistles to Timothy.³

¹Cf. I.xiii.7, cf. I 4:2; xvi.3, cf. I 4:1, 7; Tit 3:1,
10; II.xiv.7, cf. I 6:20; xvii.1, cf. I 2:4; III.iii.3, cf. II
4:21; IV.xvi.3, cf. I 1:9 (Migne). For complete evidence see:
W. Sanday and C.H. Turner, Nouum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei
Episcopi Lugdunensis, Oxford, 1923, pp. 181-187, 284.

²This Letter, preserved only by Eusebius (H.E. V.1-iii)
was written to sister churches in Asia about A.D. 180.

³Supernatural Religion, pp. 254f.

H.E. V. i. 17. καὶ εἰς Ἄτταλον Περγαμηνὸν τῷ γένει, στῦλον καὶ ἔδραϊωμα τῶν ἑνταυθα ἀεὶ γεγονότα.

H.E. V. i. 30. ὁ δὲ μακάριος Ποθεινός... καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἐσύρετο... ἐπιβοήσεις παντοίας ποιουμένων ὡς αὐτοῦ ὄντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀπεδίδου τὴν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν.

H.E. V. iii. 2. ὁ Ἄλκιβιάδης μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἄλλοις τύπον σκανδάλου ὑπολειπόμενος. πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἄλκιβιάδης πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανεν καὶ ἠὲ χαρίζεται τῷ θεῷ.

I 3:15. ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἔδραϊωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

I 6:13. παραγγέλλω ἐνώπιον... καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν.

I 4:3f. ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων, ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον.

There is more to the value of this testimony than the obvious linguistic phenomena. Ponthius was ninety years of age at the time of his martyrdom in A.D. 177. Thus, any acceptance of the Pastorals by these churches, would be founded upon the knowledge of a man whose life span began well before the turn of the first century. Furthermore, according to Dr. Robinson, this letter shows traces of a NT Latin version.¹ If substantiated, it would indicate that prior to A.D. 180, the Pastoral Epistles were sufficiently accepted in Gaul to warrant such a version.

EASTERN WRITERS

Asia Minor

Polycarp. Since he was both a Bishop of Smyrna and a disciple of the Apostle John², the witness of Polycarp is of para-

¹The Passion of St. Perpetua, p. 99, as cited by Bernard, PE, p. xvii, and James, p 6.

²So, Irenaeus, III. iii. 4. Cf. Lightfoot, Supernatural Religion, pp. 89ff; and V. Stanton, "NT Canon", HDB, III, 532b.

mount importance to the Ephesian tradition. In defense of his teacher's witness, Irenaeus observes that Polycarp not only received his instruction *παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Λόγου* but also that it was completely *σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς*.¹ Irenaeus further recommends Polycarp's work as an excellent record of his faith and preaching.² Prior to examining such attested evidence, it is well to observe, with the Oxford Society, that even where undoubted quotations from the NT clearly exist, the order is treated freely, unexplained omissions occur, and the general impression is of a transcription from memory.³

Although not many authorities would list the twenty examples set forth by Spicq,⁴ certainly the following parallels are of peculiar note.

IV.1. Ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλ-
επῶν φιλαργυρία. εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι
οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν.

I 6:7, 10. οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσ-
ηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὅτι οὐδὲ
ἐξενεγκεῖν τί δυνάμεθα... ῥίζα γὰρ πάν-
των τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία.

The independent evaluation of the Oxford Society is worthy of reproduction in connection with this comparison.

It is almost impossible to believe that these passages are independent. The formula (*εἰδότες ὅτι*) with which Polycarp introduces the second of the two sentences, indicates that he is conscious of quoting, and points to the priority of I Timothy. The word *οὖν* may perhaps show that reference is being made to a well known source, and that the one quotation has suggested the other. It

¹Eusebius, H.E. V. xx. 6.

²III. iii. 4.

³So, Oxford Society, p. 84. Cf. J.B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers, pt I, vol I, London, 1890, 10.

⁴Op. cit., p. xcvi. Cf. White (pp. 78f) who lists 5 parallels; and James (pp. 10f), 6.

may further be noted that ἀρχή is less vivid than ῥίζα; this also points to the priority of I Timothy.¹

Further observe the similar use of equally obscure prepositions on the part of each writer to introduce the second clause.

IX.2. οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν
ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα.

II.4:10. Δημίς γὰρ με ἐγκα-
τέλιπεν ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα.

Note that the context in both cases is an exhortation to faithfulness in spite of peril; and Polycarp's customary ὁ αἰῶν οὗτος is replaced by ὁ νῦν αἰῶν.²

XII.3. ut fructus vester
manifestus sit in omnibus

I 4:15. ἵνα σου ἡ προκοπή
φανερὰ ᾖ πᾶσιν.

XII.3. orate pro regibus.

I 2:1. Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρώτων
πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις... ὑπὲρ
βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ
όντων.

The plural 'regibus', the context of prayer, and the connection of thought, would appear to argue for dependence upon I Timothy.³

VIII.1. προσκαρτερῶμεν τῇ
ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν... ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

I 1:1. καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

The order of Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς is significant since it is found neither elsewhere in Polycarp, nor in parallel passages of

¹Op. cit., pp. 95f. For similar observations of εἰδοτές ὅτι cf. Easton, PE, p. 30; P.N. Harrison, Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians, Cambridge, 1936, p. 243; and Knowling, Testimony, p. 126, quoting Harnack. See, V.1 for the phrase when it is used to introduce a clear quotation from Gal 6:7.

²Bernard, PE, p. xv.

³Oxford Society, p. 96: "That kings and rulers are mentioned in the praises of the Church is clear from I Clem lxi. The plural regibus is strange as applied to the Emperor, and has even suggested to some critics an argument in favour of the spuriousness of Polycarp's Epistle (Lightfoot, Ignatius and Polycarp, i, 592). But the late date suggested is impossible on other grounds, and the plural is most easily explained by reference to I Timothy."

Ignatius.¹ Gealy dismisses any weight of dependence by asserting that the phrase was common, and "might well have circulated freely among Christians in the second century."² Yet the fact remains that a phrase must be inaugurated before it can become common. Furthermore, it stands as pure conjecture that the parallel in question ever circulated freely.

Even more significant than the examined parallels is the similarity of thought and treatment as found in the precepts concerning deacons, their wives, widows, and presbyters (IV-VI). Although certainly not a "textual reproduction" of the Pastorals,³ the injunctions would appear to be outlined upon their contents.

Other parallels of interest: V.2 cf., II 2:11f; I 3:8; XI.2 cf., I 3:5; XI.4 cf., II 2:25; and XII.1 cf., II 1:5.⁴

Although admittedly including some of unequal merit, such a collection of similarities at this early date, and considering the brevity of the Polycarp Epistle, is certainly of interest.

¹Cf. Ignatius, Magn XI; Trall. Inscr; II. For a study which shows that Χριστός Ἰησοῦς is peculiarly Pauline, see, B. Hellier, "The Pauline Usage of the Names of Christ", The Theological Monthly, III, IV (1890), 17-32, 73-185, 239-251.

²Introduction and Exegesis to "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus", The Interpreter's Bible, XI, Nashville, 1955, 369. Cf. Dibelius, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 6, 54; J. Knox, Marcion and the NT, Chicago, 1942, p. 176; and E. Goodspeed, INT, New York, 1937, p. 344.

³So claimed for the beginning of chapter iv by F. Godet, INT, tran W. Affleck, Edinburgh, 1894, p. 569. Cf. Bernard, PE, p. xv; and Weiss, INT, I, 51.

⁴More obscure comparisons: IV.3, cf. I 5:5; VI.3, cf. Tit 2:14; IX.1, cf. Tit 3:1; X.2, cf. Tit 2:5. Knowling (Testimony, p. 126) observes that "whilst in some cases he (Harnack) thinks that it may be urged that Polycarp may be merely referring to some commonplace saying, or to some common basis in his appeal to his converts, yet in chapter five of Polycarp's Epistle, II 2:12 is too plainly cited to admit of any such explanation."

If dependence has been indicated, and in the judgment of most scholars it has,¹ one conclusion may be drawn at this point: the Pastorals must have been published sufficiently prior to such extensive utilization by Polycarp for him to have become so familiar with them. Thus, the sentiment can be expressed, with J.D. White, that it is difficult to believe that Polycarp would have made such honorable use of letters which were compiled within his own lifetime (A.D. 70-155).² If this conclusion is valid, then any hypothesis involving a second century dating of the Pastorals might need to be reviewed. Whoever the author, it would appear that the Pastorals must have been composed well before the close of the first century to account for this early acceptance.³

To avoid this dilemma, Harrison postulates that the accepted A.D. 117 date for Polycarp's writing applies only to the composition of chapters 13 and 14. He conjectures that these chapters were sent as a 'covering letter' to the Philippian Church along with the requested Ignatian Epistles;⁴ while the

¹Scholars who agree that Polycarp was dependent upon the Pastorals include: Goguel, Holtzmann, Jülicher, Moffatt, E.F. Scott, and Streeter. Cf. Easton, PE, pp. 30f; and T. Henshaw, NT Literature in the Light of Modern Scholarship, London, 1952, p. 321.

²Op. cit., p. 79.

³R. Heard, INT, London, 1950, p. 208: "As 1 and 2 Timothy are both quoted by Polycarp early in the second century, an early date for the Pastoral Epistles is certain...may well have been composed as early as A.D. 70-80." Cf. Mitton, Formation, p. 40.

⁴Streeter (p. 161) uses this Ignatian collection interestingly: "The existence of this demand for a collection of the letters of Ignatius is explicable only if the Pauline Corpus had familiarised that church with the idea of, and created the demand for, collected letters by Christian Saints."

'crisis letter', formed by chapters 1-12 (which, significantly, contain all the Pastoral allusions), belongs to the period of A.D. 135-40.¹ Among other motivations stated for this procedure, Harrison expresses the concern that no other writing shows such a degree of indebtedness to the NT at that early date. He asserts that "we should find ourselves in a quandary if challenged to substantiate by any positive proof - outside Polycarp's Epistle - that the Pastorals were in circulation as early as the last years of Trajan or the earliest years of Hadrian's reign."² But, it is questionable, whether Harrison should employ the literary technique of removing that evidence which does exist. Within the time considered, who else of the extant writers could even be queried concerning literary indebtedness?³ Moreover, this hypothesis is apparently constructed without due recognition of the ecclesiastical organization disclosed by the epistle; an organization which is completely incompatible with any mid second century dating. Goodspeed maintains that Harrison exaggerates the crisis atmosphere in the letter, "and loses sight of the important fact, that while Polycarp is familiar with the Pauline corpus, he shows no acquaintance with the Fourfold Gospel, a thing incredible in

¹P.N. Harrison, Polycarp, p. 241. Followers include: K. Lake, review of Harrison's work, JBL, LVI, pt I (1937), 72-75; J. Knox, Marcion, p. 176; and Quasten, p. 80.

²Harrison, Polycarp, p. 7.

³For discussion of the method of inquiry which seeks to remove difficulties by changing the dates of documents, see: W.M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 2nd ed, London, 1903, pp. 180, 190.

a Christian leader in Asia after A.D. 120."¹ Thus, it would appear, that Harrison's theory would only serve to create more problems than might have previously existed.²

Acts of Paul and Thecla. Composed in Greek (circ A.D. 160), and preserved only in a fragmentary Coptic translation, the Acta was written by a presbyter in Asia, who was deposed following his confession of guilt.³ It contains at least one close verbal parallel.

xiv. ἦν λέγει οὗτος ἀνά-
στασιν γενέσθαι ὅτι ἤδη γέγονεν
ἐφ' οἷς ἔχομεν τέκνοις.

II 2:18. λέγοντες ἀνά-
στασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι.

However, the Acts' true value for this present study rests not in any vocabulary allusions, but in the historical situation expressed. The historical details suggest that the Apostle was released from his Roman imprisonment recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and that he embarked upon subsequent travels.⁴

¹A History of Early Christian Literature, Chicago, 1942, p. 25.

²One of the difficulties is found in paragraph 9 which indicates that Ignatius is already martyred; while in paragraph 13, the expression 'de his qui cum eo sunt' might imply that he was still alive. Yet Lightfoot (The Apostolic Fathers, pt II, vol I, 2nd ed, London, 1889, p. 588) observes that "we have only to retranslate the Latin into its original language *περὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ* and the discrepancy vanishes, for all reference to present time disappears."

³See Tertullian de Bapt 17 for the earliest extant account of the circumstances of the Acts' composition, and subsequent deposition of the presbyter. Cf. A. Souter, The Text and Canon of the NT, 2nd ed rev C. Williams, 1954, p. 72. Text references: Acta Pauli et Theclae ed C. Tischendorf, Lipsiae, 1851.

⁴Cf. Goodspeed, INT, p. 331; and Bernard, PE, pp. xiiif.

Furthermore, the personalia of the Acta were undoubtedly dependent upon either II Timothy, or the accepted tradition. Paragraph one mentions Demas (II 4:9f) and Hermogenes (II 1:16f) as ὑποκρίσεως γέμοντες ; while paragraph two depicts Onesiphorus as seeking for Paul (II 1:16f). It is perhaps significant that the latter two names are hapax legomena of the Pastoral Epistles.¹

Syria

Ignatius. To Kirsopp Lake, the Epistles of Ignatius are pure "epistolary fiction";² yet to most scholars, they are the authentic expressions of thanksgiving and exhortation as recorded by the condemned Bishop of Antioch while traveling to a Roman martyrdom. The exact year of this death is uncertain, yet within the limits of A.D. 110-117 there is wide acceptance.³ As in the case of Polycarp, direct quotation of scripture is all but lacking in the Ignatian Epistles. This style is perhaps

¹Another Western witness, the Acts of Martyrdom of Polycarp (circ A.D. 155) may contain an allusion to the thought and language of the Pastorals in X.2 (cf. I 2:2; Tit 3:1).

²K. Lake (JBL, LVI (1937), 74) makes an exception of the Epistle of Ignatius to Rome since it is the only Ignatian Epistle quoted by Eusebius. Cf. E.W. Barnes, The Rise of Christianity, London, 1948, p. 264.

³Eusebius (H.E. III.xxii.1) asserts Ignatius to be the third bishop after Paul and Peter; and in his Chronicon he lists the martyrdom as being in Rome in the 10th year of Trajan (i.e. A.D. 108). A.C. Headlam ("The Dates of the NT Books", Criticism of the NT, St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902, p. 147) suggests a date of about A.D. 110; while A. Farrer (Rebirth of Images, Westminster, 1949, p. 23) asserts a date of about A.D. 115. Cf. H.P.V. Nunn, "The Epistles of Ignatius", EQ, xviii, no 4, (1946), pp. 262ff.

accountable either by the circumstances involved,¹ or possibly by Pfleiderer's explanation that Ignatius was of a mystical nature.² In spite of this peculiarity of style, these Epistles are not lacking in interesting parallels.³ To facilitate examination, the parallels are here divided into three categories: verses or passages; expressions or phrases; and echoes of style or content.

Expanded verses or passages.

<p>Magn VIII.1. Μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὖσιν. εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι.</p>	<p>I 1:3-5; Tit 1:14; cf., 3:9. μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ὑπεράνωτοις ...μὴ προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων.</p>
---	---

Here the verbal resemblance is in words that are not only Pastoral hapax legomena, but are similarly uncommon in early Christian literature as well.⁴

<p>Eph II.1. κατὰ πάντα με ἀνέπαυσεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναψύξει.</p>	<p>II 1:6. δὴ ἔλεος ὁ Κύριος τῷ Ὀνησιφόρου οἴκῳ, ὅτι πολλάκις με ἀνέψυξεν καὶ τὴν ἄλυσίν μου οὐκ ἐπαισχύνθη.</p>
--	--

Smyrn X.2. ἀ οὐχ ὑπερηφανήσατε οὐδὲ ἐπαισχύνθητε.

These two verses, when taken together, are of ^acertain interest. In Harrison's opinion, the Ephesian passage is one of two from Ignatius in which the literary connection is "too

¹So Nunn, ibid.

²Primitive Christianity, tran W. Montgomery, III, London, 1910, 371.

³St. George Stock (cited in "Notes on Recent Exposition", ET, XVIII, (1906-7), 241) asserts that the passages which recall the Pastorals are more frequent relatively than those recalling the other Pauline Epistles. For a comprehensive review of the parallels, see, Harrison, Polycarp, pp. 254ff.

⁴Oxford Society, p. 72: "It is also clear that if literary dependence be admitted, it is on the side of Ignatius."

striking to be dismissed as accidental." Since this parallel to the Pastoral Letters is with one of Harrison's accepted Pauline personalia, he postulates that Ignatius became acquainted with the fragment while in Smyrna on the way to Rome.² The following parallel is Harrison's other non "accidental" passage.

Pol VI. 1, 2. συγκοπιᾶτε ἀλλήλοις, συναθεῖτε, συντρέχετε, συμ-πάσχετε, συγκοιμάσθε, συνεγείρεσθε ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμοι καὶ πάρεδροι καὶ ὑπηρέται. ἀρέσχετε ὃ στρατεύεσθε, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὰ ὀψώνια κομίζεσθε.

II 2:3ff. συνκακοπάθησον ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματίαις, ἵνα τῷ στρατο-λογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλή τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ.

Although the comparison cannot be classified as a quotation, the concepts are sufficiently analogous to suggest a literary connection. Since in this instance, however, the passage is not paralleled with one of his accepted fragments, Harrison concludes that dependence is with the auctor ad Timotheum. It is his hypothesis, that the author avoided any explicit quotation because the martyrdom of Ignatius and his writings were "still fresh in the mind of every Christian in Ephesus and Smyrna."³ It need only be noted that this is pure conjecture and not proven fact.

Phrases or expressions of note.

Pol II.3. νῆφε, ὡς θεοῦ ἀθλητῆς τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, περὶ ἧς καὶ οὐ πέπεισαι.

II 4:5. νῆφε ἐν πᾶσιν.
II 2:5. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλή τις.
II 1:10. πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων.
II 1:12. πέπεισαι.

Pol III.1. ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦν-τες μὴ σε καταπλησέτωσαν.

I 1:3; 6:3. μὴ ἑτεροδίτασ-καλεῖν.

¹Harrison, Polycarp, pp. 244ff.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

Pol III.2. τὸν ἄορατον.

Pol IV.3. δούλους καὶ δούλας μὴ ὑπερηφάνει ἀλλὰ μηδὲ αὐτοὶ φυσιοῦσθωσαν, ἀλλ' εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πλέον δουλευέτωσαν.

Pol VI. 1. ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμοι.

Pol VI. 2. ἄρέσκατε ᾧ στρατεύσθε.

Pol VIII. 3. ἔτοιμοί ἐστε εἰς ἐνποιῖαν θεῷ ἀνήκουσαν.

Magn XI.1. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

Rom II.2. σπονδισθῆναι.

Rom VII. 3. σπέρματος Δαυείδ.

Rom VIII. 2. τὸ ἀψευδὲς στόμα, ἐν ᾧ ὁ πατὴρ ἐλάλησεν ἀληθῶς.

Rom IX. 2. ἀλλ' ἠλέημαι τις εἶναι ἐὰν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω.

Eph I. 1. ἀναζωπυρέω.

Eph X.3. ἐν πάσῃ ἀγνεΐᾳ.

Eph XIV. 1. τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη.

Eph XIV. 2, (cf., xvii.1). πῆστιν ἐπαγγελόμενος.

Eph XX. 1. οἰκονομία.

Phil II. 1. καλοδιδάσκαλος.

Tral III.2. κατάστημα.

Tral VII. 2. καθαρὸς ἐστὶν τῇ συνειδήσει.

Tral VIII. 1. πραῦπάθειαν.

Smyr IV. 2. αὐτοῦ με ἐνδυναμῶντος τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου.

I 1:17. ἄοράτω...θεῷ.

I 6:1f. Ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξιούσας ἠγγείσθωσαν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βκασφημῆται.

Tit 1:7 (cf., 1 C 4:1; 1 Pet 4:10) ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμου.

II 2:3f. ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης...στρατεύομενος.

Tit 3:1. (Cf., II 2:21) πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐτοιμοὺς εἶναι.

I 1:1. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

II 4:6. σπένδομαι.

II 2:8. σπέρματος Δαυείδ.

Tit 1:2. ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς.

I 1:13. ἀλλ' ἠλεήθην.

II 1:6 (cf., 1 Clem xxvii.3). ἀναζωπυρεῖν.

I 5:2. ἐν πάσῃ ἀγνεΐᾳ.

I 1:5. τὸ δὲ τέλος...ἀγάπη.

I 1:5; 3:6 (cf., R 7:23; 2 C 10:5). τῆς παραγγελίας...πίστεως.

I 1:4. οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ.

Tit 2:3. καλοδιδασκάλους.

Tit 2:3. καταστήματα.

II 1:3 (cf., 1 Clem xlv.7). καθαρᾶ συνειδήσει.

I 6:11. πραῦπαθειαν.

II 4:17 (cf., I 1:12; II 2:1). καὶ ἐνδυναμῶσεν με.

Echoes or Style or Content. The Pastorals' close intermingling of personal charges to the addressee, with admonitions, often of a delicate nature, directed to the congregation, is a feature also to be found in the Ignatian Epistle to Polycarp.¹ Instructions regarding the care of widows (IV.1 cf., I 5:3f), attitude of slaves (IV.3 cf., I 6:2), ministry of the presbyters and deacons (VI.1 cf., I 3:1f), and conduct of women (V.1 cf., Tit 2:4f) are all interspersed with exhortations for Polycarp to "flee evil arts" (V.1 cf., I 6:11).

Other noteworthy echoes: the admonition that the church, in spite of Polycarp's middle age, should not presume on his youth (Magn III.1 cf., I 4:12); and the exhortation that the church should give no occasion for reproach (Tral VIII.2 cf., I 5:14; 6:1).²

Finally, a most conspicuous phrase of Ignatius to the Ephesians must be observed: ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει (Paul) ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (XII.2). If the Pauline Corpus is minus the Ephesian and Pastoral Epistles, and if the meaning of 'every' is maintained for πᾶς without an article, then 1 Corinthians alone remains which contains a reference to the Ephesians. On the other hand, if the Pastorals were a part of the Pauline Corpus known to Ignatius, then "we might accept Ignatius' statement as an excusable exaggeration, arising from a desire to compliment the Ephesian Church, and from a superficial acquaintance with Paul's letters."³ Because of a

¹So, White, p. 78.

²Cf. also: Rom II.2, cf. II 4:6; Magn XI.1, cf. I 1:1; Poly II, cf., II 2:25; Eph XVIII.2, cf., II 2:8.

³Mitton, Formation of the Pauline Corpus, pp. 41ff.

similar observation, Streeter concluded that the Ignatian collection incorporated the Pastoral Letters.¹ On the other hand, at least two hypotheses have been constructed to counter the necessity of such a conclusion: the aforementioned theory of Harrison that the genuine fragments to Timothy were shown to Ignatius while at Smyrna; and Goodspeed's postulation that the Pauline Corpus was collected and edited at Ephesus, and that by his statement, Ignatius was only recognizing that in a sense each letter was a reminder of this Ephesian service.² It is certainly questionable whether the words of Ignatius would bear either postulation. Perhaps it is best to recognize that the phrase is obscure, and that it can most satisfactorily be dealt with only when included in the other interesting parallels offered with the Pastorals.

It is the judgment of Gealy that the aforementioned points of contact are "generally too vague and uncertain to merit confidence in any theory of literary dependence."³ Yet, it is significant that the independent witness of the Oxford Society concluded that "the reminiscences of II Timothy, as of I Timothy, are tolerably clear...Both Epistles are nearly in Class B."⁴

¹Streeter, note, p. 102.

²Goodspeed, The Formation of the NT, pp. 28f. Yet, Harrison (Polycarp, p. 249) questions whether the words of Ignatius will bear this interpretation.

³Op. cit., p. 369. Weiss, INT, p. 50: "We are reminded of the Pastoral Epistles by a number of expressions...but a certain application of any particular passage cannot be proved." Cf. Moffatt, INT, p. 418.

⁴Op. cit., p. 73. In this work, the mark of 'B' was awarded by the committee if the proof of dependence is less than conclusive, yet highly probable. Thus this committee felt a strong affinity between the Ignatian writings and the Pastorals. It is noteworthy that in these ratings, only 1 Cor and Eph were accorded higher grades than the Pastorals.

Theophilus. While writing an apologetic treatise (circ A.D. 180) on Christianity to a learned heathen named Autolytus, this Bishop of Antioch¹ not only quotes the Pastorals, but speaks of them as proceeding from the θεῖος λόγος.

III.14. ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις καὶ εὐχεσθαι ὑπερ' αὐτῶν κελεύει ἡμᾶς ὁ θεῖος λόγος ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.

Tit 3:1 . . . ὑπομίμησθε αὐτοὺς ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι.

I 2:1f. ἵνα ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.

In view of this pronouncement, the following examples are unmistakable in their resemblance and can "hardly have been accidental."²

II.16. ὅπως ἦ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ καλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

Tit 3:5. διὰ λουτροῦ καλιγγενεσίας.

I 2:4. εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν.

I.1. φράσις εὐεπῆς τέρψιν παρέχει . . . ἀνθρώποις ἔχουσι τὸν νοῦν κατεφθαρμένον.

II 3:8. οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωπος κατεφθαρμένος τὸν νοῦν, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν.

Thus, by A.D. 180, both Western and Eastern writers accepted the Pastorals among the authentic, inspired writings.

NORTH AFRICAN WRITERS

Tertullian. At least three factors make the witness of this first Latin Father (A.D. 160-240) of interest. (1) Since Christianity was late in being adopted in North Africa, Tertullian therefore inherited an accepted ecclesiastical dialect

¹Eusebius (H.E. IV.xx) lists Theophilus as the sixth in succession from the Apostles. Cf. H.E. IV xxiv.

²Lightfoot, Supernatural Religion, p. 44.

and literature. (2) It is clear from his writings that a Latin Version of the Pastorals was current, and sufficiently authorized by general use, to form the basis for theological disputation in the country.¹ (3) Tertullian gives indication that his adversaries employed this Scripture as proof-texts in debate.²

Only one passage is necessary to illustrate Tertullian's unreserved acceptance and employment of the Pastorals.

De Praes xxv. quia et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: O Timothee, depositum custodi; et rursum: Bonum depositum serva.³

I 6:20. Ὁ Τιμόθεε, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον.
II 1:14. τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον.

From this point in the chapter, the author proceeds to quote directly from I 1:18; 6:13; and II 2:2. Thus from the earliest of the Latin Fathers, comes testimony of literary indebtedness to the Pastorals.

Clement. The witness of Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 165-220) is important because it conveys the traditions of one of the principal centres of Christendom - Egypt. Here the beliefs of East and West were fused by a school which was devoted to the

¹So B.F. Westcott, A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the NT, 7th ed, London, 1896, p. 258. Cf. H.F.D. Sparks, "The Latin Bible", The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions, ed H.W. Robinson, Oxford, 1940, p. 108.

²A. Harnack, Origin of the NT, tran J.R. Wilkinson, London, 1925, pp. 197f: "The community already treat the NT just in the same way as Tertullian himself, that is, they have the same ideas about the book and therefore apply the same method of interpretation to, and make the same demands upon the book as he. Thus they required that for each regulation in Christian Discipline, a text of Scripture must be in existence..."

³Text: Tertulliani, Quinti Septimii Florentis. De Praescriptione Haereticorum. ed. T.H. Bindley, Oxford, 1893,

study of the Scriptures and served as the depository of truth "derived from their ancestors and the Apostles."¹ Since by his own testimony he had studied in Greece, Italy, Syria, Assyria, and Palestine (prior to his instruction under Pantaeus),² Clement would thus be familiar with the breadth of the Church tradition.

Two examples are adequate to show how Clement makes direct mention of both the author and recipients of the Pastorals.³

Strom I.xiv. τὸν δὲ ἑβδομον οἱ μὲν...οἱ δὲ Ἐπιμενίδην τὸν Κρήτα...οὐ μέμνηται ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τίτον Ἐπιστολῇ λέγων οὕτως...Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται κατὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί καὶ ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής.

Tit 1:12. εἶπεν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κατὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί. ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής.

Strom II.xi. περὶ ἧς ὁ Ἀπόστολος γράφων, ὡς Τιμόθεε, φήσιν τὴν παρα (κατα) θήκην.

I 6:20f. Ὡς Τιμόθεε τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον.

GRECIAN WRITER

Athenagoras. In an appeal to the Emperor regarding the unjust persecution of Christians,⁴ this obscure Athenian apologist closes his writing appropriately with the phraseology of

¹Strom I.i. Cf. Eusebius, H.E. V. xi.

²Pantaeus may have been instructed by the disciples of the Apostles, Cf. Eusebius, H.E. V. x.

³Cf. II, cf. I 1:18f; III, cf. I 4:1,3; IV, cf. II 1:7f; Tit 1:16; 2:3ff. Note that in each instance the writer is quoting Paul as addressing Timothy or Titus.

⁴Athenagoras addresses his petition to Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus; hence a circulation date of about A.D. 176 is agreed upon.

I Timothy 2:2.

Legatio 37. τοῦτο δ' ἔστι καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν ὅπως ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διαάγωμεν.

I 2:2. καὶ πάντων... ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διαάγωμεν.

In the following parallel Athenagoras uses two similarly employed words found in I 6:15f. It should be noted that although ἀπρόσιτος is used by Philo and Plutarch, in the NT, it is a Pastorals' hapax legomenon.

Legatio 16. πάντα γὰρ ὁ θεός ἔστιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ φῶς ἀπρόσιτον.

I 6:15f. καὶ κύριος...ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπρόσιτον.

If this evidence can be accepted, and in Knowling's judgment it "can scarcely be doubted,"¹ the Timothean Epistle was employed in Athens by A.D. 176.

ANONYMOUS WRITERS

Barnabas. What with the writer's habit of allegorizing the OT, his handling the NT in a "free and glossing way,"² and the doubtful date of the document,³ any appraisal of dependence is difficult. The following comparisons are not uninteresting, however.

V.9. τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους...ὄντας ὑπὲρ πάσαν ἀμαρτίαν ἀνομιωτέροθς ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοὺς.

I 1:15f. Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ...ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρῶτῳ ἐνδείξῃται Ἰ. Χ τὴν...

¹Knowling, Testimony, p. 127. Cf. C.R. Gregory, Canon and Text of the NT, Edinburgh, 1907, p. 210.

²Oxford Society, p. 3.

³Ibid: "...it is most probable that the epistle was written under Vespasian (iv.4f), within a very few years of the destruction of the Jewish Temple." Streeter (p. 238) would set the date anywhere between A.D. 70 and A.D. 132. Cf. A.C. Headlam, "The Dates of the NT Books", p.147. Lightfoot suggests a date before A.D. 79; while Gebhardt and Harnack suggest about A.D. 120.

The concept herein expressed of Christ's grace being manifest in the choice of the Apostles is so bold an idea as to suggest that Timothy "prompted Barnabas' thought."¹

VII.2 εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν.

II 4:1. ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

This parallel, however, would appear to be a common formula of faith (cf., 1 Pet 4:5; Acts 10:24; Poly ad Phil II.1; II Clem I.1).

V.6 αὐτὸς δὲ ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ - ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι ὑπέμεινεν.

II 1:10 (cf., I 3:16). φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον φανίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ...ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί.

Even though the phrase ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθῆναι, as it applies to the manifestation (ἐπιφάνεια) of Christ, was used frequently (cf., VI.7,9,14; XII.10; XIV.5), the conjunction of these two ideas, similarly combined in II 1:10, is of significance.²

XIV.5. ὅς εἰς τοῦτο ἡτοιμάσθη, ἵνα αὐτὸς φανείῃ, τὰς ἤδη δεδαπανημένας ἡμῶν καρδίας...λυτρωσάμενος...λυτρωσάμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ σκότους ἐτοιμάσαι ἑαυτῷ λαὸν ἅγιον.

Tit 2:14. ὅς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθάρσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων.

This linguistic resemblance and the concept of Christ redeeming a prepared people is so striking that to B. Weiss, the other reminiscences must also be allowed to show literary dependence.³ Yet, it must be noted that many scholars believe

¹Oxford Society, p. 12. Moffatt (INT, p. 417) would list this as a "striking parallel."

²See Oxford Society (p. 13) for discussion of the hold such a phrase had in the later Apostolic age.

³INT, p. 49. Cf. Gregory, p. 210.

that the Pauline echoes are too general for determination, and would agree with Holtzmann that the parallels which occur are generally in early stereotyped doctrinal phrases.¹

Apostolic Constitutions. The judgment of Harnack regarding these fragments is worthy of verbatim transcription.

At the first glance our documents appear as a speaking supplement for the justice of the well-known sentence of the Muratorian Fragment regarding the pastoral epistles: 'in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt.' The pastoral epistles, especially the first Epistle to Timothy, appear to have formed the basis for the canon law definitions of our author. We possess from the oldest times no other documents in which the service, which the pastoral epistles have afforded to the settlement of ecclesiastical order and discipline, appears to come out as plainly as here. The Apostolic Canons which, as far as I know, have not yet been used for the history of the pastoral epistles, thus prove themselves a very important monument with regard to the early history of the New Testament Canon. But does a use of the epistles of Timothy really occur here? The question is not, in my opinion, a simple one. That a literary connection exists is without doubt; but do our documents presuppose the pastoral epistles in their present form, and is it really to be made out whether the priority should be given to them or to A and B?...If we were sure that the pastoral epistles are in every point of view integral and original pieces of writing we could rest satisfied in spite of everything (that will have to be conceded) with the opinion that they had been read and taken advantage of by the authors of our documents.²

In his Chronologie Harnack would add that "manches spricht dafür, dass beide aus einer gemeinsamen Quelle den ihnen ge-

¹So, Bernard, PE, p. xix; and Moffatt, INT, p. 417. Other parallels of note: I. 3,4,6, cf. Tit 3:5f; XII, cf. I 3:14,16; XIX, cf. I 5:17.

²A. Harnack, Sources of the Apostolic Canons, tran L.A. Wheatley, London, 1895, pp. 48ff. On page 52, Harnack discusses the assorted dates, ranging anywhere within the second century, which have been conjectured for these fragments.

meinsamen Stoff entnommen haben; doch ist jene Annahme vielleicht doch die einfachere."¹

To Lock, however, the more probable view is that "the Apostolic Constitutions give a later and fuller adaptation of I Timothy."² Assuredly, the fourteen instances of verbal parallels and similarity as to subject matter brought together by Harnack should be consulted. It is sufficient for this investigation to observe the close similarity of instruction to the *διάκονοι* (par 4, cf., I 3:8f; par 6, cf., I 3:13); *ἐπισκοποὶ* (par 1, cf., I 3:2f); and to the *χῆραι* (par 5, cf., I 3:8; 5:15).³

VERSIONS AND CANONS

By the middle of the second century, two primitive versions were circulated which included the Pastorals - the Old Syriac (basis for the fifth century Peshitta)⁴, and the Old Latin.⁵ Representing as they did, the verdict of the Eastern and Western Church, the inclusion of the Pastoral Epistles implies not only

¹Chronologie I, note, 483. See pages 483f for parallels between the Canons, and the PE.

²"First Epistle to Timothy", HDB, III, Edinburgh, 1900, 772_a.

³Cf. also: 2, cf. I 2:11; 8, cf. I 2:12; 4, I 3:3; 5 cf. I 5:10; 2, I 5:20; 5, cf. I 6:17f; 3, cf. II 4:5.

⁴T.H. Robinson, "The Syriac Bible", The Bible in Its Ancient and English Versions, ed H.W. Robinson, Oxford, 1940, p. 90: "There are grounds for suspecting that the Gospels were translated into Syriac during the first half of the second century, and the Acts and Epistles cannot have been neglected much longer." Cf. J.P. Lilley, PE, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 5; and Spicq, p. c.

⁵A Latin version was discussed previously in connection with the writings of Tertullian and the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons. Cf. Sparks, "The Latin Bible", p. 108.

an acceptance of the Epistles' claim to apostolicity, but also an adequate period of time to become so established. There is, therefore, in these versions, a sure terminus ad quem which would appear to militate against any mid-second century hypothesis for the dating of the Epistles.

With the birth of the canon concept and its resultant determinatives of apostolicity, universality, and conformity of contents,¹ it is noteworthy that the only hint of controversy regarding the Epistles of Timothy and Titus is concerning their private character. Thus, although the Muratorian Fragment declares against the admission of the Shepherd of Hermas, it voices a special plea for the inerrant right of the four personal Epistles attributed to Paul to be included in the canon.

...ueru ad filemonem una'
 et at titu una et ad tymotheu duas pro affec
 to et dilectione In honore tamen ecclesiae ca
 tholice In ordinatione ecclesiastice
 de(i)cepline scificate sunt Fertur etiam ad
 Laudencenses alia ad alexandrinas Pauli no
 mine fincte ad heresem marcionis et alia plu
 ra quae In chatholicam ecclesiam recepi non
 potest Fel enim cum melle misceri non con
 cruit...²

Traces of this same controversy might be perceptible in

¹For discussion of canonicity criteria, see: W. Sanday, Inspiration, London, 1894, pp. 47-55; Jülicher, INT, pp. 503-13; A. Harnack, The Origin of the NT, esp pp. 49-54. Goodspeed's theory (Formation of the NT, p. 22) that the original Pauline Corpus was the perfect number seven, and was only later changed to thirteen to compete with Plato's collection, is too fanciful for wide acceptance. Cf. Zunst, pp. 276-9.

²Text by S.P. Tregellis, Canon Muratorianus, Oxford, 1867, pp. 19f, Fol. 1b, iia. This crude Latin translation of a late second century Greek original is so named for the discoverer and publisher, L.A. Muratori (circ A.D. 1740). The fragment, authoritative in tone, recognized the entire NT except Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, James and 3 John.

the Epistles' omission (or loss?) from the Chester Beatty (P46) papyrus (circ A.A. 200). Harrison,¹ following the investigations of Sir Frederic Kenyon², concludes that the missing seven leaves of the manuscript are inadequate for the inclusion of the Pastorals - a factor which might be used to discredit the Epistles' claim to apostolicity. Jeremias, however, counters that the scribe may have been mistaken regarding the size of his task, and that a need for additional leaves could well have arisen.³ Even if it could be shown that the original papyrus omitted the Pastorals, the determination as to cause is impossible. The similar absence of Philemon might well indicate their exclusion on the basis of their private character. Yet, if somehow the Pastorals were not included within the missing leaves, what writings occupied their place? In the absence of facts, it is precarious to be dogmatic on causative factors.

While commenting upon Philemon, Tertullian alluded to the personal nature of the Pastorals as a possible explanation for their omission from Marcion's earlier canon. Thus, Tertullian thought it to be a 'strange' (miror) or perhaps even 'new' phase of Marcion's teaching to have omitted the two letters to Timothy and Titus but to retain Philemon.

¹Review of "Saint Paul, Les Épîtres Pastorales, par Le Père C. Spicq," JTS, XLIX (1948), 205.

²G. Frederic Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasciculus III, London, 1936, esp pp. xff.

³Jeremias, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, 6th ed rev, Göttingen, 1953, p. 4. Zuntz (pp. 18f) apparently concurs when he describes the manuscript as "by no means a good manuscript. The scribe committed very many blunders...My impression is that he was liable to fits of exhaustion...the omission of whole clauses owing to homoioteleuton is an outstanding characteristic...Faulty additions, though more rare, do occur."

Soli huic epistolae breuitas sua profuit, ut falsarias manus Marcionis euaderet. miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusauerit. adfectauit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare.¹

Through these oftquoted words of Tertullian, Marcion becomes an unwilling, yet positive, witness to the acceptance and not rejection of the Epistles within the contemporary, orthodox ecclesiastical circles. "The matter of importance," observes E.K. Simpson, "is that these awards were deemed subjective eccentricities by the church catholic."² Harnack, on the other hand, observes that Tertullian was merely reacting in accordance with the accepted theology of his time, and not that of Marcion. "Die Privatschreiben des Paulus im Kanon," he states, "waren zu Tert.s Zeit und auch später noch ein Problem, und er da hörte, dass irgend wo die Pastoralbriefe verworfen werden, der musste sofort auf den Gedanken kommen, das sei geschehen, weil sie nicht an Gemeinden gerichtet seien."³ The inclusion of Philemon in the heretic's canon would appear to argue against the Pastorals' rejection because of their private character. Yet it must be remembered that Philemon was inseparably joined to the Colossian letter.

¹Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani, *Adversus Marcionem* V.xxi, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, xlvi, ed A. Kroymann, 1906. Scholars who regard the private character of the Pastorals as the reason for their exclusion, include: Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 19; Bernard, *PE*, p. xviii; and R.D. Shaw, *The Pauline Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1903, p. 432.

²*PE*, p. 4. Cf. White, pp. 76f.

³A. Harnack, *Marcion: das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott*, Leipzig, 1921, pp. 151f.

Many other conjectures have been made to account for Marcion's attitude. B.W. Bacon believed Marcion rejected them because they were "on the whole falsely purporting to come from Paul."¹ while E.F. Scott questions similarly that Marcion could "have passed them over if they were already accepted by the whole Church as the undoubted work of Paul."² Some scholars postulate that Marcion did not reject the Epistles, but that his canon simply did not contain them. For C.H. Turner, who retains the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, the cause of omission was due to their private character and therefore later acceptance by the Church;³ while Easton conjectures a later dating for the Epistles, and thus they were not included in the canon of Marcion's youth.⁴ Yet these explanations would appear unsatisfactory in view of the Epistle's probable use by Polycarp, and their apparent admission to Version status within the lifetime of Marcion. "Dass Marcion die Pastoralbriefe im kirchlichen Gebrauch vorgefunden," states Zahn, "galt als ausgemacht,"⁵

The majority of critics would agree with Lightfoot that

¹INT, New York, 1902, pp. 127f. Cf. Kruger, p. 79.

²PE, p. xvi. Yet, Spicq (p. c) contends that "on sait que Marcion a rejeté ces Epîtres du canon du Nouveau Testament, sans toutefois mettre en question leur origine apostolique.

³The Study of the NT 1883 and 1920, Oxford, 1920, p. 21.

⁴PE, p. 32. Alfred Loisy (The Origins of the NT, London, 1950, p. 273) contends that the "first draft of the Epistles may be contemporary with the outburst of Marcionism." For discussion of this phase of the problem, see, *Infra*, ch. 5.

⁵T. Zahn, Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons, I Erlangen, 1889, 226. Cf. Lock, PE, p. xxii.

the language of the Pastorals "did not square with their (the heretics') favourite tenets," and were therefore excluded.¹ Although it is true that the Pastorals' content would prove irksome to the heretic, it is difficult to see why Marcion would not have just as unhesitatingly expurgated those portions from the Letters proving undesirable to his tenets, as he did elsewhere in his canon.² Blackman might well be correct in his observation that since Marcion was founder "of a church with a definite organization and a missionary programme," no part of the Pastorals would be acceptable to him.³

It would appear to be more advantageous to recognize the difficulty involved in attempting to decipher Marcion's attitude; and to conclude with Westcott that "it is unsatisfactory to conjecture where history is silent. And the mere fact that Marcion did not recognize the Epistles cannot be used as an argument against their Pauline origin, so long as the grounds of his decision are unknown."⁴ That the early heretic fails to

¹Supernatural Religion, p. 273. So Fairbairn, Godet, Knowling, Lilley, Sanday, Salmon, et al.

²So A.S. Peake, A Critical Introduction to the NT, London, 1909, p. 61; Mitton, Formation, pp. 38f; and Easton, PE, p. 32.

³E.C. Blackman, Marcion and His Influence, London, 1948, p. ix. Cf. Moffatt, INT, p. 419f.

⁴Canon, p. 285. Plummer (pp. 10f) indicates the complexity of the silence of Marcion if a second century date for the Pastorals is insisted upon. "If this had been so," he states, "would Marcion, with his intimate knowledge of St. Paul's writings, have been in ignorance of the fact; and if he had known it, would he have failed to denounce the forgery? Or again, if we assume that he merely treated this group of Epistles with silent contempt, would not his rejection of them, which was well-known, have directed attention to them, and caused their recent origin to be quickly discovered? From all which it is manifest that the theory of forgery by no means frees us from grave obstacles."

express himself in explicit prohibition is evident by his followers' later use of the Epistles in question.¹ The words of Jerome in his Prologus Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Titum are an appropriate conclusion to this discussion of Marcion.

Et siquidem redderent causas, cur eas Apostoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid respondere, et foristan satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero cum haeretica auctoritate pronuntient et dicant: Illa epistola Pauli est, haec non est; ea auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescunt falso simulare.²

The Christian centuries between the third and nineteenth found the Pastoral Epistles universally accepted and revered in the canon of the Church. As seen by the extant manuscripts,³ canon lists,⁴ and patristic witnesses,⁵ the authenticity of the Pastorals remained unchallenged by the Church, whether it be

¹ According to Jerome's Prol to Titus, Tatian regarded Titus at least, as genuine. Harnack (Marcion, p. 140) argues that, although the 'Marcionite Prologues' are later in the case of the Pastorals than the other prefaces, they are nevertheless Marcionite. Cf. Souter, Canon, p. 71; and D. Theron, Evidence of Tradition, London, 1957, pp. 82f.

² Guthrie, PE, p. 14: "Marcion's lone voice, biased as it undoubtedly was, must not be allowed to outweigh the strong attestation from orthodox early Christian writers."

³ Cf. Alford, pp. 116-126; White, pp. 86ff; and Spicq, pp. cc-cviii, for a complete list of manuscripts and lectionaries containing the Pastorals. E.g. Alexandrinus, Ephraem, Sinaiticus, and Vaticanus manuscripts.

⁴ Cf. Westcott, Canon, pp. 548ff; and Goodspeed, Formation of the NT, pp. 191-203, for complete accounting of lists including the Pastorals.

⁵ For discussion of the unbroken usage of the Pastorals by the Church Fathers, see, C.H. Turner, "Patristic Commentaries", HDB, ex vol, 1904, 489a-530b. For an annotated bibliography of this witness, see, Spicq, pp. iii-viii.

the Eastern, Latin, African, or Syrian.¹ This evidence may be dismissed on the presumption that the Church during this span was blissfully uncritical,² and that these Epistles remained unstudied;³ but such unquestioning support to their claim is significant.

Although many of the parallels cited in this study of the Pastorals in Ancient Literature may be quite incidental, the mass of external evidence vindicating the Pastoral Epistles' claim to authenticity is so very strong that there must be an accounting for it. The failure of the early Church to quote explicitly from the Epistles until after the middle of the century is entirely in accordance with its attitude toward the NT writings as a whole. It is remarkable that even though the Epistles are personal in nature, only I Corinthians and Romans were given any higher rating of literary dependence by the Apostolic Fathers in the considered judgment of the six competent scholars forming the Oxford Society Committee.

Moreover, although Jerome and Tertullian intimate an earlier discussion regarding the private character of the Pastorals, it is a tacit argument for the Traditionalists that at no time was there any debate or comment by the early Greek critics which regarded the Epistles as unPauline in style (as in the case of Hebrews), of their inerrant right to canonical status, nor was any

¹Cf. Jülicher, INT, pp. 534f.

²Discussions regarding James, Hebrews, and the Johannine Epistles would disprove this thought.

³A glance at the list of early commentaries would be adequate to dispel any doubts.

other author ever suggested. Furthermore, with their acknowledged use by Polycarp, universal acceptance by A.D. 180, and Version status by mid-second century, any date within the second century for the writing of the Pastorals would appear to be out of the question. The external evidence seemingly carries the authorship back into the first century when any mistake as to authorship is unlikely.

Co-incidences in thought, language, and tone between the Apostolic Fathers and the Pastoral Letters must be explained. To attribute any parallels merely to common atmosphere fails to account for the creation of the atmosphere. If, as has been suggested, the author of the Pastorals was dependent upon Ignatius and not vice versa, is the conception of such phraseology to be attributed to Ignatius? A study of Ignatius would hardly warrant this conclusion. The power of originality should be accorded to the writing whose apostolicity is in question. Moffatt, maintaining the fragmentary position suggests that when compared with sub-Apostolic writings, it is difficult to "resist the idea which returns upon one with almost every sentence that... the Pastorals are astonishingly superior."¹

The remainder of this thesis will seek to determine whether the internal evidence vindicates the declaration of the Muratorian Fragment that the Pastorals were and are "to be in honor with the Catholic Church for the ordering of the ecclesiastical mode of life" or whether "gall" did, after all, get mixed in with "honey".

¹The Historical NT, 2nd ed, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 556. Cf. Godet, INT, pp. 599f; and H.P.V. Nunn, "The Shepherd of Hermas", EQ, XVIII (1946), 121f.

ANCIENT LITERATURE IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

The facts as disclosed in the foregoing section intimate that these Epistles were regarded as canonical from the time when 'canonical' first began to have a meaning. It is the purpose of this section to examine the Epistles internally, and to inquire of their relationship to non-canonical works antedating them, and with the canonical Scriptures. That such an investigation is essential, is seen from the observation of Lightfoot. "An important criterion of date in the case of an unknown author," he states, "may in many cases be found in his quotations or plagiarisms and generally in his literary obligations, whether acknowledged or not, to those who have gone before him."¹ It is well to apply this diagnostic to the Pastorals.

NON-CANONICAL SOURCES

Hellenistic Literature

Epimenides. In Tit 1:12, the author supports his argument concerning the sinful condition of man by quoting the following hexameter verse: *κρητες εσι ψευδοι, κακα θηρια, γαστερες αργαι*. Whether or not the lines quoted are from Epimenides, a sixth century poet, revered by the Cretans, or by Callimachus (B.C. 270), is the subject of much discussion. Because the verse is in Attic, rather than Cretan dialect, Lock questions the correctness of its attribution to the venerated Cretan.² Simpson, however,

¹Apostolic Fathers, pt II, vol I, 402. Cf. James, p. 125.

²PE, pp. 134f. Cf. E.F. Scott, PE, pp. 159f; and A.R. Gordon, "Quotations", HDAC, II, 294.

has shown that many "Homeric verses are cast in the same mould"¹; and the testimony of classical and patristic writers is in accord with its Epimenidian source.² The importance of the quotation to the exegete consists in the facts that the author attributed the verse to Epimenides as a prophet; that the Greek quotation assumes a comparable role in this Cretan addressed letter as the OT did for Paul when addressing Jews; and that the Pastoral-Paul is perhaps citing the same passage as the Lucan-Paul in his Areopagean address.³ This subtly skillful application of their prophet's⁴ own words is certainly worthy of the Paul who alone brought classical poetry into Christ's service.⁵ Certainly if

¹Op. cit., p. 99.

²Cf. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. I.lix.2; Jerome, ad loc.

³J.R. Harris, "The Cretans Always Liars", Exp., series 7, II, (1906), 305-317; "A Further Note on the Cretans", series 7, III (1907), 332-337; "St. Paul and Epimenides", series 8, IV (1912), 348-353), presents adequate evidence to show that it was not habitual vituperation that is alluded to; but the Cretan's claim that the father god Zeus was mortal and that his tomb could be seen in Crete. The author further shows that the reference to bestial gluttony was due to the fact that they ate their god raw in the form of a sacred animal. The pertinency to our discussion is in the fact, that Harris is able to show that our text is from the same Epimenidian poem about Minos found in Acts 17:28; a conclusion drawn from the work of Ishodad, the Nestorian church father. By slight changes Harris has restored the hexameter verse to a suggested original form. For acceptance of the theory see: K. Lake, "Your Own Poets", The Beginnings of Christianity, pt I, vol V, ed Lake-Cadbury, London, 1933, 250f. Cf. F.F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, London, 1951, pp. 335ff.

⁴E.F. Scott, PE, p. 159: "Whether he considered this wise heathen to have been divinely inspired is beside the point. He merely says, 'Here was a man whom the Cretans themselves regarded as a prophet'." J.A. M'Clymont (p. 196) observes that the "word 'prophet' in this passage is compared with 'poet' in the quotation reported in the Book of Acts, is against the supposition of imitation." Cf. N.B. Stonehouse, The Areopagus Address, London, 1949, pp. 32-37.

⁵Cf. A.R. Gordon, p. 294; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, Nashville, 1950, pp. 75f.

the 'popular-tag' from Menander (1 C 15:33) is permitted to stand as an example of Pauline utilization of the Greek Poets, then there appears no reason to deny the Epimenidian inclusion in Titus. An extensive knowledge of the literature is not demanded; oral transmission through the popular Hellenistic rhetoricians is sufficient to account for these pithy lines.¹

Proverbs. I 6:7-10 has been described as "a Stoic commonplace" and "the very essence of Stoicism."² This recognition, however, ought not to be employed as an argument against their authenticity; for examples of Stoic resemblances in style and concept are evidenced throughout the writings of Paul.³ Furthermore, although Stoic parallels to the ideas expressed regarding wealth may be cited,⁴ and even though it is conceivable that by the time of writing, the words may have received a proverbial status, yet it must be acknowledged that the principles expressed were held in common with all late Greek philosophy, Rabbinic and Scripture writers as well. Verse 6 has transformed the Stoic philosophy of contentment, from that of self-mastery, to the oft-

¹Cf. Deismann, Paul, p. 78. Cf. Spicq, p. 242; and C. Clemen, Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources, tran R.G. Nisbet, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 50.

²Easton, PE, pp. 164f. Cf. Dibelius, Pastoralbriefe, pp. 52f.

³So J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, London, 1935, Cf.R 2-3; 9-11; and Phil 4.

⁴For references, see Lock, PE, p. 69; and Simpson, pp. 85f.

discussed opinion in Jewish literature of contentedness in God.¹ If this concept of the unimportance of wealth is regarded as peculiarly Hellenistic, it must also be recognized as reflecting the teaching of Christ (cf. Mt 10:5ff; 6:25-33). Moreover, Seneca, a Roman Stoic contemporary of Paul's (Ep cii, 24-25), and the Mishnah,² have expressed the sentiments of verses 7 and 8 - viewpoints earlier disclosed in Ec 5:15 and Job 1:21. Verse 10 also has many classical allusions,³ and from all appearances may have been a well-known maxim; but again, the idea is found to be held in common with both heathen and Jewish moralists.⁴

Since there is no method of final determination, Titus 1:15 may also be regarded as a proverb. Its source, however, could well have been Christ's own words (Mk 7:15; cf. Lu 11:41), with such subsequent application by Paul (I C 6:12; 18:9; 10:23; R 14:20) and the early Christians, that the maxim became utilized by them "when challenged by Jewish Christians or Jews with demands for ritual purity."⁵

Thus, in the two allusions to Hellenistic literature, there is found nothing contrary to that which is explicitly taught in Scripture and which therefore might be expected in a Pauline epistle.

¹Cf. Phil 4:11; Prov 13:11; R. St. John Parry, PE, Cambridge, 1920, p. 39. For contention that verse 8 is a quotation from the Hebrew text of Ec 5:15, see Simpson, p. 85. For the early Rabbinic attitude, see, I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Cambridge, 1st series, 1917, ch 14. Cf. Pirke Aboth 4.3; 6.4,9.

²e.g. Pirke Aboth 6.4,9. Cf. Test of 12 Patr. Judah c. 19.

³For references see Simpson, p. 86.

⁴For references see R. Falconer, PE, Oxford, 1937, p. 154.

⁵Ibid., p. 106. For a comparison with Philo and Seneca, see, Lock, PE, p. 135.

Jewish Literature

Palestinian Apocryphal Literature. Jannes and Mambres.

In a passage dealing with the evil-doers who will arise in the last days (II 3:8), the author alludes to two legendary Egyptian magicians, who, although imitating the feats performed by Moses and Aaron, were eventually defeated (Ex 7:9-8:7). Ἰαννης καὶ Ἰαμβρη¹ became the subjects for so many tales that it is perhaps impossible to determine whether, with Origen, there was such a book,² or, with Theodoret, the names came ἐκ τῆς ἀγγραφῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων διδασκαλίας.³ Since little more than their names is incorporated in both Jewish and heathen writings,⁴ it may be that Thackeray is correct in his attribution of the borrowing to Haggadic influence rather than to an apocryphal book of that name.⁵ It is pertinent to observe that such illustrative use of Rabbinic legendary interpretations of Scripture, devoid as it is of any emphasis upon historical validity, is in keeping with the Paul who incorporated the rock (1 C 10:4), the allegorical inter-

¹So the prevailing Western Greek text. Cf. Talmud: יַנְנֵס וְיַמְבְּרֵס ; and Latin: Jannes (or Jamnes) et Mambres.

²Matt 117 (Migne): "qui suprascribitur Jannes et Mambres liber." Cf. E. Schürer, History of the Jewish People, in the Time of Jesus Christ, tran P. Christie and S. Taylor, II, iii, Edinburgh, 1886, 149f; and Gordon, p. 295.

³Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni, ad loc, Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii, ed H.B. Swete, II, Cambridge, 1882. Cf. H. St. John Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, London, 1900, pp. 215-222.

⁴Cf. Men 85a, SBT, p. 513; also Sotah 11a; San 106a; Pliny, Historia Naturalis, xxxi.11; Eusebius, Praep. Evangelica, ix.8. For late Christian allusions, see Thackeray, p. 219; cf. Apost. Const. viii.1. For discussion, see K. Kohler, "Jannes and Jambres," SJE, VII, 1904, 71; and J.T. Marshall, "Jannes and Jambres," HDB, II, pp. 548b-549a.

⁵Op. cit., p. 221. Cf. E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the OT, Edinburgh, 1957, p. 55.

pretation of Isaac and Ishmael (Gal 4:21-31), and as will be seen later, legends regarding the fall of man, into his writings.

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. There are, seemingly, no direct quotations from the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Jewish literature to be discovered within the Pastorals. The breadth of the Pastorals' vocabulary, however, is disclosed when Harrison's second century A.D. parallels are compared with those uncovered in 2nd and 4th Maccabees.¹ An impressive Wortschatz peculiar to both the Maccabean literature in the LXX, and to the Pastorals in the NT are set forth by these writers. Direct comparisons in phraseology with the Apocrypha are limited, yet, see: βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων (I 1:17; 6:15);² for I 6:19 compare Tobit 4:9;³ for I 6:6 compare Tobit 4:21;⁴ while Charles suggests that the form of address "my child Timothy" has a recurring parallel in Tobit.⁵

Reminiscences of the pseudepigrapha are more extensive. The "worthy of acceptance" phrase of I 1:15 is paralleled in Enoch (xciv.1),⁶ as is the theme of the unapproachability of God

¹For 2 Maccabees' parallels, see Bernard, PE, n, p. xxxix; for 4 Maccabees', Falconer, PE, p. 10.

²Cf. Tobit 13.6; also Sir 36.19; Enoch 9.4. Yet, cf. Dt 10:17 and Ps 136:3.

³R.H. Charles (The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT, I, Oxford, 1913) translates Tobit 4:9: "and be not afraid to give alms according to that little; for thou layest up a good treasure for thyself against the day of necessity."

⁴Charles (ibid.), translates Tobit 4:21: "thou hast much wealth, if thou fear God and avoid every kind of sin and do the things which are good in the sight of the Lord thy God."

⁵Ibid., p. 199. Cf. "mercy and peace" in I 1:2 with Apocalypse of Baruch LXXVIII.2.

⁶Charles' translation (Apocrypha, II, 163ff): "For the paths of righteousness are worthy of acceptance."

(xiv.21f, cf. I 6:16). Charles believes that the "Pauline borrowings" from the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs are too numerous even to be dealt with; but for the Pastorals, he does suggest that the following be included: the growth in covetousness (Judah xxi.8, cf. II 2:16), plea of ignorance (Judah xix.3, cf. I 1:13), mediator (Dan vi.2, cf. I 2:15).¹ The Assumption of Moses contains a similar teaching of the evil men who will arise in the last days (xviii, cf. I 3:1ff; II 3:1ff). When these parallels with the Pastorals are compared with those cited by Charles for the accepted Pauline Epistles a common attitude toward this literature is evidenced on the part of both authors. The similar lack of any direct quotation, yet abundant instances of similarities in vocabulary and phraseology which can be explained, as Jowett, to common source, and/or subject, are the striking features of agreement.²

Rabbinic Literature. Although the Talmudic literature is late, and it embodies Pharisaic elements which were dominant after A.D. 70, any NT parallels should prove to be genuine. Any alterations of the writings would tend to be in opposition to Christian teaching rather than in marked agreement.³ Strack-Billerbeck afford numerous Pastoral-Rabbinic parallels,⁴ including

¹Ibid., p. 292. See pp. lxxxv-xc for indications of influence on the accepted Pauline Epistles. Cf. Ass. Moses 1.14.

²Cf. B. Jowett, The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, London, 1894, p. 200; B.F. Westcott, The Bible in the Church, London, 1901, p. 44; and Ellis, pp. 76f.

³Cf. A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 5th ed, London, 1890, 710.

⁴H.L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, III, München, 1954.



"a gadabout widow,"¹ and "lift up your hands in holiness and bless ye the Lord."² Gittin, displays an amazing and early comparison with the problematical verse on wine (I 5:23): "R. Hiyya taught: If a man wants to avoid stomach trouble, he should take tibbon (bread dipped in wine) regularly summer and winter. In a meal which you enjoy indulge not too freely..."³

In I 2:13ff the author enforces his restrictions of women's activity by asserting that Eve, although created second, sinned first. Such an affirmation of the moral and physical priority of man, although ultimately finding its basis in the Genesis account, has its exposition in the Haggadic traditional manner of the time. That the woman was the first beguiled is the reasonable deduction from Genesis; the implications from this fact, although unintelligible and unconvincing to the modern reader, are in the acceptable form of Rabbinic exegesis. The Sanhedrin 29a,⁴ Genesis Rabbah,⁵ Sirach 25.24,⁶ Sotah 9b,⁷ and the Apoc of Moses xvii, afford a background for the contemporary Jewish

¹I 5:13, cf. Sotah 22a, SBT, p. 111.

²I 2:8, cf. Sotah 39a, SBT, p. 192.

³Gittin 70a, SBT, p. 333. Cf. Eph 5:18. Even if the statement is not directly attributable to him, it would be a part of quite ancient Rabbinic lore, since R. Hiyya was the first of the fifth generation of Tannaim (A.D. 165-200). Cf. J. Lauterbach, "Tannaim and Amoraim", SJE, XII, 49. Other salient comparisons: exhortations to prayer (Berakhoth 12b; 34a, cf. I 2:1; yet cf. 1 Sam 12:23 and James 5:16); age of 60 designated the "elderly" age (Aboth 5.21, cf. I 5:9); discussion of wealth (Aboth 6.4, 7, 9, cf. I 6:6ff).

⁴SBT, p. 178. Cf. 38a.

⁵Genesis Rabbah, I, ed H. Freedman, London, 1939, 165. For discussion of Haggadic Midrash, see, Schürer, div II, I, 339-50.

⁶Charles' translation (Apocrypha, I, 402): "From a woman did sin originate, and because of her we must all die."

⁷SBT, p. 40. Cf. Pirke Aboth 1.5.

interpretation of woman's position as determined by her fall. When this text is compared with a similar treatment in I C 11:8ff and 2 C 11:3, along with the previously discussed Pauline affinities to Rabbinic literature, it is found to be in keeping with Pauline authorship.¹

Alexandrian Literature. Harrison is "strongly inclined to think" that the author of the Pastorals read and incorporated Philo; while the fact that St. Paul had read the Alexandrian philosopher, "seems more than doubtful."² Apparently supporting this contention of the Pastorals' affinity with Philo would be the striking number of parallels to be found in Adolf Bonhöffer's Epiktet und das Neue Testament.³ Yet, if the emphasis of comparison is to be shown in content, it must be recognized that there is a sharp contrast between Philo's mixture of moral and philosophical emphasis with intellectual defects, and the Pastoral-Paul exclusively ethical concern.⁴ If the concern is over the coincidence of hapax legomena, it may well serve to underline the fact that the Pastorals' vocabulary is nearer to profane Greek than that of the accepted Pauline Letters. The recognition that 120 such words occur in Philo, and only 93 in the combined literature of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, certainly militates against any attempt to give a late date to

¹Infra, chap 5. Cf. Thackeray, pp. 50-58, 215-222; and Ellis, pp. 54f.

²"Important Hypotheses Reconsidered III. The Authorship of the PE", ET, LVII (1955-6), 78.

³Giessen, 1911, pp. 135f.

⁴See Parry (p. cxxiv) for other variances between Philo and Paul. Cf. H.E. Ryle, Philo and Holy Scriptures, London, 1895, pp. xiv-xvii.

the Pastorals because of the hapax legomena. The investigation of Hitchcock is significant if an analogy between the total vocabulary is sought. Hitchcock has discovered that 87.5% of the Pastorals' vocabulary ~~are~~ ^{is} found in Philo; while only 81% of the Pauline Wortschatz is paralleled. The balance is equalized, however, when it is recognized that 1 in 40.2 words in the Paulines do not occur directly or indirectly in Philo; while the proportion for the Pastorals is 1 in 37.2.¹ Again, the recognition that the vocabulary of the Pastorals stands somewhat closer to Philo than it does to the second century ecclesiastics, would tend to make unsuccessful a second century dating of the Epistles on the basis of vocabulary comparison.

Furthermore, the explanations afforded for the Paul-Philo parallels² are assuredly valid in those of the Pastoral-Philo. Michel states that we must accept that Paul and Philo "von gemeinsamen Traditionen und exegetischen Methoden abhängig sind, die durch die am Sabbat stattfindenden synagogalen Vorträge verbreitet wurden."³ Jowett, agreeing, would add that the similarities would appear greater than is the case, "owing to the accident of all the resemblances being collected together in a short space." "Surprising as these coincidences are," he continues, "they are, in the writings of Philo, scattered through

¹F.R.M. Hitchcock, "Philo and the Pastorals", Hermathena, LVI (1940-1), 113-135. Cf. Spicq, pp. cxxxixf.

²For the enumeration of Paul-Philo comparisons, see, W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, Cambridge, 1925, pp. 131f.

³O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, Gütersloh, 1929, pp. 110f. Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion, London, 1919, p. 9; Thackeray, p. 233; Ellis, p. 80; Stewart, pp. 55f.

many volumes amidst endless platitudes."¹

This much can be concluded on the basis of the Pastorals' literary relationship with Jewish literature: the author is in complete harmony with the best of Pauline utilization of the same literature. Whoever the author, he was steeped in the milieu of Judaism.

CANONICAL SOURCES

Old Testament

Scope. It is generally recognized that the Apostle Paul's interpretation of the OT, although transformed after his conversion, was nevertheless impregnated by the dialectical methodology and hermeneutical norms of his Jewish heritage. Paul was steeped in the language of the OT; for him, the sacred Scriptures "carried an overwhelming authority."² This authoritative estimate of the OT was accepted by the author of the Pastorals as well. At the turn of the century, Jowett suggested that the degree of interpenetration of the OT phraseology might be used to determine the genuineness of the Epistles. For, he proposed, "no one would imagine that it could have occurred to a forger of a later age to imitate the manner in which St. Paul used the language of the LXX."³ Some forty years later this approach to genuineness was

¹Op. cit., p. 393.

²Stewart, p. 39. Cf. W. Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, London, 1958, pp. 15ff; Ellis, pp. 38-47. J. Klauser (From Jesus to Paul, tran W.T. Stinespring, New York, 1944, p. 466) certainly overstated the case, however, when he observed that "there is nothing in the teaching of Paul - not even the most mystical elements in it - that did not come from authentic Judaism."

³Op. cit., p. 201. Cf. Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, pt II, vol I, 402.

applied to the Pastorals with the conclusion that they were definitely unPauline.¹ A more recent treatment of the subject, however, proclaims that the "references to the OT in the Pastorals are, for the most part, characteristic of the Apostle Paul."² Clearly a re-examination is in order.

The locus classicus for the NT doctrine of the inspiration and efficacy of the OT is found in II 3:15f. Although the most explicit statement of the doctrine, its view is in complete accord with the Pauline concept of the spiritual value of the OT,³ with that of NT writers (2 Pet 1:21), and with Christ (Mt 19:4). The purpose of the passage is not to distinguish between inspired and uninspired Scripture. Neither is its aim to state the method of or the nature and extent of inspiration. The intention of the statement is that the sacred Writings, which were known to Timothy from childhood, are adequate both for his own admonition and for his work as a teacher.⁴

The range of the Pastorals' incorporation of this inspired Scripture consists of three quotations (I 5:18; II 2:19; II 4:14), and extensive reminiscences. This limited use of the direct citation is in accord with the Pauline pattern of a wide use of reminiscences, but with specific quotations being basically

¹H.K. Moulton, "Scripture Quotations in the P.E.", ET, xlix, (1937-8), 94.

²Ellis, p. 8.

³Cf. R 15:4; 1 C 10:11; Thackeray, p. 180.

⁴For discussion of the implications of the text, see: F.C. Grant, An Introduction to NT Thought, Nashville, 1951, pp. 74f; H. Rolston, Consider Paul. Apostle of Jesus Christ, Richmond, 1951, pp. 121-135, 205; J. Moffatt, Approach to the NT, London, 1921, pp. 71f; R.V.G. Tasker, The OT in the NT, London, 1946, p. 136.

confined to his four Hauptbriefe.¹ As with Paul, the text of citation is the LXX.² The mode of quotation involves the following Pauline characteristics: use of an introductory formula λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή; ³ anonymity; the coupled or merged citation of totally different passages of scripture;⁴ affording a spiritual meaning of the OT citation;⁵ Rabbinic disregard for context;⁶ and short quotations.⁷

Quotations. I 5:18 is a merged quotation of the Mosaic precept of Dt 25:4. The LXX (οὐ φημίσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα) is followed, rather than the Hebrew (יִשׁוּטַא יִשׁוּ טַוּוּן־אֲבִי). This

¹H.B. Swete (IOT in Greek, Cambridge, 1900, p. 392), lists 71 of 78 quotations to be found in the four principal writings; Jowett (p. 199) observes 84 of 87 instances; cf. Sanday and Headlam, p. 302; and Ellis (p. 11) detects 87 of 93 (only 4 in Eph, with others in Hauptbriefe outside of Pastorals). Ellis (p. 11) determined a quotation by the introductory formula, verbal affinity and context. However, he observes that "the gradation from quotation to allusion is so imperceptible that it is almost impossible to draw any certain line."

²So, B. Weiss, Biblical Theology of the NT, tran D. Eaton, I, 3rd rev ed, Edinburgh, 1882, 382; Jowett, p. 199; Ellis, pp. 12f; and Sanday and Headlam, p. 302.

³Cf. R 10:11; 9:17; 4:3; Pes. 81b, SBT, p. 426; Yeb. 39a, SBT, p. 248.

⁴Cf. R 9:33; 11:34f; 1 C 3:19f; 15:45; B. Weiss, Theology, I, 382. Note especially the kai connective in R 9:33; 11:3. Cf. R 15:9-12; 1 C 3:19.

⁵Cf. 1 C 6:16; 9:9; 2C 6:16ff; H.A.A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, London, 1904, p. 45.

⁶Cf. R 9:25f; Sanday and Headlam, pp. 303f; Thackeray, p. 187. R. Harris (Testimonies, part I (1916), part II (1920), Cambridge), suggests an early collection of polemical passages from the OT - a theory which has met with considerable favor. Cf. A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, London, 1940, pp. 69f; E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, 1946, pp. 24f; Tasker, p. 80. Cf. also, C.H. Dodd, The OT in the New, London, 1952, pp. 3f.

⁷Cf. Jowett, pp. 190-200.

allegorical application to rational beings of a text applied to animals, is in contradistinction to Philo's literal application (de Caritate 19). The method is necessarily early in view of the specific Rabbinic prohibition of the method in the second century.¹ The variance in word order, merged quotation, and similarity of application, speak against the theory of direct borrowing from 1 C 9:9, and in favor of the same mind working in each text.²

It is in the application of the latter clause of the merged citation that disagreement ensues. Several exegetes have attributed the first citation alone to the $\gamma\rho\alpha\varphi\eta$; the second being a proverbial saying which had also been quoted by Christ.³ It is possible that the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ connective should be taken in this manner; as introducing an interpretation of the scriptural citation, and not as an additional quotation. The addendum is given to transfer the application to man from the ox. This would be in keeping with the Pauline practice of utilizing Christ's words for practical and parnetic purposes rather than doctrinal.⁴ But, the manner in which the verse is parenthetically inserted under the heading of $\gamma\rho\alpha\varphi\eta$ (as being inappropriate to 'oral'), and the verbal agreement with the Lord's own words in Luke 10:7,

¹So, Thackeray, pp. 193f.

²For a linguistic comparison, see C.H. Toy, Quotation in the NT, New York, 1884, pp. 173f.

³Cf. Bernard, PE, p. 86; Horton, p. 129; and A. Humphreys, The Epistles to Timothy and Titus, Cambridge Bible, Cambridge, 1895, p. 133. In the NT cf. Mt 10:10; Lu 10:7.

⁴Cf. 1 Th 4:15f; A. Hunter, Paul and Predecessors, pp. 52f.

would seem to necessitate its inclusion in the same category of Scriptural proof.¹ Although it is possible that the words of Dt 24:15 (cf. Lev 19:13) may be the underlying principle, the allusion would be so vague as hardly to warrant the designation of Scripture.² Another conjecture is that it may be an oral saying of the Lord, which was by a zeugma coupled with Scripture.³

There is yet another explanation. It is possible that within the lifetime of Paul, the concept of γραφή included more than the OT. E.K. Simpson suggests that since "apostolicity be the canon of canonicity," Luke's gospel could well have gained such anticipatory recognition.⁴ This early emergence of a NT canon along with the OT may be inferred from several Pauline texts: 1 C 15:45, similarly cited as Scripture, but with the second clause also of undetermined origin; the peculiar association of R 13:11 and Eph 5:14 with John 5:25; and the κατὰ τὰς γραφάς of 1 C 15:3. Clearly the sayings of Christ were regarded by Paul

¹Only the word order is altered. Mt 10:10 has τροφή instead of μισθοῦ; again showing the close Lukan-Pastoral relationship. For discussion that the second clause forms a merged quotation as Scripture, see, M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam", SJT, VII, no.2 (1954), 170ff.

²D.M. Turpie (The OT in the New Edinburgh 1868, pp. 39f) argued that the idea is contained in substance in the OT. This, he suggested, was sufficient for the designation of γραφή.

³So, Lock, P.E., pp. 62f; Cf. Parry, p. 34; E.F. Brown, The PE, Westminster Series, London, 1917, p. 45; Dibelius, Pastoral-briefe, p. 50.

⁴Op. cit., pp. 77f. Eusebius (H.E. III.iv.7) relates that some said Paul was accustomed to quote from Luke's Gospel since he said: 'according to my Gospel'. Harnack (The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, tran J.R. Wilkinson, London, 1911, p. 93) has come to believe that "there is a high degree of probability in favour of an early date for the Lukan writings."

as the Word of God;¹ while 2 P 3:16 seems to equate Pauline writings similarly. Furthermore, it must be remembered, with Ellis, that "the exercise of the gift of prophecy was no less from the Holy Spirit than the oracles of the OT prophets."² When these observations are viewed in conjunction with the Pastorals' insistence on the Word of God, the Words of Christ (I 6:3), and their public reading (*ἀνάγνωσις*, I 4:13), it may well be that we have the earliest indication of an extended *γραφὴ*, which included the Gospel of Luke, or at least Luke's 'Q' source.³ If the latter, Meinertz might be correct in his observation that Luke "hat ihn dann in der Form, wie er ihn wohl öfters aus dem Munde des Apostels gehört hat, in sein Evangelium aufgenommen."⁴

¹In discussing I C 11, Deissmann (Paul, pp. 195f) observes that other "words of Jesus are also quoted as unimpeachable authority." Cf. 1 Th 4:15; 1 C 9:14; Acts 20:35. Easton (PE, p.161) suggests that "any commandment of the Lord (I C 7:25) had the same authority as Scripture." For the observation that in the time of Paul, words of Jesus had been called for hortatory purposes, see, Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, tran B.L. Woolf, London, 1934, p. 243. Cullmann ("'Kyrios' as Designation for the Oral Tradition Concerning Jesus", SJT, III (1950), p. 187) suggests that perhaps in regard to content, "all those traditions concerning Christ, kerygma, words of Jesus, narratives, are to be considered as the one true interpretation of the Old Testament law. This is at least indicated by the words *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* in the formula of faith which is delivered in 1 Cor 15:3ff."

²Op. cit., p. 37. Cf. Acts 2:17; 19:6; 21:4; 1 C 14.

³Cf. Lock, PE, pp. 62f; Spicq, p. 177; E.F. Scott, PE, p. 65; and Burn, p. 587. T.H. Bindley ("PE", The Interpreter, ix (1912-13), pp. 191f) declared that graphe was not applied historically until the time of Irenaeus and Hippolytus. Yet, note the similarly merged quotation (Ps 4:5 and Eph 4:26) designated as Scripture in Polycarp ad Phil XII.1: "Modo, ut his scripturis dictum est, irascimini et nolite peccare, et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram."

⁴M. Meinertz, Die Pastoralbriefe des heiligen Paulus, 4th ed, Bonn, 1931, p. 70.

For the encouragement of Timothy, the author inserts another merged quotation (II 2:19) affirming the Lord's knowledge of the hearts of men. Except for the fact that the author followed the Hebrew יָדָע instead of the LXX $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, the first clause is an exact citation from the LXX (No 16:5).¹ The second clause, although having no exact counterpart in the OT, resembles such passages as Is 52:11, and 26:13, as well as the contextual continuation of the first quotation (No. 16:26). Scott may be correct, however, in his assertion that the OT language has been combined with the words of Christ.² It is significant that, as in the case of I 5:18, the second clause is again in agreement with Luke's (13:27), rather than Matthew's (7:23) Gospel. Both writers use the Aorist imperative form of the verb $\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\eta\mu\iota$, and the noun $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$ in contrast with Matthew's $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\chi\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\iota\alpha$.

In II 4:14 is found an application to a particular case (Alexander's) of the OT promise that God would "render to every man according to his work." There is a similar use of Ps 62:12 (or Prov 24:12?) by Christ (Mt 16:27) and Paul (R 2:6), where in each case the application is to an ethical attribute of the Lord. Timothy, however, uses the particularized $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$; while the other examples have substituted $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omega$ for $\alpha\tau\lambda\epsilon\iota$. Similar phraseology and teaching may be found elsewhere in both Testaments.³

¹Turpie, The OT in the New, p. 21: " יָדָע is translated as Hiph, let know, i.e. shew, and hence the various readings: but it may read in Kal, יָדָע and rendered know, or יָדָע part. act. knowing, which is preferable."

²PE, p. 112. Cf. Lock, PE, pp. 100f. Turpie (The NT View of the Old, London, 1872, pp. 305f) suggested that neither clause is a quotation; yet, see, Toy, p. 203.

³Cf. Ps 28:4; Job 34:11; R 12:19; 14:12; 1 C 3:8,13; 2 C 5:10; Col 3:25; Rev 2:23; 20:12; 22:12.

Allusions. Along with these direct quotations, there is a veritable mosaic of intentional allusions (or perhaps involuntary reminiscences) which are, for the most part, analogous to those found in such profusion in accepted Pauline Epistles.¹ The following allusions are discernible: discussion of the Law, which includes a list of sins following the order of the Decalogue (I 1:8-11);² the application to woman's subjection of the temptation of Eve (I 2:13f); "a reminiscence of the seven-fold refrain of Gen 1" (I 4:4);³ instruction with regard to parental care (I 5:4, cf. Ex 20:12, Eph 6:2); caution regarding the accusation of an elder (I 5:19);⁴ faulty service recognized as blasphemy against God (I 6:1);⁵ vanity of wealth (I 6:7f, cf. Job 1:21); the designation of "Lord of lords" attributed to Christ (I 6:15);⁶ vessels of honor and dishonor (II 2:20);⁷ the common metaphor of deliverance: "delivered out of the mouth of the lion" (II 4:17);⁸ the phrase: "commandments of men"

¹For references, see Ellis, pp. 153f.

²Cf. R 1:28f; I C 6:9f; Gal 5:19f. For rebuttal of Clemen's contention (p. 63) that the lists of vices are attributable to the Stoic philosophical school, see: Tasker, pp. 136f; and G.B. Stevens, The Theology of the NT, Edinburgh, 2nd ed, 1911, pp. 368f.

³Lock, PE, p. 48. Yet, cf. Ecc 39:16; Acts 10:15; R 14:14; I C 10:30; and Mt 7:19.

⁴Cf. Dt 19:15; Mt 18:16; 2 C 13:1; Mishnah, San 5.4.

⁵Cf. Prov 22:7; Is 52:5; R 2:24; Eph 6:5; Tit 2:5; Clem Cor 1.3.

⁶Cf. Dt 10:17; Dan 2:47; 2 Macc 13:4.

⁷Cf. Is 52:11; R 9:21ff; I C 3:12; Acts 9:21; Wisd 15:7.

⁸Cf. Dan 6:20; Ps 22:21; Esther 4:13. In NT, cf. 1 Th 2:18; 2 Th 3:2. C.A. Beckwith ("Lion", HDAC, I, 702f) observes an allusion to the punishment of being thrown to the lion. Cf. Horton, p. 171. But most modern scholars regard the phrase as familiar OT designation of deliverance from extreme danger. Cf. e.g. Falconer, PE, p. 100; and E.F. Scott, PE, p. 140.

(Tit 1:14);¹ and the phrase: "peculiar people" (Tit 2:14)² coupled with a declaration of Christ's redeeming man from all iniquity.³

The conclusion to be drawn from this review of the author's indebtedness to the OT: there is a common attitude on the part of the Pastorals' Paul and the Apostle Paul toward this literature.

New Testament

It would be tempting to dismiss the parallels which exist between the Pastorals and the Gospels, by attributing them to oral tradition. In the case of the first two Gospels this would be acknowledgeable; for perhaps the only real coincidence of thought and/or language not similarly found in Luke is the attribution of *κύριον* to Christ.⁴ Any contacts with John⁵ are all embodied in the doctrinal discussions at the 'faithful saying' phrase, and need not be considered at this time. The

¹Cf. Is 29:13; Mt. 15:9; Col 2:22.

²Cf. Ex 19:5; Dt 7:6; 14:2; 26:18. In NT, cf. Col 1:12; and I Pet 2:9. *λαὸν περιούσιον* is the LXX rendering of *יְהוָה*

³Cf. I 2:6. Note that Ps 130:8 varies only in the plural. Cf. Ezek 37:23. For *κυριώω* see Mk 10:45 and Luke 24:21.

⁴I 2:5f, cf. Mk 10:45; Mt 20:28. For similarity of teaching, see Gal 1:4. See chap 5 for recognition that these verses may have formed a primitive credal statement.

⁵e.g. *ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον* (I 1:15); *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί* (I 3:16); and "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Tit 3:5). Cf. chap 5; A. Schlatter, *Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus*, Stuttgart, 1936, pp. 18f. Spicq (p. clvi) after explaining the similarities of the Pastorals and John, by the Ephesian environment, states that "s'il est établi que "Jean est le plus ancien et le plus grand interprète de Paul" (so Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 4), l'analyse précédente confirme cette fidélité doctrinale par rapport aux Pastorales elles-mêmes, qui ne peuvent donc être que l'œuvre d'un Apôtre."

parallels with Luke, however, would appear to be too numerous to be so casually dismissed.

If, as Cadbury suggests, the coincidences with Luke (Gospel and Acts) are attributable to "common Christianity" and "common-places" of vocabulary,¹ why are the resemblances not found to the same extent with the other NT writers? Why is it peculiarly with the Lucan writings that so many parallels with the Pastorals are disclosed? No close resemblance must, of course, be expected. The historical books are narrative, and concerned with the life and teachings of Christ and the Apostles; the Pastorals are didactic and deal with the emergent problems of Gentile churches. Yet affinities with the Lucan writings are truly remarkable, and have been appropriately displayed by several authors.²

Briefly, what are these affinities? For textual similarities with the Gospel, compare especially: I 4:8, cf. 18:30; I 5:5, cf. 2:37; I 5:18, cf. 10:7; I 6:17ff, cf. 12:16-21; II 2:19, cf. 13:27; II 2:11ff, cf. 12:9; Tit 1:15, cf. 11:41. It is to be noted that in these comparisons the agreement is peculiar to Luke, in contradistinction to the Marcan tradition; a factor to be similarly observed in the genuine Pauline Letters.³

Similarities also exist with Acts where, significantly, it is within the Pauline speeches that the most marked parallels

¹"The Speeches in Acts", The Beginnings, pt I, vol V, 415. Cf. Moffatt, INT, p. 414. For suggestion that the resemblances are due to oral tradition, see, Lock, PE, p. xxiii; and James, p. 137.

²Cf. Holtzmann, p. 95f; Falconer, PE, pp. 11-17; James, pp. 154ff; A.C. Clark, The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford, 1933, pp. 396-406; and R. Scott, The Pauline Epistles, Edinburgh, 1909, pp. 333-366.

³So A.W. Argyle, "Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q", ET, LX (1948-9), 318ff.

occur. It is totally irrelevant to object, as some are prone to do, that Paul's speeches in Acts are too Petrine and Peter's too Pauline.¹ As the discipline of Form Criticism has shown, Paul's kerygma, and similarities of exhortation, subject-matter, and even OT quotation, can probably be attributed to a common source.² It is suggestive, however, that it is with the Lucan recording of Paul, and the Pastoral-Paul that such similarities exist. In the speech recorded in Acts 20:18-35, the same organization of presbyter-bishop under apostolic supervision, similar anticipations of developing error, and characteristic vocabulary,³ are found in common with the Pastorals. There is also the noticeable affinity in vocabulary, e.g. the 34 Lucan-non-Pauline words shared, and the words peculiarly medical in scope.⁴

What is the explanation of these similarities? Besides being used to demonstrate a common milieu of Christianity, they disclose to at least one writer that Luke himself composed the

¹Cf. J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, p. 23. Cadbury ("The Speeches in Acts", p. 412) contends that the Acts' speeches could not be Pauline because it is unlike "Paul's letters to quote a saying of Jesus as in xx. 35". This objection is untenable in view of 1 C 7:10; 9:14; 11:23ff; and 1 Th 4:15f.

²Infra, chap 5. Cf. F.F. Bruce, The Acts, p. 20.

³e.g. testify, course, pure, apparel, take heed, presbyter, bishop, acquire. Cf. Acts 23:1-6 for the phrase "good conscience"; R.B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, London, 1910, p. 384. For Thessalonian-Gospel parallels, see G. Milligan, St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1908, pp. lxiff. For Gospel-Pauline parallels, see W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948, pp. 138ff.

⁴e.g. cauterize (I 4:2); nausea (I 6:4); gangrene (II 2:17); scratch or itch (II 4:3); stomach (I 5:23); healthy (I 1:10); puff up (I 3:6; 6:4; II 3:4); bodily exercise (I 4:8). Cf. E.H. Plumptre, "St. Luke and St. Paul: An inquiry into their mutual relations." Exp, IV (1876), 134-156.

writings at a later period.¹ Yet if Luke were the author, it is difficult to understand why he should virtually ignore Titus in his history, and yet employ him as the central figure in his Epistles. Still other exegetes have suggested that Luke served as the amanuensis of Paul.² Certainly the casual mentioning of the "beloved physician" in both Col 4:14 and II 4:11 would lend support for this solution. For reasons outlined in chapter 3, however, this explanation would not appear plausible. Perhaps no more can be concluded than the suggestion that the lengthy intercourse between the Apostle and his friend had influenced his literary habits. If the affinities indicate nothing more than the fact that the Lucan writings and the Pastorals proceed from the same circle of cultivation, it is, at least, a further indication of a first, rather than a second century date.³

Except for the Epimenidian citation, which has the suggested connection with Acts 17:28, this study disclosed that any Hellenistic affinities may be explained through other associations. Furthermore, the author was found to be steeped in the canonical and non-canonical writings of Judaism. The impact of Jewish literary methods and of Scriptural interpretation is manifested. NT parallels of style and vocabulary are

¹So R. Scott, p. 353.

²Infra, chap 3. Cf. Ellis, pp. 5-9; James, p. 154.

³Infra, chap 2 for parallels with Paulines; chap 5 for Pastorals - Peter relationship. Other NT parallels, e.g. those with James, as cited by J.B. Mayor (The Epistle of St. James, London, 1892, p. xc) are too vague to show dependence.

found peculiarly with the Lucan writings to such an extent that a first, rather than a second century circle of cultivation, is suggested. Although the case for Pauline authorship can not be vindicated through this study, the arguments against the Apostle's authorship would have been greatly strengthened if it could not be shown that in each instance the literary inclusion was in keeping with a possible Pauline tradition of the sixth decade.

...exhaustive examination of the Pastoral Epistles by J. H. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, presented such a bewildering array of statistics and graphic computations as to dwarf all other similar attempts. The work is established as the ultimate treatment of the problem from the point of view of those denying authenticity to the epistles. His varied computations have made so profound an impression, that the overwhelming weight of modern scholarship would agree with him that the "epistles" are "genuine" and the linguistic arguments against Pauline authorship... the words of the author of the Pastoral are not the words of Paul.² Thus, although the subject has been repeatedly dealt with³ and ever though one might like to state that the problem is still an unsettled one, the treatment of the Pastoral is complete without

¹ See Hunter, Introduction to the NT, London, 1917, p. 81. Cf. E. Hatch, Greek Literature in the NT, London, 1909, p. 232.

² Journal of Theological Studies, III, p. 404 and Divinitas, p. 100.

³ See Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, London, 1921, p. 100. Cf. also The Mind of Paul, London, 1921.

CHAPTER II

LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PASTORALS

Introduction

It has been observed that although allegations relating to unPauline theology and ecclesiastical organization of the Pastorals may be satisfactorily argued against, any reply to the linguistic charge "looks like so much special pleading."¹ The seemingly exhaustive examination of the Pastorals' Wortschatz by P.N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, presented such a bewildering array of statistics and graphic compilations as to dwarf all other similar attempts. The work is established as the ultimate treatment of the problem from the point of view of those denying authenticity to the whole of the Epistles. His charted computations have made so profound an impression, that the overwhelming weight of modern scholarship would agree with Gealy that no matter how many "ingenious counter arguments" are advanced "to neutralize the force of the linguistic argument against Pauline authorship...the words of the author of the Pastorals are not the words of Paul."² Thus, although the subject has been repeatedly dealt with³ and even though one might like to avoid it, the problem is still so fundamental, that no treatment of the Pastorals is complete without

¹A.M. Hunter, Interpreting the NT, London, 1951, p. 64. Cf. Dibelius, Fresh Approach to the NT, London, 1936, p. 232.

²Op. cit., p. 365. Cf. Moffatt, INT, p. 406; and Dibelius, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 3.

³Cf. Holtzmann, who lists 171 hapax legomena; and most recently, Guthrie, PE, esp. pp. 212-228; The PE and the Mind of Paul, London, 1956.

its examination.

As recently as 1956, Harrison stated that he has been strengthened in his postulation "by the inability even of those who reject this hypothesis to deny the facts on which it rests."¹ Since Harrison is the leading representative of this school of thought, it will therefore behoove us to examine each "fact", compare it with the "ingenious counter arguments", while attempting always to maintain the operating premise of Harrison of an "absolutely open mind and a single eye to truth."² Since Harrison's criticism is two-fold, asserting on the one hand that the linguistic phenomena exclude Pauline authorship, and on the other, that the evidence proves a second-century vintage, this section will be divided to examine his facts accordingly. In the latter part of the chapter, the equally enigmatic question of style will be discussed.

VOCABULARY

HAPAX LEGOMENA

Hapax Legomena and Statistical Analysis. The first fact, as presented by Harrison, is that the 175 Pastorals' hapax legomena (ἅπαξ λεγόμενα) form a total disproportionately great when compared with the accepted Pauline Epistles. When this figure is numerically computed for the average occurrence per page, it is found that 1 T has an average of 15.2 per page, 2 T 12.9, and Tit 16.1. The accepted Epistles, however, vary only

¹"Important Hypotheses Reconsidered III", pp. 77ff. For an evaluation of this remark, see, B. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against the Pauline Authorship of the PE", ET, LXX (Dec 1958), 91ff.

²PPE, p. 3.

from 3.3 for 2 Th to 6.2 for Phil. Thus the gradually ascending scale of Diagram I (p. 21) becomes an incongruous pitch when the Pastorals are added. The unPauline character is even more vividly portrayed when to the 175 hapax legomena, the 131¹ non-Pauline words are added in Diagram II (p. 23). It is now evident that 36% of the Pastorals' vocabulary is non-Pauline. When this figure is placed in a per page ratio, 1 T contains 27.3, 2T 24.4, and Tit 30.4 per page. The accepted Pauline Epistles, however, are shown to maintain a "normal, easy, gradual curve" (p. 22) ascending from 7.5 for 1 Th to 12.7 in Phil. On the basis of argumentum ad quantitatem, it is obvious to all that the Pastorals are incompatible linguistically with the other Epistles attributed to Paul.

Harrison's employment of mathematics, however, in evaluating linguistic phenomena has been shown to be fraught with inaccuracies, and therefore perhaps "ausserordentlich überschätzt,"² and might well prove a "trügerische Hoffnung."³ As Michaelis has so astutely observed, Harrison's inquiry rests completely on the theory that the Wortstatistik is a valid argument against the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, and that their language should in all its totality and in all of its particulars be comprehended statistically.⁴ But quantitative analysis can only be

¹The combined total of 306 has since been reduced to 305 by Harrison in his article in ET.

²A. Harnack, Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus, Leipzig, 1926, p. 75. Cf. Meinertz, p. 17.

³Michaelis, "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik", ZNTW, XXVIII (1929), 76.

⁴Ibid., pp. 69f. Cf. Ellis, pp. 7f.

acceptable in so far as it affords a safe indication of the author's interests, personality, and circumstances; and only then when employed accurately. It would appear that these conditions may have been violated.

It must first of all be observed that optically or graphically the diagrams of Harrison assume a "normal, easy, gradual" ascending curve, only because the Epistles are not charted chronologically. Thus Harrison has masked the fact that the Pauline Epistles are not in an evolutionary ascending scale between the two extremes of 2 Th (3.3) and Phil (6.2); but rather contain a marked fluctuation between Epistles. The variation of almost two to one within the accepted Paulines may well indicate the approach which must be utilized to bridge the gap in the lexical chasm: weigh, do not count, the words.

This same disregard for chronology was similarly employed in Harrison's evaluation of Workman's comparison of the hapax legomena detected in the Shakespearean plays. Workman has shown a variation from 3.4 to 10.4 words per Shakespearean page.¹ Harrison has utilized these figures to disclose "an absolutely orderly and unbroken sequence" comparable to that evidenced within the ten Pauline Epistles (pp. 59-65). Yet Harrison fails to disclose that the two extremes occur in plays which, using his Dowden cited dating, were written in consecutive years, and therefore destroy the unbroken appearance.² With Guthrie, it must be noted further, that Shakespeare's extant works of 37

¹W.P. Workman, "The Hapax Legomena of St. Paul", ET VII (1896), 418f. R. Shaw (pp. 438f) gives additional citations from Milton.

²Julius Caesar, 3.4 per page, 1601, and Hamlet, 10.4 per page, 1602. Cf. M. Hitchcock, "Tests for the Pastorals", JTS, XXX (1929), 272-279.

plays, make the peak of 10.4 hapax legomena per page proportionately higher than that cited for the Pastorals;¹ because, as shall be observed shortly, there is a greater probability of duplication when there are more extant works for comparison. Nevertheless, this observation must not detract from the fact that remarkable differences exist. Significantly a large proportion of this discrepancy is attributable to Harrison's miscalculations.

As Michaelis has noted, Harrison has also used a faulty method in determining the proper ratio to be used.² He counts the words and also the pages, and trusts to the relevancy of the statistics. Although on p. 158 he lists the sum total of words, he avoids employing them for his analysis. The fallacy is seen, when in Diagram II (p. 23), Harrison shows that out of the Roman vocabulary of 993, there is a combined total of 261 hapax legomena and non-Pauline words. On the basis of Westcott and Hort's 26 pages, the computation is 10 such words per printed page. Colossians contains 6 pages, has a total of 409 words, of which 58 are hapax legomena and non-Pauline; this Harrison computes to be a 9.7 ratio per printed page. The Pastorals average 22.4. If, however, one takes as his basis, not the pages (which although uniform in size vary as to the distribution of words), but the vocabulary total, it will be seen that Romans (261 ÷ 993) has a 0.263 percentage, and Col (58 ÷ 409) a 0.142 percentage. Now it is seen that Romans has slightly less than

¹PE, p. 213.

²"Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik", pp. 71f. The words-per-page method is, however, an improvement over Findlay's ("PE", p. 354) words-per-chapter method. Cf. Lilley, pp. 38ff.

double the amount of linguistic peculiarities found in Colossians. Harrison's calculations, however, were 10 and 9.7 respectively. For the Pastorals, the computation would be: $108 \div 413$ equals 0.261 for 2 T; $73 \div 293$ equals 0.250 for Tit; and $171 \div 529$ equals 0.323 for 1 T. Using this method of statistical analysis, Romans and the Pastorals are in a comparable percentage position and not twice as many as the chart would lead one to believe.

This same statistical error can be seen in diagram VI (p. 44 and 155f), where the chart of A-privative compounds vividly shows Galatians to have 1.5 instances per page, and 2 Th the most, with only 2.3 of the 105 Pauline occasions. However, the graph line shoots up to 4.1 for 1 T, 2 T 5.1, Tit 6.75, of 54 Pastoral occasions. On the basis of the graph, the Pastorals ought to contain about 4 times as many words with A-privative as do the other Letters. But, is this proportion correct? $105 \div 2177$ (total Pauline vocabulary) equals only 4.8%; while $54 \div 848$ (total Pastorals' vocabulary) equals only 6.4%. That there is an abnormal amount of such compounds is obvious - but not at the ratio of 4 to 1.

Michaelis further asserts that the statistical method of Harrison contains a basic failure which places his conclusions in doubt.¹ The foundation of all statistical and graphical analysis demands that similar quantities be established before comparison is made. Thus, the shorter the text, the greater the number of essential words in the vocabulary; the longer the text

¹Ibid., pp. 74f. Cf. Ellis, pp. 7f.

the more frequently the vocabulary is repeated; while the proportion of new words to the total is correspondingly smaller. This may be exemplified by: Romans, 26 + 993 or 38.2 words per page; I T, 6 1/3 + 529 or 83.5; 2T, 4 2/3 + 413 or 88.5; Tit, 2 2/3 + 293 or 109.9. The comparison shifts markedly in favor of the Pastorals, however, when the less comprehensive Pauline Letters are considered, e.g. Phil, 6 + 429 or 71.5; 2 Th, 3 + 243 or 81; and Phlm, 1 1/4 + 129 or 103.2. Thus the Pastorals, when viewed in this light, are not particularly wordy and the statistical method to adjudge the language of the Pastorals would appear to be overestimated. Even scholars who would agree with Harrison's conclusions, are not impressed with his methods. Thus Dibelius would assert: "dass diese statistische Methode zur Bestreitung der Echtheit nicht ausreicht."¹

Yet the vocabulary is singularly copious even if allowance is made for the errors in statistical analysis when applied to linguistic phenomena. Nevertheless it must be asserted that only when it can be shown that the vocabulary could not possibly have been Pauline either because it is of a later vintage, or psychologically impossible, can any validity be ascribed to this linguistic argument. Delaying the former possibility for later discussion, what can be noted as possible explanations for these hapax legomena - explanations which cannot, perhaps, be deduced arithmetically? The causes of linguistic inequality are so varied that it may be impossible to account for more than a small

¹Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 3. Cf. F.P. Cheetham, "Language and Style in the NT", CQR, XCIV (1922), 314f. Spicq (p. cxvii) states that Harrison's method is unreliable because "elle suppose une confusion de l'histoire et de la psychologie avec la logique et l'arithmétique."

percentage of that presented. Admittedly some attempts have more merit than others, but the following should be accepted as at least providing a partial explanation of the problem.

Hapax Legomena and Subject

It must be acknowledged that hapax legomena, however numerous, have no meaning in and of themselves. In any given writing it is the subject which determines the vocabulary. Thus a more suitable question would be whether the author would be likely to deal with the subject under consideration, and not one concerning the particular vocabulary employed. If the change in ecclesiastical structure, method of combating doctrinal errors, formalized content, and the other many-faceted subject-matter can be satisfactorily attributed to the increased Pauline sphere of interest, then these considerations will also serve as the solutions to the problem.¹ The exigencies of the times were not the questions of Judaism, but of the qualifications of deacons and presbyters, statutes concerning widowhood, and the concomitant problems of institutional discipline. It would appear, therefore, that the author was conforming to the Pauline tradition of innovating and creating a terminology necessitated by the somewhat amorphous organization, and seemingly amoral society of the Church.²

¹Cf. T. Nügel, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, Goettingen, 1905, p. 87; White, pp. 57f; B. Weiss, INT, p. 400; Bernard, PE, pp. xxxviiif; and Spicq, p. cvx.

²So, W.M. Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy", Exp, 7th series, VII (1909), 488f.

Even the most cursory glance at the tabulation in Appendix A removes any possible misconception that if a book is accorded a 3.3 hapax legomena average, that an even distribution internally is actually to be found. This is vividly shown in 2 Th where 19 lines of the first chapter, and 18 of the third contain all the hapax legomena to be found in that book; while the great heart of the Epistle, numbering some 51 lines is totally devoid of peculiar words. 2 Cor, with a 5.6 average, is shown to fluctuate from 1.1 to 9.4. Rom, having a 4.0 average, varies from 0 for chapters 13-14, to 8.9 for chapter 11; while 110 of the 261 words peculiar to Romans occur in just 182 of its 943 lines. Other salient variations occurring are: 23 of the Col Wortschatz within 79 lines for an average of 9.0; a 10.3 average in the closing parenetical section of Eph; and a 9.9 average in a similar section of Phil. Nor are the Pastorals devoid of internal peculiarities, as is evidenced by the widely accepted 2 T manifesting a variance from the respectable 4.4 to the astronomical 21.7; while 60 of the 75 words peculiar to 1 T are clustered in just 45 verses.

Significantly, marked variations are to be observed between each of the Pauline groups of letters, and between the earlier (3.3) and the later (6.2). This discrepancy of almost 2 to 1 might cause one to wonder, with J. Weiss, if it is possible on the basis of Wortstatistik to prove that the same author who wrote 2 Th and Col also penned 1 C;¹ or to assert with White

¹Jesus von Nazareth Mythos oder Geschichte? Tübingen, 1910, pp. 99f.

that "the difference between the Paul of Phil and the Paul of 1 T is not greater than, perhaps not as great as, between the Paul of Th and the Paul of Eph."¹

What may be declared to account for this fluctuation? Is not the obvious also the most satisfying? Subject determines vocabulary. Just as the Epistles of the third group, written at the same period, and with a similarity of subject, are most closely related in vocabulary, even so, and for the same reasons, the Pastorals are most closely related. The affliction of hapaxomania results when a critic fails to make allowance for the fact that whether it is the Colossians' Paul, or the Pastorals' Paul, he is ex hypothesi dealing not with a calculating machine, but with a man; a man not phlegmatically inclined, but one who wrote to meet the urgent exigencies of the times. Thus, in writing the Galatian Epistle, Paul spent but 10 lines, lines totally devoid of any peculiar terms for his customary prolegomena and metalegomena. Because of the need for a defense of message and apostleship against the manifested Judaistic tendencies, the Epistle is unified in subject and consequently in vocabulary. With no other epistle is this the case; but rather in each subject there is the accompanying introduction of new vocabulary. Only the repetition of subject matter (e.g. 2 Th 1:11-3:5, and the subject of the parousia) succeeds in restricting the hapax legomena to a minimum.

The validity of this assertion is seen in the fact that

¹Op. cit., p. 59. Cf. Meinertz, p. 17; F. Torn, "Uber die Sprachen in den Pastoralbriefen", ZNTW, IV (1917-18), 243; Findlay, "PE", p. 354; and Lock, "First Epistle to Timothy", pp. 772b.

whenever Paul characteristically turned in the closing chapters to a subject of parenetical import there is a corresponding increase in unfamiliar vocabulary. Thus, Rom 12:3-20 jumps to a 7.3 average, Col 2:8-4:1 to 9.0, Phil 4:8-20 to 9.9 and Eph 6:10-20 to 10.3; figures closely resembling those of the Pastorals.¹ Correspondingly, Paul's unique discussions of marriage (1 Cor 7), monetary problems (2 Cor 11), and rejection of Israel (Rom 11), each in turn introduces a new Wortschatz. Conversely, in the exordium and consummation of each Epistle, where personal glimpses of affection and greetings are incorporated, hapax legomena are conspicuously absent. This fact can likewise be observed in II 4, the only Pastorals' chapter so relegated. Surely it is open to question whether its relative freedom from peculiar vocabulary is due to the certainty of Pauline fragments or to the similarity of subject matter.

Finally, that subject matter is largely responsible for variations is shown by Parry, who categorized the vocabulary under appropriate subjects,² and by Hitchcock, who asserted that the variations have an analogy in Cicero where the oratorical works have an average of 4 hapax legomena per page, his

¹For discussion that these sections are of a more practical nature, and therefore most closely resemble the Pastorals, see, Hitchcock, "Tests for the Pastorals", pp. 272-79; and F.J. Badcock, The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews in Their Historical Setting, London, 1937, p. 125.

²Op.cit., p. xcv. Parry lists R 1:18-3:26, where the Jew-Gentile discussion required 88 peculiar words, and R 16:17-20, 5 such words. Cf. Bernard, PE, pp. xxxviif.

epistles 19, and his philosophical works 25.¹ Any argument on the basis of hapax legomena, without an awareness of content, would certainly necessitate the unwarranted conclusion of plurality in authorship of Cicero's works.

Hapax Legomena and Situation

Another possible explanation for the increased Wortschatz is the author's change of situation. If there are differences in vocabulary, is it really difficult to understand in a man with a catalogue of experiences like that recorded in 2 Cor 11? Add six or seven years of increasing age,² anxieties concerning the preservation of Christ's Body, additional persecution and imprisonment, and the education of supplementary missionary travel, and inevitably their impact would be felt. E.K. Simpson succinctly observes that Paul "does not revolve painfully in a closed circle of dictionary-terms; his language is attuned to his surroundings and immediate design."³ There is also the feasible, yet purely hypothetical, possibility that after a most arduous schedule which precluded extensive study, Paul was able, through the seclusion of his Roman imprisonment, to have time to

¹"Tests for the Pastorals", pp. 272-79. Cf. W.B. Sedgewick, ("The Authorship of the Pastorals", ET, XXX (1919), 230f), for a similar comparison with Plato; and W. Leonard (The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, London, 1939, pp. 172f), for discussion of subject matter as determining hapax legomena within Hebrews.

²Cf. C.H. Turner, Study of the NT, p. 21f; and Jones, esp. pp. 276-93.

³Op. cit., p. 15.

read or be read to.¹

The Roman imprisonment could not only have given occasion for an alteration in Paul's reading habits, but would have had a profound impact in a more tangible way. Burn has depicted most impressively how Paul would have had his own acquired Greek knowledge considerably influenced by the Greek, affected by Latin idiom, which was spoken in Rome.² Although this would not have made any immediate impression, he observes that Latinisms, and indications of a more literary stratum,³ were bound to appear. The possibility of such an impact is evidenced by Harrison's tabulation of peculiar words which are found both in the Pastorals and in the later Ecclesiastics. "Clement of Rome," asserts Harrison, "uses in common with the Pastorals 63 words never so far as we know employed by Paul, 2 Clem 28, Ignatius 39, Polycarp 20, the Martyrdom of Polycarp 22, The Didache 21, Barnabas 28, Hermas 75, the Ep. ad Diognetum 27 and the fragments from Papias 4; while Aristeides has 7, Tatian 61, Justin 116, Athenagoras 59, and the fragments from Melito 5." (pp. 72f). It is obvious that Clement, Hermas, and Justin, who were Christians of Rome and therefore subjected to the same influences as Paul in his later years, have more literary affinities with the Pastorals than do the other men. This fact is even more

¹Cf. II 4:13. For the possible indications of the influence of such study, *ibid.*, pp. 16f, and Lilley, pp. 39f.

²*Op. cit.*, pp. 579ff. Hervey (pp. viif) observed that reading affects one more in the case of an acquired language.

³Cf. Nägeli, pp. 87ff.

apparent when it is observed that Ignatius is comparable in size with Clement ad Cor, and closer in content to the Pastorals. When the influence of the lengthy companionship of Luke is remembered, the change in vocabulary might not be too startling. If there is validity in these combined observations regarding Paul's change of situation, it would have been strange had there been no impact upon his writing. In fact, there could be a more serious allegation regarding authenticity if these indications of impact were omitted.

Hapax Legomena Evaluated

Turning from possible psychological explanations it is also vital that each peculiar word be individually evaluated. The significance of this fact was earlier observed by Reuss (an author who fluctuated on the Pastorals' authorship question): "In case of a language so rich as the Greek and a mind so rich as that of Paul, such counting of words is a precarious pursuit."¹ Not only is an author's Wortschatz occasioned by his subject, but there are also other valid explanations for linguistic variation. For example, it is clear that words occurring in quotations should be eliminated from serious consideration. If this be acceptable, at least 16 hapax legomena (e.g. διαβεβαίωσθαι Tit 3:8) and non-Pauline words (e.g. ἀργαί, Tit 1:12) are redundant. The total will be reduced further by excluding those words

¹History of the Sacred Scriptures of the NT, tran 5th ed E.L. Houghton, Edinburgh, 1884, pp. 122f.

which, although peculiar, are derivative or cognate forms of words employed by Paul, and which retain the same fundamental meaning. Spicq has listed 13 such forms,¹ to which might be added the 18 cognates listed in Appendix C. Spicq would assert, in addition, that there are a considerable number of words which were contemporary, but were omitted owing to special and accidental causes or because Paul had had no occasion to use them.²

Finally, in this connection, remembering the apostle's word formation propensities, a reasonable explanation for some, at least, of the Pastorals' hapax legomena might be found in the compounds. For example: φιλόθεος (II 3:4), φιλόξενος (I 3:2, Tit 1:8), and φιλότεχνος (Tit 3:4) are non-Pauline, but Paul used the prefix in compounds previously (φιλόναϊκος, 1 C 11:16; φιλόστοργος R 12:10); ψευδολόγος (I 4:2) is a hapax legomenon, but compare ψευδαπόστολος (2 C 11:13) and ψευδάδελφος (2 C 11:26) and ψευδομάρτυς (1 C 15:15). Guthrie has made the additional observation that κενοφωνία, has two analogous NT forms (κενοδοξία, Phil 2:3 and κενόδοξος Gal 5:26), which are also peculiar to Paul.³

Harrison agrees that derivatives should be taken into account, but maintains that if this is done, it would only tend to strengthen his theory; and when applied to the relation between the Pastorals and second century writers, it reduces "almost to the vanishing point those elements in the vocabulary of the Pastorals

¹Op. cit. p. cx. Cf. James, pp. 149f.

²Ibid. To Spicq's list of 16 should be added: μάμμη, βιβλία, μεμβράνα, φελόνης, χαλκείος.

³PE, p. 218. Cf. Reuss, pp. 122f. For additional citations, see Appendix D.

which cannot be shown to belong to the current phraseology of the period to which our criticism assigns them." (p. 65). Yet, the present discussion regarding cognates and analogies does not question that the postulated Paulinist of the second century could have employed the words under discussion, but only avers that they were similarly available and impressionable to the Pauline mind of the first century. Harrison's line of argument in this connection also enables the Pastorals to be assigned to almost any period.

OMISSION AND MISUSE OF CHARACTERISTIC PAULINE TERMS

FACT TWO of Harrison's thesis is that characteristic Pauline terms are either omitted, or are used in an unPauline sense in the Pastorals. To Harrison this loss of favorite Pauline terms implies a change of perspective, a shifting of horizons, a profound modification of the whole mental and spiritual outlook"; (p. 34) and constitutes a serious difficulty in the way of assigning the Pastorals to the same author as the accepted Epistles. Since the problem is so diversified, it may be best to investigate it under the following headings.

Variation in Meaning

For Harrison, there are a number of words "which carry a totally different meaning in the Pastorals from that which Paul gives them, or are used in a radically different way." (p. 27) This fact, in itself, discloses the fallacy of the counting-house

method for determining authorship. The fact that a word is repeated or not repeated does not indicate identity or difference of authorship; for it is possible to employ the natural extension or application of a familiar sense of a particular word. For example, in the Pauline Epistles, διδασχῆ is used for the subject matter or discourse (cf. R 6:17, 16:17; 1 C 14:6,26), and it is utilized in that fashion in Tit 1:19. In II 4:2, however, a more correct application would be to the teaching function rather than subject. Thus, the Pastorals' Paul incorporates both a Pauline and unPauline sense of the term within his writings. Although διδασχῆ is not included, Harrison does list the following words, (pp. 27f) which upon examination, may not confirm the applied adverbs of "totally" and "radically" different.

a. ἀναλαμβάνω . Objection: that in I 3:16 it is applied to the Assumption, but in Eph 6:13, 16, to the taking up of spiritual weapons. However: the I 3:16 passage is an undoubted quotation; it may well bear the connotation of 'take up'; the desired meaning is also to be found in II 4:11; both connotations are in Lucan writings, and therefore were available to the first century Paul. Hitchcock has observed eight different meanings for the term.¹ Surely this cannot establish that the writings ascribed to Polybius were by eight different authors.

b. ἀντέχομαι . Objection: that in Tit 1:9 it is applied to the 'holding fast' of the word, but in 1 Th 5:14 to the support or

¹"Philo and the Pastorals", pp. 114f.

aid of needy church members. However: the term is employed only four times in scripture and in each instance it denotes the 'holding fast' to something: its use in the parallel Gospel accounts indicates the holding fast to the master (Mt 6:24; Lk 16:13); 1 Th 5:14 to the weaker members (not necessarily, aid or support); and Tit 1:9 to the word. Hence, the term's use in Tit 1:9 is in keeping both with Paul, and the NT.

c. γράμματα . Objection: that in II 3:15 the application is to the distinctly good sense of the OT writings; while in Paul it is "always in a bad sense." However: although Paul characteristically uses γραφή of the Scriptures and γράμμα of the letter as opposed to the spirit, the use of γράμμα in Gal 6:11 for a letter or writing would indicate that Paul doesn't "always" use the term in a bad sense; the Pastorals' connotation is also found in Philo, and was thus available to the first century Paul.

d. ἐπαγγέλλομαι . Objection: that in I 2:10; 6:2, it refers to profession, while in Paul "always" of the Divine promises. However: the "always" consists of only two occasions (R 4:21; Gal 3:19); the Pauline sense is also found in Tit 1:2, and thus not foreign to the author.

e. ἐπέχω . Objection: that in I 4:16 it means to 'take heed' while Phil 2:16 'to hold forth'. However: the meaning of 'to hold' or 'to give attention to' is applicable in both cases; two connotations are found in Lucan writings (cf. Lu 14:7; Acts 19:22) and were thus available.

f. καθίστημι . Objection: that in Tit 1:5 it means the appointment to an office, while in R 5:19, to set down or 'be made to be'. However: both contexts permit the connotation of being made or constituted; the righteous are constituted or made righteous in R 5:19, the elders are made or constituted in Tit 1:5; cf. also Acts 6:3, where the same word is applied to the ecclesiastical function, and thus available,

g. κοινός . Objection: that in Tit 1:4 it has a good connotation, but in R 14:14 it is in reference to that which is unclean. However: that both concepts were possible and available is seen from Acts 2:44 (common or good) and Acts 10:14 (unclean).

h. μακάριος . Objection: that in I 1:11, 6:15 it is applied to God, but "never so in Paul." However: Paul's only use of the comparable term is in an OT quotation in R 4:7f; the cited 1 C 7:40 passage is in the comparative form; the attribution to God is found throughout the LXX from Gen 9:26 onwards, and was thus available.

i. μόρφωσις . Objection: that in II 3:5 it is applied in a bad sense; while in R 2:20 to a good connotation. However: in both cases it is used in an ironical sense; those in 2 T who hold a form of Godliness are to be shunned; while those in Rom who have only a form of knowledge are ultimately cause for the name of God to be blasphemed.

j. οἶκος θεοῦ . Objection: that in I 3:15 it means God's house, but in Paul only of human dwellings where the church meets. However: although admittedly unPauline, it is found similarly employed in the Synoptics (Mt 12:4; Mk 2:26; Lu 6:4) and from Christ's own words in Jo 2:16, and was thus available and circulating in the first century.

k. παρατίθημι . Objection: that in II 2:2 it refers to a commitment, but in the only other instance of 1 C 10:27 to the placing of food on a table. However: is it not stretching the point that a man can not, on the one hand, 'set' food before a man, and on the other 'set' a charge, or word of God before a man?

l. προσδέχομαι . Objection: that in Tit 2:13 it refers to the looking for the blessed hope, but in Paul to the reception of visiting saints. However: it is certainly possible for one to await and receive the Lord, as well as to await and receive the saints; both connotations of 'waiting' and 'receiving' are found in the Lucan writings (cf. Lk 15:2; Acts 23:21) and were thus available.

m. πληροφορέω . Objection: that in II 4:5,17 it refers to the fulfilling of one's ministry, while in Paul to the convincing or persuading of a mind. However: etymologically there is no great distinction between R 4:21 et al passages denoting the mind as being brought to the full measure, and the Pastorals which afford the work of the ministry a similar concept.

n. ὑποτίθημι . Objection: that in I 4:6 it means to 'put in mind of' but in R 16:4 to 'lay down', 'risk' (one's neck). However: the root idea of 'to lay down' is the same whether it involves ideas or lives.

Even if it could not be shown that the declared antithesis was forced, Harrison's admission that no author should "invariably use every word in exactly the same sense," and that Paul himself uses words in varying senses¹, militates severely against this line of argument.

¹e.g. εὐλογία (R 16:18) meaning 'flattery', R 15:29, meaning 'blessing', and 2 C 9:5, 'collection'; ξένος, Eph 2:9, 'stranger', and R 16:23, 'host'. Cf. ibid.,

Variation in Synonyms

"And once again," asserts Harrison, "we have to judge whether the instances, studied in detail and collectively, are favourable to, or even compatible with, unity of authorship."¹ Yet, an examination of even a few of the alleged variations (pp. 28f) might well lead to an alternative judgment to that afforded by Harrison.

a. καταφρονέω . Objection: that in I 4:12, it is applied to Timothy, but in 1 C 16:10, a comparable passage, Paul uses εξουθενέω. However: the objection is invalidated since Paul uses καταφρονέω elsewhere (R 2:4; 1 C 11:22).

b. ἀνεπίλητος . Objection: that it is used in place of the Pauline ἄμωμος or ἄμειπτος . However: the Pauline synonym, ἀνέγκλητος which he uses as frequently as the cited terms, is found in I 3:10 and Tit 1:6,7. Thus, who is to say that ἀνεπίλητος is not a synonym for the existing ἀνέγκλητος rather than the missing ἄμωμος ?

c. ἐπιφάνεια . Objection: that it is used in the Pastorals for the expected return of Christ, whereas the Pauline term is παρουσία . However: Paul also used ἐπιφάνεια (2 Th 2:8); and the term is twice found in Harrison's accepted fragments which are alleged to be "genuine Pauline material."²

d. μαίνω . Objection: that the writer of the Pastorals prefers this term (as do, apparently the second century writers) to

¹PPE, p. 28. Lock (PE, pp. xxviiiif), although maintaining Pauline authenticity, observes this as a real problem.

²PPE, p. 93. Cf. II 4:1,8.

the Pauline μολύνω . However:μιαίνω is found only in Tit 1:15 in the Pastorals, and μολύνω only in 1 C 8:7 in the Paulines. The preference is therefore not of sufficient frequency to become stereotyped. Since both terms are found alike in the LXX and in the second century writers, no merit may be attached to Harrison's citation of the appearance of μιαίνω in the Apostolic Fathers. According to Trench,¹ the words contain a variance in meaning which would enable the writer to utilize that word which best expresses his thought at the time.

1. δεσπόται . Objection: that it is used in I 6:1,2 and Tit 2:9, where Paul uses κύριος in Eph 6:5, and Col 3:22. However: δεσπόται is also found in a similar passage in 1 P 2:18, and the Pastorals' employment is therefore in keeping with the suggested first century source material of Selwyn. After observing the variety of uses, Trench notes how "little, in popular speech the distinction of the grammarians was observed."²

Is it not quite possible that the same writer might use different words to express the same thought at different periods of his life? That Paul varied his synonyms was clear from the discussion of ἄμωμος , from his use of ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν in Col 1:14 (cf. Eph 1:7), but πάρεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων in R 3:25; as well as from the use of ἀποκάλυπτω when referring to the revelation of God in R (1:17,18; 8:18) and 1 C (2:10), but φανερώ in Col 3:4; and from the perusal of any work on synonyms. To content many critics

¹Synonyms of the NT, 9th ed, London, 1880, p. 110.

²Ibid., p. 97.

of vocabulary an author must, it seems, with Simpson, "never break out in a new direction; having had his vision and his dream he must henceforth be like a star and dwell apart. To be stereotyped is his only salvation."¹

Omission of Characteristic Terms

Not only is there the problem of 175 hapax legomena, but there is also the serious difficulty of omitting the "most frequent and characteristic terms in the Pauline vocabulary."² Harrison's chart, disclosing the absence of 80 such terms, used in aggregate 1229 times in the ten accepted Epistles, as well as the omission of 27 cognate groupings, presents a formidable obstacle for any who would still cling to Pauline authorship. That the unfavorable impression created might be illusory, however, is shown by the following considerations.

Mathematics has again been employed for a linguistic problem, and in so doing, Harrison has incorporated a disproportionate ratio. He is comparing 13.66 Pastorals' pages against the aggregate of 105.25 Pauline pages, and declares: look at the missing words! Not only so, but the argument itself is subject to question mathematically. For, if every one of the Pastorals' Paul's Wortschatz had been a Pauline term, there would still have been omitted some 1329 words which had been employed by the

¹Op. cit., p. 14, an unattributed quotation. That words are used in different parts of the NT in varied senses, is discussed by E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, Oxford, 1889, pp. 7ff. For a similar problem regarding Ephesians, see, F.J.A. Hort, Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Ephesians, London, 1895, p. 159.

²PPE, p. 30. Cf., Moffatt, INT, pp. 406f; and R. Scott, p. 334.

Apostle. This means, that although the 80 listed were chosen to disclose the glaring weakness of the Pastorals, 1249 additional words could have been employed to portray the tragic condition. Yet using this test of omissions for authenticity, Romans is destitute of 1184 Pauline terms, the Philippians of 1748. Which one of the accepted Paulines could withstand such a test?

The inconsistent position of Harrison's criticism is exhibited in yet another way. For, within the scope of his work, he complains on the one hand that the genuine Paul would not have omitted such characteristic terms, and that they would certainly have found their way into his writings; and on the other, he employs Goodspeed's argument regarding Ephesians,¹ when he asserts that "freshness and originality of expression" are lacking because of the "composite links connecting the Pastorals" with the Paulines. "Indeed," attests Harrison, "so numerous and striking are these verbal agreements that it becomes a very serious question whether Paul would have been able, or likely, to reproduce, purely from memory, such a variety of extracts from letters which he had dictated seven or eight years previously."² Is it really possible for the Pastorals to be both too Pauline and not enough Pauline at the same time? If an accepted Epistle is under discussion, any resemblance is a vindication of Pauline authenticity; while discrepancies produce the distinctive characteristics that are inimitable. On the other hand,

¹The Meaning of Ephesians, Chicago, 1933, esp pp. 82-164, where he attempts to show through the use of parallel columns how the text of Ephesians was a collection of borrowed phrases from the accepted nine Epistles.

²PPE, p. 89. Yet, cf. A.E. Hillard, The PE of St. Paul, London, 1919, p. xxxii.

if a questionable Epistle has phrases or thoughts which are unparalleled in Paul's accepted letters, the Apostle did not write it; if the Epistle savors of too much Paulinism, it is adjudged to be a crude imitation of a forger, or devout, but clumsy, Paulinist. Where is the happy meeting ground of contemporary criticism regarding such writings?

An analysis of the omissions discloses that they are not so much characteristically Pauline as they are distinctive to both of the first two centuries, as well as to the various NT writers. All 80 omissions cited are extant in other NT writers, 17 within the Lucan writings; while all but 3 are found within the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

Their incidental, rather than indispensable, character is manifested when it is recognized that not one of the 80 (and only 47 of the 2177) is utilized in each one of the ten accepted Letters; only 4 in 9, and 6 in 8. According to Form¹ some 1257, or over half of the Pauline vocabulary, occur only in some one Epistle. Of the 80 characteristically Pauline words listed, 29 are not found in group I;² while an additional 22 are used only once. 15 are used only once in group III; an additional 22 only twice. 55 of the 80 are used a total of but 10 times or less in group II; 21 a total of 5 times or less. The 80 are found in 1229 instances, but 30 only 10 times or less. Of the 1229 instances, there is but an aggregate of 116 in group 1. That distribution is markedly according to the size and content

¹Op. cit. p. 229. Harrison (PPE, p. 46) sets the figure at 1113.

²To facilitate comparative study, the traditional groupings of the Thessalonians (I), Missionary (II), and Captivity (III) Epistles will be followed.

of the particular Epistle, is seen from the following facts: ἄλλος is found 23 times in 1 C, but only 8 additional times in 4 other Epistles; ὄμα is found 43 times in 1 C, a total of 66 times in group II, but only once in group I; σοφία is used 17 times in 1 C, only once in Rom, and not at all in Gal, Phil, 1, 2 Th, Phlm; πρόσωπον is found 17 times in group II (including 12 in 2 C), but only once in group III. Group II contains: 29 of 31 instances of καυχάομαι ; 18 of 20 of κατεργάζομαι ; 17 of 20 of εὐαγγελίζομαι and 36 of 41 of ἀποθνῆσσω . 16 of 26 instances of χαίρω are in 2 Epistles; while φρονέω is used 11 times in groups II and III, but not at all in group I. Since it is obvious that subject-matter determines vocabulary, this should exclude the assumption that mathematical calculation can predict an author's working vocabulary from one writing or group of writings to another.¹

In conjunction with the concept, that subject is the determinative of vocabulary, it should be noted, that such lists as Harrison's and Holtzmann's include words which could not be expected here.² Such words as ἀκροβυστία, διαθήκη, and ἐλεύθερος do not occur, but they are virtually confined to the great missionary Epistles with their heated conflict over Jewish authority. One might also question the occasion for such words as: δεξιός, ἐπιστολή, ουρανός, σταυρός .

Since Harrison argues from missing cognates as well, it is significant that in Appendix E of this thesis there are no less

¹Cf. Guthrie, Mind of Paul, pp. 7f.

²Cf. PE, pp. xxxixf.

than 41 of the 80 missing words which are shown to have cognate forms within the Pastorals. When these are analysed, Harrison's list of 27 groups of cognate words that are missing from the Pastorals (p. 33) is found to be not altogether a true picture. For, although the words he lists are omitted, cognate words, belonging to the same families are to be found. The exclusion of ἀναγκαῖος, ἔργον, καταφθείρω, περιφρονέω, κενοφωνία, πνεῦμα, σοφίζω, τέλος, ὑπερπλεονάζω, ὕστερος, invalidate 10 of the 27 groups cited. When it is recognized that all but 5 of the 27 groups occur with equal frequency among the Apostolic Fathers, the value of this criticism is further brought into question.

It should also be noted that the entire value of synonyms is destroyed unless, in at least 12 instances, the equally Pauline synonym is recognized as a justifiable substitute. For example: ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις are omitted, but the equally Pauline φανερώ is present (cf. Appendix F).

Finally, is the question of vocabulary omission one of mathematics or of psychology? The only data presented fall within the category of the former; but Harrison inserts a psychological judgment into the question when he alleges that what is known of Paul prohibits such vocabulary variance. "To discard suddenly," he states, "at the end of a lifetime such a host of favourite expressions, and introduce in their stead such a mass of new and unfamiliar terms, might indicate a certain kind of versatility, but not the kind which we have any reason for attributing to the Apostle." (p. 46). Thus, Harrison's concept of Paul is conditioned by excluding the Pastorals, permitting the

accepted Paulines to determine what is known of Paul, proceeding to extract the dissimilarities between this and what is discovered from the disputed books, and then finally concluding that the disputed books cannot be Pauline. Is this type of discussion to be taken as the more scientific? Is it to be conscientiously doubted that an author, whether of Paul's stature or not, might so vary? "It is one of the curiosities and absurdities of all literature," asserts Ramsay, "that one of the greatest masters of Greek, the man who adapted Greek to the expression of a new ethic and a new religion - not in an artificial jargon of technical terms, but in the language of the world - should have been described by so many modern scholars as unable to write Greek."¹ Harrison himself admits that Paul's vocabulary was of a greater dimension than the extant 2,177 words (p. 46). If greater, could it not be as extensive as the required 2,483? He also contends, that he does not wish "to impose an arbitrary cast-iron standard on any human mind, least of all on Paul's mind"²; yet if there is no desire to be arbitrary, why is there this arbitrary limitation? Surely, no one uses even a moiety of the words he knows. Therefore, if there were possible factors involved in the Pastorals' vocabulary formation, then the limitation must be adjudged arbitrary. Schürer's words would appear applicable here, when he asserts that such arguments, "have weight only with him who makes the Apostle Paul, that most living and mobile spirit the world has ever seen, a man of habit and routine,

¹First Christian Century, London, 1911, p. 102. Ramsay further asserts (p. 190) that the argument from omission is a "wire-drawn, artificial and utterly unconvincing series of fanciful suppositions."

²PPE, pp. 46f. Yet, see, Lock, PE, p. xxviii.

who began to write each of his letters like all the others, to repeat in the following one what he had said in the preceding and to say it again always in the same way, and in the same terms."¹ Such rejection of the Pastorals' vocabulary can only be deemed psychologically justifiable if adequate reasons can be brought forward to indicate that Paul could not have known the additional words. It is not sufficient to assert that Paul did not, or would not have employed the words in question; it must be exhibited that he could not because they were not available.² This factor Harrison attempts to show by his examination of the vocabulary in its relationship with second century writers. As few doubt that the Pastoral Epistles were written either by the Apostle, or by a disciple, the problem is confined to the issue: do the real affinities of the Pastorals' Wortschatz lie with the Pauline or with the sub-Pauline writings?

THE LANGUAGE OF THE PASTORALS AND OF PAUL COMPARED
WITH THAT OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND APOLOGISTS

The third general fact set forth by Harrison is that the Pastorals, when compared with the writings of the second century, show a greater literary affinity with them, than with those of the first. He correctly assumes that a Paulinist would inadvertently have disclosed his true era of writing by a divergence in speech;

¹Cited by M.R. Vincent, Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, ICC, Edinburgh, 1897, p. xxx.

²E.g. the designation 'Christian' could not have been employed before the time of Christ. Cf. W.H. Simcox, "The Pauline Antilegomena", Exp, 3rd series, VIII (1888), 185; J.V. Bartlet, "The Historic Setting of the PE", Exp, 8th series, V (1913), 164; and Badcock, p. 123.

for, "he could say much, but not all, that he had to say, in the ipsissima verba of his master."¹ Item after item is so vividly portrayed in substantiation, that Harrison can confidently conclude that "it does not seem possible to regard any one of the series of facts adduced in this section as merely accidental." (p. 73) If his conclusion is substantiated, this, and not the problem of hapax legomena, would prohibit Pauline authenticity. Again, however, there is a need to review, not the facts, but the inferences drawn from these facts.²

It must be observed that Harrison is operating on the faulty assumption that simply because no other NT writer employs the words in question they were therefore unknown, and thus not available in the first century. Yet, it is impossible to scan the hapax legomena without arriving at the concomitant truths that if the first century Paul had not employed them it was because he had no occasion, and also that most, if not all, of them were available to him.³ Regarding this latter truth, words are not of such an exiguous duration as to make this argument valid. The caution of Grimm-Thayer is applicable here:

¹PPE, p. 67. Cf. Moffatt, INT, p. 408.

²Cf. Guthrie, PE, pp. 212-20; Mind of Paul; Hitchcock, "Tests for the Pastorals", pp. 272-79; Badcock, pp. 125sq; "The Authorship of the PE", CQR, LXIII (1906-7); A.E. Brooke, "The Problem of the PE", JTS, XXIII (1922), 255-262; Henshaw, p. 332; and Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments".

³Cf. M. Dods, INT, 5th ed, London, 1892, p. 176f. Hillard, p. xxx: "...their occurring or not occurring in a particular book can only be a matter of accident."

The surprises almost everyone has experienced in investigating the age of some word in his vernacular which has dropped out of use for whole stretches of time and then reappeared, may admonish him of the precarious character of conclusions respecting the usage of ancient language of which only fragmentary¹ relics survive, and those often but imperfectly examined.

It should be obvious that any word found in other NT, but non-Pauline, writings, might well have been employed by a first century Pastoral-Paul; and therefore this discussion will be basically confined to the 175 hapax legomena. When these are examined, Harrison's assumption is found to be completely untenable. M. Hitchcock has shown that 153 out of the 175 hapax legomena (88%), and 125 out of the 131 (96%), or an aggregate of 90%, occur before A.D. 50;² while Harrison has been able to uncover but 61 in the Apostolic Fathers, and an additional 32 in the Apologists (p. 68) 79 of the Pastorals' hapax legomena, or 19 more than the total found within the second century ecclesiastical writers (including 42 of the 60 found in the Apostolic Fathers, 18 of those shared with the Apologists, and 22 of those not found at all in the second century church writers), are paralleled in the LXX.³ Although this author has personally examined the earliest appearances of each hapax legomenon Hitchcock's summary can not be improved upon in its brevity and scope.

Forty-four of these are in the Greek drama (20 Aesch., 7 Soph., 17 Eurip.), chiefly in the Oresteia and other plays in which Nero acted after his mother's murder. (A.D. 50). Aeschylus has also strings of words in a-priv. and compounds in φιλο - as we find in the Pastorals. Forty-four also are in the standard Classics, 34 in Polybius and

¹A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT, 4th ed, Edinburgh, 1905, pp. 687f.

²"Tests for the Pastorals", pp. 278f.

³For a complete list of the Pastorals' hapax legomena found in the LXX, see, Guthrie, Mind of Paul, p. 40.

Strabo, 6 in Meineke's *Fragmenta*, 12 in Philo, Josephus, etc., 5 in Latin. The LXX gives 6 (76 altogether), Diodorus 8 (40 altogether). Thus 159 are accounted for, 153 (omitting 2 from Josephus and 4 from Plutarch) of which are found before A.D. 50. Of the others many cognate and similar forms are also found before that date.¹

Similar evidence is dismissed by Harrison as follows:

And the fact that a given word, or group of words, is known and its meaning understood, does not at once prove that it is likely to be used, by a given author, or at a certain time. Nor can it be conceded as self-evident that Paul must have been familiar with every Greek word in the LXX and Apocrypha. (p. 66)

Yet, what he denounces as impracticable to expect of Paul, he demands of the second century Paulinist when the scope of that century's literature is used for comparative purposes with the Pastorals.

In Hitchcock's article, "Philo and the Pastorals", the fallacy is exposed of affording a late date to the Pastorals because of the hapax legomena present in second century writings.² Harrison has located 93 such words in the later writings; Hitchcock, 120 in Philo. There are 68 instances of a-privative in the Pastorals; 52 or 76% of these are in Philo. Of 193 a-privatives in the Pauline Epistles, 142 or 74% are in Philo. Of 2, 262 words in the accepted Letters, 1,829 are in Philo, or 81%. Of the 893 words in the Pastorals, 781, or 87.5%, are in Philo. Harrison has noted 664 words out of 848 found in the Pastorals in the Apostolic Fathers, or 78.3%; and 641, or 75.5% to the Apologists. It is of interest, however, that 781 out of 893 or 87.4% represents the proportion of Philonic words, not counting cognates. Using the same methods employed by

¹"Tests for the Pastorals", pp. 278f.

²Op. cit., pp. 113-135.

Harrison, Hitchcock was able to prove that "the vocabulary of the Pastorals stands closer to Philo than it does to the Apostolic Fathers or Apologists."¹

Not only is Harrison guilty of a faulty assumption, but again of faulty arithmetic. He has once again incorporated the previously exposed words-per-page method, as well as attaining a working ratio through the comparison of literature of disproportionate bulk. One can not proportionately compare the Pastorals' vocabulary of 848 words, or even that of Paul's 2,177, with that of the 4,020 Wortschatz of the Apostolic Fathers' alone. In addition, the greater divergence from Pauline vocabulary enhances the possibility of greater affinity of the Pastorals elsewhere; while the more hapax legomena with which to compare enables more opportunities of a second century linkage. This disproportionate ratio is further enhanced when Harrison incorporates the writings of the Apologists to the year A.D. 170 (pp. 71ff). He is thus admitting, that only 60 of 175 hapax legomena are found in the huge 4,020 Wortschatz of the Apostolic Fathers (which is the era of the hypothetical Paulinist), and must therefore look elsewhere for support of his argument. His inclusion of writings more than 50 years later than his own datings of the Pastorals, is inconsistent with his failure to grant the same 50 year vocabulary span necessary to bring an authentic Pauline-Pastorals' vocabulary into the Apostolic Fathers' era. The ratio is further aggravated

¹Ibid., pp. 117f.

by Harrison's resort to the vocabulary of secular writers, as well as cognates (p. 83); although such a procedure is rejected for affirmation of a first-century vintage. According to Kenyon, "the second century palaeographical material is more plentiful than for any other period in the whole history of writing upon papyrus, not a single year being unrepresented by at least one accurately dated document."¹ It is this wide range of documents with which Harrison wants to compare the Pastorals.

Using this dis-proportionate ratio, Harrison arrives at the conclusion that 1,543 out of 2,177 Pauline words, or 70.9%, are found in the Apostolic Fathers; while 664 out of 848 Pastorals' words, or 78.3, are similarly found. Actually, as the following chart will disclose, these percentages are misleading.²

	Total Vocab- ulary	Absent From AF	Percentages Not In In AF AF		Absent from AF & Ap.	Percentages Not In In AF or Ap AF or Ap	
Romans	993	182	18.3	81.7	104	10.5	89.5
1 Cor	934	149	16.0	84.0	89	9.5	90.5
2 Cor	762	150	19.7	80.3	95	12.4	87.6
Gal	503	71	14.1	85.9	47	9.3	90.7
Eph	523	72	13.8	86.2	47	9.0	91.0
Phil	429	58	13.5	86.5	40	9.3	90.7
Col	409	59	14.4	85.6	40	9.8	90.2
1 Th	353	42	11.9	88.1	25	7.0	93.0
2 Th	243	22	9.0	91.0	14	5.8	94.2
Phlm	129	10	7.7	92.3	5	3.8	96.2
Past	848	184	21.7	78.3	113	13.3	86.7

Such statistics seriously vitiate those of Harrison. The only satisfactory conclusion to be drawn is that the predominant portion of both the Pauline and the Pastorals' language is current within

¹The Paleography of Greek Papyri, Oxford, 1899, p. 45.

²Chart taken from Guthrie, Mind of Paul, p. 41.

both the first and second centuries. Appendix B discloses that when only the hapax legomena are compared, 1 C is seen to have a higher percentage of words found in common with the second-century ecclesiastical language than has either 1 T or Titus. Since it is unthinkable that 1 C should be assigned to the second-century, the inability of mathematical calculations to prove linguistic affinity is again exposed.

"But," states Harrison, "the outstanding fact here is that one word in every four throughout the Pastorals, 211 out of 848, while foreign so far as we know to the vocabulary of Paul, is now proved to form part of the working vocabulary of Christian writers between the years A.D. 95 and 170 - including many words which recur with some frequency." (p. 73) But, he neglects to point out that this working vocabulary contains no more than 45 of the Pastorals' 175 hapax legomena which occur in more than one author during this 75 year span. It would seem, therefore, that the great majority of the Pastorals' hapax legomena are actually peculiar to the second-century writers' vocabulary **as** well. Harrison again makes a similar statement: "We find more than a few of the Pastoral Hapax Legomena recurring again and again in one writer after another." (p. 69) When the seventeen words which he cites to substantiate this claim are analysed, it is found that with but one exception these are the only words which occur in three writers or more during the A.D. 95-170 span. It should further be noted, that with but one exception, the words are all found in the LXX.

Finally, the validity of Harrison's deductions is affected, when he gives insufficient attention to the possible influence of the Pastorals upon the later writers' vocabulary. As was disclosed in the first chapter, the Pastorals were employed as early and as extensively as most of the accepted Pauline Epistles by the ecclesiastical writers of the second-century. Furthermore, with the similarity of content, it is surprising that an even greater proportion of affinity is not uncovered. This possibility of influence is answered by Harrison with recourse to the number of Pastorals' hapax legomena found in secular writers like Epictetus, Appian, and Marcus Aurelius; he therefore contends that these men could not have been so affected. But, as Guthrie has observed, "it is not a matter of enriching vocabulary so much as using words in common ecclesiastical usage for similar purposes."¹ That there is a real connexion between the language of the Pastorals and the second century writers is evident; but it must be apparent that there is also a difference between their content and the essentially second-hand character of the sub-apostolic literature. The question must be posed: Are the Pastorals merely a product of that age, or did they aid in the formation of its language? Harrison's 'facts' do not, as alleged, require the former choice.

Consideration of the facts under review will suggest the need of extreme caution in the use of the argument from vocabulary. The dogmatic assertions, and the over-positively

¹PE, p. 214.

stated conclusions drawn from hapax legomena were astutely fore-cautioned by Grimm-Thayer:

The monumental misjudgements committed by some who have made questions of authorship turn on vocabulary alone will deter students, it is to be hoped, from misusing the lists exhibiting the peculiarities of the several books.¹

That there are marked peculiarities, both in the presence and absence, of the vocabulary, is obvious. There is no intention to minimize this fact; but to guard against the evidence of vocabulary as acquiring a disproportionate significance where the only documents for comparison are but ten brief letters, which were spread over a period of some 15 years, with no more background than a few chapters of Acts. The study of the acknowledged vocabulary peculiarities must form but one aspect of a document's composition: psychological probability, historical perspective, causative or formative factors, and so many varied phases, must be considered as well. In reviewing the work of Harrison, Cheetham observed:

Enthusiasm for certain aspects of a problem may blind us to equally weighty considerations of another kind. Thus the literary specialist may be led to form his opinion by the phenomena which appeal most strongly to his own particular interests and understanding. He may be, without knowing it, comparatively unresponsive to other factors no less important.²

That there are other factors leads us to still another field of study - style.

¹Op. cit., p. 689.

²Op. cit., p. 320. Cf. P. Fairbairn, PE, Edinburgh, 1874, pp. 13f; and C.H. Turner, The Study of the NT, p. 20.

STYLE

Preliminary Investigation

Problem. Although the characterization may vary, few would disagree that the Pastorals are not without their own stylistic peculiarities. In contradistinction to the genuine Pauline Epistles, these are asserted to be "slow, diffuse, incoherent, repetitious, and on the whole lusterless."¹ Concurring, other scholars² complain, in addition, of the lack of, or illogical, progression; while Harrison maintains also that the Pastorals are too "sober, didactic, static, conscientious, domesticated" to be Pauline.³ Expositors of all schools of thought acknowledge "a more circumscribed orbit of expatiation,"⁴ and in general, a production which appears "inferior" if accorded to Paul.⁵

Such concurrence of scholarship would suggest that the charges are well founded. But, as in the case of the vocabulary, it is in the inferences drawn from the facts, the evaluation of these observations, that coincidence of thought is lacking. For Burn, the entire question of style should be briefly dismissed, since it is the vocabulary which constitutes the greatest pro-

¹Gealy, p. 363. Cf. Jülicher, INT, p. 182.

²Cf. Easton, PE, p. 13; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 401.

³PPE, p. 42.

⁴E.K. Simpson, p. 2. Cf. R. Falconer, p. 8; and Humphreys, p. 31.

⁵F.W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul, London, 1885, p. 744.

blem;¹ while Sanday and Headlam would make the question of style the "most substantial" argument.² The varied interpretation of the evidence is seen when Eichhorn and Gealy see in the style a single spurious pen, Schleiermacher and Harrison two, the genuine and the spurious, while Lightfoot and White see but one undeniably Pauline pen - yet separated in time from the others.³ For Bowen, even the linguistic peculiarities point to the Pauline pen, since the admitted style of his master would have been more closely followed by any would-be fabricator.⁴ Such a scene of divergent scholarship depicts the lamentable fact that there is no comity in the establishment of criteria governing the most basic judgment of style.

Granted that there is a want of structural growth, that the Epistles are sober and didactic in character, that the emotional verve and passion of the accepted epistles is absent - in what way does this recognition of style invalidate their authenticity? If, with Moffat,⁵ it is contended that such stylization particularizes them as being unworthy of Paul, that is an issue which is dependent upon one's concept of the Apostle. If, on the other hand, it be asserted only that the style lacks the desired warmth and vigour, that the Epistles are terse and compressed - what

¹"PE", pp. 578f. Cf. Reuss, p. 122. The question is virtually ignored by such writers as E.F. Scott (PE, p. xxi), and Barclay (PE, p. xxiii).

²Op. cit., p. lxx. Cf. Guthrie, PE, p. 224.

³J.B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, London, 1893, pp. 400ff; White, p. 63. Cf. C.J. Ellicott, Commentary on the PE, 4th ed, London, 1869, p. xxi.

⁴W.E. Bowen, The Dates of the PE, London, 1900, pp. 6f. Cf. M'Clymont, p. 191; and R.M. Pope, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to Timothy and Titus, London, 1901, p. 25.

⁵HNT, p. 558.

then? Were there not mitigating factors which, although when viewed singly they are hardly sufficient to account for style variances, yet when taken concurrently may serve to explain the divergences? Is the only alternative that a pseudepigraphical writing has found its place within the Pauline corpus? Are the traditional attempts to explain the Pastorals' style only the "myth of desperate and needless conservatism?"¹ What, after all, produces style is a question that cannot be so casually dismissed. It seems necessary to insist that whoever the author, there were formative or causative factors which must be taken seriously. Some of the attempts to reconcile the style divergences with Pauline authorship may be dismissed quickly; not because they are valueless, but because scholarship knows not how to evaluate them adequately.² Others have noticeably more merit and must be observed in greater detail.

Literary Analogies. A study of Lutoslawski's work on Plato changed W.B. Sedgwick from his "absolutely convinced" position regarding the unauthenticity of the Pastorals to a pro-Pauline position.³ Plato, like the Pastorals' Paul, becomes more dogmatic, writes as an old man, and attacks new and different problems. Yet for all the comparisons, Sedgwick maintains that "any Pauline Epistle is more like the Pastorals than the

¹Ibid., p. 124. Cf. Gealy, p. 363.

²e.g. Spicq's suggestion (p. xc) regarding the psychology of a prisoner as manifest in the Pastorals.

³Op. cit., pp. 230f, using W. Lutoslawski, The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic, London, 1897.

Euthyphro is like the Sophists, or Laws."¹ A similar study, on the varieties of Shakespearean style, is noted by Burn;² while Simpson cites the contrast between Tennyson's In Memoriam and his Northern Farmer, and the "ornate luxuriance of the more sonorous cadences of Paradise Lost and the tragic austerity and loin-girt athleticism of Milton's latest work, the Samson Agonisties!"³ Although one must use the utmost caution in the argument from analogy because of its dependence upon the exact extent and character of the resemblance, and although Harrison questions that such an argument solves the problem,⁴ it is possible that it leads somewhat towards a solution. Since the comparison is not between Paul and Plato, but the possibilities of style change within the separate writings, it might indicate that Paul too could so fluctuate. What, therefore, are possible factors which might produce a change of style?

POSSIBLE FORMATIVE FACTORS OF STYLE

Psychology of Age

If Hort is able to explain the calmness of Ephesians as due to the mellowing effect of years upon the Apostle,⁵ and if with White Paul had ceased to be the "Paul the aged" of Philemon, and had rapidly, even prematurely, become an old man,⁶ what effect

¹ Ibid.

² Op. cit., p. 580. Cf. W.P. Workman, pp. 418f.

³ Op. cit., pp. 15f.

⁴ PPE, pp. 59-65.

⁵ Prolegomena, p. 153.

⁶ Op. cit., pp. 59f.

would this probably have upon style? Spicq asserts that the frequent retrogression rather than creation, desire to give advice, predilection for youth and anxiety for their esteem, recourse to stereotyped formulae, inertia and tendency to synthesize, accenting the basic and diminishing the secondary, and the desire for moderation, dignity, and respect, are all features of the Pastorals, and that they accord perfectly with the psychology of an aging man.¹ Yet, it is to be questioned whether the lessened vitality of age even with an interval of 5 or 6 years from the noticeably vigorous Philippians, can alone account for the Pastorals' style² - unless accompanied by circumstances which should further explain the alteration.

Change of Circumstance

Two long imprisonments in Caesarea and Rome, and possible prolonged Western travel, would inevitably have had a profound impact upon a man's style - but what? and how much? At the age of 60 or 65, they are certain to have had a premature aging effect and would possibly have resulted in a subsequent inclination to brevity and conciseness. Furthermore, if the Apostle were to engage in any extended conversation during his imprisonment, it would have been with the ever present, well-trained and

¹Op. cit., p. xc. Cf. Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus, p. 16; Findlay, The Epistles of the Apostle Paul, London, 1895, pp. 213f; Godet, p. 599; Simpson, p. viii; Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, II, London, 1877, 656; Lock, "First Epistle to Timothy", p. 722b; and Ellicott, pp. xviif.

²Cf. R. Falconer, PE, p. 8; and Moffatt, HNT, p. 558.

educated, pure Italian-blooded Praetorian guards. Since even the Greek spoken in Rome was affected by Latin idiom, it is conceivable that Paul would have seized upon this opportunity to expand any knowledge of Latin; especially if any hope lingered for missionary activity in Spain. That the author of the Pastorals writes as a cultivated Roman Christian is abundantly clear from such evidence as the following: some 160 Latin terms and phrases traced by M. Hitchcock (e.g. the Pauline εὐχαριστέω is now χάριτι ἔχω and διό is now δι' ἣν αἰτίαν);¹ the propensity for φιλο- and α- privative compounds which is paralleled in Cicero;² personal authority enhanced through the abundance of imperatives; and lucidity of formulated doctrine which is abetted by Latin preciseness. Actually, if the Pastorals were devoid of any Roman impact, and were more markedly Pauline in style, the question could be legitimately raised why a genuine Pauline writing had not become more influenced.³

Amanuensis and the Ancient Art of Letter Writing

To many, the most plausible, and therefore the most widely accepted, explanation of the Pastorals' stylistic differences,

¹"Latinity of the Pastorals", ET, xxxix (1928), 347f; gratiam habeo, I 1:12; II 1:3, cf. Lu 17:9; and ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω in I C 10:30; quam ob causam, II 1:6, 12; Tit 1:13, cf. Lu 8:47. See also for discussion of the guard's educational status. Cf. Knowling, Testimony, p. 136; Badcock, pp. 122f.

²10 compounds with φιλο - in the Pastorals, 24 in Cicero; 49 compounds with α- in Pastorals, 60 in Cicero. So, Hitchcock, ibid.

³For discussion of the Pastorals' Latinity, cf. Hitchcock, ibid.; "Classical Allusions in the PE", Theology, XVII (1928), 62-71; Burn, pp. 579ff; Godet, p. 599; Findlay, "PE", p. 358.

is the employment of a new amanuensis after Paul's first captivity. That the Apostle availed himself of such assistance is known (cf. R 16:22; 1 C 16:21 et al); for the secretary to have introduced some peculiarities of phrase and diction is possible; but the questions of what and how much of style is to be so attributable, and the precise role of the amanuensis in ancient letter writing, make evaluation difficult. Selwyn, commenting on I Peter,¹ and Burkitt on Thessalonians,² make a distinction between the duties of a scribe, who was expected to record the author's precise words, and a trusted amanuensis, who could be granted a wider scope in interpreting his master's mind; they accord the latter role to Silvanus with regard to both epistles. Others, with varying degrees of latitude, would claim this same role for the Pastorals' amanuensis. A modern parallel is found in the relationship of a skilled native writer assigned to foreign missionaries. After the missionary records his thought, the writer reads it, talks about it, and then drafts the material afresh into the classical phraseology. The thoughts are the author's; the structure, the writer's.³ It is obvious that the style would vary markedly with each new writer. Because of the wide

¹Op. cit., pp. 10f. Cf. C. Bigg, 1 Peter, ICC, Edinburgh, pp. 5.

²F.C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, London, 1924, pp. 131f. Cf. G. Milligan, pp. 125f.

³Moule, cited in "Notes of Recent Exposition", ET, XVII (1906), 433f. Josephus might be cited as an ancient parallel. The differences between the different amanuenses can be detected easily in his works.

diffusion of the ancient art of shorthand,¹ and the inevitable inequality of scribal capability, this would appear to be a valid explanation of stylistic problems.²

Nevertheless, such a suggestion, although plausible, is not without its objections. If one is willing to assume that Paul simply outlined the material, and that the secretary put his own style and mentality into the Epistle, then a major objection is removed. It is always open to question, however, whether the Apostle would ever grant such authority. Perhaps the advance in age, and/or change in circumstances would require the relinquishing of literary rights. Yet, it would appear that Paul's individuality was too pronounced;³ his personal touch too necessary, the delicate Pauline turn of phrase too vital, to allow for the latitude required. Why, with the number of different secretaries employed in the accepted writings, did not a more drastic change in style occur? Why, when writing to two trusted colleagues and friends, was so much more scope granted? Why, when the mention of all forsaking him (II 1:15; 4:11) gave the opportunity, was his collaborator not mentioned? These, and other questions (e.g. the enigmatic problem of both the required unity of the three epistles, and yet divergence from the Paulines) must

¹Cf. Jones, pp. 289f. For discussion of the use of abbreviations and the use of symbols as a type of shorthand, see F.G. Kenyon, The Paleography of Greek Papyri, pp. 32f. For an important work on the ancient art of letter writing, see, O. Roller, Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe, Stuttgart, 1933, pp. 4ff. Cf. Jeremias, pp. 6f; and Ellis, p. 8.

²So, Bernard, PE, p. xli; Sanday, Inspiration, p. 342; Sanday and Headlam, pp. lxf; Jeremias, pp. 5f; Spicq, p. cxix; Rackham, p. 19; Rolston, pp. 19f.

³Cf. Bartlet, Apostolic Age, p. 512.

be answered. Their unity requires a single pen; their history requires a differentiation in time separating each epistle. Finally, if, as is so often done, Luke is to be accorded this role, because of affinities between the Pastorals and his writings, one could expect more of the literary grace and charm which is so conspicuous in the Lucan writings. Although this suggestion may well account for some of the peculiarities,¹ the Pastorals' unique character forbids us from accepting the argument as all conclusive.

Editor

F.C. Badcock postulates that the Pastorals were written in three stages: stage one is an expansion of the amanuensis theory in which the original notes involved abbreviations, omission of particles, prepositions, and the like; stage two the letters were then written out in full and checked over by Paul and/or the committee with him; and in stage three the fair copy was drawn up and sent to its destination.² If, as Badcock suggests, the fair copy were lost, but the original draft remained in Rome where it was edited shortly after Paul's death,³ it is then more readily understandable how the Pastorals

¹So, Alford, p. 79; Wood, The Life, Letters, and Religion of St. Paul, Edinburgh, 1925, p. 372; A.H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the NT, 2nd ed rev C.S.C. Williams, Oxford, 1953, p. 196; Burn, p. 579; and Badcock, p. 127.

²Op. cit., pp. 127-133.

³A.C. Deane (pp. 245-259) conjectures that this editor was Onesimus in the year A.D. 90 who utilized actual Pauline documents.

exude the voice of the Apostle without retaining his form. It would also explain how, for instance, the original abbreviated $\chi\alpha\pi\iota-\omega$ could have been mistaken by the Latin editor as $\chi\alpha\pi\iota\upsilon-\epsilon\kappa\omega$ instead of $\epsilon\chi\chi\alpha\pi\ \lambda\epsilon\tau\omega$. It might be asserted that this is all too hypothetical and therefore subject to question; but it certainly involves no more conjecture than that which is required by any of the widely accepted fragmentary theories. Although this attempt may explain the peculiarities, either totally, or in part, it is questionable whether of all the extant Pauline correspondence, the Pastorals, which are under suspicion on other accounts, should alone have required this editing.

Addressees and Content

Professor Deissmann, stressing the difference between the true letter and the epistle, has, in contradistinction to the accepted Paulines, classified the Pastorals in the latter category.¹ Yet, it can be argued that all of Paul's writings are true letters in that they emanate from his heart, that they are penned without thought of publication to meet a specific situation,² and that such classifications are artificial since they combine elements of both categories.³ It is obvious, however, that a distinction must be made between the Pastorals and the accepted Paulines. It must always be remembered that the Pauline letters were not ephemeral productions which were com-

¹Paul, pp. 9-14; and Bible Studies, chap. 1.

²Cf. Badcock, pp. 127f.

³Cf. T. Henshaw, pp. 204-7.

posed hastily, and with little thought; Paul knew that his church communications were to be publicized, and he was therefore concerned with the proper turn of phrase in co-ordinated style and thought.¹ There was no such need for studied content in these Epistles. It is not that the Pastorals are private letters in contradistinction to the others as public; for then Harrison's objection that they are still manifestly different from Philemon, is valid, (pp. 55f). Even in Philemon, however, there was a need for diplomacy. Yet here the investigator is dealing with semi-private communications which were designed not for publication, but for functionaries of the church under their direction; commissioners who had assumed quasi-apostolic authority of superintending a work which had to outlast the Apostle's direct guidance. These terse, compressed polemics were a message of guidance to and through friends who, along with their charges, were confronted with new and conflicting cross-concurrents of religious faith and customs. These contain not discussions of theology, but practical pointers on piety; they were authoritative, yet not argumentative. The letters appear to be occasional, in the highest Pauline tradition; occasioned by churches which were not struggling for vindication of their Gospel, but organization; who wanted to know, not of Christology, but whether widows should marry,² It is therefore open to question whether it is right to expect

¹Cf. E.F. Scott, The Varieties of NT Religion, New York, 1943, p. 124.

²Cheetham (p. 305) failed to see that it is just this interest in the belittled 'minor details' that makes the Pastorals different.

logical development, complicated periods, or subtle innuendoes. There was no need to write to trusted disciples of a studied refutation of heretics; but to provide reasons for and disposition of matters at hand; for the application of principles already established and understood; for the purpose of confronting the heretics, not defining the heresy.¹ But, having recognized the Pastorals' right to be different, and granting that this altered character may account for their unstudied, disorderly, turgid appearance, missing particles and the like must still be explained.

COMPARISON WITH THE ACCEPTED PAULINE EPISTLES

Pauline Particles, Prepositions, Pronouns, and the Like

According to Harrison, 112 words which form the vital connective tissue of Paul, are excluded from the Pastorals (pp. 34-38). Although much of the criticism leveled against these Epistles can be answered, it is recognized that it is just in "such subtle points that a writer unconsciously reveals himself."² It is a legitimate question which Wood raises whether a man of 60 or 65 years of age would so readily give up his favourite expressions.³ But it is misleading for Harrison to show graphically that one or other of the 112 "has hitherto appeared on the

¹For further discussion of this theory see: B. Weiss, INT, pp. 399f; Bowen, pp. 37-44; R. Scott, p. 355; Knowling, Testimony, p. 136; H.L. Goudge, The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul, London, 1913, pp. 9f; Brown, PE, pp. xxviif; Lilley, p. 40; James, pp. 108f; and White, p. 67.

²H. Bisseker, "PE", A.S. Peake's, A Commentary on the Bible, London, ed Grieve, 1936, p. 881. Cf. A.C. Clark, p. 395; and Jülicher, INT, p. 181.

³Op. cit., pp. 370f.

average nine times to every page that Paul ever wrote." (p. 35) His mathematics fails to exhibit that ἄρα, for instance, is found 27 times, but only 3 of that figure occur in either the first or third groups; that 30 of the 35 instances of οὐτε are found in group II, the other five in 1 Th; that of 28 instances of κέλιον 25 are in group II, the other 3 in Phil; that 35 of the words occur in only one Pauline Epistle; that only 25 of the 112 are common to Galatians and Romans, in spite of the kindred theme; or that only 6 of the numbers are common to the analogous Col and Eph. It is further misleading in view of the fact that of 93 additional particles and the like Guthrie has shown that all but one (ὅτι, found only in 2 C) are found in the Pastorals, and all but 8 in the Pauline Epistles.¹ Of the combined total of 205, Romans is seen to have 131, 1 Cor 139, 2 Cor 113, Gal 107, Eph 76, Phil 86, Col 64, 1 Th 73, 2 Th 57, Philm 44, and the Pastorals 92. It would appear from such figures, that the Pastorals compare favorably in connective tissue. Harrison objects that the particles present in the Pastorals are common also in the Apostolic Fathers, and occur with too great a frequency in the Pauline Epistles (p. 38). Of Harrison's list of 112, however, all but 21 are also to be found in the Apostolic Fathers. Regarding their frequency, it is peculiar that in his argument on hapax legomena, Harrison was seen to contend for the frequency of the omitted words; now he is claiming that they are too frequent to be characteristically Pauline. It might be inferred that Harrison's exclusion of these frequent expressions

¹ PE, pp. 224f; and Mind of Paul, pp. 13ff, 41ff.

is based not upon their frequency, but upon their appearance within the Pastorals. It would appear foolish to argue from mere numerical lists, without considering the quality of things represented by those numbers. The absence of many Pauline particles, a tendency already noticeable in the third group, may be explained by the practical rather than the theological scope of the Epistles. It is also quite possible that the discussed change of amanuensis might account for a considerable amount of the detected change in style. It would appear plausible that a scribe would be given more freedom in the choice of 'connective tissue', than in the selection of vocabulary.¹

Known Style

Differences must not be exaggerated. To offset by objective evidence the impression given in the outset of the discussion of style, there is need to compare the Pastorals with the known Pauline style.

¹For further discussion of particles see: E.F. Brown, "PE", Exp, XIII, series 8(1917), pp. 212f; R. Falconer, "Epistles of Timothy and Titus", HDAC, II, 592; "The Authorship of the PE", p. 353; Parry, p. cxiv; Findlay, "PE", pp. 359ff. For parallels with Pauline hortatory sections see, Badcock, pp. 125f; Hitchcock, "Tests for Pastorals", pp. 277f; and Lock, PE, pp. xxviif. For general comparison with the accepted Pauline Epistles, see: A.E. Barnett, Paul Becomes a Literary Influence, Chicago, 1941, pp. 251-277; and Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus, pp. 14f.

Grammar. Antithesis and Oxymoron. To J. Weiss, this feature is the most distinctive characteristic of the Pauline style.¹ For examples compare: I 5:6,13; 6:7, 19; II 1:7,12; 2:4 cf. 1 C 15:42f; R 14:7ff; 1 C 12:3,26 et al.

Anacoluthon and Parenthesis. This digression of thought and the entering upon a parenthetical sentence "may be deemed a badge of authenticity."² For the author of the Pastorals, as for Paul, the thoughts sometimes outran the power of expression, so that logical sequence is broken by the intrusion of new ideas, leading to this ungrammatical construction. Compare: I 1:3-5; 8-9; 2:1,12; 3:15; Tit 1:1-3; 3:4-7 cf. R 5:12ff; Eph 3:1-14 et al. For involved parenthesis merging into a chain of relatives compare: I 1:18-20; 4:1-3; 6:13-16; II 1:3-5; 8-12; Tit 1:1-4 cf. 1 C 2:7,8; Col 1:27ff; R 1:1-7 et al.³

Metaphor. This well-known Pauline affinity for analogous figures of speech is seen in the following: athletics (I 6:12; II 2:5; 4:7,8 cf. 1 C 9:24-27; Phil 3:12,14); military (II 2:3,4 cf. 2 C 10:3,4; Eph 6:13-17); kindling of fire (II 1:6 cf. close similarity of Phil 4:10); sacrifice (II 4:6 cf. Phil 2:17); fruit (II 2:6 cf. 1 C 9:7); vessel (II 2:20 cf 1 C 3:12).⁴

Paronomasia. Compare: νόμος-νομίμως (I 1:8); φιλήδονοι-φιλόθεοι

¹History of Primitive Christianity, I, 411.

²T.K. Abbott, Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, ICC, Edinburgh, 1897, p. xxi. His reasoning is, that a forger would not have incorporated the anacoluthon since it produces an embarrassment relating to the interruption of reasoning. Cf. Bernard, PE, pp. xlif; Findlay, "PE", p. 360; Farrar, Life and Work of St. Paul, pp. 744f.

³For citation of other grammatical anomalies, see, A.C. Hervey, p. iv.

⁴Cf. also the confusion of metaphors in I 6:19.

(II 3:4); στρατεῦν-στρατεῖαν (I 1:18); δεσμῶν-δέδασται (II 2:9); ἄρτιος-ἐξαρτιζῶ (II 3:17). Closely allied is the repetition of words, e.g. πορισμὸν...εὐσέβειαν (I 6:5,6).¹

Compounds. Findlay asserts that 15 of the 40 negative compounds (i.e. ἄ or ἄν) attributed to Paul, are to be found in the Pastorals.² Not only do the Pastorals have a predilection with Paul for sonorous compounds as ἕτερο-, καλο-, κενο-, ὀρθο- , but also for derivatives, e.g. οἴκο-, φιλο-, ψευδο- .

Others. Doublets, e.g. προσευχή and δέησις (I 2:1; 5:5 cf. Phil 4:6; Eph 6:18); extensive use of imperative: in 1 Th 5, there are 17 imperatives in 15 lines; in I 4:11-16, 8 in 10; participle used for the imperative in II 2:14, 25; Tit 1:13f cf. R 12:9-19, 13:11 et al;³ hyperbole (II 1:15; 4:11, 16 cf. 1 Th 2:17-3:13); seemingly illogical transitions (I 3:1 cf. R 6:23-7:1; 2 C 2:13f; Phil 3:1f); and anarthrous substantive (I 2:5 cf. R 1:4; 1 C 12:1-10).

Vocabulary Mannerisms. Argumentative use of οἶδα (I 1:8,9; II 2:23 cf. Gal 2:16; 4:13 et al.); μάλιστα used as a qualifier (I 5:8; 17; 4:10; Tit 1:10 cf. Gal 6:10; Phil 4:22; Phm 16); designation of opponents as τινε (I 1:3,6; Tit 1:12 et al cf. Gal 1:7; 6:3 et al); intensive use of πᾶς (I 1:15; 2:6; II 4:2 et al cf. 1 Th 5:14 et al); agreement of ὅστις with its predicate

¹Cf. I 6:17, 18; 1:12-17; 2:1-7; E.A. Gardiner, The Later Pauline Epistles, London, 1936, p. 167.

²"PE", p. 356. The author considers this a peculiarly delicate test of authorship; "for while a forger may with some success reproduce in novel combinations the identical language of his original, to create fresh words in the same analogy...is a feat of literary personation beyond belief." Cf. Spicq, note 3, p. cviii.

³For the significance of the participial imperative, see: D. Daube, "Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter", The First Epistle of St. Peter, E.G. Selwyn, London, 1946, pp. 467-488.

(I 3:15 cf. Eph 6:2; Phil 1:28); exclusively Pauline employment of πιστεύω in the passive (I 1:11; 3:16; Tit 1:3 cf. R 3:2; 1 Th 2:4; 2 Th 1:10); use of δοκιμάζω (I 3:10 cf. 1 C 11:28; 2 C 13:5); repetition of a word and its cognates (e.g. πίσις, I 1:12-17; πᾶς, I 2:1-7; and πλοῦτος, I 6:17f).

Composition. Salutation, including the familiar χάρις and εἰρήνη;¹ the exordium commences with the customary Pauline thanksgiving (8 of 10 Pauline Epistles so begin) and assurance of prayer (7 of the 8 beginning with thanksgiving); enumerations or maxims (I 2:1f; 3:2ff; 4:1ff; 5:12f; 6:4f; II 3:1-5; Tit 1:8ff); double greeting (II 4:19ff cf. Phil 4:21ff); doxology (II 4:18 cf. Phil 4:20 et al); interposition of doxology (I 1:17 cf. R 1:25; 9:5 et al); quick passage from doctrinal basis to practical application (II 1:12; 2:7).

Tone. Marked by: intense, emphatic, sermonizing (cf. Phil 2:19-30; 1 C 16:1-9); dialectical (cf. R 4:2-5; 1 C 15:12-19; Gal 3:5-22); harmony of authority and affection (cf. 2 Th 1:3; 3:6);² humility (I 1:13ff cf. 1 C 15:9); caustic irony (Tit 1:12 cf 2 C 10); general simplicity of the Pauline Epistles.

Content.³ As in I Corinthians there is no attempt at

¹For argument that a forger would have been more careful to preserve the obvious Pauline salutation without the insertion of mercy, see, T. Zahn, INT, II, 131, note 21; and Bernard, PE, p. xxxix.

²The Pastorals' author, like Paul, never vacates his position of authority, nor intimates a doubt of his readers' acceptance. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, tran A.M. Hellier, London, 1899, p. 270f: "He preaches not only with authority, but by authority." For the element of affection, compare the warmth of 1 C, mixed as it is with censure.

³For a general discussion of the similarity of thought and subject, see Parry, pp. cliif. For comparison of the Pastorals with Phil, see Knowling, Testimony, p. 136

rhetorical artifice; only ardent conviction. Epistles are marked by: resignation (I 4:10; II 4:6f cf. 2 C 1:10; Acts 20:34); anticipation of apostasy (I 4:1; II 3:1 cf. 2 Th 2:3 Acts 20:29); ecstatic avowals of God's grace (I 1:2-16; 2:5-7; 6:13-16; II 1:8-11 et al cf. R 1:5, 14-17; 1 C 1:17 et al); sufferings for the Gospel (II 1:8, 12; 2:9f; 3:10f cf. 2 C 1:4-10; 11:23-28 et al); frequent retrogression (II 1:3-5, 16ff cf. 1 Th 1:2-8); concern for conservation (II 1:14 cf. 1 C 15:1-11; 2 Th 2:15; Col 2:6 et al); hortatory nature concerned with common precepts, e.g. slaves (I 6:1f cf. Col 3:22-25); qualities of saints (I 3:2 cf. R 12:13); disorderly brethren (II 3:5 cf. 2 Th 3:6); admonitions in keeping with the exigencies of the times, e.g. known youth and timidity of Timothy (I 5:23; II 1:2-5 cf. Phil 2:19f; 1 C 16:10); needs of the Churches: censorship of the rich opulent Ephesus (I 6:3-10 cf. Acts 20:35); but urging civil subordination to the insubordinate Cretans (Tit 1:12; 3:1); mixture of confidence and anxious solicitude (II 1:3-14 cf. 2 C 11:28; 2 Th 2:13ff); mixture of compassion and excommunication of adversaries (I 1:20; II 4:20 cf. 1 C 5:3ff); individualizing propensity:¹ e.g. conversion (I 1:12f cf. 1 C 15:9; Eph 3:8) and apostle of Gentiles (I 2:7 cf. R 11:13); unexplained concepts (I 4:12; II 4:11, 16 cf. 1 C 15:29); similarity of employment of the names of Christ.²

¹With 23 personal allusions (16 unknown from other sources), and old figures like Demas set in a new guise, it is at least questionable whether a falsarius would care to endanger his position in such a way.

²That the Pastorals' author alone, of all NT writers, follows the Pauline principle of the use of Christ's names, is shown by B. Hellier, op. cit. Cf. Findlay, "PE", p. 361.

McGiffert has alleged that such similarities are but "superficial likenesses" which cannot offset "so extensive, so radical, and so thoroughgoing" differences.¹ But surely, the persistence of so many Pauline idiosyncrasies, so varied in character, so interwoven in text, would make literary criticism difficult if they were not attributable in some measure to Paul. It is strange that the Paulinist who had caught these subtle, delicate, pervading correspondences, should not have avoided such "radical" differences.

Paul and Style Change

It is a well-denounced mistake to speak of the style of Paul's acknowledged Epistles being in anyway homogeneous.² To be objective, it would have to be said that the stylistic criticisms of the Pastorals is that they are homogeneous, while the accepted works are marked with variety. Group II, for example, is rhetorical, controversial, and temperamental; while group III has the appearance of a studied composition, of a distance being maintained between Apostle and church, with accompanying omission of dialogue, and hymns being quoted rather than the OT. Yet, can such sweeping determinatives be made? For within the groups and within the several Epistles,

¹Apostolic Age, p. 400.

²For Pauline oscillations, see: B.J. Kidd, A History of the Church, I, Oxford, 1922, 30; A. Schlatter, The Church in the NT Period, tran P. Levertoff, London, 1955, p. 222; Robertson-Plummer, 1 Corinthians, ICC, Edinburgh, 1911, p. xlv; W. Sanday, "The Criticism of the NT", Criticism of the NT, 1902, pp. 21-25; and Inspiration, p. 340.

changes of style are manifest which are as extensive as those between the groups. Romans is rhetorical and argumentative it is true, but it is also didactic and hortatory, with still other sections maintaining a moralizing tone. There is, furthermore, a vast difference between the fervid Galatians, and restrained Romans, in spite of their analogous subjects. That Paul is more interested in what G. Milligan regards as the "rhetoric of the heart" rather than of formalized style,¹ is further seen from the fact that he can at once be beautiful (e.g. R 8:18-39 and 1 C 13), or heavy and laborious (e.g. Eph 1:3-14). Indeed, almost every Epistle is affected by this problem of style;² so much so that one may question with J. Weiss whether Paul's writings might not be compilations of documents rather than a unified whole.³ This recognition, however, does not destroy the concept of unity of authorship, but only heightens the problem arising from the need for the establishment of a proper standard of measurement. This was evident when the Tübingen school judged Paul by the highly subjective and controversial Galatians; Lightfoot and Sanday would insist that Thess and the Captivity Epistles afford the true impression of Paul's style;⁴ while Deissman insists that the starting point is Philemon.⁵

¹Op. cit., pp. lvif.

²Cf. Cheetham, p. 308; Salmon, p. 402f; B. Weiss, INT, p. 412.

³History of Primitive Christianity, I, 156; and Jesus von Nazareth, Mythos oder Geschichte?, pp. 99f.

⁴Cf. Sanday and Headlam, p. lxii.

⁵Paul, p. 19.

Not only do scholars make a mistake in thinking in terms of a homogeneous Pauline style, but also in assuming that every Pauline section is fundamentally different from other NT writers. C.H. Dodd has shown that certain NT passages would puzzle even the best of scholars, if authorship were to be based upon style alone.¹ Compare 1 Th 5:14-18, for instance, with Heb 13:1-3 and 1 P 3:8f; and, it might be added, these should be compared with Tit 3:1ff. Much of the Pauline ethical sections is so different that it might as well be attributed to another author.

Herein the glaring weakness of the argument from style is disclosed; a weakness not sufficiently admitted in discussing the question of the Pastorals' authorship. The components which unite to constitute style are so subtle, with only the more insignificant parts lending themselves to objective treatment, that the final determinative is dependent entirely upon the susceptibility of the investigator. The ultimate decision is whether the Epistle in question has the impressionable, subjectively adjudged, Pauline ring; which according to Peake, "is of all arguments among the most cogent" to those so impressed.² This ring may lead one man to adjudge the Pastorals as cold, subdued, and unimpassioned; while another will see a mighty movement under the ephemeral calm. This subjective test led Denny to assert that Paul could have spoken the contents of the Pastorals, "but probably he would have said it otherwise, and not all at a time";³ while others see rich outbursts that

¹Gospel and Law, Cambridge, 1951, pp. 18f.

²INT, p. 68. Cf. Moffatt, HNT, p. 134.

³J. Denney, The Death of Christ, London, 1902, pp. 202f.

could only come from the pen of Paul. If not the same sustained power, at least the same pregnant, expressive power is heard in such passages as II 1:8-11: "Be not ashamed therefore of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner..." Is it really conceivable that this passage, and others like Tit 2:11-15; I 1:8-14; 2:5ff; and II 1:15-18, to say nothing of II 4, are simply the work of an impersonator who is imitating his master's style to add verisimilitude to his composition? If our subjective sense relates such a decision to us then perhaps it might be necessary to gain a new concept of the Paul upon whom the ring is to be based.

A portion of the problem of the Pastorals' style is found within the Epistles themselves; but a significant amount is attributable to the exegete's concept of Paul. It may well be that one's attitude toward the Pastorals suggests a test for the adequacy of one's insight into the total Paul. If style really is the man, then it is necessary to know the man before an evaluation of his style can be attempted; and if the man emerges into a many-sided figure, scholarship is thus precluded from expecting any uniformity of style. It is obvious that what Paul is conceived to be, say, or do, is primarily dependent upon the corpus chosen to make the evaluation. The initial question, then, is whether it is more scientific to attempt to glean a picture of the Apostle from the 13 Letters attributed to him, and see if this Paul is a psychological unity or probability, or whether it is best to exclude the Epistles under discussion, form our opinion of Paul, and then

compare this product with the excluded Epistles.

Each Epistle brings into relief a totally new quality of the Apostle's disposition, character, concepts, and manner of writing. There is not an Epistle which could be discarded without an impoverishment in the knowledge of Paul. Is it an essential prerogative in establishing genuineness, that the Epistle in question should not contain any new light on his character or style?¹ Matheson stressed that the Pauline Epistles exhibit not only a chronological order, but also a mental order which had been conditioned by the successive phases through which the church unfolded.² Discounting any evolutionary concept, C.H. Dodd has attempted to show a definite relationship between Paul's circumstances and his psychological and spiritual processes.³ Now, if such progress and/or alteration is not compatible with inspiration, then it is questionable why along with varied influences and modified circumstances, such changes could not have been produced as those observable in the Pastorals. "Would it be surprising," queries Dodd, "if his (Paul's) thought took fresh turns?"⁴ The answer is yes, only if we think, as did Jülicher, that

¹Cf. W. Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy", Exp, VIII, 7th series (1909), esp 346ff; and J.V. Bartlet, "The Historic Setting of the PE", esp. pp. 344-7.

²Spiritual Development of St. Paul, Edinburgh, 1890, pp. 3-9, 299-304, 314-321. Cf. R.J. Drummond, The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ, Edinburgh, 1900 pp. 24ff.

³NT Studies, Manchester, 1953, pp. 67-128. Cf. The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach, Manchester, 1933, pp. 83f; and, Change and Development, 1934, pp. 36-45.

⁴Mind of Paul, p. 84.

Paul was always substantially the same,¹ or that he was unaffected by countless influences.

Paul was subject to drastic fluctuations and oscillations; his mood was not necessarily happy and flowing at all times.² Depression, languidness, sluggishness, and a remarkable degree of sensitivity were a part of the total Paul make-up; the emotional, intellectual, and spiritual sides each had their part to play. The Pastorals provide a propitious and harmonious close to the life of the whole-man. When once the investigator has rid himself of the disappointment of finding these Epistles to be devoid of theological grandeur, he is ushered into an irreplaceable avenue for the understanding of the true greatness of Paul. This is not a "desiccated and senescent Paul with fires burned out and creative vigor abated";³ but an adaptable, mobile, missionary minded Paul, a Paul who was not fettered in mode of teaching or expression, a Paul who rendered valued service of disciplining and organizing churches. His earlier gospel was so lofty as to be unintelligible to the masses; a simple, rudimentary, categorical, instructional gospel was needed, and perhaps, given. "It is not their greater poverty," Matheson succinctly states, "but their superior riches which makes them prosaic; they are less filled with the transcendental because they are more full of man."⁴

¹INT, p. 183.

²Cf. Dodd, The Mind of Paul, pp. 4f; Sanday and Headlam, pp. lvii; Sanday, "NT Criticism", p. 24; Reuss, p. 83; and A.B. Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, Edinburgh, pp. 3-14.

³Gealy, pp. 363f.

⁴Op. cit., p. 319. Cf. E.F. Brown, pp. xxviiiiff.

Conclusion

In this chapter, there has been an attempt to show that the decision regarding style and vocabulary is not a closed issue; that the negative conclusion should not be taken as a dogma of critical competence and open-mindedness. That there are problems, regardless of what conclusion one comes to concerning the authorship question, will be seen in the following chapter; but to attempt to determine mathematically what the Apostle could or could not have said and how he would have said it in every year of his life is extremely hazardous. Full sympathy with all the facts is needed to gain a proper perspective of the Pastorals. If the amanuensis had more to do with the composition of Paul's extant letters than is commonly attributed to him,¹ and if these Epistles could have been written with Paul's own hand, with all the discussed component influences exerting their own proportion of impact upon his style and vocabulary, then there is no reason at this point in this research why Paul COULD not have been the author. Moule cautions that the Lord "can take a human personality...and throw it freely upon its task of thinking and expression - and behold, the product will be His."² If there is a new vocabulary, newly adopted method of sentence connection, and the accepted Pauline style subverted, it might be easier to explain in some manner as has been done in this chapter, than to determine in the next just how or when these letters could have come from another hand.

¹So J.I. Still, St. Paul on Trial, London, 1923, p. 213; and J. Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity, I, 416.

²H.C.G. Moule, Romans, Exp Bible, London, 1894, p. 8.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGIN OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

This present investigation has formed the following general conclusions: that of the Pauline Epistles, only 1 Corinthians and Romans have as early and as extensive external verification as do the Pastorals; that the literary relationship, although at times unusual, was for the most part in complete harmony with Paul's accepted writings; and, that the literary character offers the widest grounds for suspicion and subsequent rejection of the Epistles, and therefore demands the widest of explanations from Traditionalists. But, if it is the task of criticism to set forth the historical understanding of the documents in question, and not simply their rejection, then in the case of the Pastorals, its task has not, as yet, been completed. Before proceeding into the varied hypotheses of authorship, however, the significant questions of the Epistles' corporate condition, and the historical situation presupposed, must be investigated.

Preliminary Investigations

Unity of the Epistles. There is veritable unanimity today that the three Pastorals must be treated as an indivisible unity.¹ This is not to say that each Epistle does not manifest

¹Critics of widely divergent viewpoints agree on this unity. Cf. Dibelius, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 5; Baur, Paul, II 104f. So also Jülicher, Schweitzer, E.F. Scott, Easton, and Moffatt. Also cf. Lock, PE, p. xiii; and Alford, p. 87.

its own character; 1 T is basically ecclesiastical in content and inorganic in structure; 2T, a more personal work, is correspondingly warmer and more closely integrated; while Titus combines both the personal and pastoral elements. A comparison of the vocabularies might also appear to substantiate the claims for separate authorship: for of the some 848 words, 529 occur in 1 T, 413 in 2 T, 293 in Titus;¹ 278 are peculiar to 1 T, 185 to 2 T, and 96 to Titus. If vocabulary alone were examined, this divergence would point to separate authorship of each Epistle. Yet the individual peculiarities do not mask the fact, that all three Letters exhibit unmistakable signs of literary unity of style, vocabulary, and grammatical constructions; they presuppose the same Apostolic authorship as Paul writes (or is made to write) to his assistants, and agree in historical situation, and the state of church and heresy. They afford a common purpose as summarized in I 3:15; also include a similar stress upon the necessity for good works, and adherence to the Apostolic doctrine. Such agreement has led to the general consent of critics that the three Epistles are "from one mind and pen."² Before attempting to ascertain whose mind and pen is involved, certain conclusions from this fact of unity (conclusions which have, for the most part, been overlooked), are pertinent at this point.

Firstly, it is to be observed that the differences, even though great, have not precluded common authorship. This

¹Figures taken from Harrison, PPE, pp. 158ff.

²R. Scott, p. 331. Cf. Bernard, PE, pp. xxxvif. Souter (Text and Canon, pp. xiif) observes that the Epistles "stand or fall together."

conclusion is drawn in spite of the fact that the Epistles differ so greatly that some scholars agree with Easton that the pseudo-Paul took great pains "to preserve the Pauline atmosphere...and to avoid palpable anachronisms" in 2 T, but in the sequels Paul has retired so completely in the background, "that the pseudonymity is a bare convention."¹ Therefore, if it can be accepted that the "one mind and pen" might vary in such an extensive way, it might well be questioned why that mind and pen could not have been Paul's. If such drastic allowances for variations can be accorded to the unknown pseudo-Paul, then perhaps the same consideration should be granted to the echter-Paulus.

Secondly, if the Epistles stand or fall together, and if, with Reuss, 2 T is found to be so authentic that "even did the name of the writer not chance to be mentioned at the beginning it would be easy to discover it,"² and if, with the two originators of the modern controversy, Titus too is to be retained,³ then there is the strong possibility that 1 T is genuine also. If one or two of the letters is, in whole, or in part, admittedly genuine, then the case for 1 T becomes strengthened. There is no more valid reason to reject the group because of the one betrayer⁴ than there would be to permit the stronger brethren to

¹PE, p. 19. Cf. Moffatt, HNT, pp. 559f.

²Op. cit., p. 121.

³Schmidt and Schleiermacher, followed by Usteri, Lucke, Bleek, Neander, and Ritschl. For discussion, see Moffatt, HNT, pp. 560f; and Plummer, p. 8. It would appear that no author has followed the lead of the Gnostic Tatian, by accepting only Titus.

⁴So, Baur, p. 105.

support the weaker.¹ One of the most characteristic of all the Epistles ascribed to Paul is 2 T; there must therefore be strong grounds for rejecting its companions.

Lastly, the kinship of the Epistles not only rules out the possibility of a plurality of authors, but also prohibits them from being separated by any prolonged period of time - a fact which, together with the complete change of tone from the accepted Pauline Epistles, prohibits any attempt to find a place for them within the framework of Acts. If Pauline, that which binds them together also separates them from the other Epistles.² Although, in the past, sporadic attempts have been made to circumvent this conclusion, with a place being sought for the Pastorals within the lacunae of the Lucan narrative, and although it would be beneficial to their authenticity to find a solution which avoids the adverse criticism of the second Roman imprisonment, it is generally acknowledged today that the close affinity of their literary character and content is unintelligible when interposed with the other prison Epistles; while their common aim renders it impracticable to disperse them over long periods of time.³

¹So, Plummer, p. 12; and H.C.G. Moule, The Second Epistle to Timothy, London, 1905, p. 20.

²So, Jülicher, INT, p. 178; von Soden, pp. 305f; and Sabatier, pp. 264f.

³V. Bartlet ("The Historic Setting of the PE") proposed that 1 T and Tit were written quite early after Paul's arrival in Rome. Others, e.g. Reuss (par. 87-92), Hug (INT, tran D. Fosdick, notes. M. Stuart, Andover, 1836, pp. 515ff, 534ff.), and Still (pp. 212ff) placed 1 T and Tit in varying occasions of Paul's missionary journeys. Agreeing, Bowen (pp. 35f) argued that the Pastorals' bond is one of nature and not time. These men are joined by Badcock (p. 108) in placing 2 T in the first Roman imprisonment. Against these views, however, see, Moffatt,

Historical Situation. The other preliminary investigation mandatory to a discussion of the authorship question, is the Pastorals' historical situation presupposed through specific references and incidental allusions. Questions regarding the period of Paul's life in which the Epistles profess to be written and what historical difficulties exist to that acceptance, comprise the present discussion. In this connection, the words of J. Weiss are appropriate. In observing that even in authentic writings certain obscure points are found which cannot be fully explained from the writer's situation, he states:

In spite of everything, however, we should at least have got to the point that it should be considered an axiom that a document must be read in the sense and in the form in which it stands until proof is brought forward that this is impossible. One should first see whether assuming its genuineness, there is a convincing historical picture; whether the writings suit the setting in which they are placed; and only when this is shown to be impossible should it be declared spurious.¹

INT, pp. 416f; James, p. 27f; Horton, pp. 12ff; Jones, pp. 284f; B. Weiss, "The Present Status of Inquiry", pp. 393-403; Hervey, p. xii; Sabatier, pp. 265f; et al. Duncan's advocacy of the Ephesian derivation of the captivity Epistles (St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, London, 1929; earlier proposed by Mosheim and T.C. Laughlin; cf. W. Michaelis, Pastoralbriefe und Gefangenschaftsbriefe zur Echtheitsfrage der Pastoralbriefe, Göttingen, 1930), with a possibility of a similar consignment of the Pastorals, is admitted by him to be a hypothesis of a "wholly tentative nature." ("St. Paul's Ministry in Asia - the Last Phase", NTS, III (May, 1957), 217f) Harrison ("The PE and Duncan's Ephesian Theory", NTS, I (May, 1956), 250-61), suggests that II 4:6-8 and 16-18 appear to support a Roman imprisonment rather than Ephesian. Dodd (NT Studies, pp. 88-108, cf. Change, pp. 6-26) and Guthrie (PE, pp. 18f) show that the historical and ecclesiastical conditions do not readily fit into the Ephesian ministry; while the required textual emendation in II 1:17 makes the theory doubtful. White (p. 72) dismisses the attempts at fitting the Pastorals into the framework of Acts as being "forced and unconvincing."

¹History of Christianity, I, 153f.

As long as reputable scholars continue to make this historical appraisal of the Pastorals, and arrive at diametrically opposed positions, then there is need for careful re-examination.¹

Specific historical references in the Pastorals

1 Timothy implies that Paul had recently been in Ephesus (1:3), where he was confronted with a new mode of teaching (1:3), and opposed by men named Hymenaeus and Alexander (1:20). When Paul left for Macedonia, Timothy was exhorted to remain in the city and contend against the false teaching (1:3). The need for writing arose when, in spite of Paul's own eagerness to return (3:14f), there was an unexpected delay necessitating instructions for the interim.

Titus implies that Paul had recently been in Crete (1:5), where he left his assistant to regulate matters in conformity with the Apostle's desires. As it was Paul's plan to winter at Nicopolis (Epirus?), either Artemas or Tychicus was to be sent to relieve Titus in order that he could join his master (3:12). The letter was apparently occasioned by the journey to Crete of the lawyer Zenas, and Paul's former Corinthian fellow-labourer, Apollos, and their need for a letter of commendation (3:13). Paul took this opportunity to remind Titus of his charge (1:5) and to furnish additional instructions

¹e.g. E.F. Scott, PE, pp. xvif: "That Paul cannot have been the author is most clearly apparent when we examine the historical framework of the letters." Cf. von Soden, pp. 312ff. Yet, Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy", Exp, 7th series, VIII, 1: "Regarded in the proper perspective, they are historically perhaps the most illuminative of all the Pauline Epistles; and this is the best and the one sufficient proof that they are authentic compositions, emanating each complete from the mind of one author." Cf. "The Authorship of the PE", pp. 67f.

applicable to the Cretan ministry.

There is a plethora of historical detail in 2 Timothy. The addressee is presumably still at Ephesus (1:18); but as Tychicus had been sent to relieve him (4:12; Titus 3:12), he was urged to make haste to the side of Paul (4:9,21), bringing Mark (4:11) and some of Paul's personal effects with him (4:13). The Apostle's anticipated return to Ephesus (I 3:14f) was prevented by his enchainment in Rome (1:16ff; 1:8; 2:9); a condition which led to a reminiscence of previous sufferings at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra (3:10f), as well as a disclosure of the attitude of Asian Christians, who, except for Onesiphorus, had deserted him (1:15-18). Although Alexander had greatly contended against him (4:14), Paul had been delivered by the Lord in his first defense. Now, however, Paul has only to look forward to martyrdom (4:6-8), the impact of which has already penetrated to Ephesus, having a dispiriting effect upon Timothy (1:6f). This, it would appear, is the occasion for the letter. The otherwise unknown evangelization of Gaul (or Galatia) and Dalmatia by Crescens and Titus (4:10), the absconding of Demas to Thessalonica (4:10), the presence of Erastus at Corinth, and illness of Trophimus at Miletus (4:20), complete the specific Pastoral historical references.¹

¹For additional discussion, see, J.V. Bartlet, "The Historic Setting of the PE", pp. 28-36; B. Weiss, INT, pp. 374-384, 413, 420; F.W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul, pp. 659f; Badcock, pp. 85ff; and P. Carrington, The Early Christian Church, I, Cambridge, 1957, 256.

Incidental Historical Allusions in the Pastorals

The question of persecution, although virtually ignored by modern critics, is important for a true historical picture of the Pastorals. Even though Cullmann characterizes the historical situation of the Pastorals as a time when "Christians were being most cruelly persecuted,"¹ it would appear, with Ramsay, that the attitude of the Roman authorities was not, as yet, one of direct antagonism toward Christianity, and that the persecution referred to was still in its formative stages.² It is true that the Pastorals presuppose Paul to be in chains, but this imprisonment was as a criminal (κακοῦργος); a condition which produced a sense of shame in Timothy (II 1:7f). This is further evidenced in the fact that the persecution which Timothy is exhorted to withstand is one of dislike and malevolence on the part of the community, and not one of a definitely formulated governmental policy.

There is a strong analogy between the Pastorals and 1 Peter in this connection.³ In both, the Christians have a definite accusation leveled against them as evil-doers (1 Pet 2:12; 3:15 II 2:9); but in 1 Peter there is a trend toward Christianity becoming religio illicita where the profession of the Name was a criminal act in itself (4:15f). In 1 Peter the Christians were apparently being sought out to be charged (3:15; 5:8); while

¹The State in the NT, London, 1957, pp. 84f. Cf. Jülicher, INT, pp. 193f.

²Ramsay has made a most detailed study of the level of persecution reflected in the Pastorals. See esp The Church in the Roman Empire, esp pp. 254 sq. Cf. R. Shaw, pp. 477f; James, p. 37; Badcock, p. 122.

³For the argument in detail see Ramsay, ibid., pp. 280ff.

Paul's encouragement of Timothy to come to Rome is an indication that the persecution was not yet of such a general nature (II 4:9,21). Finally, the Pastorals depict the Christians as sufferers, whose defense lay in an irreproachable life; not as martyrs, whose only release would come through death.¹ There is always the possibility that the persecution died away after being more intense for a time. Thus, the Pastorals could represent a later, calmer stage of development than that reflected in I Peter. But the persecution level as reflected is in keeping with the presupposition of the Pastorals' author, and therefore affords additional indication of the Epistles' historicity.²

It is now time to examine the varied hypotheses set forth to harmonize these facts, and attempt to discover which most plausibly explains the Epistles by the relations and tendencies depicted within. Each proposed solution must not only account for the variance in Pauline literary characteristics, but must also reconcile these historical incidents, explain the questions of motive and place of writing, addressees, external evidence, number and sequence of Epistles, and numerous other problems.³

¹This observation discounts Barnett's (The NT, Its Making and Meaning, New York, 1946, pp. 283f) A.D. 160 date for the Pastorals because of the alleged martyr emphasis. Gealy (p. 370) notes that "at any time during the first three centuries the Christian summons was to a heroic stand, if not to actual martyrdom." Cf. 1 Clem V where the martyr's witness is already being described.

²J.V. Bartlet (The Apostolic Age, Edinburgh, 1900, p. 515) observes that "the attitude towards the Roman State is incompatible with the period between 64 and the death of Domitian in 96."

³For two pages of problems under any authorship, see Harrison, PPE, pp. 1f.

It may well be that to reject the Epistles is only to exchange one set of difficulties for another, unless these questions can be satisfactorily answered. Now it is not the purpose of this present investigation to traverse again the ground which many writers have in recent years explored and made familiar. What is meant to be accomplished is to call attention to certain points at which the investigation of the Pastorals' origin has not satisfactorily been explored. In this investigation, the question will be examined under the following headings: pseud-epigraphical, fragmentary, and Pauline. It is to be observed that no hard and fast division exists between these three schools of thought - considerable over-lapping may exist.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL THEORY

This theory can not be so casually dismissed as Traditionalists are prone to do.¹ Although it is no longer as widely accepted as in the days of Baur and Holtzmann, the identification of this extreme theory with so many contemporary reputable writers - notably, Goodspeed, Dibelius, Gealy, and J. Knox² - would alone warrant its careful appraisal. The acceptance of the position involves the prior decision that when the contents of the Pastorals are dispassionately considered, they are completely incompatible with any theory of Pauline authorship. Upon this determination, it follows: that, the personalia and

¹e.g. Guthrie, PE, p. 19: "But this theory may at once be discounted because it fails to account for the obvious realism of the personal allusions."

²Also, Barnett, Cross, Loisy, Jülicher, Rist, Schweitzer, Streeter.

historical allusions are to be regarded as fictitious devices to procure an illusion of authenticity; that such procedure is not a fraud or forgery, but a recognized literary convention readily adopted from both the Greek classical writers and the Jewish Apocalyptic literature; that the method was adopted because of the writer's humility, love for Paul, belief that the Apostle would similarly denounce the problems of the writer's day, and a desire to reclaim his Master for orthodoxy. Advocates of pseudepigraphy assert that its very use must be regarded as "a most important service rendered by the author both to Paul and the Church, a service which in the times could not have been rendered otherwise."¹ But, although this theory might satisfactorily account for the manifestations of un-Pauline literary characteristics within the Pastorals, it is not without its own peculiar problems.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHY IN HISTORY

Definition of Terms

Prior to the discussion of the subject of pseudepigraphy in history, a definition and clarification of the terms involved is demanded. There is no attempt here to relate the evolution of these terms, but only to observe how they have at times been falsely applied. Two terms may be eliminated because of their complete irrelevance to the Pastorals. The term 'anonymous',

¹Gealy, p. 372.

denoting unknown or unavowed authorship, may be applied to the Epistle to Diognetus, but not to the Pastoral Epistles. Similarly, the term 'apocrypha', or 'apocryphal', once signifying the hidden or secret lore, and a term which since the sixteenth century has been applied to the non-canonical appendices of the Old and New Testaments, has no accurate application to the Pastorals.¹ These Epistles are neither 'anonymous' nor 'apocryphal'. On the other hand, the terms 'pseudonymous' and 'pseudepigraphical', often used synonymously and interchangeably when applied to these Epistles, can not be dismissed so summarily.

A great deal of confusion exists regarding the proper application of these words. Its existence has led some scholars to apply the word 'pseudepigrapha' to those books which are really spurious in nature in contradistinction to those works within the Apocrypha which may contain some elements of truth; while others use the term synonymously with 'pseudonymous'. But a more accurate definition of terms is mandatory.² A work might be pseudepigraphical (i.e. falsely entitled) but otherwise completely authoritative. Furthermore, it is possible for a work to be pseudepigraphic without being pseudonymous, and pseudonymous, without being pseudepigraphic. A distinction, not heretofore generally recognized, must be drawn between pseudonymity as the possibly falsely ascribed collective opinion of the Church, and pseudepigraphy as a literary device. Writings such as Hebrews,

¹Although the term was applied thus by Renan, The History of the Origins of Christianity, III, London, 1889, xiii.

²For additional discussion of terms, see, M.R. James, The Apocryphal NT, Oxford, 1924, pp. xivf; and T.K. Abbott, p. xvii.

some of the Psalms, and the Epistle of Barnabas are pseudonymous in that they make no internal claims to Apostolic or Davidic authorship. Actually, they, like probably 2 and 3 John, are anonymous works which have become pseudonymous through popular acclamation. The Acts of Paul and Thecla, however, makes a specific attempt to set itself off as Pauline and is, therefore, pseudepigraphical.

In reference to these distinctions, it is important to remember that the Pastorals are not to be viewed as anonymous writings, nor are they apocryphal or pseudonymous. Since they are Letters which make a distinct claim to be the work of Paul, they must be recognized as either the product of a writer who designed that they should be accepted as the work of that Apostle - and, therefore, pseudepigraphical - or they are genuine.

Further vital distinctions preliminary to any discussion of pseudepigraphy are those which must be made between the epistle, letter, treatise, tractate, and homily. There are some writings which have been accorded the designation of epistle or letter, but which in reality fall into one of the other differentiations. As Dibelius has correctly noted, the Epistle of Barnabas has neither the introduction nor the conclusion of a letter, contains no correspondence, and is therefore more appropriately designated a treatise.¹ Similarly, The Epistle of Jude is more applicably entitled a tractate (i.e. an urgent exhortation dealing with concrete matters). It has long been recognized that the Epistle of Second Clement is not a writing in the form of a letter, but a

¹For a full discussion of these terms, see, Dibelius, A Fresh Approach, pp. 137-208.

sermon or homily. Regarding the distinction between the epistle and letter, Dibelius, following the lead of Deissmann, has differentiated the genuine letter from the epistle by the mark of correspondence; the letter becoming an epistle when its form "has only been artificially adopted."¹ Although it can be maintained that the accepted Pauline Epistles exhibit both characteristics, a decision regarding the origin of the Pastorals must be made before there can be a final determination whether they are rightfully termed letters, or whether the form was only "artificially adopted." With these distinctions, it is possible to examine more intelligently the scope of early Christian pseudepigraphical epistolary literature. From this survey of terms, there is the intimation that much of the literature commonly accorded that designation has been inaccurately named.

Scope of Pseudepigraphy in the Early Christian Literature

To compose under fictitious names is indeed an ancient literary device. Motives ranged from the desire to conceal the author's true identity in the case of danger, or his desire to prove his literary skill to deceive, or the alleged veneration of his master, to that of the more tangible mercenary motive.² The Church must never be obscurantist. If pseudepigraphical

¹Ibid., p. 140. Cf. Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 3-9.

²J.S. Candlish, "Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books", Exp, 4th series, IV (1891), 94: "The formation of the two great public libraries, that in the Museum of Alexandria, founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus (283-247 B.C.), and that of Pergamus, founded by Eumenes II (197-159 B.C.), created a great demand for copies of the works of famous authors; and since large prices were given for these by the competing librarians, there was a temptation to ascribe to an illustrious name any anonymous work that was similar to those that truly bore it."

literature was so common as to be an accepted literary device by the early Church, then its possible entrance into the canon must be accepted. But, what are the facts? It would appear that the virtually unanimous and confident assertion, without adequate discussion, that pseudepigraphy was similarly appropriated as a literary device by the early orthodox Church may not be supported under critical investigation. It is to be regretted that the extent of the extant literature originating in the early centuries is of such a limited scope. The awareness of this fact, however, should be a warning against over-positive generalizations concerning its character. A survey of the known Apocryphal literature, bearing the names of NT personages or concepts, gives the following results.¹

Of the approximately ten Gospel fragments originating within the first four centuries, at least eight are known to have arisen from a heretical movement or sect. Only two of the ten make any internal pretense of pseudepigraphy: the fourth century Egyptian-Gnostic Gospel of Philip (cited and denounced as a forgery by Epiphanius);² and the second century Docetic Gospel of Peter (similarly denounced by Serapion in the same century).³ This latter work, which is concerned with Mary's virginity and narrates of incidents not found in the Gospels,

¹Basic texts for study: M.R. James, The Apocryphal NT; Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature, Chicago, 1942; A. Harnack, Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur, Leipzig, 1893; and Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur; H.B. Swete, The Akhmin Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter, London, 1893.

²Adv. Haereses XXVI. xiii (Migne).

³Eusebius, H.E. VI. xii.

makes but one attempt at pseudepigraphy.¹

Of the approximately twelve Infancy Gospels, ten are variations of the Gospels of James and Thomas which alone date to the second century. These Gospels are fanciful and fictitious accounts of the infancy of Christ and perpetual virginity of Mary. Only one attempt at pseudepigraphy is made in each work;² the remainder is void of any first person and is narrative in form.

All the Passion Gospels are of late origin except the second century non-pseudepigraphic narrative entitled the Gospel or Questions of Bartholomew.

In the five primary Acts, which apparently replaced the canonical Acts for the Manichaeans, is found religious fiction in its wildest form. Only two are of second century origin: the Docetic, feigned account of the miracles and travels of John; and the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the oft-discussed attempt to counteract the antifeminist tendencies of the Church. Both are in third person narrative form, and are non-pseudepigraphic; the former being written, according to later writers, by Leucius Charinus, and the latter, by an Asian presbyter who was degraded from office for his attempt. The secondary Acts of Philip, Andrew and Matthew, Peter and Andrew, et al, are later variants of the primary Acts.

Of the Apocalypses, only the one accorded to Peter dates to the second century. It is of too fragmentary a nature to

¹XIV (M.R. James, p. 94): "But I Simon Peter and Andrew my brother took our nets and went to the sea..."

²James XXV (M.R. James, p. 49): "Now I, James..." and Thomas I.1 (M.R. James, p. 49): "I, Thomas the Israelite, tell unto you..." It is significant that this latter attempt at pseudepigraphy is found in the Greek text, but not the Latin.

discover whether it makes any pretense of pseudepigraphy. The Apocalypse of Paul is from the fourth century and is of such a character as to have been laughed at by St. Augustine.¹ The origin of the former is unknown; the latter is attributed by Epiphanius to the Caianites (Cainites?).²

The epistolary form was not popular with apocryphal writers. The reason is perhaps best described by M.R. James as follows:

...it does appear that the Epistle was on the whole too serious an effort for the forger, more liable to detection, perhaps, as a fraud, and not so likely to gain the desired popularity as a narrative or an Apocalypse. Certain it is that our apocryphal Epistles are few and not impressive.³

The entire known epistolary output for the past nineteen centuries numbers but eleven. This figure includes two from the nineteenth century; only two known to be from the second: the impersonal Third Letter of Paul to the Corinthians which is embodied in the aforementioned Acts of Paul and Thecla; and the Epistles of the Apostles. This latter work, makes no attempt at epistolary form, is a combined narrative and homily of questioned orthodoxy.⁴ The only attempt at pseudepigraphy is in the confused opening leaves of the fourth or fifth century Coptic MS where are found the words: "We, John, Thomas... write..."

Therefore, the common assumption that writing in the name and

¹S. Augustini Episcopi in Joannis Evangelium Tractatus XCVIII (Migne).

²S. Epiphani. Adv Haereses XXXVIII. ii (Migne). Cf. M.R. James, p. 525.

³Ibid., p. 476.

⁴Cf. Ibid., p. 485.

person of an Apostle was a customary practice that was well understood and accepted at the time, is found to be extremely dubious. Rather than "countless pseudepigraphy,"¹ this survey has shown that there are no known orthodox pseudepigraphic works of the time most commonly accorded the Pastorals (A.D. 80-120). Only nine apocryphal works date to the second century, of these only five make any pretense at pseudepigraphy. Within the realm of early Christian literature, it is found that true epistolary pseudepigrapha is almost non-existent. The majority of the works identified as pseudepigraphical are in reality pseudonymous. This is not simply a play upon words; there is a vast difference between a work being falsely ascribed to or about a person, and its actually purporting to be from him. There is now need to proceed one step further in the investigation and make a comparative study of the writings with which the Pastorals are associated in the pseudepigraphical theory.

Characteristics of Early Christian Apocryphal Literature

The contemporary assumption that pseudepigraphical literature was common, appears to be based upon the character of the Jewish apocalypses in vogue within the synagogues and early Church. But if the early Christians were of a mind to follow this precedent of an elaborate supernatural setting encased in some historical crisis of Israel, they would have composed, as did the author of

¹Jülicher, INT, pp. 52f.

the Ascension of Isaiah, in the name of some ancient worthy. The framing of a supernatural picture around an apostle did come; but not until a sufficient time had elapsed to surround him with a romantic atmosphere. The fact that during the succeeding centuries there arose a body of literature about Paul's name, does not in the least discredit the Pastorals' claim to authenticity. When they are placed within this literature, they stand unique and their claim to authenticity would appear to be enhanced; for when this literature did take shape, it failed to convey either true religion, or true history. Religiously, the writings were penned to propound a new and heretical doctrine, and therefore had need to claim the highest of authority.¹ As history, they attempted to supplement the meager accounts received. But, as M.R. James has observed:

they fail of their purpose...the authors do not speak with the voices of Paul or of John, or with the quiet simplicity of the three first Gospels. It is not unfair to say that when they attempt the former tone, they are theatrical, and when they essay the latter, they are jejune.²

These writings so excluded themselves from canonicity by their disjointed, dramatically supernatural content, that only the writings of Barnabas, Clement, and Hermas, were ever seriously considered for canonicity.³ The epistolary literature continually betrayed itself by anachronisms, was almost totally void of any personal references, and continually evidenced an aura of un-naturalness. When an attempt was made to follow the known

¹So, C.T. Cruttwell, A Literary History of Early Christianity, I, London, 1893, 153.

²Op. cit., p. xii.

³Cf. Westcott, Canon of the NT, pp. 521f.

style of the claimed author, as in the case of the fourth century Epistle to the Laodiceans, the work became "a mere cento of excerpts from genuine writings."¹ In precision of narrative, and in depth of spiritual insight, the discernible difference between the Pastorals and the literature of the first two centuries must be acknowledged. If there is a gap between the Pastorals and the accepted Paulines, there is a giant chasm which separates them from the literature to which it is compared. For, as T. Zahn has observed, "a class of pseudo-writers possessing originality and genius, and able to write in a dignified, crisp, and pithy style, has never existed."² Yet scholarship is asked to assume that the one writer of his age who most nearly grasped the depth of Paul, who could speak with an authority that deceived men for eighteen centuries, wrote only this collection, assumed an unusual literary form, and was never to be heard of again.

Early Christian Writers' Attitude toward Pseudepigraphy

This final phase of the present discussion will be examined under the headings of two common assumptions regarding the early Christian attitude.

What has been cited as the acceptance of pseudepigraphy by

¹Badcock, p. 126.

²INT, I, 140, see also pp. 158f. For further discussion, see, H.C.G. Moule, The Second Epistle to Timothy, p. 21; F.W. Farrar, Paul, pp. 662f; Jones, pp. 291f; Tenny, p. 419; Carrington, The Early Christian Church, I, 259f; and Bernard and Wynne, Literature of the Second Century, London, 1891, pp. 60-96, 100-4.

orthodox Christians may not prove to be so. It has previously been observed, for instance, that many works may be pseudonymous in designation, but not pseudepigraphical in character. But, it should also be noted that although certain books were quoted with great respect by early Christian writers, and although these works are now known to be falsely ascribed writings, these can not be presented as the evidence that pseudepigraphy was accepted by the Church. W.J. Deane has, for instance, suggested that the Wisdom of Solomon is an example of a writing which was not intended to deceive the Church that so widely accepted it.¹ Yet if this be true, the innocent deception was unsuccessful. An examination of the early witness discloses that the work was accepted as an inspired, genuine writing of Solomon. Thus Hippolytus (A.D. 170-236) quoted Wisdom ii.1, 12, 13, as the words of Solomon.² It was this way that Tertullian (A.D. 160-225)³ and Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 165-220) regarded the work.⁴ Origen (A.D. 185-254) classified the Wisdom of Solomon as the genuine word of God, as the treatise of Solomon, and as Scripture.⁵ This view is taken in spite of the fact that elsewhere he relates that the work is not similarly esteemed by all.⁶ There is perhaps room to question the

¹Pseudepigrapha, Edinburgh, 1891, pp. 1f. Cf. Moffatt, HNT, p. 621.

²S. Hippolyti, Demonstratio Adversus Judaeos, IX, X (Migne).

³Tertulliani, De Praescriptione Haereticorum, VII (Bindley).

⁴Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata, VI xivff (Migne).

⁵Origens, Contra Celsum, III. 72; V. 29; III.1 (Migne).

⁶Origenis, De Principiis, IV (Koetschau). For similar findings regarding the Sibylline oracles, see Candlish, pp. 100f.

exactness of criticism within the early centuries, but it must be acknowledged that such works were accepted and employed because of the belief in their genuineness.

Furthermore, what is cited as "orthodox indifference" to contemporary pseudepigraphical efforts¹ may not prove to be correct. An examination of the early writers who discussed known pseudepigraphical productions discloses the most stringent of denunciations for such procedure. The earliest Christian reference to the possibility of forgery is the precaution taken by the Apostle Paul that the Thessalonians might not be misled by such productions. (2 Th 2:2, 3:17) Since the known pseudepigrapha were of later second century vintage, the earliest possible reaction subsequent to Paul's is to be found within the Apologists. The fragments of Hegesippus (A.D. 170) as preserved by Eusebius, relate that some of the Apocrypha (ἀποκρύφων) were fabricated (ἀναπεπλάσθαι) by certain heretics.² It is also through Eusebius that Serapion (A.D. 190), the bishop of Antioch, is shown to have rejected writings which falsely bear the names of Peter and the other Apostles.³ Origen, in his Preface to de Principiis, informs us that the treatise entitled the Doctrine of Peter should not be quoted since it was composed neither by Peter nor anyone else inspired by God's Spirit, and was, therefore, not included among the accepted books. Eusebius quotes Dionysius (A.D. 250) as saying that since the apostles of the devil had filled writings as inferior as his

¹Jülicher, INT, pp. 52f. Cf. Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 34.

²H.E. IV. xxii.

³H.E. VI. xii.

letters with tares it is not amazing that they had also falsified the Scriptures.¹ Cyril of Jerusalem took a similar view when he observed that of the NT there are only four Gospels τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ψευδεπίγραφα καὶ βλαβερὰ τυγχάνει . Continuing, he writes of the Manichaean Gospel of Thomas, and denounces it as one which διαφθείρει τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἀπλουστέρων .² By the time of Eusebius, forgeries were denounced as being full of every kind of blasphemy, as being devoid of Apostolic phraseology and content, as failing to preserve the pure τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας, and for their heretical origin, and subsequent omission from the orthodox writers of the Church.³ It would appear, therefore, that there is no vindication of the allegation that the early orthodox Church was indifferent to the question of pseudepigraphy.

The admission of 2 Peter into the canon, rather than being an argument for "orthodox indifference," is actually a vindication of the position taken in this section. As Sanday has correctly noted, the Epistle is not even mentioned until the third century, and is doubted just as soon as it is mentioned.⁴ In addition, it should be observed that the Epistle was unavailable to many Syriac-speaking Christians until far into the Middle Ages.

¹H.E. IV. xxiii.

²Catechesis, IV. xxxvi (Migne).

³Cf. H.E. IX. v; VI. xxv; III. xxv; xxxviii; iii.

⁴Inspiration, p. 348.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL COMPOSITION OF THE PASTORALS

Motive

The principal motive for early apocryphal literature was seen to be the promulgation of a new or heretical doctrine. The most frequently postulated pseudepigraphical motive for the writing of the Pastorals, however, is not the declaration of heresy, but the desire to rescue the Pauline Corpus from the disfavour to which it had fallen through its being championed by heretics. Or, in the words of its main postulator: "Paul is being made a tool of Marcionism, and he must be rescued and recovered for the uses of the church. The Pastoral Letters accomplish this."¹ An adequate motive is mandatory, and if there were sufficient internal evidence in its support, it would greatly enhance the theory's position. Yet, as will be shown in detail in chapter five, and is recognized by critics of Pastorals' authenticity, the elaborate "Gnostic systems of the middle of the second century are not taken account of in the Pastoral Epistles."² There is a general exhortation against contentious arguments, yet the Pastorals are not as concerned with the refutation of errors as with strengthening men's character. The antithesis of I 6:20 which is declared

¹Goodspeed, INT, p. 338. Cf. A.E. Barnett, Paul Becomes a Literary Influence, p. 251; Gealy, p. 372; J. Knox, Chapters in A Life of Paul, p. 20; Bisseker. pp. 881-888; and M. Rist, "Pseudepigraphic Refutations of Marcionism", JR, xxii (1942), 50-62. This contemporary position is an elaboration of that earlier held by Schleiermacher, Eichhorn, Baur, and Pfleiderer.

²Dibelius, A Fresh Approach, p. 233. Cf. von Soden, p. 321.

to be a "clear indication of the Marcionite doctrine"¹ can as well be a reference to those dogmas which were opposed to sound doctrine as to the technical Marcionite sense of 'anti-thesis'. That similarities exist between the teaching denounced within the Pastorals, and the Marcionite system is accepted; but it must also be acknowledged that these same similarities may be shown to exist within the historical framework presupposed within these Epistles. Furthermore, if the pseudo-Paul were really concerned with meeting the needs of his day, but avoided a detailed refutation of Gnosticism for the sake of the fiction involved, the Pastorals would then contain not only a refinement of pseudepigraphy un-paralleled in such literature, but also contents which would then be applicable only to Paul's day, and would thus have been valueless to the author's own time. It might also be noted in passing, that the unanimity as to the "how?" of such a composition, is not found for the "why?". Loisy, for instance, suggests that the first draft of the Pastorals was anti-gnostic, but not anti-Marcionite; the canonized edition added the anti-Marcionite material at a later date.² Goodspeed intimates that the corpus of the Pastorals was written under the influence of the Pauline collection, with which it was combined in order to bring it to the number within the corpus of Plato's letters.³ It would appear that a satisfactory motive remains to be found for this theory.⁴

¹Baur, pp. 99f. Cf. Goodspeed, INT, p. 338.

²Op. cit., p. 279.

³New Solutions of NT Problems, Chicago, 1927, p. 45.

⁴See Moffatt (The Approach to the NT, p. 203) for stress on the need for an adequate motive in the historical method. Cf. J. Rutherford, "PE", ISBE, IV, 2262.

Addressee, Number, and Sequence

It cannot be repeated often enough that one does not remove the problems and hypotheses of origin merely by pronouncing a work to be pseudepigraphical. The despair of this hypothesis is vividly disclosed when Gealy, in discussing the addressee, number, and sequence of the Pastorals states:

IF we could be certain WHY three letters were written, or WHEN they were written, or to WHOM they were first sent, we should be in a better position to know the ORDER in which they were written. EVIDENTLY the author was...He MAY have thought three letters...and PERHAPS circulated...OR they MAY have been issued...It is PERHAPS possible...it is MOST unlikely...¹

The italics have been inserted to show the extent to which the pseudepigraphical theory must resort to hypothesis. Is scholarship reduced to the position of determining which hypothesis is the most original and ingenious or can not a more plausible basis be found for reconciling the composition of these Epistles?

For Goodspeed, the pseudonymity is double; both author and recipients are fictitious. This, he asserts, is to lend the authority not only of Paul, but of his principal lieutenants, as well.² However, as Loisy observes, that would be operating on the false assumption that Titus was a disciple of Paul on the same level as Timothy. Rather than despair over the entire historical framework, Loisy suggests that "the artificiality of the whole composition makes it useless to search for precise

¹Op. cit., pp. 371ff.

²INT, p. 341.

applications."¹ But if the question of recipients is answered, there is still the problem of number. Why three? Barnett suggests that the three letters were a literary artifice involved in a single composition.² Gealy differs, maintaining that the three letters represent a "broadside attack, more effective if discharged one after the other."³ But, why three? And if three, why not to three different men? If it were the purpose to standardize the ecclesiastical organization, why were the Epistles not sent to three different geographical locations? Is it really likely that a pseudo-Paul would compose two documents so closely resembling one another as do 1 Timothy and Titus? Goodspeed, in attempting to explain the question of recipients, observed that they were chosen because Paul "might most naturally be expected to have written" to them, and because they "might most naturally represent the first Christian ministry in the Greek world."⁴ Well then, if it is so natural, the most natural explanation might also be found in the situation as presupposed within the Epistles.

The question of proper sequence of the Epistles becomes even more involved than that of recipients for those who deny their authenticity. Apparently, no one within this group has

¹Op. cit., pp. 277f.

²NT Its Making, p. 277.

³Op. cit., pp. 371f.

⁴INT, pp. 329f. Moffatt (INT, p. 409), suggests that Titus was chosen because of his connection over circumcision. Gealy (p. 344), conjectures that the recipients were chosen to assure the contemporary ministry of their own apostolic succession and commission.

contended that the proper order should be with Titus first.¹ Some scholars, like Dibelius, however, have maintained the traditional order (i.e. 1 T, Tit, 2 T) to be correct, with the Pastorals' growth in personal tone serving as a final, direct appeal to Paul.² The majority of the advocates of this theory would, notwithstanding, contend that the supposed growth of opposition to the heretics, and in ecclesiastical organization, as well as the progressive lessening of the purely personal elements (asserted to be more natural within the writings of a pseudo-author) would demand that 2 T be first.³ It is possible, however, that the fuller ecclesiastical organization, and the development of heresy can be explained by the variance of circumstance, rather than by a variance in date and order.⁴ If one is to argue from the personal notices, it must be observed that in Colossians and Philemon, Paul includes Demas in his greetings; but in 2 T, an argument for a later date might be seen in Demas' defection. But it has seemingly not occurred to the advocates of pseudepigraphy that in their use of internal evidence they are in fact arguing from the Epistles' spuriousness of authorship to their genuineness of historical situation. To note, with Easton, that this order presents a growth in the elder system, although still being of a pre-Ignatian date, is

¹Only known Traditionalist who maintains that Titus was written first is A.C. Hervey (pp. xiff).

²Pastoralbriefe, pp. 5, 45. Cf. Jülicher, INT, p. 184; and H.F.D. Sparks, The Formation of the NT, London, 1952, p. 73.

³So, Baur, Holtzmann, von Soden, Gealy, Easton. Those maintaining the fragmentary position, yet contending for this sequence, include: Harrison, McGiffert, and Moffatt.

⁴So, Lock, "The First Epistle to Timothy", p. 770b.

arguing from fiction to fact.¹ If the Epistles are forgeries, with no real circumstances as their basis, then the developed reprobation of Hymenaeus, or of the church organization, has no historical validity. Moffatt asserts, that the traditional order of the Epistles was accepted by the Church because it "naturally argued from the internal evidence that 2 Timothy, with its richer individual references reflected the last phase of the Apostle's career."² It might just well be that the order deemed most natural by the early Church is, after all, most natural.

Date and Place of Writing

Since, in a pseudepigraphical writing, any personal reference is "a literary device intended to ensure both the authenticity of the letter and the necessity for writing it," it necessarily follows, that such details "cannot be taken at face value."³ Such reasoning, however, did not prevent Gealy from arguing on the very next page from I 1:3, II 1:15,18, and Tit 1:5, that Ephesus was the place of writing.⁴ Dibelius, because of the names in II 4:10, regarded Caesarea as the scene of origin;⁵ Goodspeed contended for Rome;⁶ Easton for Syria or

¹PE, p. 21. Goodspeed (INT, p. 339) appears to take the most logical pseudepigraphical position when he insists that the Pastorals must not be approached atomistically, but rather as a corpus.

²INT, p. 397.

³Gealy, p. 367. Cf. Jülicher, INT, p. 183.

⁴Ibid., p. 368. Cf. H. Leitzmann, Beginnings, p. 289.

⁵Pastoralbriefe, p. 79.

⁶INT, pp. 342f. Cf. Barnett, The NT, Its Making, p. 284.

Asia Minor.¹ Thus, once again it is obvious, that no matter what theory of authenticity is decided upon, agreement is wanting.

With those maintaining either partial or complete pseudepigraphy, the question of date has produced the following plethora of conjectures: A.D. 65-95, Wood; A.D. 70-80, Falconer; A.D. 70-100, Taylor; A.D. 80-85, Clarke; A.D. 85, Henshaw; A.D. 90, De Wette; A.D. 90-120, Harnack, Streeter, and Harrison; A.D. 95-100 Renan; A.D. 95-105, Easton, and E.F. Scott; A.D. 95-135, Moffatt; A.D. 100-125, Jülicher, and J. Weiss; A.D. 100-150, Bultmann, Dibelius, and Kennedy; A.D. 130-150, Holtzmann, Grieve, Gealy;² and A.D. 140-180, Barnett, Goodspeed, J. Knox, Baur, Bauer, Pfeleiderer, and Rist. Although no theory is to be rejected because of the divergence of opinion amongst its advocates, it must surely be recognized that a theory that does not have to resort to such extensive hypothesis has more to commend itself to scholarship.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL CONTENT OF THE PASTORALS

Our final examination under this present theory is its explanation of the content. Although it has been recognized above that this theory discounts the validity of any internal references, its position does not eliminate the problems. For example, to denounce the traditional theory of origin because it demands a historical situation outside the framework given in

¹PE, p. 22.

²Op. cit., p. 370: " a reasonable conjecture."

Acts also reflects upon the pseudo-author who was at the same time so adroit as to mimic the style, sentiment, and doctrine of Paul while being so maladroit as to compose an impossible situation. If, on the other hand, the historical situation is alleged to be valid, or at least dependent upon strong tradition, then one serious objection to traditional authorship is removed. The only evidence, (to be discussed later in this chapter) which can be submitted to show that the historical content was pure fiction, is that the situation depicted cannot possibly belong to the period presupposed.¹ Furthermore, it is surprising, as Falconer observes, that there is a lack of emphasis which might be expected in a Pauline Epistle: e.g. the mystical union with Christ, and the emphasis upon the Holy Spirit;² but it is also strange, if a later product omitted the pre-eminence of the bishop, and of the refutation of theoretical gnosticism. Likewise, it is possible to note, as Harrison has done, many Pauline phrases in the Pastorals which can be attributed to the transcription of the pseudo-Paul,³ and perhaps compare this procedure with the fourth century Epistle to the Laodiceans and its mosaic-like usurpation of Pauline phrases; but, a studied variation of the dislocating of phrases and inter-mixing the new terms with the old is both too refined, and unparalleled in ancient pseudepigraphical literature. Similarly, it is possible to take notice of some peculiar elements of Pauline vocabulary and style, but it is difficult to explain how a work so avowedly

¹So Badcock, p. 89. Cf. Findlay, "PE", p. 349.

²PE, pp. 27f.

³PPE, pp. 166-175.

unPauline could have been placed in circulation up to 70 years after the issuing of the Pauline corpus.¹ It is also possible to suppose that the Pastorals' content is dependent upon Polycarp rather than Polycarp upon the Pastorals,² but their acceptance in Rome, Asia Minor, Gaul, Egypt, and North Africa, as well as their canonical status by mid-century or shortly thereafter, would be difficult to explain for a forgery perpetrated so late.

Perhaps one of the most significant points which scholars have consistently urged against any theory which regards the Pastorals as pure fiction, is their abundance of purely personal and historical references.³ It is so unlikely that a fabricator would write of Asia's defection from Paul (II 1:15), or the recommendation of wine for Timothy's stomach (I 5:23), or the need for a cloak and books (II 4:13), not to mention other details which bear the stamp of truth, that the majority of critics, including those who most strenuously deny that the entirety of the Epistles was Pauline, acknowledge these autobiographical sections as derived from a genuine Pauline source. It is, of course, possible to conceive of these names and facts as being borrowed from the Acts, from the Pauline corpus, or from free invention;⁴ but any such explanation is invalidated by a comparison of the Pastorals with the second century literature. The latter is concerned not with these specifics; but

¹So, Plummer, p. 10. Cf. A.C. Deane, pp. 252ff.

²So, Gealy, p. 369.

³Cf. Harrison, PPE, pp. 93ff; B. Weiss, "The Present Status of Inquiry", pp. 392f; "Authorship of the PE", pp. 85f; and all Fragmentarians.

⁴Cf. Jülicher, INT, p. 199.

with generalities. This unparalleled use of the autobiographical material includes the names of 26 ancient church members: 15 of which are not previously mentioned; 11 to be found elsewhere. In the case of this latter group, Salmon has carefully shown how new, and often conflicting, details are confidently supplied.¹ It was indeed a remarkable falsifier who would make the faithful Demas to be the current defector, and turn the deserter Marcus into a profitable servant.² Equally unintelligible is the subordinate position of Linus, if the unquestioned tradition of his being the successor to the Apostles as bishop of Rome is correct, and if these Epistles were forged to enhance the ecclesiastical framework of the Church.³ The earlier the date that is established for the forgery, as is seemingly demanded by both the external and internal evidence, the more difficult it is to explain how the new names in peculiar roles, and the old names in new situations, came to be accepted. Certainly, if forged within a generation of the Apostle, either the personages involved, or their friends were alive and could expose the perpetration.⁴ For an Epistle that probably pre-supposes a Roman origin, it is interesting that of the Roman Christians made to send greetings in 2 T, not one is mentioned in Romans 16. Although it would appear that such invention as that cited, as well as the unique personal instructions and notices⁵ and the

¹INT, pp. 409-12.

²It was also a remarkable author who would detect in Col 4:10 that Marcus was at Colossae, and then in II 4:11 place him in the neighbourhood of Ephesus where Timothy could fetch him.

³So, White, p. 82.

⁴So, B. Weiss, INT, pp. 417f.

⁵e.g. I 3:14; 5:23; 6:20; Tit 3:12ff; II 4:13, et al.

unparalleled geographical associations¹, are beyond the dexterity of a forger, perhaps it would still be possible if it were not for another feature of these Epistles.

The Pastorals' estimate of individuals, although pronounced "incredible"² and "psychologically inconceivable"³ if composed by Paul, presents a formidable obstacle for the pseudepigraphical theory. Now it might be incredible that there would be a need for the genuine Paul to warn his disciple against juvenile vices, or to refer to his youth, considering the decade or more of intimacy between them; but it is equally inconceivable that if the forgery were perpetrated to rescue Paul from disrepute, and to enhance the ecclesiastical framework of the church, both Paul and Timothy should be frequently deprecated. Legendary tales of the later centuries were laudatory in tone, not defamatory. The question is, whether it is easier to understand the Timothean instructions as the Pauline desire to supply a form or record of general principles which might be employed after his departure, or the stress on Apostleship as being demanded just because of the intimacy which might tend to becloud the element of authority; or whether it is best explained as the attempt of the pseudo-Paul to lend an unparalleled verisimilitude to his writings. The need for such instructions might be questioned if the disciples were soon to join their master. An examination of the character of exhortations, however, discloses the following facts: Timothy

¹e.g. connecting Paul, Titus, Artemas, Tychicus, and Apollos with Crete.

²Moffatt, HNT, pp. 562f. Cf. McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 399f.

³Jülicher, INT, p. 186. Cf. von Soden, pp. 310f; Easton, PE, pp. 9ff; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, pp. 95-98.

is not being recalled in the First Epistle, where there is such a stress on organization; the directions in Second Timothy, where his presence is requested, are not pastoral, but personal, and therefore applicable at all times in his ministry; and in the Epistle to Titus, although Titus was soon to rejoin Paul, the pastoral directions are for a newly formed church which needed guidance in its formative stages, needs, which perhaps could not have waited for the personal conference. Certainly Paul appears to be anxious, but there is always the note of confidence and faith in them. As Schlatter has stated, Paul "might admonish with severity, but all the time he believed in the grace of God."¹ The real question, then, is whether the boldness of exhortation to Timothy is more natural from the echter Paulus, who, under the stress of circumstance became perhaps a bit too solicitous,² or whether it is the pseudo-Paul's unparalleled attempt at verisimilitude. One thing seems certain: known pseudepigraphical writers did not compose their fictions in the way required by the references in the Pastorals.

It is because these personal elements would appear to be so unlikely in a pseudepigraphical production that the majority of critics who deny the authenticity of the Pastorals' in their

¹The Church in the NT Period, p. 226. Cf. Godet, pp. 600-606; F.W. Farrar, Paul, p. 659; Jones, p. 282; and F.C. Conybeare, Myth, Magic and Morals, London, 1909, pp. xvif.

²Holtzmann's reaction to one personal reference, that of I 4:12 and Timothy's perpetual youth, has been taken up by E.F. Scott (PE, pp. 51f) as an indication that Paul could not have been the author at the time demanded by the Epistles. "Timothy," he asserts, "would then be a man of about forty, and no one would think it presumptuous in him to come forward as a teacher." Cf. Easton, PE, p. 146. This objection would appear to be invalid, however, for even the extreme critic Gealy (p. 345) recognizes that the terms can be used affectionately as an indication of a

entirety find genuine fragments interwoven into the Epistles.

FRAGMENTARY THEORY

This theory, like the pseudepigraphical, has been too casually dismissed by the exponents of Pauline authenticity.¹ The array of scholars identified with it - notably, Harrison, Moffatt, Harnack, and Falconer - is so formidable, as to demand its careful examination.² Although the details depend upon the individual critic, the adherents are agreed upon at least two points: that in their present form, the Pastorals could not have come from the hand of Paul; but that they contain genuine Pauline fragments which account for the historical situation. This agreement was achieved after making the following observations: that the Epistles are inorganic and composite in structure; that the phraseology and general style are against the genuineness of the Epistles; that life-like personalia, particularly in 2 Timothy, are so much like Paul, and unlike a falsifier, that they must be accounted for; that the historical picture demanded by the traditional theory is completely untenable; that the general atmosphere is that of a later generation; and, therefore, that a devout Paulinist, after studying the genuine letters of his master,

position of subordination rather than age. For discussion of ancient attitude toward age, see: Simpson, p. 8; Conybeare and Howson, p. 657; Bernard, PE, pp. xliiif; and Carrington, Early Christian Church, I, 262. It is significant that Ignatius should have to admonish the church (Magn III.1) not to presume upon Polycarp's youth, in spite of the fact that the Bishop of Smyrna was undoubtedly middle age.

¹e.g. Simpson, p. 22.

²Also, Clemen, von Dobschütz, A.M. Hunter, McGiffert, E.F. Scott, von Soden, Streeter.

incorporated the acquired notes into the letters of exhortation and presented them in all humility to meet the needs of his generation as he knew Paul would have done. Advocates of this hypothesis assert that such inculcation of unacknowledged material was in keeping with the literary customs of ancient writers; and that, since all of the contemporaries were aware of the procedure, humility, and not deceit, was the trait of the author. Although this theory is a sincere attempt to account for the problems presented by the Pauline authorship of these Epistles, it might be found that it is "merely an exchange of one set of difficulties for another."¹

FRAGMENTARY-PSEUDEPIGRAPHY IN HISTORY

Method

There is a vital question which must be asked the Fragmentist: Upon what documentary evidence is your theory founded? That it is an ingenious hypothesis which admirably attempts the retention of choice Pauline words is noteworthy; but upon what historical precedents is it established? Apocryphal productions are acknowledged to be prevalent in the generations succeeding the Apostolic writings; that there were pseudepigraphical works, although fewer in number than generally recognized, has also been noted; but, is there one writing of the early centuries which demonstrates the use of genuine unpublished frag-

¹Plummer, p. 9.

ments being mixed with apocryphal material in order to make a pseudepigraphical creation? That literary productions, characterized by a cento or mosaic-like selection of Pauline phrases, were possible, is evidenced by the aforementioned fourth century Epistle to the Laodiceans; but the inclusion of genuine, unpublished fragments, is completely unparalleled.

Equally unparalleled is the literary dexterity required on the part of the author under such a hypothesis. The author so gifted as ingeniously to interweave the genuine with the fictitious, resulting in an integrated whole virtually defying division, was a genius of no ordinary character - a man supreme among his contemporaries. One of the presuppositions of the theory is that the fragments believed to be genuine "are too circumstantial and concrete to be explained" as the work of a fabricator;¹ that in II 4, "we are listening to the echter Paulus."² Yet, as Goodspeed has asserted, "an author capable of such brilliant reversal of the familiar encyclical technique may certainly be credited with such small literary details as the cloak and books left at Troas."³ Goodspeed further considers that the fragmentary position is shattered upon the fact that just such details characterized the later Acts of Paul and therefore rightfully belong to the "very rudiments of fiction."⁴ A glance at the comparison, however, discloses that he may have overstated his case. It may be true, as claimed, that the

¹Moffatt, INT, pp. 398f.

²A.M. Hunter, Interpreting the NT, p. 64.

³INT, p. 342. Cf. Jülicher, INT, pp. 199f.

⁴Ibid., p. 341.

description of Paul (II 3) is just as circumstantial as that of the cloak and the book (II 4:12f); but there the analogy ends, for both the personalia and composition are at variance. Using the complete Greek text, rather than the later fragmentary Coptic, it is found that the entire work is fanciful and unhistorical to the extreme. In contradistinction to the Pastorals, it is laudatory in tone, and narrative in form; rather than at times deprecatory and epistolary. Whereas the Pastorals are almost evenly divided between the inclusion of new and old names, the Acts include only four old names. It is significant that the inclusion of these four, Demas and Hermogenes in roles of antagonism towards Paul, Onesiphorus in one of friendship, and Titus as a Pauline envoy, may well have their source in the Pastorals. Furthermore, with the introduction of the historical Queen Tryphaena¹ a flagrant anachronism is incorporated. No such anachronism has been established within the Pastorals. It is now generally believed that the author may have used a local legend of Thecla, an early Christian martyr, and patroness of the popular cult of St. Thecla. No such source material has been postulated for the Pastorals. The supernatural elevation of Paul, and the heretical stress on virginity, are, in contrast with the Pastorals, completely in keeping with the apocryphal works of the later generations. The Third Letter of Paul to the Corinthians which is embodied in the Acts, again, unlike the Pastorals, is a doctrinal treatise, not a letter, and is devoid of personalia. Yet this much would appear to be certain, that

¹Apparently the widow of Cotys, King of Thrace and mother of Polemo II, King of Pontus. Cf. M.R. James, p. 272.

the skill demanded on the part of the author under the fragmentist theory, is at least as remarkable as that which their invention would have involved under the pseudepigraphical hypothesis. When an examination is made of the literature to which the Pastorals must be compared, it seems that with either theory, whether it involves the invention of the personalia, or their incorporation, the critics have attributed to the author twentieth century refinements of literary dexterity unparalleled in his age.¹

Required by the fragmentist position is also an unparalleled interest in Paul on the part of the author. If he had written in keeping with his contemporaries in the early decades of the second century, he would have quoted extensively from the OT, but would have rarely and inexactly utilized the New. As was seen in the first chapter, the NT influenced the thought of the Apostolic Fathers, but few of its phrases are to be found verbatim within their writings. It was not until the time of Marcion that an emphasis, albeit a faulty one, was laid upon Paul's writings. For reasons previously stated, such a late date in order to achieve the required Pauline atmosphere appears out of the question. It is a fragmentist presupposition that the author must "have been deeply versed in those Pauline writings which have come down to us";² but if so, it must also be presupposed that the only man of his age who was able to reflect the Pauline spirit and manner was also consigned to literary and spiritual oblivion apart from

¹ Cf. Shaw, p. 483.

² Harrison, PPE, p. 88. Cf. pp. 9-12.

these pseudepigraphical writings. Is it conceivable that one supposed to be so versed in the Pauline Epistles, could still compose in his master's name after the denunciation of such action by Paul in 2 Thessalonians? No mistake ought to be made at this point. Regardless of the alleged humility, devotion, love, and conformity to Paul on the part of the author, or even if genuine fragments are involved, the final verdict is the same - the Pastorals are pseudepigraphical, if not genuine. As Dibelius has noted, "die Fragmentenhypothese entlastet den 'Fälscher' nicht, sondern schreibt ihm nur eine andere Methode zu."¹ Since all possibility of an accidental inclusion of the fragments is ruled out, it is now necessary to investigate what the moral attitude of the ancients would be to the alleged innocent deception.

Morals

Deissmann has asserted that there is a certain type of pseudonymity which is "innocent, sincere, and honest," with the character of such a writer not being involved in malice or cowardice, but rather of "modesty and natural timidity."² This stress upon the innocency of deception, and the good faith of the author, is the unanimous decision of adherents to the fragmentist theory. Thus, Harrison postulates that the author never intended to deceive, and that it was not until a later time when the author was no longer around to correct it, that the false impression of

¹Pastoralbriefe, p. 6. Cf. Dibelius, Fresh Approach, pp. 232f; B. Weiss, INT, p. 418.

²Bible Studies, pp. 15, 34. Cf. Moffatt, HNT, pp. 619-23; W.J. Deane, pp. 1f.

Pauline authorship arose.¹ Although it is difficult to see the purpose or advantage of pseudepigraphy if all were aware of the Epistles' true origin, scholarship today is still encouraged to examine such a procedure not in the light of the twentieth century, but as a legitimate artifice of the author's age.² "The problem is not moral" it is asserted, but "historical."³ If historical, then to history let us return.

In the first two centuries of this era, true pseudepigraphy was rare, and not common. Epistolary pseudepigraphy was almost non-existent. Innocent pseudepigraphy, that is, writing with no intent to deceive, is difficult to trace at this late date. Candlish in his very important article, has, however, charted the varied reasons for writing under an assumed name within the ancient world. His general conclusion is worth stating.

...so far from innocent and recognised fictions in composition being more common in ancient than in modern literature, the very opposite is nearer the truth; for of ancient pseudonymous books a far larger proportion was meant to be received as genuine than of modern; and indeed it seems doubtful whether any but a very few were written in perfect good faith.⁴

Sanday, although agreeing with Candlish that ancients were not indifferent to the moral character of literary impersonation, would add, however, that "truthfulness has been a virtue of slow growth. Some forms of intellectual sincerity have hardly had full recognition before our own day."⁵ This evolution of

¹PPE, p. 112. Cf. Harrison, "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered III", p. 77; Easton, PE, p. 19; Hincks, p. 116.

²Cf. Dibelius, Paul, ed. W. Kümmel, tran F. Clarke, London, 1953, p. 6; and W.H. Simcox, The Writers of the NT, London, 1890, p. 38.

³Gealy, p. 372.

⁴Op. cit., p. 97.

⁵Inspiration, pp. 224f.

literary perpetration might well be correct, and it might well be that many works are to be classified within this category; but it cannot be shown that the general, orthodox opinion approved of such a procedure. When the early Apocryphal literature is examined, it is to be noticed how scrupulously the earliest orthodox writers resisted the temptation of this literary technique.¹ As has been noted, it would appear that the Apocryphal literature received in a condition which would enable determination, betrays signs of origin outside the orthodox circles. At least eight of the ten early Gospel Fragments are of heretical origin; the remaining two do not provide enough evidence for determination. The only two Infancy Gospels of the second century are from heretical circles; while the five Primary Acts probably replaced the canonical Acts for the Manichaeans. It would appear, therefore, that the supposition that pseudepigraphy was so common in the ancient world as to incur no moral taint even among the orthodox circles may not be justified. Although morality may have been slow in evolving, it apparently grew at a faster rate amongst Christians, as the natural fruit of the apostolic doctrine.²

Three literary analogies are given to verify the practice of innocent pseudepigraphy. Moffatt contends that since the speeches in Acts were fabricated, Luke must have approved of the procedure and would therefore have consented to entire letters being attributed to the Apostles as well.³ The giving of the

¹Cf. C.T. Cruttwell, p. 154.

²Cf. Fairbairn, pp. 4f; Simpson, pp. 6f; and Shaw, pp. 478-82.

³INT, p. 415.

facts and thoughts of a person's speech from a historian's viewpoint, is not analogous to the composition of a work to propound a new doctrine, and its subsequent ascription to an Apostle in order to gain his authority.¹ Many exponents of the Pastorals' authenticity plead only for the possibility of the facts and thoughts coming from the Apostle and not the verbatim material. The other two analogies have been taken from the writings of Tertullian. When discussing the ancient art of pseudonymous writing, Mitton uses Tertullian, *adv. Marcionem*, IV.5, to assert that "it might even have been thought an impertinence for a pupil to seek to summarize his master's message, and allow his own name, instead of his master's to appear in it."² However, such an interpretation is difficult to derive from that passage which reads: "nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Capit autem magistrorum uideri quae discipuli promulgarint."³ The statement in context was meant to apply to the writings of Mark and Luke and might well serve as a verification of the ancient ability of authorship perception and not perpetration. Tertullian's discussion appears to vindicate the earlier position taken in this chapter. For a publication so to appear to be the work of an author as to be regarded by the public as his work is different from that of the work's actually being published in his master's name. The one is pseudonymity; the other pseudepigraphy. The former would be Church opinion; the latter

¹So, Ramsay, The First Christian Century, pp. 78f.

²"Important Hypotheses Reconsidered VII", ET, LXVII (1955-6), 195-8.

³Adversus Marcionem, IV (Corpus Scriptorum).

the author's literary artifice.¹ Actually, Mitton's argument may be used conversely. If, out of modesty, the disciple was using Paul's name in recognition that the thoughts were in reality his master's, it is an admission that these thoughts are not required to be placed in post-Apostolic times. Furthermore, it is a recognition that Paul had become sufficiently interested in such matters to have either written or conversed concerning them - thus removing serious doubts regarding Pauline authorship. On the other hand, if Paul had not so related of his attitude, then the word devout should be removed from the characterization of the author, since he was writing in conformity with his own presentments and not the known concepts of his master. The closer it is necessary to place the Pastorals' thoughts with the Apostle, the more redundant does the theory of the Paulinist become.

The other statement of Tertullian is provided when he alludes to the origin of the Acts of Paul and Thecla in his discourse about the forwardness of women in the Church. Since two conclusions are drawn from the interpretation of the same passage, it might be well to recall its exact words.

quodsi quae Pauli perperam inscripta sunt exemplum Theclae ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique defendunt, sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, conuictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse loco decessisse.²

That the author was punished by being degraded from the presbyterate is certain; but was this punishment for heresy or for the composition? Certain authors have insisted that the presbyter was

¹So, Guthrie, "Tertullian and Pseudonymity", ET, LXVII (1955-6), 34lf.

²De Baptismo, 17 (Corpus Scriptorum).

degraded not for forgery, but for the adulteratio scripturae which the teaching of women's rights was to be regarded.¹ If such a position can be substantiated from Tertullian's words, then it naturally follows that the second century Church apparently condoned the writer, who, in love, wanted to enhance the glory of his master, but not the heresy. Admittedly the context is dealing with heresy, but the section under discussion, would appear to be Tertullian's contention that writings wrongly ascribed to Paul could not be used in support of the false doctrine.² The immediate antecedent to the statement of conviction and confession of guilt, is the phrase, "heaping up a narrative as it were from his own materials under Paul's name."³ Since probably the whole of NT Apocryphal literature was heretical in origin, it is difficult to see the possibility of ecclesiastical endorsement of pseudepigraphy from this one example of confession and subsequent degradation.

THE PROBLEM OF COMPILATION

Motive

Assuming for a moment the historical possibility of a fragmentary-pseudepigraphic production, there is still the vital problem of providing an adequate motive. Remembering that the primary motive of apocryphal literature was the promulgation of heresy,

¹Cf. Jülicher, INT, p. 53; Streeter, p. 5; W.K.L. Clarke, Concise Bible Commentary, London, 1952, p. 893.

²Cf. Ramsay, The First Christian Century, pp. 80-83.

³Translation by A. Souter, Tertullian's Treatise Concerning Baptism, London, 1919, p. 67.

it seems strange that the Pastorals should again be made the exception as to have been written to combat false doctrine. If these Epistles really were designed to secure Pauline authority against a particular second-century heresy, then an examination of their contents would yield some distinctive and definite trace of the heresy in mind. However, apart from the already discussed doubtful allusion in I 6:20, no such traces are to be found. The contents would appear to be applicable neither to the Docetic nor the Marcionite systems current within the dating extremes of the theory. If, on the other hand, the writings were composed not to refute heresy, but to "strengthen the authority of Timothy and Titus,"¹ the Epistles have again failed in their purpose. The contents do not permit the using of Timothy and Titus as pseudonyms for the monarchical bishops of the Ignatian era. Even if the author were to have avoided all obvious anachronisms, and were able to depict the church organization as it existed in the days of Paul, what value would the Epistles then have to the Church framework of his own time? If on the other hand, the readers were all aware that the author was only attempting to bring Paul up to date, and have him speak to the current needs, then the content would have proved more suitable to the known Church structure of the second and third generations than it does.

As if the problem of motive from the author's standpoint were not enough, there is also the question of the original

¹Falconer, "Epistles of Timothy and Titus", p. 593.

Pauline notes. If the author were really so devout, why did he take letters with whose aims his own had nothing whatsoever to do, and intermix them? If it were for the purpose of affording his own letters the appearance of genuineness, then his innocent motive is exposed; while if it were for the purpose of preserving the notes, there is still the question why he didn't keep them intact, as was Romans 16, for instance. It seems entirely inconceivable that one so devout would utilize the extremely insignificant obiter dicta only to detach and discard the more serious communications.¹ It is of course possible to contend that that which has been incorporated is the extent of the preserved material. Critics who would advocate thus, are then presented with the improbability of the sudden emergence of genuine letters after at least fifty years of obscurity.² It would certainly be unlikely that these fragments would have remained hidden for an additional twenty years after the search for and publication of the Pauline corpus in the postulated A.D. 90.³ Recognizing, however, that Paul undoubtedly wrote many more letters than have been preserved, and therefore, the possibility that such alleged fragments not only existed, but also were preserved, there is still the question how the author knew the notes to be genuine. If for verification the salutation is included, then the objection regarding the unPauline character of the

¹Cf. Godet, p. 608; and Salmon, p. 408.

²So, Plummer, p. 11.

³J.N. Sanders, "The Case for the Pauline Authorship", Studies in Ephesians, ed F.L. Cross, London, 1956, p. 12, suggests that if the editor in Goodspeed's theory of Pauline corpus compilation wrote anything in A.D. 90, it was the Pastorals, and not Ephesians.

salutation is no longer valid. On the other hand, if there were an authentic salutation, and the author arbitrarily altered it, then he is no longer either devout or clever.

Division

The subjective acumen necessary to separate the genuine from the fictitious might well place the theory under suspicion. Every attempt to disjoin the Pauline from the Paulinist appears to be so hopeless as to lead only to an "idle play of individual acuteness."¹ The varied theories conjectured are so intricate, that although most adherents accept the majority of II 4 as being genuine, the details regarding its division and composition vary greatly. Thus Harrison admits that on one question it is difficult to be sure that the right answer has been found - "when did Paul write these personal notes?"² Recognizing as valid, Duncan's criticism that his divisions were "so involved" that the theory could "hardly expect to command general acceptance,"³ Harrison reduced his original number of five notes, to his newly "convinced" position of three.⁴ Harrison's only "certain conclusion," however, is that "two notes from Paul to Timothy are the irreducible minimum,"⁵ a decision earlier decided upon by

¹B. Weiss, "The Present Status of Inquiry", p. 394. Cf. Lock, PE, pp. xxxf; J.V. Bartlet, Apostolic Age, p. 514; Shaw, pp. 482-5; and Knowling, Testimony, p. 122.

²"Important Hypotheses Reconsidered", p. 80.

³St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, p. 187. Cf. Harrison, "The PE and Duncan's Ephesian Theory", p. 250.

⁴"Important Hypotheses Reconsidered", p. 80.

⁵Ibid.

McGiffert with his determination of one from Rome, and the other from Macedonia.¹

Even as there is no agreement regarding the number or origin of the notes, agreement is also lacking on the extent of incorporation. Thus, Barclay contends that it is "quite incredible" to believe that I 1:15 and 5:23 were forged;² while Peake asserted that in 1 T "not a single verse can be indicated which clearly bears the stamp of Pauline origin."³ Bacon believed that the fragments in Titus were so mingled that it would be "scarcely worth while to try to extricate them, or to define the occasion of Paul's life to which they should be assigned;"⁴ while others assume as certain, Tit 3:12⁵, and 3:1-7⁶, as well as the opening section of chapter 1. Von Soden included Tit 1:1, 4; 2 T 1:1f, 3-5a, 7f, and all of II 4:6-22 except verse 20 (perhaps also II 2:1, 3-12a);⁷ while the Speaker's Bible, although following Harrison in the main, includes II 1:1-10, 16-18; 2:8-15; 4:1-2; the personal references of I 1, and the credal and doxological passages of chapters 2 and 6.⁸ Lock,

¹Apostolic Age, pp. 404-14. Yet, cf. Horton, pp. 16ff.

²PE, p. xxviii. A. Richardson (An Introduction to the Theology of the NT, London, 1958, p. 283) regards I 1:12-16 as "surely a Pauline fragment."

³Op. cit., pp. 70f. Cf. W. Knox, St. Paul, pp. 132f.

⁴B.W. Bacon, The Story of St. Paul, London, 1905, p. 375.

⁵So, Moffatt, HNT, p. 700.

⁶So, The Speaker's Bible, ed E. Hastings, Aberdeen, 1942, p3.

⁷Op. cit., pp. 318ff.

⁸Op. cit., p. 3. Falconer (PE, pp. 13f) also includes more fragments of 2 T than does Harrison, e.g. 1:1-2, 13; 4:1-22, with editorial revisions and additions in 1:13,14,15b; 2:2; 4:3,4. Wood (p. 374) includes also II 1:3-12; 2:3-13. See Moffatt, INT, p. 403, for additional variations.

detecting problems in II 4, accepts the whole of the Epistles, but suggests that II 4:9-22a consists of earlier notes.¹ Although by skilful division each author is able to place the scraps into possible historical situations, the subjectiveness of the theory is further evidenced when many of the personal allusions within the Pastorals are not included in the various reconstructions (e.g. I 1:3; 3:14; 5:23; II 1:5, 15; Tit 1:5). After his own reconstruction, Moffatt admits that it is all "quite provisional and hypothetic" but that it does not work out so badly in details, "or inflict such a strain upon the general evidence, as the traditional hypothesis."² This conclusion might be accurate, but the admission of the fragmentary theory as being "provisional and hypothetic"³ and a further examination of the fragments postulated might bring the conclusion into doubt.

EXAMINATION OF THE FRAGMENTS

It has apparently been ignored that the very fragments which bear the "unmistakable stamp of the Apostle"⁴ contain

¹PE, p. xxxiii.

²HNT, p. 704. Yet, cf. A.E. Brooke, pp. 255-262.

³Just how hypothetical is evidenced in the conjectures regarding the date and place of the fragments' origin. e.g. Duncan (St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry), the Ephesian imprisonment; Clarke (p. 893), Macedonia, Caesarea, and Rome, with the observation that "agreement on these points is not to be expected." Henshaw (p. 334) contends for Rome, twenty years after Paul's death. Harnack saw three hands, with a scribe interpolating the discipline sections about A.D. 150. (Chronologie, I, 484ff). Cf. Julicher, INT, p. 198.

⁴PPE, p. 87.

many points which have been alleged to be so objectionable to the acceptance of the Pastorals as a whole. Thus, within Harrison's sections, there are a total of eighteen non-Pauline words, all of which are found within the second century writers. This should prove a problem to one who asserts that the unaccepted sections have their vocabulary kinship in the second century. Whereas it was also objected that the Pastorals contain Pauline words used in an unPauline sense, the same is found within the fragments.¹ Latinisms, e.g. μεμβράνα and φαίλωνης (II 4:13) are also to be found. Exception has also been taken to the objective use of πίστις in the Pastorals; but this sense is also to be found in II 4:7; 3:10, and Tit 1:4. Other elements that have been objected to, and yet are to be found within the accepted fragments include: pure conscience (II 1:3); godliness (Tit 1:1); good works (Tit (3:14); Paul's stress on apostleship in a personal note (II 1:1f); lengthened salutation to include mercy (II 1:1f); Timothy's need for perseverance (II 1:7f); and the prayer for mercy on behalf of Onesiphorus (II 1:16ff); ἐπιφάνεια in place of παρουσία (II 4:1,8); and the conventional piety of βασιλείαν...ἐπουράνιον (II 4:18).²

Therefore, when the same tests are applied to the fragments, it might well be questioned whether they are unmistakably Pauline.

The case for the fragmentist position is further weakened by

¹e.g. διαμαρτύρομαι, II 4:1, the adjuration before God, but, 1 Th 4:6, Paul testified to the Thessalonians; διδαχή, II 4:2, active teaching, but R 6:7, for doctrine; and πληροφόρησον II 4:5, the active voice, R 4:21, et al., only passive. For additional citations, see Lock, PE, p. xxxiv.

²Cf. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939, p. 180, n 1.

when the structure of the Pastorals is examined. With 2 Corinthians there may be valid reasons for theories of dislocation; but the Pastorals present as much unity of purpose as the ordinary discursiveness of a letter is expected to have.¹ Easton admits that much of the roughness of transition is due to "a fresh start by an author who composes as he writes;"² while fragmentist Wood observes that there is no apparent break in the unity of the three Epistles.³ The structure of the Letters is far more readily explained than is the question why the postulated author deemed it necessary so completely to tear apart the genuine notes. It would even be more understandable if he had dissected the notes and interspersed them carefully throughout his work than if he had taken perhaps five notes and had mixed them all up in the one chapter. Such a procedure might be plausible, if it were not that the fourth chapter of 2 Timothy reads as an integrated whole. Harrison insists that II 4:11 and 21 pose a problem that can only be surmounted by maintaining a hypothesis of at least two notes from Paul.⁴ Apart from the fact that verse 11 could well be referring to Paul's own personal following, and verse 21 to the Roman Church members, there is another possibility. If Harrison insists upon splitting up the chapter, it might be feasible to make a case for the displacement to have arisen when 1 and 2 Timothy were joined together. The editor might well have removed the personal

¹So Lock, PE, p. xxxii; and "The First Epistle to Timothy", p. 774a; White, p. 81.

²PE, pp. 16f.

³Op. cit., p. 373.

⁴"The PE and Duncan's Ephesian Theory", p. 250.

notices at the close of the First Epistle to the end of the combined unit. II 4:9-15, 20, 21a, might have been attached to the end of I 6; while II 4:8 would then have been followed by 4:16-18, 19, 21b, 22a. This would be in keeping with the tenor of the Epistle which up to II 4:8 is for Timothy to follow the example of Paul in spite of his master's impending death. For Timothy then to be exhorted to make haste to Rome might conceivably pose a problem. This suggestion would also provide an explanation for the problem as proposed by Harrison, as well as the absence of references at the close of 1 T. Admittedly such a dissection is unproved, but no more so than the practice of the Fragmentists who cut into verses, retain them in part, and ignore the balance of the verse which is composed of recognizably Pauline material.

One last point regarding literary style and the fragmentary theory must be made. In 2 T, where the entire Epistle is admittedly characteristic of Paul, what objective criteria have been used to determine whether it is the Paulinist echoing Paul, or Paul lapsing into his own language? Furthermore, in 1 T what conceivable explanation is there to suggest why a devout Paulinist who was steeped in the genuine letters would write such lengthy sections without attempting to provide at least a semblance of Pauline atmosphere (e.g. 3:1-13; 5:14-25)? Easton's explanation that by the time 1 Timothy was written the "method was so well known that the pseudonymity is a bare convention" fails to satisfy the picture painted of this devout disciple of Paul.¹ One certain conclusion can be drawn: the theory which

¹PE, p. 19. Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus, p. 18: "Aber für die Richtigkeit des kritischen Urteils spricht es nicht, wenn es nicht auf den ganzen Bestand dieser Briefe ausgedehnt werden kann."

has been devised to answer the problems of the Pastorals' origin, has created many of its own in the attempt.

TRADITIONAL THEORY

This theory, like the pseudepigraphical and fragmentary, has also been dismissed with uncalled for causticity by its opponents.¹ Although it is no longer as widely accepted as during the first nineteen centuries of the Pastorals' existence, the identification of the traditional theory with so many contemporary reputable scholars - notably, Meinertz, Schlatter, Jeremias, and Michaelis - would alone suggest the need for appraisal.² This position, simply stated, is that the Epistles are, as claimed, the work of the Apostle Paul. The maintenance of such a theory, however, is not as simple as its statement, for the concept is not without its problems.

CUMULATIVE PROBLEMS

Easton has observed that the problems of the traditional theory are cumulative, and that "satisfactory refutation must not only meet the separate points urged but must meet them all simultaneously."³ It is worth pausing upon this comment for a moment, for if each problem can be met successfully, or at least with a plausible

¹e.g. Moffatt, HNT, p. 700; and Harrison, PPE, p. 5.

²Also, Alford, Ellicott, Hort, Lock, Lightfoot, Ramsay, Simpson, B. Weiss, T. Zahn.

³PE, p. 15. Cf. H. Bisseker, p. 881. For the same argument applied to Ephesians, see D.E. Nineham, "The Case Against the Pauline Authorship", Studies in Ephesians, ed F.L. Cross, London, 1956, p. 23.

explanation, why does it remain a question of cumulation? If it is insisted that problems remain problems and therefore cumulate even after satisfactory disposition, then it has been shown that each theory in turn, having its own set of peculiar problems, would also have a cumulative situation. For example, the pseud-epigraphical theory might be able to explain any internal problems as being due to the rudiments of fiction, but then the advocates must explain away all of the external attestation and the ecclesiastical level. Similarly, the Fragmentarians might be able to solve the problems of style and vocabulary, while retaining the coveted personalia, but then, like the pseudepigraphical position, they must search in vain for any adequate contemporary parallels for such unparalleled literary procedure. Furthermore, each theory was shown to be fraught with problems of motive, number, sequence, addressee, and the like - problems which do not exist for the traditional position. It may not be surprising, therefore, that the traditional position is found to have its own peculiar problems.

Apart from the objections already discussed in the course of this work there are yet three main modern objections: the advanced ecclesiastical framework; the unPauline theological concepts and heresy refutation; and the historical situation. Since the first two objections form the basis of the following chapters, it remains at this time to discuss the historical situation. In so doing, it will be found that as the pseudepigraphists had to propose a mid-second century fictional hypothesis, and the fragmentists that of a devout Paulinist, the

traditionalists too are forced to a hypothesis - that of the second Roman imprisonment of Paul. Although having to resort to postulation it must not be forgotten that, as with the question of problems, so each theory was seen to have its own set of hypotheses to contend with them. That this fact has not always been recognized is seen from the statement of Harrison's that "defenders of the traditional view are obliged to claim the benefit of the doubt, and insist on a shadowy 'off-chance', much too often."¹ Yet this same author gives the following as his "positive" conclusion:

that the real author of the Pastorals was a devout, sincere, and earnest Paulinist, who lived at Rome or Ephesus, and wrote during the later years of Trajan or (?and) the earlier years of Hadrian's reign. He knew and studied deeply every one of our ten Paulines. In addition to these he had access to several brief personal notes written by the Apostle on various occasions to his friends Timothy and Titus, preserved by them till their death, and then bequeathed as a priceless heirloom either to the Church or to some trusted friend.²

This, involving hypothesis as to authorship, place and dating of the letters, literary pursuits of the author, as well as the question of fragments, and their preservation, is the conclusion of the fragmentary position. Therefore, valid hypothesis cannot be ruled out from other attempts to explain the Pastorals' origin.

¹PPE, p. 6.

²Ibid., p. 8.

THE HYPOTHESIS OF THE SECOND ROMAN IMPRISONMENT

The Case Against the Imprisonment

Dibelius has suggested that even though the Pastorals' biographical data may awaken doubts as to their authenticity, "nevertheless they do not decide the question, because we know too little of Paul's life."¹ Most scholars are agreed, however, that "any positive conclusions as to authorship must rest on" the historical data.² As observed earlier in the chapter, the Pastorals' historical data demands the release and subsequent journeying of Paul. This has been vigorously objected to for the following reasons.

The Evidence of Acts. The first objection to the release is based upon the silence of Acts regarding any further activity of Paul. There is no doubt that Luke was aware that after the "two whole years," Paul was condemned and executed. If the trial ended in the declaration of Paul's innocency, Luke would not have hesitated in making this vindication known for apologetical purposes. Furthermore, Luke would have omitted Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus concerning his presentiment of death if he had known that Paul had been released and had revisited Ephesus.³

The Evidence of Patristic Writers. The earliest trace of the legend is in the Gnostic Acts of Peter; genuine history is silent.⁴

¹Fresh Approach, p. 231

²E.F. Scott, PE, p. xx.

³For detailed arguments, see, E.W. Barnes, pp. 216f; Peake, pp. 61f; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 417ff; and F.B. Clogg, INT, London, 1937, pp. 113f.

⁴Cf. Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 381.

Clement's oft-quoted passage relating how Paul came ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δόσεως (5.4-7) can only refer to Rome and not Spain.¹ Since the ancient Churches are silent concerning such a visit, the belief in a trip to Spain must be due purely to an "imaginative expansion of Rom. 15:24,28."²

The Evidence of the Pastorals. The Epistles are completely silent concerning a release from the grasp of Nero and the proposed trip to Spain. Furthermore, certain unmistakable analogies are contained in the Epistles with known earlier circumstances in the life of Paul. The references are so similar, that "these earlier situations must have repeated themselves in a remarkably similar fashion in the hypothetical new period - a supposition of the highest improbability."³

The Case For the Imprisonment

Although the theory has been dismissed as "fiction"⁴ and an "artificial defence"⁵ which is "based openly on the desire to save the genuineness of the P.E. by finding a place for them,"⁶

¹Cf. Harrison, Review of "Saint Paul, Les Epitres Pastorales by Spicq", pp. 206f. Cf. Bartlet, Apostolic Age, p. 201.

²Moffatt, INT, p. 417.

³Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 382. Cf. B.W. Bacon, pp. 372f.

⁴McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p.,419. Cf. Harrison (PPE, p. 6), labels the theory as "legend"; Sanders (p. 12) as a "desperate hypothesis"; and Moffatt (HNT, p. 559) as "proofs of ingenuity of exegetical despair". Cf. INT, p. 423.

⁴Renan, p. xxi. Cf. Reuss, pp. 133f.

⁶Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 382. Cf. Jülicher, INT, pp. 192f.

it should be noted that the belief in the Apostle's release can be presented independently of the adherents to the Pastorals' authenticity or of the Epistles themselves. It is on the basis of ancient tradition which one "cannot refuse offhand to accept" that J. Weiss defended the release, and not a desire for the retention of the Pastorals.¹ Rather than "fiction," Harnack regards the second imprisonment as lying "in the clear light of history"² and the "well-established opinion" of himself and many other scholars.³ The wealth of literature which has been produced concerning the close of the Apostle's life is indicative not only of a great interest in his life, but of its obscure character as well. As long as opponents of the Pastorals' authenticity recognize that the later period of Paul's life abides in the realm of which scholarship is "wholly ignorant"⁴ then it would appear that such vituperative dismissals are unwarranted.

The Evidence of Acts. The conclusion of Acts requires one of two hypotheses: either the release of Paul; or his conviction. K. Lake contends that this difficulty should be resolved in the form of a question: Why does Luke seem to stop short?⁵ This, he

¹History of Christianity, I, 390.

²The Expansion of Christianity, tran J. Moffatt, I, London, 1904, 462.

³Date of Acts, p. 103.

⁴Sabatier, p. 264. Cf. Sparks, Formation of the NT, pp. 75f; Dibelius, Fresh Approach, p. 231; and G.B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, London, 1892, p. 84.

⁵"What was the end of St. Paul's Trial?", Interpreter, V (1909), 146-56. Cf. Cadbury quoting Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, pt I, vol V, 326-338. It would appear that Luke was too careful a historian to have split such an important narrative if he had planned the third work as proposed by Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, 7th ed, London, 1903, 303-9). Cf. Rutherford, "PE", p. 2259; and H.C.G. Moule, The Second Epistle

asserts, may be answered in one of two ways: that in spite of all the indications of Acts,¹ and the Prison Epistles,² Paul was executed; or, although the trial ended favorably for the Apostle, the decision "was of such a nature that it added nothing to St. Luke's implied argument, and was from this point of view even a little disappointing."³ Lake defends this theory on the basis that Luke's purpose was to show that the Romans were not hostile toward Christianity, and further to indicate that the Jews rejected it, in spite of their own Scriptures. Thus, when the prosecutors failed to appear within the statutable time, and Paul was released by default,⁴ the verdict was not advantageous to Luke's

to Timothy, p. 20. Harnack, Date of Acts, p. 97: "The more clearly we see that the trial of St. Paul, and above all his appeal to Caesar, is the chief subject of the last quarter of the Acts, the more hopeless does it appear that we can explain why the narrative breaks off as it does, otherwise than by assuming that the trial had actually not yet reached its close. It is no use to struggle against this conclusion. If St. Luke, in the year 80, 90, or 100, wrote thus he was not simply a blundering but an absolutely incomprehensible historian! Moreover, we note that nowhere in the Acts is either St. Peter or St. Paul so treated as if his death was presupposed; we indeed rather receive the contrary impression."

¹e.g. 25:25; 26:31,32. Apparently in the judgment of Festus and Agrippa, Paul was innocent. The Apostle had not appealed against a verdict, but against the place of the court. The case was still the Jews versus Paul, for as yet the government had no formulated policy of persecution. Cf. E.F. Brown, "PE", pp. 212-221; and Bernard, PE, pp. xxvii. Parry (pp. xv) notes that the Aorist verb ἐπέμεινεν describes the period of residency in Rome as past, and implies that at the end of the two years he left the city.

²e.g. Phil 1:13f, 19, 25; 2:24; Phm 22. It would appear that these passages are not based upon conjecture, but upon the course of the trial. Cf. T. Zahn, INT, II, 55. Several authorities contend that the term "praetorium" refers to the supreme court of appeal before which Paul had favorably defended his case. Cf. Rutherford, "Praetorian Guard", ISBE, IV, 2428; Ramsay, Traveller, p. 357; and H.B. Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 2nd ed, London, 1906, p. 35.

³"What was the End of St. Paul's Trial?", p. 149.

⁴Cf. Ramsay, Traveller, pp. 356f.

theme. A knowledge of Roman law confirms the point that the period of "two whole years" (Acts 28:30,31) would have been as explicit to the Lucan readers as "served his time" would be in the terminology of the present. That Acts is not more positive is to be regretted; but this presents a difficulty only if it is contended that Luke had presented a complete biography of the Apostle. The obvious lacunae within the narrative force the rejection of any argument upon silence,¹ and suggest the need to seek for additional sources.

The Evidence of Patristic Writers. That the tradition is late regarding the possible release of Paul is true, but not surprising in view of the meager communications regarding him. The writings of the Fathers were concerned with exhortation, and not the preservation of historical truths. Possibly too, the tradition is piously based upon Paul's declared intention of visiting Spain (Rom 15:23ff);² but it remains evidence, and there is none contrariwise.³ To decide from the rhetorically constructed Clementine narrative whether Paul's aspirations were ever fulfilled

¹For a discussion of the difficulty in harmonizing the Pauline Epistles with Acts, see Goodspeed, Formation, p. 20. Critics like J. Knox (Chapters in a Life of Paul) are in the peculiar position of asserting Acts to be unreliable, and then rejecting the Pastorals because they don't fit into the known life of Paul. For discussion of this phase of the release question, see, Salmon pp. 403-6; Humphreys, pp. 40-44; Hervey, pp. xxiiif; Schlatter, NT Period, pp. 219f; Lightfoot, Philippians, pp. 3-5; and F.F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 11ff, 481. For rebuttal of Paul's presentment of death (Acts 20:25), see, Hitchcock, "The Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul", ET, XLI (1930), 20-23.

²E.H. Gifford (Romans, London, 1886, pp. 27-30) conjectured that R 16:3-20 was part of a letter written to Rome after Paul's first imprisonment there. Cf. Lock, PE, p. xxx.

³Cf. B. Vincent, The PE for To-day, London, 1932, p. 14.

would appear impossible. Yet even many opponents of the Pastorals' authenticity recognize that the passage clearly teaches a journey to Spain for Paul; and that Clement apparently had sources of information no longer available.¹ It is possible to assert that later witnesses² are to be discounted because of the influence of Clement's statement; but such an assertion is an admission that the release of Paul was the contemporary interpretation of both the words of Clement and of the Pastorals. On the a-priori assumption of release, "there is beyond doubt a stream of tradition which held that Paul journeyed to Spain."³ On the other hand, the theory of release, and with it the possible authenticity of the Pastorals, has too long been linked with the tradition of Spain. Whether the Pastorals are to be taken as genuine or not, they are themselves evidence, not of a Western journey, but of an early recognition of the Apostle's renewed activity in Asia and the East.

The Evidence of the Pastorals. Apart from the Pauline Epistles and Acts, two sources are asserted by the Fragmentarians to have been available to the Paulinist: genuine Pauline frag-

¹Cf. Dibelius-Kümmel, Paul, pp. 150ff; Dibelius, Fresh Approach, p. 231; J. Weiss, History of Christianity, I, 390; Barclay, PE, p. xxvi; Carrington, The Early Christian Church, I, 184; W. Knox, St. Paul, Edinburgh, 1932, p. 148; and Harnack, Chronologie, I, 239.

²e.g. Eusebius, H.E. II, xxii, xxv; S. Athanasii, Epistola ad Dracontium, IV (Migne); S. Epiphanii, Adversus Haereses, XXVII (Migne); and Theodori Mopsuesteni, Argumentum in Ephesios, I (Swete). For discussion and additional references, see, Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 421-437.

³Barclay, PE, p. xxvii. For discussion of this phase of the release question, see, Bindley, "PE", pp. 184-197; Bernard, PE, pp. xxix-xxxiv; Simpson, p. 4; Still, pp. 278ff; Plummer, pp. 7-15; Edmundson, pp. 87, 113f; and Meinertz, pp. 5f.

ments, and ancient tradition. If the fragments came from one letter,¹ they imply that Paul was released and had returned to missionary endeavor. If the Paulinist, as claimed, was "naturally acquainted" with the current traditions regarding the life and death of Paul,² his writing would either be in keeping with the belief, or the term devout should no longer be applied to the author. It would have been easy for an author as clever as demanded, to compose a situation reconcilable with the Lucan account. Since he has not done so, it must be concluded that the author wrote in accordance with contemporary belief.³ It is not uninteresting to note with Schlatter, that the Pastorals are devoid of reference to the earlier imprisonment, a fact in keeping with Pauline authorship,⁴ but not with the panegyric narrations of the later generations. The correctness in using the Pastorals in defense of the Apostle's release is admirably stated by Knowling, as follows:

And although it may be said that we cannot make the genuineness of the P.E. to depend upon an event which cannot be proven, or the event to depend upon Epistles the genuineness of which is disputed, yet, at least it may be said that the hypothesis of a release and second imprisonment of St. Paul explains our letters in the most satisfactory manner, whilst the existence of our letters may be adduced as supplementing and completing the presumptive evidence from other Epistles which point to the Apostle's release.⁵

¹Cf. R. Heard, p. 208.

²Harrison, PPE, p. 9.

³Cf. Findlay, "Paul the Apostle", HDB, III, 714a; Parry, p. xviif; and Simcox, Writers of the NT, p. 38.

⁴NT Period, p. 235. Yet, cf. E.F. Scott, PE, p. xx.

⁵Testimony, p. 135.

It is not a maxim of scholarship that a lone witness is necessarily a false one; and the Pastorals attest to a release of Paul.

It remains to examine the observations that if the Pastorals are genuine, then history must "have repeated itself with a vengeance";¹ and that if there were a second Roman imprisonment, it must have been in "an astounding number of details an exact duplicate of the first."² In support of the first observation, it is noted that Acts records journeys from Ephesus to Macedonia, from Corinth by way of Troas and Miletus, and that in the Pastorals the same routes and companions are involved. Paul, it is concluded, "would not have repeated himself in this aimless way."³ It is difficult to see the reasoning here. If the Pastorals had depicted Paul as visiting totally new locations, then the opponents would have argued that the Pastorals are not in keeping with the known activities of Paul. Since the Pastorals are in conformity both with the known policy of Paul to revisit the established churches, and his own expressed desires, the Epistles must then be dependent upon Luke's narrative. It is true that the chronological relations and companions of the Pastorals are similar to those previously related; but significant changes must also be noted. On Paul's last recorded trip to Asia (Acts 20:4-6), the order was from Macedonia, and Timothy did not remain in Ephesus; whereas I 1:3 states that the disciple was left at Ephesus while Paul was enroute to Macedonia. Demas has now deserted Paul (II 4:10); whereas he was formerly faithful (Phm 24). Acts' only recorded visit of Paul to

¹Harrison, PPE, p. 111.

²Ibid, p. 114.

³E.F. Scott, PE, p. xx.

Crete was during his journey to Rome, without the presence of Titus; whereas the Pastorals depict Titus left in Crete (Tit 1:5), and thence to Dalmatia (II 4:10). Mark was still in Asia (II 4:11) where he had been recommended by Paul in Col. 4:10; but Luke was still with Paul II 4:11), and Tychicus was on an errand (II 4:12).¹

As for the similarity of prison situations there is a sharp contrast between 2 T and the Prison Epistles. In the Timothean imprisonment, the end was near (4:6,7); there was a question of surviving the winter (4:21); no one had rallied to his support during the satisfactorily completed first phase of the trial (4:17);² in the interim, his accusers had become more vicious (4:14);³ his condemnation and execution would come at any time. Contrast this with the aforementioned expectations of release as evidenced in the Prison Epistles, and it can only be recognized that formerly he was still pressing (Phil. 3:13), but in the Pastorals, he had finished his race, and the time of his departure was at hand (II 4:6). Altogether, the travels and prison experience were quite different as expressed in the two sets of Epistles.

Although Scott remarks that a "considerable time" of freedom is demanded,⁴ and even though many have devised lengthy itiner-

¹Cf. Tenny, p. 346.

²For discussion of the first trial, see, Schlatter, NT Period, pp. 238f; and Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, pp. 187f.

³For discussion of Alexander's opposition, see, M. Hitchcock, "The Pastorals and the Second Trial", pp. 20-23.

⁴PE, p. xix.

aries,¹ the Pastorals themselves necessitate no elaborate undertakings. The minimum requirements involve no more elaborate journey than a visit to Crete, where Titus is left; a visit to Miletus, from where he either departed for Ephesus, or merely sent for Timothy as was done with the elders on a former occasion; and a coastal journey to Macedonia, by way of Troas, where 1 T and Titus were probably penned. There is no need to assume that because Paul anticipated a winter in Nicopolis, this was permitted by the Roman authorities. It is not impossible that time could be found for a longer trip which would include a trip to Corinth (II 4:20), perhaps an additional visit to Ephesus (II 4:10), and even a short stay in Spain, but such an extension is not required by the Pastorals themselves.² Even this minimum record has the advantage of accounting for all the historical references - a factor omitted by Harrison's reconstruction.

Conclusion

From the nature of the case, it is impossible to prove to the satisfaction of all that the Pastoral Epistles are, or are not the work of Paul. Their internal character presents perplexing peculiarities; while it is possible to insist that the Pauline characteristics are due to a clever imitator. But, the peculiarities do not appear to be so many, or of such an unanswerable

¹Cf. Meinertz, pp. 2-8; Michaelis, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Bern, 1946, p. 262; Spicq, pp. lxxxiii-viii; Godet, pp. 609ff; Hervey, pp. viii-xviii; and Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 215-233.

²Cf. A.E. Brooke, pp. 255-262. For detailed discussion of the release theory, see, esp. Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, 2nd ed, London, 1914, pp. 346-382; C.H. Turner, Studies in Early Church History, Oxford, 1912, chap 8.

quality as to outweigh the strong external testimony to Pauline authorship, supported as it is by the coveted personalia. It appears to be far more difficult to frame a rational historical picture of their origin in terms of unparalleled literary procedure, than it is to grant the plausibility of a release and second imprisonment which would provide a completely compatible situation. The dilemma of origin led Sabatier to make the following observation:

The defenders of the epistles do indeed succeed in making us question their apocryphal origin, but not in convincing us of their authenticity. Their adversaries easily throw doubt upon the authenticity of these writings, but without enabling us to understand their later origin.¹

This one thing can be concluded: Paul could have penned these Epistles; but when the writers of the second century are surveyed, no other likely prospect is discovered. Actually, if the historical situation is conceivable, then the only entirely convincing argument against their origin as claimed is whether the content is psychologically consistent with the mind and purpose of the Apostle as revealed by his earlier writings. It is this phase which is to be discussed in the remaining chapters.

¹Op. cit., p. 264.

CHAPTER IV

ECCLESIASTICAL ORDER OF THE PASTORALS

Introduction

The constitution of the early Christian community has been and remains a topic of debate. The conflict is due, in part, to the succumbing of Christians in subsequent generations to the natural desire to establish the fact that their own peculiar ecclesiastical framework is endorsed by the NT. Thus, in Olaf Linton's book on Das Problem der Urkirche in der Neueren Forschung the conclusion is drawn that primitive Christianity was a college - a congregational democracy where all had an opinion.¹ In contrast, Farrer, in Kirk's The Apostolic Ministry, contends with Harnack's 'heresy' of the congregation having a say in the election of the local ministry, and asserts the bishopric to be both the original and basic church office.² The claims of the oligarchy have also been advanced when Michaelis recently discounted the role of the episcopate and stressed the centrality of the presbyterate.³ Such divergence of opinion is not purely due, however, to personal inclinations or subjective preconceptions; for as Reicke has observed, objective arguments for each of the postulated constitutional concepts can be traced within the NT.⁴

¹Uppsala, 1932, esp pp. 189-196.

²"The Ministry in the NT", London, 1946, pp. 113-181.

³Das Ältestenamt der christlichen Gemeinde im Lichte der Heiligen Schrift, Bern, 1953.

⁴"The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents", The Scrolls and the NT, ed K. Stendahl, London, 1958, pp. 143-156.

This cleavage of Christ's Body is also to be accounted for by the fragmentary nature of the available evidence which prohibits incontestable conclusions.¹

Lamentably, the scope of this present work excludes any attempt to harmonize the conclusions regarding the varied orders of the ministry. The investigator's present concern is not how the Church order evolved, but to discover the state to which the level had emerged at the time of the Pastorals' author. Because of the organizational gulf between the earliest and the latest of the Epistles attributed to Paul, serious question is raised concerning the latter. Large sections of 1 T and Tit are relegated to Church order which 1 Th disposes of within a matter of phrases. Therefore, upon determination of the Pastorals' level, the investigation must proceed to question whether the dozen or more years' interval is sufficient to account for the gigantic strides in development, or whether the advocates of a later date are more accurate. It need only be mentioned in passing, that it is not the truth of the ecclesiastical organization represented that is questioned; but only the stage of that organization, and the attempt to ascertain where it most logically fits within the developing Church. Although, apart from the Didache and the library of Qumran, very little has been discovered since the monumental work of Lightfoot on this subject, the plethora of literature, and the continued interest since, have had the effect of causing once familiar passages of scripture to take on delicate gradations of meaning. An attempt will be made to incorporate these nuances within this

¹So, K. Latourette, A History of Christianity, London, 1954, p. 115.

study.

Since so many conflicting concepts have been set forth concerning the organizational level as reflected within the Pastorals, it appears that the most convenient method of investigation will be first to marshal the evidence and then to draw conclusions which it would seem to warrant. As the Epistles were written from the presupposition of the Apostle instructing his disciples, this evidence will be examined under the several categories of injunctions involved.

INSTRUCTIONS TO TIMOTHY AND TITUS

INSTRUCTIONS TO TIMOTHY

The status of Timothy has been described in such dissimilar terms as that of an apostolic vicar,¹ and, as will be seen later, a monarchical bishop. Yet it is not uninteresting that not only is he nowhere so designated within the Epistles, but neither is there any official title accorded to him at all. Timothy is, however, exhorted to discharge fully his work as an εὐαγγελιστής and his διακονία (II 4:5). The former serves as a descriptive title of the itinerant ministry which may have formed the link between Apostles and the local ministry (cf. Eph 4:11). It may be that its proper application in this present text is to a distinct work or function and not to the technical office described in the Didache (cf. Acts 21:8).² Διακονία too is capable of

¹So, Lock, PE, p. xix. Cf. J.V. Bartlet, The Apostolic Age, p. 489, "apostolic assistants"; and Gore, The Church and Ministry, London, 1919, p. 221, "apostolic delegates."

²So, Bernard, PE, pp. 141f.

being taken in an entirely untechnical sense (cf. Acts 1:25). Yet the possibility can not be ruled out that Timothy may have been either, or both; and that whatever ministry he was currently performing was in their fulfilment. Other appellations of Timothy include: *δοῦλον κυρίου* (II 2:24; cf. R 1:1; Phil 1:1), used here, perhaps, in the restricted sense of a minister; and the Hebrew designation of a prophet *ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ*,¹ being chosen in recognition of his calling as a *κῆρυξ* (II 4:2; cf. I 2:7; II 1:11), a *διδάσκαλος* (II 2:24; I 4:11, 13; 6:2), and an *ἐργάτης* (II 2:15; cf. 2 C 11:13; Phil 3:2). Until Paul arrived (I 4:13), Timothy was expected to acquaint the members of the Ephesian Church with Paul's instructions in order that they might know how to conduct themselves in the House of God (I 3:14). These directions were pertinent to the members as a whole and to the varied ecclesiastical orders in particular.

Instructions Relating to Church Members

Entire Congregation. Although Timothy was exhorted to discharge faithfully his calling as a *κῆρυξ*, and in *ἀνάγνωσις* (I 4:13; cf. 2 C 3:14; Acts 13:15), it is with his capacity as the *διδάσκαλος* that the bulk of the instructions are concerned. This teaching involved the laying before the brethren (*ὑποτιθέμενος*, I 4:6; cf. R 16:4) that which concerns future apostasy, as well as the commitment (*παράθου* II 2:2) to the faithful of other things learned from Paul. Additional descriptions of his teaching ministry included exhortation

בְּיָדָא-וִיחַ I 6:11; II 3:17; I Sam 9:6; et al.

(παράκλησις, I 4:13; 5:1; 6:2; II 4:2); bringing to remembrance (ὑπομιμνήσκω, II 2:14; cf. Tit 3:1; 1 C 4:17); and meekly instructing(παιδεύοντα, II 2:24f; cf. I 1:20; Tit 2:12). It is only on occasions of irregularity that the instructions on Timothy's teaching ministry take on a more authoritarian stamp. Thus, the disciple is to rebuke (ἔλεγχω, I 5:20; II 4:2) the ones who sin, solemnly protest (διαμαρτύρομαι, II 2:14; cf. I 5:21; II 4:1) and charge (παραγγέλλω, I 1:3; 4:11)¹ certain men who sought only to engender strife and not love by their false teaching.

Women. In addition to the instructions regarding the observance of the proprieties of worship, Timothy, in contrast with Titus (2:3-5), is simply admonished to entreat (παρακαλέω) the πρεσβυτέρας as mothers, and the νεωτέρας as sisters - with perfect decorum (ἀγνεία, I 5:2).²

Men. Titus will again be seen to receive the fuller directions regarding his dealings with the members. For Timothy, any authority to be wielded is in cognizance of the filial relationship which is to exist within the family of God. Apparently Timothy was feeling his own inadequacy through the age factor which makes many a young minister's ministry more difficult. Thus the disciple is instructed to avoid any stern reprimanding (ἐπιπλήσσειν) of the older men (πρέσβυς); but rather to entreat them as a son would his father (I 5:1; cf. Tit 2:2). This advice to Timothy for the maintenance of dealings with men in a family relationship is further seen in the suggestion to exhort

¹It should be noted that the force of this term may be modulated when translated 'commit' or 'transmit' a message.

²For pertinent comments on these instructions, see, Goudge, Pastoral Teaching, pp. 114f; and Lietzmann, Beginnings, pp. 192f.

the νεωτέρως as a brother (I 5:1; cf. Tit 2:6), and to lay before the ἀδελφοί Paul's words with regard to the last days (I 4:6). Although not attempting to particularize inclusively his instructions, the Apostle's concern for the reputation of the Church within the world led him to advise the slaves to show complete fidelity to their masters (I 6:1 cf. Tit 2:9; Col 3:22; Eph 6:5) and thereby to accept their high calling of working to the glory of God. This same motivation and continued moderation of tone is seen in the advice Timothy is to give the πλουσίως (I 6:17-19). No attempt is made to begrudge them their riches, but only to warn of the deceitfulness, and to admonish the proper use of their wealth.

Instructions Relating to the Ministry of Women

Γυναῖκας (I 3:11). Amidst the discussion of the qualities of the deacons is found a verse which enjoins the γυναῖκας to be sober in both mental and moral fabric, to display complete trustworthiness, and to avoid being talebearers.¹ But who are the γυναῖκας in question? Is this verse a parenthetical insertion of the requirements of deaconesses? Or, is the verse a continuation of the deacon's qualifications which ought to include wives acceptable to the work? The bulk of scholarship has followed the earlier lead of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, contending for the former position.² The context, parallelism between these

¹ μή διαβόλους surely being used here in its classical sense (cf. II 3:3; Tit 2:3) and thus corresponding to μή διαλόγους (I 2:8).

² So, F.D. Bacon, Barclay, Bengel, Bernard, Falconer, Guthrie, Hort, Horton, Lightfoot, Lock, Luther, Moberly, Ramsay, E.F. Scott, Simpson, Spicq, von Soden, T. Zahn. Cf. Ap. Const. ii.26; iii.15. For discussion, see, C. Robinson, The Ministry of Deaconesses, London, 1898, esp pp. 13ff.

qualities and those of the deacons, the introductory use of *δοῦλως*, and the correct application of the theory of the definite article, are the arguments suggested in its favor.¹ Yet the thought in the phrase as translated in the A.V., "even so their wives", is not without its own modern support.² Easton has noted that while the verse is adequate for a discussion of the qualities of the wives, it is "too cursory" for deaconesses.³ Furthermore, there is the question of the relationship of the widows (I 5:3) to the deaconesses if the verse is to be so applied. Why should there be two distinct orders of women who would apparently be performing similar functions? Assuredly, if the wives were being addressed, one would expect something akin to *τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν*. Yet, if deaconesses were involved, it would be more natural to have *τὰς διακόνους*, unless with Simpson, the common gender of *διάκονος* would make it redundant to repeat the appellation. Historically too there is doubt whether it is possible to accept as decisive the isolated reference to a deaconess in Rom 16:1. Apart from Pliny's mention of two "ancillis quae ministrae dicebantur,"⁴ deaconesses appear to have their first unambiguous designation in the Didascalia Apostolorum.⁵ The decision is

¹Cf., Lightfoot, On a Fresh Revision of the English NT, London, 1891, p. 127. Ramsay (Exp, 7th series, VIII, 406f) observed that "there was among the Pagans a tendency, and even in some cults a positive custom, that the wife of a priest was officially a priestess; and it is quite likely that among the Christians some tendency to appoint husband and wife as Deacon and Deaconess prevailed."

²Cf., Easton, PE, pp. 133ff; Goodspeed, INT, p. 342; Moffatt, Translation; B. Weiss, INT, p. 402; Richardson, Theology, pp. 333f.

³PE, pp. 133ff.

⁴Ep to Trajan X. xcvi (LCL).

⁵iii.12f, and later recognized in the canons of the councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon, and in the correspondence of Chrysostom.

difficult. That there was an early need for a feminine ministration of visitation, as well as perhaps the attendance of women candidates for baptism, is assured, But can this isolated, ambiguous, seemingly displaced verse fulfil this need? For the purposes of this investigation, no determination is demanded. In view of Rom 16:1, either interpretation will enable the placing of this phase of the Pastorals' organization within the known structure of the Church.

Χήρας (I 5:3-16). This passage is fraught with so many problems, and capable of such a plethora of interpretations, that it is impossible to ascertain positively what the author wished to convey to his reader. It is quite possible that for the sake of the external witness of the Church nothing more is meant by the text than to suggest a method of determining those widows who were legitimately in need of assistance. There would be an early need to seek for restraining measures where the distribution of alms was concerned. If this is the way that the text should be viewed, then Timothy is expected to charge the church to render assistance¹ to bona fide widows who meet certain conditions.

The widow is to be not merely husbandless, but completely destitute of anyone from whom financial assistance might be normally expected (4-5a,8). In the eleemosynary outreach of the Church, it is not Her place to relieve the responsibilities of the families. When even the pagan society surrounding the Church had standards which required the care of parents, the Christian's failure in his

¹ Τιμή (I 5:3), although meaning 'respect' or 'honor', is regarded by most commentators as implying practical aid. In view of I 5:17, this seems only natural. Cf., Guthrie, PE, pp. 100-5; E.F. Scott, PE, pp. 57f; Simpson, pp. 72-77; et al. For meaning of 'respect', see, Lilley, pp. 123-131.

obligation would take on spiritual implications.¹ Furthermore, assistance was only to be given to widows who had lived a decorous married life and who were completely devoted to the Lord (5:5b) rather than to the immoral pleasure (5:6) to which a widow within the Ephesian society might be inclined to turn for support. The examples of what constituted an approved character would appear to be only specimen samples, and are thus not intended to be demanded for each candidate (5:10). If so, the widow most worthy of support was to be a motherly person, who had been known for her hospitality, or other forms of humble service and active benevolence.² That she should be at least sixty years of age appears only sensible from the author's experience with those who were younger. Not only is the younger widow actually happier when she assumes her natural place within the home,³ but there is less danger of a faulty witness for Christ whenever,⁴ in her idleness she might grow physically restless or perhaps succumb to such pastimes as talebearing. This interpretation modulates the force of *καταλέγω* (5:9) from the meaning

¹Cf., D. Mackenzie, "Widows", *HDAC*, II, 676f.

²Zahn (*INT*, II, 94) asserts that the explicitness of instruction indicates that the place of the widow is still in an early and fluid state. For discussion of these qualifications, see, Goudge, *Pastoral Teaching*, pp. 133f; Findlay, "Paul the Apostle", pp. 726f; and Ramsay, *Exp*, 7th series, IX, 436-440.

³Simpson (p. 76) asserts that it is out of keeping with a later pseudo-Paul to "have comported with the ascetic exaltation of celibacy and deprecation of marriage so quickly foisted into the patristic milieu." Ignatius' admonition that unmarried women were to be included with widows (*Smyrn XIII*) is also of note.

⁴*ὅταν* (I 5:11) must here carry the significance of 'whenever' or 'in case they do' rather than 'when' as in R.V.

of 'enroll' or 'enlist' to that of 'reckon' or 'count as'.¹ Verse nine would thus be paraphrased: "Let not a widow be regarded as worthy of any permanent assistance who fails to meet the following requirements, namely..."

Such an explanation, however, is not without its objections and objectors. Following the lead of the early Fathers, many would discover two distinct groups of widows under discussion: those who are objects of charity (3-8); and those who are officially employed in the Church (9-16).² The suggestiveness of *καταλέγω* would certainly warrant this view. Without such a position it would also appear that the church was limiting its aid to a very select minority. It is noted that the age of sixty would certainly exclude many widows sincerely in need.³ Thus it is possible that the term 'widow' is here to be rendered in both its later technical sense of a precise ecclesiastical order with official status, as well as its more normal and ordinary sense. Yet, whatever the later relations of the Church may have been, it must be recognized that the instructions here are capable of

¹Cf. L and S, I, 897b. The versatility of the word is seen in the fact that it can also mean 'recount', 'repeat', 'conclude', or even 'accuse'. A business-like procedure has been introduced, but an official enrollment into an order of widows is not demanded by this term. Cf. Simpson, pp. 72-77.

²So, Horton, pp. 124-8; Lock, PE, pp. 56ff; Bernard, PE, pp. 78-84; Scott, PE, pp. 57ff; Clogg, p. 117; King, A Leader Led, London, 1957, p. 92. Baur (note, p. 103) stated that "this is the clearest proof that the Epistle can not belong to the apostolic age, when the Church had no special order of the kind."

³Bernard (PE, pp. 78f) contends from this age limit for an entirely new order of widows. Yet it would appear that the limit was unusually high for an entrance into an official order. So. Easton (PE, pp. 185f) who regards the deaconesses and widows as one order. Perhaps Guthrie (PE, p. 102) is correct in observing that special duties are involved, without any recognition of official status.

being interpreted as for the benefit of the destitute with its resulting witness for Christ, and not the proposed benefits to be received by the Church. An enrollment, perhaps; but not an order. The emphasis throughout the passage is eleemosynary - not hierarchical. In this emphasis there is no prohibition of help for those who are in temporary need; but certainly the limited funds of the Church should be carefully channeled in any permanent way to those older, and therefore most helpless. It is not impossible that those widows so aided might react in service to the Church which assumed the role of the family, and in the same way she would have served her family - but this is not demanded by the text.¹

Instructions Relating to the Ministry of Men

Three grades, or more accurately titles, of ministry are to be noted within the instructions to Timothy. Since the recipient was undoubtedly aware of the origin, method of appointment, and functions, of these ministries, the counsel is confined to their fundamental moral qualifications. The comparatively external nature of those necessary characteristics may be accounted for,

¹If this is accepted as an official order, it is only formal recognition of the rôle which women played within the early Church. From among the earliest proselytes of Judaism women were found to be numerous, and known for their charitable devotion within the Community. Cf. Acts 9:39,41; 16:13; 13:50; Gal 3:28; R 16:1,6; Col 4:15; James 1:27. Such recognition would be the logical outcome of Acts 6, and the ancient concern of Israel. Cf. Dt 10:18; 14:29; 27:19; Lk 2:37; Spicq, p. xlix; Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 67f, 161f; and F.D. Bacon, Women in the Church, London, 1946, pp. 15f. Lock (PE, pp. 56ff) observes that "the care of widows would be required very early, and all that is laid down here would be possible in a church that had been founded for ten years."

in part, by the fact that the author is instructing Timothy about the type of men that are to be chosen rather than directing him regarding the type of men they necessarily are. No words are spent upon the inner character of the men involved, since it is the outer side which man alone can see in the practical difficulty of fulfilling the complement of an existing order. In view of the fact that qualifications alone, and not functions, are being dealt with, it may well be that many confident assertions concerning the level of the Pastorals' ecclesiastical organization ought to be reviewed.

Ἐπίσκοπος (I 3:1-7).¹ Seemingly adopting the approved experience of the contemporary society, the author's instructions are to the end that the 'overseer' should be of such positive character as to be a testimony within the environs of the home,

¹For comprehensive word studies, see: H.W. Beyer, TWNT, II, 604-17; Michaelis, Pastoralbriefe, pp. 47-55; Carpenter, "Minister", TWBB, pp. 146-152; Easton, PE, pp. 221-228. Cf. Ramsay, Church in Roman Empire, pp. 367-71. For classical references, see, L and S, I, 657. There is no agreement on the origin of the episcopacy. C.H. Turner (Studies in Early Church History, ch II), discusses the theory of administration of alms in Pagan guilds. Sanday ("The Origin of the Christian Ministry", Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 100-3) goes to the LXX for the derivation (cf. James, pp. 73f). Yet (Harnack, "On the Origin of the Christian Ministry", Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 321-343), insists that the derivation is from the Gentile world, and not from the Jewish Archisyagogi. Jeremias (p. 19) discovers both Jewish and Hellenistic parallels. C. Bigg (The Origins of Christianity, ed T.B. Strong, Oxford, 1909, pp. 64f) discusses the two divergent theories of origin as set forth by Theodore of Mops. and Jerome. A. Ehrhardt ("The Beginnings of Mon-Episcopacy", CQR, CXL (1945), 113-126) traces the origin to the constitution of the municipia of the Roman empire. Perhaps the comment of Falconer (PE, p. 61) is the best way to view the term: "An old name was filled with a new content and became a new creation."

Church, and outside world.¹ Only the title, and the injunctions relating to hospitality, aptitude in teaching, and ability in home management, give any indication as to the functions expected.² But if these desired qualities afford an indication of function, there are still other unanswered questions. For instance, is the ἐπίσκοπος in question to be regarded as singular or plural? Or, to re-phrase, is the organization depicted to be taken in the sense of the monarchical episcopate? Such writers as Carpenter and Ehrhardt would have it to be so.³ Certainly the use of the plural in Acts 20:28, and Phil 1:1, but the singular here and in Tit 1:7, would lend weight to the theory.⁴ The later usage of the term might well substantiate the claim for a single bishop. Furthermore, if with Gealy, the texts are so

¹For discussion of the similarity of the required virtues to those demanded of public administrators, see, Easton, PE, pp. 83f; Spicq, p. xlvi; Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 153. For discussion of the qualities, see Goudge, Pastoral Teaching, pp. 58ff; Farrar, Paul, pp. 653; Findlay, "PE", pp. 395ff; and Falconer, PE, pp. 57f.

²Varying opinions of the overseer's functions, include: Sanday ("Origin", pp. 100-3), overseeing the deacons, and not of work; Harnack ("Origin", pp. 342), overseeing worship and administration; Hatch (BL), exclusively financial; and G. Salmon ("The Christian Ministry", Exp, 3rd series, VI (1887), 2-27), the overseeing of spiritual matters.

³Carpenter, pp. 146-152; A. Ehrhardt, The Apostolic Succession, London, 1953. Cf., W.K.L. Clarke, "The Origins of Episcopacy", Episcopacy Ancient and Modern, ed C. Jenkins and K. Mackenzie, London, 1930, pp. 23f. Beyer, TWNT, VI, 667f: "In dessen darf die Gleichsetzung beider Amter in den PE nicht ohne weiteres vollzogen werden."

⁴Two alternative suggestions have been made: Lock (PE, p. xx), without implying any difference of grade or status, observes that the singular was used because of the early need for the singular office in the management of finances, to exercise hospitality, lead in worship, and the like. J.A. Robinson ("The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Periods", Early History of the Church and Ministry, ed H.B. Swete, London, 1918, pp. 59-92) asserts that the singular is because the bishop's function is singular in import and not because of monarchical connotations.

ambiguous, that they must be interpreted not by what they say, but by the clearly defined system of hierarchical orders existing at the time of their writing in the second century, the monarchical episcopate can be defended.¹

Yet, it need not be so. If the definite article involved is regarded generically, and the translation is rendered 'an overseer' rather than 'the bishop', a different concept is gained.² Such a translation would appear to preserve the force of *τις* in both I 3:1, and in Tit 1:5 sq. To render *εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ* as, "If a man seeketh the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work," is destitute of linguistic basis. It is a work to which one who desires to be an overseer is called - not an office. It should be further noted, that the import is one of a work which is available to all who meet the qualifications. That there was a plurality of overseers is substantiated additionally by the apparent connection between the presbyters and the bishops. This then raises the question of what this relationship is.

A fact generally accepted since Lightfoot's dissertation on "The Christian Ministry", is that *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* are interchangeable, or convertible, terms.³ While there have been later

¹Op. cit., p. 347.

²Cf. Falconer, PE, pp. 56f; F.J.A. Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, London, 1897, pp. 193f.

³Dissertations on the Apostolic Age, London, 1892, pp. 137-146; cf. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, 8th ed., London, 1888, pp. 95-99. Scholars who substantially agree, include: J.W. Falconer, From Apostle to Priest, Edinburgh, 1900, pp. 116f; Michaelis, Das Alttestenamt, p. 52; Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, London, 1903, pp. 163f; Clogg, p. 117; Badcock, pp. 90f; Lilley, p. 156; Wood, pp. 364ff; Lock, PE, pp. xixf; R. Falconer, PE, pp. 58-61; Guthrie, PE, p. 25; Findlay, "PE", pp. 395ff; Simpson, pp. 10f; B. Weiss, INT, p. 403; J.R. Harris, "Dr. Sanday and the Christian Ministry", Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 225-235; Latourette, p. 116; W. Robinson, "Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon", ET, XXXIV (1923) 89ff; and R. Bultmann, Theology of the NT, tran K. Grobel, II, 1955, p. 102.

refinements of the position, such as the assertion made by Hort, that the 'elder' is the title, while 'oversight' is the function to be exercised by the holder of the title within the Ecclesia, the basic premise has received only limited challenge.¹ Reasons most frequently proposed for this identification include the following. There appears to be no reason why the author of the Pastorals would write concerning the requirements of the overseer and the deacon (I 3:1-13) and pass over those of the presbyter, except on the supposition of a direct relationship. This problem is met if I 5:17 is regarded as supplementary in character to the discussion of the third chapter. Furthermore, there would appear to be no convincing explanation why the elder should be accorded a double honor for the discharge of his functions without the same privilege being afforded the overseers and deacons.²

¹Hort, Christian Ecclesia, pp. 190f. Cf. James, p. 98. G. Edmundson (pp. 182-5) stressed a difference because of a distinction of function. Cf. Harnack, "Origin", pp. 321-43. But Sanday ("Origin", pp. 105f) observed that this was possible only by making the Pastorals' references very late interpolations, and Acts 20 as second century. Hatch (BL) stressed a separation because of the origin of terms; but, see Findlay, "Paul the Apostle", p. 727. Bernard (PE, pp. lvi-lxxv) contends for differentiation because of the sharp division of the terms; while Gealy (p. 347) stresses division of terminology and function. Milligan ("Origin of the Christian Ministry", Exp, 3rd series, VI (1887), 352f) offered the unique suggestion that 'presbyter' was a religious title, comparable to that of 'reverend'; while 'bishop' was a particular office.

²In a lengthy discussion, Michaelis (Das Alttestenamt, pp. 112-119) contends that τιμή should be regarded as 'respect' or 'honor', and not 'honorarium' as it is commonly understood. Observing that μισθός (5:18) must mean reward, he concludes that there must be a reason for the change in vocabulary. He further observes that γραφή would not have been attributed to the words of Christ so early (yet see ch 5). Therefore, 5:18 "nicht vom Apostel Paulus stammer kann" (p. 116); and 5:17 can therefore be interpreted that "die Alttesten, die in ihrem Dienst ganz aufgehen, nach 1 Th 5:13 'in ganz besonderem Masse lieb und wert zu halten' sind." But it must be noted that early in the apostolic age teaching had become such a vital element in the community that those who were taught were called upon to support the teacher (so, Burton, Galatians,

Tit 1:5-7 is another text which points to an identification of the bishop-presbyter. There is no apparent reason why Titus should be instructed in the appointment of presbyters, only to proceed to the necessary requirements of men who are to be involved in a completely different, and as yet, unmentioned order. There is no linguistic reason why the article should not be taken in its true resumptive force (1:7). The connecting particle (γάρ) would also receive its proper emphasis if with Hort the passage is taken as follows: "A man who is to be made an Elder should be one who is ἀνεγκλήτος for (γάρ) he that hath oversight must needs be ἀνεγκλητος as a steward of God."¹ Such an interpretation has been recently disputed by A. Farrer, however.² Although admitting that in Acts 20 the two terms are synonymous, he yet contends that the Pastorals disclose a later divergence. Farrer would make a complete stop after διαταξάμεν (1:5) and place εἴ τις at the beginning of a new sentence in verse six. In the support of such action, he notes that in four other passages in the Pastorals εἴ τις is similarly employed. But this observation is irrelevant; for in each of the four instances cited, εἴ τις is followed by a normal main clause. To force these words to mean "here's your man" is without support syntactically.³ Harnack, reversing his earlier

ICC, New York, 1920, in commenting on Gal (6:6). If Gal 6:6 refers to a class of paid teachers, then there is no reason to dislocate 5:18 in order to maintain only 'respect' in 5:17. Cf. 1 C 9; Ap const 2.28). Scholars who maintain the sense of 'honorarium' include, Lock, PE, p. 62; Easton, PE, p. 159; Bernard, PE, p. 85; Guthrie, PE, p. 105; Moffatt, Approach to the NT; and J. Reid, "Honour", HDAC, I, 583.

¹Christian Ecclesia, pp. 190f.

²"The Ministry in the NT", pp. 160f.

³Cf. W.H. Vanstone, "The Ministry in the NT", The Historic Episcopate, ed K.M. Carey, London, 1954, pp. 23-40.

position that the terms were synonymous, has also attempted to show a distinction in Tit 1:5-9.¹ By making verses 7-9 a later interpolation, although without manuscript support, such a distinction is possible. Yet the argument is weakened by the fact that the 'editor', by inserting the verses in this way, seemingly believed that the terms were interchangeable.

No attempt is here made to assert that the two terms were used as "indifferently" as Lightfoot assumed; but only that it was possible for the episkopoi to be presbuteroi - if not vice versa. As previously indicated, the confusion of terms may well be explained etymologically. In this case, the distinction is not one of function, but of title. It is quite possible that the concept of governing by councils of elders, although familiar to those of a Judaistic background, may have been replaced by the more congenial term of overseer in the Gentile communities.

That the terms are in some way interchangeable is substantiated by other passages of the NT. There is an unequivocal transition in Acts 20:28, where Luke records that Paul summons the 'presbyters' of the Ephesian Church to Miletus, and promptly bids them as 'overseers', to shepherd the flock. A similar linking of the terms is found in 1 Pet 5:1,2, where the author appeals to the 'presbyters': ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνίον τοῦ θεοῦ . Phil 1:1 has also been set forth as proof of the identity of the two terms, since it is inconceivable that Paul would pass from the first to

¹Expansion, II, 64ff: "the Apostle Paul has not forgotten the presbyters, for at first the same officials bore the name of 'presbyters' as well as that of 'bishop'..." Yet, see The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries, London, 1910, pp. 67f, where Harnack contends for the interpolation theory.

the third orders in his address and thereby ignore the presbyters. But the inclusion of this verse into the argument may not be justified if Harnack's theory is permitted. It is his contention that only the deacons and bishops are addressed because of Paul's desire to thank those responsible for the assistance rendered to him.¹ Going outside of the NT, however, it would appear from Clement XIII that the identification is still to be made at least within the Corinthian community.² This is not to assert that each of the instances of interchange is incapable of other interpretations. Nor does it assume that every elder was an overseer or vice versa; or that there were never any differences to be found. Yet, it does appear valid to assert that unless the Pastorals are interpreted as actually characterizing "a more clearly defined system of hierarchical orders than the tests themselves reveal,"³ they are in conformity with the NT practice of interchanging the two terms.⁴

Πρεσβύτερος (I 5:17-25).⁵ Assuming the close identity of

¹"Origin", pp. 338ff.

²Cf. Falconer, PE, pp. 60f; Jerome's Commentary on Tit 1:7. See, J. Gieseler, A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, tran S. Davidson, I, Edinburgh, 1846, pp. 88-90, for citations of authorities throughout the Medieval Church who maintained a similar position.

³Gealy, p. 347.

⁴It is generally conceded that the necessity of a centralized administration for unity of doctrine and discipline occasioned an early transformation to the monarchical episcopate. For discussion of the process, see, Rackham, p. civ; Sanday, "Origin", pp. 7-10; Lindsay, pp. 169ff; J. Knox, The Early Church and the Coming Great Church, London, 1957, pp. 119-127; Hatch, BL, pp. 40ff, 83-112; and Simcox, "The Pauline Antilegomena", pp. 211f.

⁵Comprehensive word studies include: L.G. Bornkamm, TWNT, VI, 666ff; Easton, PE, pp. 188-197; and Michaelis, Das Alttestenamt. For classical references, see, L and S, II, 1462. Scripture offers no definite knowledge concerning the origin of the 'presbyters'. All

πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι, the passage now under discussion contains the only other instructions to Timothy which compel an application to presbyter in its technical sense. While the third chapter was concerned with the qualifications to be sought in choosing these leaders of the Ecclesia, the counsels in this passage refer to the proper treatment which ought to be accorded those elders already serving. From this advice, at least two insights are to be added to the information already gleaned concerning the presbyters.

The intimations concerning the functions of the elders, as disclosed in the earlier list of qualifications, can now be shown to be substantiated. In verses 4 and 5 of chapter three, the expectant presbyter was required to manage (προΐστημι) his own house in order to give evidence of his capability to govern the house of God. In 5:17, the same verb is employed to describe an elder who is performing his functions properly (καλῶς). This stress on general superintendence has been seen to be in keeping with the injunctions of Acts 20:28 and 1 Pet 5:1,2, where the presbyters are exhorted to govern (ποιμαίνω) the flock of God. At the same time, the verse goes on to relate not only of governing presbyters, but

nations associated authority with age: Romans governed by the Senate or Seniores; Greeks by the Gerousia, with its members being called πρεσβύτεροι. Cf. Rackham, pp. xcixff. Streeter (pp. 77) observed that since Paul thought of the Church as the authentic Israel it was natural to organize as the synagogue. Cf. Humphreys, p. 15; J. Weiss, Primitive Christianity, I, 48; Easton, PE, 188ff; The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, Cambridge, 1934, pp. 75-78; and James, pp. 102-6. Sanday ("Origin", pp. 8f) cautions that the origin was not from the synagogue, but the Sanhedrin. Spicq (p. xlv), following the lead of Deissmann (Bible Studies, pp. 153-7, 233ff), traces the Jewish usage to Egypt where the 'presbyter' was an official title for Pagan priests, and the Christian, to the members of civil corporations in Asia Minor. Cf. Parry, p. lxxix.

of those κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ . Preaching and teaching is now seen to be added to their field of service. Although the chief duty of the Jewish πρεσβύτεροι was probably that of discipline, the Mishnah has preserved the information that they also interpreted the received tradition.¹ This allotment of the teaching ministry was apparently incorporated into the Christian community as well. As the visits of the prophets and Apostles became rarer, either because of the expansion of the Church, or of their own passing away, the gap would inevitably be filled from within the ranks of the local Church leaders. The stress within the Pastoral Epistles on the ministry of teaching is no doubt accounted for by the need to counteract the teachers and teachings of those unqualified to meet the emergency. Probably, those elders who administered in both the teaching and governing ministries were in the minority. The Church could not expect more than the χάρισμα afforded.² When the functions of pastoral oversight, preaching, teaching, and hospitality, as reflected in the Pastorals, are added to the ministries of healing (James 5:14) and finance (Acts 11:30), a fairly complete picture of the early presbyterial ministry is undoubtedly gained.

I 5 also gives pertinent information regarding the treatment Timothy and the Church are to accord the presbyters. The caution registered in verses 19-25 is of a two-fold nature: "do not pre-

¹San Ex 24.9. Cf. Gore, The Church, pp. 235f; Lock, PE, p. xx; Lilley, pp. 26-30; Humphreys, p. 15.

²As late as the third century Cyprian also distinguished the teaching elders from the others (Ep xxix). For the close connection of the functions of teaching and ruling, cf., Acts 20:17, 28; 1 Th 5:12f; 1 Pet 5:2. For additional discussion, see, Michaelis, Altestenamt, pp. 92-153.

judge a case, admitting doubtful charges because you do not like the man, and do not be lenient on any personal grounds, when a case is proved."¹ The first caution is corroborated by a maxim which was a cardinal principle of Jewish legal procedure (Dt 19:15; cf. Mt 18:16; 2 C 13:1), namely, that except "at the mouth of two or three witnesses" no man was to be condemned. If there were found to be a real basis for the accusation,² then disciplinary action was to proceed before all.³ This public censure had the dual purpose of sobering the sinner and to "overawe the others."⁴ After the judgment has been passed, 5:22 would appear to indicate that the offender should not be hastily or prematurely restored to the communion. The entire current of the preceding thought is concerned with offenders; that which follows, with the danger of being implicated in the sins of others when the restoration by the familiar act of blessing is too hastily conferred.⁵ Discipline, especially when directed by Timothy as a younger man, is so exceedingly difficult that it requires not only personal preparation, but keenness in observation regarding the sincerity of the penitent.⁶

¹E.F. Scott, PE, p. 66.

²The use of the present participle might well indicate a case of habitual sinning rather than an isolated case.

³Cf. Jas 5:14ff; 2 C 2:6-11. "Before all" has been regarded either as "before the entire Church," so, King, A Leader Led, pp. 101ff; Scott, PE, p. 66; or, "before the co-presbyters," so, Bernard, PE, p. 87; Horton, p. 129.

⁴Moffatt's translation for ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσιν (I 5:20).

⁵For reference to the early Church custom, see, Cyprian, Ep 74:12; Eusebius, HE, VII, ii; Ap Const 2.18. Modern adherents of this interpretation include J.W. Falconer, pp. 135ff; Gwatkin, "Ordination", HDB, III, 631; Lock, PE, p. 64; Easton, PE, p. 160.

⁶I 5:23 may be interpreted as the strengthening of self for the ordeal; or, more probably, the result of the ordinary discursiveness of a letter. Cf. Simpson, p. 80; King, A Leader Led, p. 103.

But, the words χειρας ταχως μηδενι επιτιθει are capable of a different, and more widely accepted connotation, namely, "Never ordain anyone hastily."¹ Thus, by Timothy's being too lax in his choice of an elder, he might become a sharer in the disgrace of any subsequent failure. This interpretation is certainly possible; for as Scott has observed, the other Pastorals' references to the imposition of hands must certainly be regarded as ordination.² Yet, perhaps this observation is not too pertinent since I 4:14 and II 1:6 are concerned with Timothy's ordination, and not his authority to ordain; while Tit 1:5, as will be noted later, does not necessarily demand such an interpretation. Scott's other arguments against the imposition of hands as an allusion to restoration might also prove unsatisfactory. Admittedly, it might not be necessary to assure oneself of the genuineness of the offender's repentance in order to restore him to fellowship; but certainly when a question of leadership is involved the proof of sincerity would seem mandatory to the external witness of the Church. Furthermore, E.F. Scott's suggestion that past sins were in question with Church penitents, but future sins are here being discussed, would seem to be away from the point. The object of the advice herein given to Timothy is for his guidance in the future disciplining of elders. There would seem no other way to approach the subject apart from the hypothesis of future sin. The question is a difficult one.

¹For discussion of the various translations, see, Goodspeed, Problems of NT Translation, Chicago, 1945, p. 181f. Modern adherents of the interpretation of 'ordination', include, Michaelis, Alttestenamt, pp. 78f; Bernard, PE, p. 88; Horton, p. 130; Gore, The Church, p. 221; Harnack, Constitution and Law, p. 26; Simpson, p. 79; and T.F. Torrence, "Consecration and Ordination", SJT, XI (1958), 238.

²PE, p. 68. Cf. Clarke, "The Origins of Episcopacy", p. 24.

The verse appears to be capable of either interpretation: ordination or restoration. This much is certain: Timothy was a referee in matters of dispute concerning the moral character of the presbyters. Whether upon determination the judgment was sealed with ordination or restoration cannot be ascertained with assurance.

Διάκονος (I 3:8-13).¹ The noun διάκονος, which occurs some thirty times in the NT in many shades of meanings, must be taken in this text in a definitely specialized sense.² In these instructions to Timothy, the stress is once more upon the antecedent qualifications, as determined by the report of both the home and society, of those who might become 'deacons', rather than descriptions of functions or functionaries already serving. Thus once again any determination of function as gathered by the instructions, must be derived from the general meaning of the word, and the qualifications recorded.

The Classical connotation of διάκονος is that of a servant of menial status within the household. The contemporary Greek world was accustomed to its application in both this original sense of lowly service to a master (cf. Mt 22:13) and in that of state servants (cf. Rom 13:4).³ This element of service, although undoubtedly

¹For comprehensive word studies of the term's technical and non-technical application, see, H.W. Beyer, TWNT, II, 89-93; Easton, PE, pp. 181-5; Hort, Christian Ecclesia, pp. 202ff; and Michaelis, Pastoralbriefe, pp. 55-60.

²While the term is also used within the Pastorals in application to Timothy as a 'minister' of Christ (I 4:6; cf. 1 C 3:5), the verb in reference to the ministration of Onesiphorus at Ephesus (II 1:18, cf. 2 C 8:9), and the substantive, to the service of the Apostle's (I 1:12; cf. Acts 1:25; R 11:13; 2 C 4:1) and of the delegates (II 4:5, 11), a more technical use is demanded in I 3:8-13.

³Cf. L and S, I, 398.

arising out of this latter "heidenchristlichen Boden" in contradistinction to the presbyters' "Judenchristentum" origin,¹ has its earliest Christian application to the elected servers of Acts 6. The care of the destitute is an intimate factor in the Pastorals' prohibition of talebearing - a valid requirement in the ministry of visitation. For "the ones who serve," the other listed virtues of seriousness, truthfulness, temperance, and honesty, were also indispensable.² It would be misleading to assume from the relationship of the deacon and bishop in such passages as Phil 1:1 that the service involved is anything other than this pastoral care. H.W. Beyer contends that "der diakonos ist nicht nur Diener seiner Gemeinde, sondern auch seines Bischofs."³ Such service may well have been involved in the duties of the deacons within the later developed ecclesiasticism⁴ - but no such teaching is to be derived from the Pastorals. The *διάκονοι* of I 3 were not the assistants of the *ἐπίσκοποι*, but of the destitute.

If such a position is valid, then what, precisely, is the relationship of the 'servers' to the 'overseers' and the 'elders'?

¹H.W. Beyer, TWNT, II, 91. Cf., Spicq, p. xlvi. For discussion of the component organization in Judaism, see, Barclay, PE, pp. 79f. Hort (Christian Ecclesia, pp. 210f), however, contends that the diaconate does not have its origin in the Hazan of the synagogue since the functions are so different. Ramsay (Traveller, p. 375), although finding many Jewish analogies, turns to the Roman organizing methods for the vitality of the diaconate.

²For discussion of the qualifications, see, R.C. Moberley, Ministerial Priesthood, 2nd ed, London, 1899, pp. 137f; Hort, Christian Ecclesia, p. 195; Goudge, Pastoral Teaching, pp. 36f.

³H.W. Beyer, TWNT, II, 90. Cf. Falconer, PE, p. 62.

⁴In this way, Ignatius could speak of the deacons as not only servants of meals, "but are those who tend the Church of God" (Trall. II.3); and by the time of Hippolytus the bishop alone was to ordain the deacon, since he was "to serve the bishop and to execute the bishop's commands" (Apostolic Tradition 9).

The precise determination is not easy, for the exact forms of the early Christian community have long been a source of debate. It must be remembered that there seems a distinct possibility that the πρεσβύτεροι, because of their duties of administration, were also described as ἐπίσκοποι. It follows, that if ἐπίσκοπος in I 3:1,2 is to be regarded as descriptive of function rather than office, then it is possible that διάκονος may also be descriptive of function. This interpretation would tend to explain why the qualifications of the presbyters were omitted from the third chapter; afford the rightful stress on ὡσαύτως in the transition to the eighth verse; as well as afford a natural explanation of 5:17. There is thus a distinct possibility that if any differentiation was to be made within the presbyterate it was one of an originally "undifferentiated ministry."¹ This is not without support from the Lucan narrative of the early Church development. According to Moberly, the "instinct of the Church has never doubted" the identification of the seven in Acts 6 as 'deacons'.² This statement is certainly corroborated by Irenaeus who appears to be the first to make such an allusion. It is noteworthy, however, that Chrysostom appears to suggest that the ἐπισκόποις and διακόνους of Phil 1:1 were within the presbyterate. Clement of Rome is even more explicit in the

¹Clarke, "The Origin of Episcopacy", p. 19. Cf. Easton, Hippolytus, pp. 79ff; J. Knox, Early Church, pp. 120f; Parry, pp. lix-lxiii; Streeter, pp. 77f.

²Op. cit., p. 136 n 2. Cf., Ramsay, Traveller, pp. 372ff. Yet, see Clarke (ibid., pp. 12f), who sees characteristics of all three of the later orders; and Parry (p. lxiv) who observes in Acts 6 the inauguration of the presbyterate. If Acts 6 is not the origin of the diaconate, the chapter at least serves as the suggestion which led ultimately to the order.

convertibility of terms.¹

This interchange may well be accidental; but if the servers and overseers were actually specializations of the presbyterate, it would aid in interpreting other Lucan references. According to Acts 11:30 the presbyters are involved in the superintendence of relief measures - a task recognized as peculiarly within the province of the deacons. It would also explain how Phil 1:1 refers to deacons and bishops, but Acts 14:23 discloses the appointment of presbyters to be the Pauline custom of missionary endeavor. The interchange of terms also explains why the seven of Acts 6 are nowhere called deacons (cf. Acts 21:8); why their qualifications and ministries were of such a high calibre; why they, and not the presbyters or bishops ranked next to the Apostles; and why the inauguration of the presbyterate was never disclosed. The arguments are not strong either way; but the Pastorals substantiate what would appear to be the NT teaching that the simple preceded the complex, that the single order diverged into the later three-fold ministry.

One more investigation must be made of the instructions to Timothy regarding the ministers. According to I 3:13, what 'standing' does a faithful servant acquire? That βαθμός indicates

¹In addressing the Corinthian Church, Clement observed that in each city the Apostles καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν...εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν (XLII.4). After vindicating this Apostolic precedence (XLIII) Clement goes on to show how they knew that strife would exist over the bishopric and that they had appointed certain men to the ministry. Clement's application to the discussion is that the Corinthians ought not to continue their sedition by rejecting the appointed ones from the episcopate (XLIV.4,5). The succeeding paragraphs are filled with appeals to be submissive to the presbyters which were set over them (LVII.1,2; LIV.2; LXIII.1).

an advance is certain;¹ but what kind of advance? At least three suggestions have found supporters.

(1) A ministerial progression, the gradus presbyteratus. The reward for the man who performs his office of deacon well is the promotion to the higher office of presbyter (or bishop). The balance of the verse would then be interpreted to mean that in the satisfactory performance, the man "will gain such a confidence in the faith that he can look any man in the face with boldness."²

(2) A 'standing', or 'vantage ground', which enables the deacon to attain a greater influence and usefulness within the Church. It naturally follows that the reputation gained through the life of one who fulfils the qualifications outlined would serve as the means to a more extensive witness. "Influence is a by-product of character," asserts Simpson; while exhortation strengthens the individual's faith.³

(3) A moral or spiritual standing. Noble service secures a foothold not upon the rung of the ecclesiastical or community ladder, but of that which ascends to God.⁴

Not one of these suggestions is impossible; but perhaps one may prove to be more probable than the others. The first would appear to be out of contextual harmony. The writer's concern is one of moral qualities required, and not the attempt to enhance

¹A Pastorals' hapax legomenon from βαίνω 'to step'. Rendered by A.V. as 'degree' which is a literal translation of the Vulgate gradus; and by the R.V. as 'standing'.

²Barclay, PE, p. 81. Cf. King, A Leader Led, p. 65; Lock, PE, ppxixf.

³Simpson, pp. 57f. Cf. Hort, Christian Ecclesia, p. 202; James, p. 100; Horton, pp. 110f; Bernard, PE, p. 60; Easton, PE, p. 133, yet on p. 134, he states that it means more than that.

⁴Cf. Scott, PE, pp. 37f; Lilley, p. 106.

the dignity of office. Although later ecclesiasticism was concerned with advancement, it would seem, with Scott, that the instructions to moral purity would be pointless if concluded on the note, "Try to be a good deacon, for you will then be in the running for the next vacancy among the elders."¹ Furthermore, if as seems possible, the servers were a specialization within a single order, then advancement would be an idea foreign to the author. The second, popularized by Hort, is a distinct possibility. Inevitably when a service is properly discharged, an element of respect and estimation is incurred. This would retain the natural relationship with the preceding verse, as well as serve to retain the force of the connecting γὰρ . Yet, the third suggestion cannot be discarded, for it appears to be more in keeping with the solemnity of the phrase "the faith which is in Christ Jesus." It would seem that the writer is making a spiritual application to his stress upon moral qualifications, and is thereby forming a most appropriate transition to the sublime heights reached in the conclusion of the chapter. It is certainly possible that such boldness in the faith would soon be reason for any change of status from 'server' to 'overseer'.

INSTRUCTIONS TO TITUS

Regrettably, the Epistle to Titus is so brief that it does not afford a great amount of information regarding the Cretan

¹Ibid. Horton, pp. 110f: "to unite ecclesiastical advancement and boldness in the faith is too incongruous a mode of speech to be attributed to any but the most ignorant writers."

missionary endeavor; yet it is not without its interesting comparisons and contrasts with its companions to Ephesus. Omitted are the vivid descriptions of the addressee's own personal ministry (e.g. εὐαγγελιστής and διακονία) which were found to abound within the Timothean Epistles. Thus, the expositor is free to draw his own description from the instructions which relate to the fulfilment of his ministry. In general, this work consisted of his being charged (διατάσσω I:5) with the responsibility of remaining on Crete until relieved (3:12) and to "finish putting things right"¹ with the mission. Specifically, the task of Titus was that he should λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς Paul's instructions as committed to him orally (ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διεταξάμην I:5) and which were summarized in the Letter. This advice falls into two distinct categories.

Instructions Relating to the Congregation.

The ministry of Titus, as was clearly the case with Timothy, is one of teaching.² As with Timothy, the only recorded occasion where Titus is expected to assume an authoritative manner is in his dealings with the false teachers whom he should rebuke

¹Moffatt's translation for ἐπιδιορθώση a Pastoral's hapax legomenon. Lock (PE, p. 129) paraphrases it: "see that things are got right under your guidance." Note the force of the middle voice with its personal application. Difficult to ascertain whether καί is employed epexegetically (hence, 'put things right namely, by appointing'), or, adjunctively (put right, and also appoint').

²Thus the disciple is to speak (λάλει, 2:1,15) to the πρεσβύτες (2:2; cf. I 5:1) and the πρεσβύτειδας (2:3-5; cf. I 5:2); to exhort (παρακάλει 2:6; cf. I 4:13; 5:1; 6:2; II 4:2) the νεωτέρος (2:6; cf., I 5:1) and the δοῦλοι (2:9; cf. I 6:1); remind (υπομίμησε 3:1; cf. II 2:14) the men of their obligations to the state; and to assert in confidence (διαβεβαίωσθαι 3:8; cf., I 1:17) that the believers should be actively engaged in personal witness.

severely (ἔλεγε...ἀποτόμως, 1:13). It is at once noticed that although each of the mentioned groups was similarly to be found in the Timothean instructions it is only in this short Epistle that their qualifications are mentioned in detail. When these requirements are compared with the qualifications outlined for the ministry, it is obvious that the writer is concerned ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημηῖται (2:5) and not with a manual of ecclesiastical order. The fullness of detail is especially significant for a young Church surrounded by such a low level of pagan morality as that found amongst the obstreperous Cretans. The members, as well as the ministers, must be taught to do their part.

Instructions Relating to the Ministry

The primitive nature of the Church organization on Crete¹ is reflected by the reference to only one order - the presbyter-bishops. The Epistle is completely free of any allusions to a 'ministry' of women, of 'deacons', or details of worship. In contrast with the Ephesian Church, where Timothy is expected to lead in the filling of any vacancies arising within the existing ministries, Titus is enjoined to inaugurate the ministry at Crete. As the relationship of presbyters and bishops has previously been discussed, the only question pertinent to the investigation at this time concerns the amount of authority which was invested in Titus. That Paul approved of the institution of elders, and laid down basic principles which were to be fulfilled is clear

¹For a contrast between the Cretan and Ephesian ministries, see, Lindsay, pp. 145f. Cf., Badcock, pp. 89f.

(1:5); but the position of Titus in the program is obscure. There are scholars who insist that Titus had been invested with Apostolic authority to ordain elders city by city (κατὰ πόλιν 1:5). Others contend that the authority of Titus consisted only of appointment, and not ordination; while still others would agree that Titus "is to see to it not so much that elders are appointed as that Paul's instructions in this respect are duly carried out."¹ Since the argument must ultimately be determined by the meaning and intent of καταστήσης (1:5) it might be well to examine the word more closely.

Καθίστημι has the root meaning of 'to set down', or 'to put down' a thing or a person. Thus, in the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants, the faithful was 'set' or 'placed' over the household (Mt 24:5; cf. 25:21). Similarly, Paul was 'brought down' to Athens (Acts 17:15); the tongue was 'set' on fire by Hell (James 3:6); and, by the obedience of Christ many are 'made' righteous (R 5:19). It is obvious, that no special sense of ordination by the imposition of hands is suggested by this word as is true of τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν (II 1:6). It is not the least interesting point that the only NT occasion where the word is employed ecclesiastically is in the Acts 6:3 where community choice is involved.² Furthermore, this verb must not be removed

¹E.F. Scott, PE, p. 153. For other positions, see, Simpson, p. 97; Lilley, pp. 155f; Guthrie, PE, p. 184; Barclay, PE, p. 247.

²Cf. χειροτονέω in Acts 14:23, but καθίστημι in Clem LXII in the description of the work of Apostolic disciples. See, W.J. Simpson, ("The Constitution of the Church in the NT.", New Commentary, ed C. Gore, London, 1934, pp. 390f) for discussion of the similarity of tradition to that recorded in the Pastorals. Yet, Plummer (pp. 217f), asserts that community election is "by implication entirely excluded"; while, Lock, (PE, p. 129), observes that community action is not excluded, but the change from the middle "points to the separate action of Titus."

from the phrase, ὡς ἐγώ σοι διαταξάμην , which follows.¹ Neither the verse, nor the Epistle, suggests whether these instructions involved ordination, appointment, or the guidance of community election. But what is evident, is that Titus had specific instructions from Paul as to how the elders were to be constituted; instructions which were now being supplemented by guidance regarding the qualifications of the men to be sought.

Finally, there are other noteworthy comparisons. At Ephesus, the Church ministry was sought after (I 3:1); not so on Crete. At Ephesus, the stress was made that the candidate must not be a neophyte,² and that there should be a probationary period (I 3:10). On Crete, however, the choice must be made from the recently converted. In both sets of instructions, the writer's insistence was upon character; that type of character which is manifest through the family relationship. It was obviously not the purpose of the author to increase official authority or alter existing structure, for the morals related were no more stringently required of the clergy than laity. The only purpose was to rectify false teaching, and counteract false teachers, by positive Christian living; by setting an example of healthy, useful, and charitable behaviour. Even the content of the teaching ministry is not discussed; the teachers are expected to teach by example.

¹So, Scott, PE, pp. 153f. Guthrie (PE, p. 184) observes that the use of ἐγώ is not because of the writer's egotism, but the "authoritative endorsement of the elder system."

²I 3:6 νεόφυτος , cf., φυτεύω I Cor 3:6-8, hence newly planted Christians.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE INSTRUCTIONS TO PAUL

There are many scholars who would, perhaps, grant the validity of the observations drawn in the preceding section; yet who are unable to believe that the Apostle Paul could have been the author of the material from which the conclusions were drawn. This is due, in part, to the aforementioned fact, that it is not the truth of the organization depicted within the Pastorals that is questioned - only the date. The assertion that the Epistles were not the product of Paul is of a twofold nature: that the organizational level as depicted is too advanced to be Pauline; and that the emphasis on organization is not in keeping with the Apostle. The subject must be examined; for if the available evidence supports this contention, the maintenance of their Pauline authorship would, of course, be untenable.

THE ADVANCED ECCLESIASTICAL ORDER

Examination of the Order Scripturally

In order to determine the merits of such a contention, it is mandatory that an investigation be made, if only briefly, of the Church order as reflected in other NT writings.

Acts. The Lucan narrative of the Early Church affords evidence of great variety in form of practice or government. Although all histories are necessarily incomplete, the early chapters depict the Jerusalem Church as being governed by the Apostles in consultation with the congregation (cf. 2;1,44;

4:32; 6:1-4). Poverty (6:1sq), and persecution (7-8), inevitably leading to the Church's expulsion from the synagogue, stimulated it to an early breadth of order. Furthermore, as Dobschutz has observed, the "Jewish Christians had both organization and ideal when they took up a decided position on the main principle, 'We Christians are the true Israel'."¹ Since the recognized form of government within the 'old Israel' was that of the presbyterate, the 'new Israel' adopted a similar order. Thus, the relief fund was despatched to the elders in Jerusalem (11:30); the Apostles and elders deliberated doctrine at the Jerusalem Conference (15); and Paul related God's blessings amongst the Gentiles to James and the elders (21:18). Chief men (ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς) were also recognized at this center of the new Israel; but singular authority, based on kinship to the Messianic line, was early invested in James.² It is therefore possible to find all three of the later orders reflected within the Jerusalem Church: at least the suggestion or the idea of the diaconate, the presbyterate, and monarchical episcopate.

The form of the Pauline Churches as reflected in Acts is also that of the Presbyterate. Ramsay has noted, that "in Luke's history we must regard the first case as intended to be typical of

¹Op. cit., p. 157; cf., James, p. 81.

²Cf., Streeter, pp. 72ff; Ehrhardt, The Apostolic Succession, pp. 22-27; Parry, p. lxv.

the rest."¹ One can assume, therefore, from Acts 14:23, that when a Church reached a certain size, it was normal procedure for Paul to institute local presbyters. Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (20:17-35) gives indication of the authority retained by the Apostle over this local ministry.² This speech is also of peculiar significance, because: it affords a glimpse of Ephesian organization near the close of Paul's lifetime; intimates the Apostle's concern for the Church upon the withdrawal of his influence; and, if the Pastorals are rejected, records the only extant remarks of this great missionary which were addressed primarily to those responsible for the maintenance of Church order.³ Since the presupposition of both the speech and the Timothean Epistles is that of Paul advising Church leaders at

¹ Χειροτονησάντες (14:23) must here be used in its original sense of election by the show of hands, or there would be no purpose in its use. Cf. Ramsay, Traveller, pp. 121f; Lindsay, p. 118; F.F. Bruce, Acts, p. 286. According to J. Knox (Early Church, p. 32), the elders so appointed would then be subject to Paul, even as Paul was to Jerusalem. For discussion of the Pauline form of government, see A.C. Headlam, (The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion, Bampton Lectures 1920, London, 1920) p. 65; and Michaelis, Alttestenamt, pp. 45f.

²In using the speech as evidence, it is unnecessary to contend that the speech is accurately reproduced in detail; for as a 'we' section, it must be Pauline either because of the reminiscence of Luke, or because of the known views of Paul. Even if a case could be established that the words were not from Paul, it is still certain that "they would not have appeared as the central point of emphasis in Paul's farewell address, unless the author of Acts had known that in after years this church had suffered, not only from heretical teaching, but also from the venality and domineering spirit of its officers." (Streeter, pp. 82f; cf. 105f).

³Streeter (ibid.) regards the passage as important because it shows "a growing desire on his (Paul's) part to enhance the prestige of and foster a sense of responsibility in, officers charged with the direction of the Church," Cf., Harnack, Luke the Physician, tran J.R. Wilkinson, London, 1907, pp. 138f.

Ephesus, a comparison should be valuable.¹

The chief anxiety motivating the speech arises from the knowledge that there would be an inevitable weakening of the Ephesian defenses when Paul is withdrawn from the scene; that motivating the Epistles is the recognition that the anxiety had proved a reality. The content of the speech is so divided as to find ready parallels within the Pastorals. There is first a recounting of the Apostle's three year ministry at Ephesus (18,19,31; I 1:3) and the testimonial that in spite of the trials (II 3:11) incurred he still taught (20; I 2:7; II 1:11) and testified of the need for repentance toward God, and faith toward Jesus Christ (21; II 2:8,9). The second division is that of prophecy (22-24). Paul realizes that bonds (II 1:8) and even death may await him, and yet his course (II 4:6-7) and received ministry (I 1:12) must be completed. He warns his hearers that wolves will enter amongst the flock (29) and that from within the fellowship, false teachers will arise (30; II 3:1-9). The third division, conveying most clearly that the institution of the pastoral ministry was backed by Apostolic authority, is that of exhortation. The presbyter-bishops (I 3:1-13) are expected to pay close attention (προσέχω) to their own personal lives (28,31) as well as to their task of shepherding the flock of God (I 3:1-13; 6:11). Furthermore, they are commended to the efficacy of the Word of God (32; II 3:14-16; I 4:6; 6:3); and also to follow Paul's example (υποδείκνυμι) regarding financial matters arising within the Church

¹R.R. Williams, (The Acts of the Apostles, London, 1953, p. 141), observes that the spirit of the passage is like that of the Pastorals. Cf., Parry, pp. lxxvif; and W.D. Chadwick, The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul, Edinburgh, 1907, pp. 195-216.

33-35; II 3:10; I 5:17-25). With a final appeal that the needs of the destitute be adequately met (I 5:1-16), the discourse is brought to a close. This comparison of pastoral guidance would suggest a verdict of dependence except for the ready alternative that the mind of Paul is common to both works. Whatever the decision, the Ephesian Church is seen to have apostolically influenced 'presbyter-bishops' within the lifetime of Paul.¹

The Accepted Pauline Epistles. Although it would appear from these writings that the earliest ecclesiastical stress was upon inspired spontaneity, this should not suggest that anarchy prevailed. In the fluid state of the Primitive Church, one would not necessarily expect to find any uniformity; yet from the first, outlines of order are discernible.

1 Thessalonians, perhaps the earliest extant source which deals with the ecclesiastical development of a Gentile Church, indicates that shortly after its foundation, the Church had leaders who were invested with recognized authority. Paul, in 5:12f, exhorts the Church to love and recognize as rulers (ἡγέομαι ; cf. Acts 14:12; 7:10; Heb 13; 7,17,24) the brethren whose work (ἔργον ; I 3:1) it was to labor (κοπιᾶω ; cf I 5:17; 1 C 16:16; Acts 20:35; R 16:6,12), and govern (προῖσθημι ; cf. I 3:4,5,12; R 12:8), and admonish (νοουθετέω ; cf. II 3:15; Acts 20:31). Whether at this early stage, those warranting esteem were official presbyters,² or merely representative of a work or activity,³ it is impossible

¹Cf. Moberly, pp. 141f; Michaelis, Alttestenamt, p. 57.

²So, Parry, p. lxix; Findlay ("Paul the Apostle", p. 727) suggests that Acts 14:23 gains support from this text.

³So, Harnack, "Origin", pp. 329f.

to determine from this text alone. If Acts 14:23 is permitted to reflect what was to be normal Pauline procedure, then it is quite possible that the men so addressed were being identified by descriptions of their service within the presbyterate. One thing is certain: that even within this earliest of writings there was a clear distinction between the teacher and the taught; between the ruler and the ruled.

1 Corinthians 12:28 is a difficult verse, fusing as it does both names of offices,¹ and descriptions of service. Following the listing of the charismatic triumvirate, the gifts of ἀντιλήψεις and κυβερνήσεις are mentioned. As both terms are hapax legomena their import can not be verified through cross reference. Yet, if the 'ministrations' has its correspondence in διακονία, and the 'governments' has one in προΐστημι, it would seem that the deacons and the episcopi of Philipians have their counterpart at Corinth.² The practical disorders which led Paul to promise fuller regulations to come (11:34) also forced him to emphasize obedience (ὀποτάσσω) to all who labored (συνεργέω) as well as to the house of Stephanus who ministered (διακονέω) amongst the saints (16:15-18). Constantly the plenary powers of Paul are to be found (cf. 4:17; 7:17; 14:37). Even though elders are not specifically mentioned, it is interesting to question who presided over the jurisdictional disputes suggested in chapter six; who wrote

¹Michaelis (Altestenamt, p. 95), suggests that the omission of such titles as 'deacons' and 'bishops' which are present in Phil 1:1, indicates that they could have appeared with different designations in varying locations. Yet, see Findlay ("Paul the Apostle", p. 727), who asserts that the silence indicates that there was no official order as yet.

²Cf., Streeter, pp. 78ff; Clarke, "The Origin of Episcopacy", p. 19; Parry, pp. lxixf; James, p. 87.

the letter which I Corinthians seems to be answering; and who determined the speech of chapter 14 as edifying or not. Surely, some one, or group, in agreement with the brethren, was commissioned with the fulfilment of the regulations as outlined by the Apostles.¹

While stressing the need for the recognition that all faculties or abilities are endowments to be used responsibly within the Body, Romans, 12:6-8 affords a glimpse into the Roman Church structure. Although there is no attempt to classify systematically distinct offices, the use of terms which have their direct counterparts within the recognized ministry is of interest. Whether the *διακονίαν, διδασκων, παρακαλῶν, and προϊστάμενος* of this text imply an established presbyterate,² or whether the Apostle "refrained from further definition in a case where he had no first-hand knowledge,"³ it is profitless to conjecture. It is certain, however, that an order of rulers, either voluntary, or appointed, existed alongside the Apostles. Further development of the ministry is to be found in 16:1 if Phoebe is to be regarded as a deaconess. Lindsay, in remarking on the allegation that the churches of Corinth and Rome were not properly organized because bishops,

¹The silence of Galatians on Church order is instructive in itself. On the basis of the S. Galatian Hypothesis, Acts 14:23 relates to the establishment of presbyters within the churches addressed in the Epistle. Furthermore, in view of the aforementioned discussion of the possibility of a paid order of teachers being intimated in 6:6, the Apostle's silence cannot be regarded as a true reflection of the existing order. Cf. Parry, p. lxix.

²Harnack ("Origin", pp. 329f), regarded the ministry as a voluntary discharge, and not an office. Cf. James, p. 85. Parry (p. lxxi), however, claims the text as a witness of the presbyterate as in the case of 1 Th 5:12. Nevertheless, the stress on the endowment is not one of any claim for pre-eminence; only responsibility (so, C.H. Dodd, Romans, MNTC, London, 1932, p. 195). This emphasis is completely in keeping both with Paul, and the writer of the Pastorals, in contradistinction to the stress of the later age.

³Clarke, "The Origin of the Episcopacy", p. 22.

presbyters and deacons are not mentioned, states:

then that means that a Christian community could be addressed as a Christian church, could be called 'Christ's body', could admit catechumens by the sacred door of baptism, could assemble together for public worship, could partake together of the Holy Supper, could exercise Christian discipline, and all this without office-bearers set apart for the purposes of the ministry in regular and ecclesiastical fashion.¹

Philippians is ecclesiastically significant from the opening verse. Whether the ἐπισκόποι and διακόνου addressed had as yet developed into clearly differentiated offices,² or are special designations of functions,³ or refer to governing and serving presbyters,⁴ is not clear. But it is evident that they are mentioned in a most unnatural way unless Paul "wished them to be recognized as persons of great importance in that Church."⁵ If the terms refer to functions, there would soon be the natural transition of the terms into the meaning of official rank. There are at least three other interesting intimations of order within this Epistle. The 'overseers' and the 'servers' were apparently responsible for the superintendence of the financial fellowship (1:5; 4:10-18) and λειτουργίας (2:30) which the Church afforded Paul. Furthermore, even though Paul was himself hoping to return to the Church quickly, he intended to send Timothy for the purpose of relating his desires to them (2:19-24; cf. I 1:3; 4:13). Finally, Epaphroditus, who is described as an ἀπόστολον and λειτουργόν, is being sent by Paul to

¹Op. cit., p. 136.

²Lietzmann (The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 190), regards the terms as "characteristic titles of these officers that became normative for the future."

³So, Hort, Christian Ecclesia, pp. 212f; James, pp. 90f; Harnack, "Origin", pp. 330f.

⁴So, Parry, p. lxxii; W. Milligan, p. 351; R.R. Williams, Authority in the Apostolic Age, London, 1950, p. 50.

⁵Streeter, p. 80.

the Philippians (2:25-30). Because of his work (ἔργον) for Christ, the Church was expected to receive him in the Lord, and to hold him in high esteem (ἐντίμους).

One last Pauline text is of interest to this investigation.¹ In Ephesians 4:11-12 a possible demarcation between the general and local ministries is disclosed:² apostles, prophets, and evangelists, on the one hand; and pastors (ποιμένας) and teachers (διδασκάλους) on the other. The expressed purpose of their ministries is for the complete preparation (καταρτισμόν) of the saints, and εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. It would appear that it is now the office that is being stressed, with its function being the necessary relation of the office to the

¹In Colossians, the following verses are of note: 1:2, faithful men (cf. II 2:2); 4:7f, Tychicus and Onesimus were sent by Paul to relate of Paul and to comfort the church (cf. I 1:3; Tit 1:5); and 4:17 cautions Archippus to guard the ministry received in the Lord and to fulfil it (cf. II 4:5). James 5 mentions the ministry of healing on the part of the presbyters. Hebrews exhorts the readers to remember (13:7), obey (13:17), and salute (13:24) them that rule over you (cf. I Th 5:13). Ehrhardt ("The Beginnings of Mon-Episcopacy", *CQR*, CXL (1945), 115) argues for mon-episcopacy from Rev 2:1sq. I Peter 5:1ff describes the function of the presbyters as ποιμάνετε (some ancient texts even include ἐπισκοποῦντες), and appeal for the subjection on the part of the readers to the elder (5:5). If Selwyn's (pp. 56-63) A.D. 62-63 date for the Epistle is accepted, the Petrine witness would indicate an early authority for the established presbyterate. (cf. Harnack, *Chronologie*, pp. 454, 718, who suggests A.D. 83-93, or maybe one or two decades earlier; hence A.D. 63-93). Yet Streeter (pp. 115ff) regards the Epistle as non-Petrine and dates it about A.D. 90. Goodspeed (*INT*, p. 269) contends that the Letter dates from the time of I Clement because of the similarity of stress on the dignity of the elder. It can be noted in passing that if I Pet 5:1 is difficult to conceive as Petrine, it is much more absurd to make a pseudo-author to have an Apostle so speak.

²Ephesians is here regarded as Pauline, for if it is not, "it is a re-writing of Colossians - of very early date, for it seems to be known to all the apostolic fathers - and is therefore evidence for the state of affairs in one of the Pauline Churches in Asia." (Streeter, pp. 80f).

corporate life of the Church.¹ This relationship of pastors (bishops? cf. Acts 20:2'; 1 Pet 5:1,2) and teachers, finds noteworthy comparison in the Pastorals (esp I 5:17).²

A summary of the ministry as disclosed in the Acts and accepted Pauline Epistles is, perhaps, called for at this point. Supreme authority was found wielded by the Apostles; with singular authority early invested in James at Jerusalem. As will be seen in detail later, the general ministry also included messengers or delegates, who were equipped with apostolic authority, prophets, teachers, and evangelists (Acts 21:8; II 4:5). On the local level, each Church disclosed some form of administrators, variously described as 'overseers', 'teachers', 'helpers', or 'shepherds'. This vague use of terms is not surprising when even the Apostolate could be alluded to as diaconate (1 C 3:5; Acts 1:25). It is possible that at first the authority was not invested in officials as such, but belonged automatically to those serving.³ Yet if Acts 14:23 is to be regarded as depicting the normal Pauline procedure of instituting presbyters in every city, then it may well be that the terms are descriptive of functions within the presbyterate. In this case, the προϊστάμενοι over the Thessalonian and Roman Churches were equivalent to the κυβερνήσεις among the Corinthians which equals the ἐπισκόποι and διακόνου of

¹Streeter (*ibid.*) referring to the text's use of 'shepherd' observes that "in the OT, more especially in the Prophets and Psalms, 'shepherds of Israel' is a standing equivalent for rulers - and the Christian Church regarded itself as the New Israel." Yet, see James (pp. 89f), who contends that the text emphasizes functions.

²Cf. Findlay, Ephesians, Exp Bible Series, 6th ed, London, 1904, pp. 238f; Parry, p. lxxii.

³So, Lindsay, pp. 112f; F.F. Bruce, Acts, p. 152.

the Philippian Christians which is the equivalent of the ποιμένας and διδασκάλους among the Ephesians which in turn is equivalent to πρεσβυτέρους of Acts 14:23 and the Pastorals.¹ Whether as offices or functions, teachers, evangelists, prophets, apostolic delegates, bishops, deacons, presbyters, monarchical authority, and possibly deaconesses, are all to be found within the life-time of the Apostle. It would appear, therefore, that the Pastorals disclose an advance, not of offices, but of the exposition of the qualifications of those offices already recognized within other writings.

Examination of the Order of Non-Canonical Sources

Clement of Rome.² In his defense of the presbyterate, at least three facts can be gleaned which are pertinent to this investigation.

(1) The nature and source of the ministry is based upon apostolic authority, and is defended both scripturally (XLIII) and historically (XLII). The direct succession was from God to Christ, Christ to the Apostles, and the Apostles to their Churches. The Apostles, and later the approved men (e.g. Timothy and Titus?), appointed (κατέστησαν; cf. Acts 6:3; Tit 1:5) the ministers in order to avoid strife (ἔρις).

¹So, Parry, pp. lxxiii-viii; Ramsay, Traveller, pp. 121f; Gore, The Church, p. 217, n 3; and R.R. Williams, Authority in The Apostolic Age, pp. 47-51.

²Clement's Letter to Corinth was an attempt to regulate that Church's schism which was caused by its rejection of certain presbyters (II.6; XLVII.6). For discussion of the Church-order in Clement, see, Bartlet, Church-Life and Church-Order During the First Four Centuries, ed C. Cadoux, Oxford, 1943, pp. 37-42; R.R. Williams, ibid., p. 69; Harnack, Constitution and Law, pp. 69-74; Turner, Studies in Early Church History, pp. 231ff; and Gore, The Church, pp. 282ff.

(2) Although there is debate regarding the inter-relationship of deacons, presbyters, and bishops, it is to be noted that the ministry is presented as one of long-standing tradition (XLII.5). Furthermore, it may well be that the supremacy of Clement himself, as evidenced by his authoritative tone, transcending that of a mere secretary, suggests that the "inner substance of episcopacy had an existence without a title."¹

(3) The sharp distinction between the clergy and laity is of special interest (XL.5). Although an element of authority still rests within the people (XVI.1; XLIV.3; LIV.2), the emphasis throughout is one of their complete submission.²

In contrast, Timothy and Titus, although backed with Apostolic authority, possess their own authority only because of the *χαρίσμα* of God (II 1:6). In addition, the general ministry appears so influential, and their local ministries so new, that sincere candidates were rare (I 3:1). In contradistinction to Clement's emphasis on obedience to the ministry to counteract schism, the Pastorals' is on the character of the minister to withstand faulty doctrine. The stress in Clement is that of clergy and laity; that of the Pastorals, the family. One point of positive interest: Clement does vindicate the peculiar position of Timothy and Titus, presupposed within their Epistles, as apostolically based. Since Clement wrote little more than thirty years after the death of Paul,

¹Moberly, pp. 184f. Cf. Dionysius (Eus. H.E. IV.xi) who makes Clement a bishop; Lietzmann, Beginnings, p. 256.

²Thus they are expected to be obedient to their rulers (I.3), submissive to the presbyters (LVII.1) and to bow their neck in obedience (LXIII.1).

there is no reason to doubt his statement.¹

Ignatius. The existence of a Church without the authoritative hierarchical triad is unthinkable to this Bishop of Antioch.² The bishop presided in the place of God, the presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles, and the deacons as the servants of the bishop (Magn VI.1; II.1; Phil IV.1; VII.1; Smyr XII.2). The supreme authority is essentially monarchical; an authority which is now defended theologically, and not apostolically (Tral III.1; II.1; Mag VII.1; XIII.1). With the bishop as a type of God, the laity are expected: to be in subjection (ὑποτάσσω) to him (Poly VI.1; Tral XLIII; Mag VI.1 et al); to follow him as a type of Christ (Smyr VIII.1); honor (Smyr IX.1) and refresh him (Tral XII); and literally to regard him as Christ (Eph VI.1). Language could scarcely be stronger in this cleavage between the clergy and laity. Yet even more significant are the sacerdotal tendencies which resulted from such authority. Marriage (Poly V.2), baptism (Poly VI.2; Smyr VIII.1) the eucharist (Smyr VIII.1; Phil IV.1), and the Church (Tral III.1; VII.1; Eph V.2) or its services (Smyr VIII.1), are impossible apart from the presence of the Bishop. Sanctification (ἁγιασθέντες) is now made possible through subjection to the clergy (Eph II.2); while martyrdom is viewed as a means of inheriting salvation (Eph XVIII). The differences between these Epistles and the Pastorals are recognizably so vast

¹Cf. Streeter (pp. 218f), who states that "what Clement does is, not to invent facts, but to harden a practice really primitive into the basis of a theory of authority." For additional comparison see Kidd, pp. 126-136.

²For discussion of the Ignatian order, see: H.P.V. Nunn, "The Epistles of Ignatius"; G. Simcox, "The Origin of the Christian Ministry", Exp, 3rd series, VI (1887), 198f; Westcott, Bible, p. 78; Bartlet, Church-Life, pp. 46-49; Harnack, Constitution, pp. 83-105; Gore, The Church, pp. 266ff; Shaw, p. 468.

that even those who reject the latter's authenticity agree "that the Ignatian letters from the standpoint of Church orders constitute a formidable objection to dating the Pastorals as late as 150."¹ Since the Pastorals have been presumed, by many, to be of a second century origin, it must then be declared that "no entirely satisfactory solution of this problem is yet available."²

"The most attractive suggestion" made so far in the attempt to harmonize the gap between the Ignatian and Pastoral Epistles, and yet retain a second century date for the latter, is that made by W. Bauer.³ The Ignatian Epistles, he asserts, do not really reveal a monarchical episcopate, but rather disclose a frantic leader of a minority group and his attempt to bring the majority into subservience. Therefore, he suggests, the description given is not one of an established order, but a new innovation which Ignatius is desperately seeking to have acknowledged. It naturally follows, then, that any differences between the two sets of Epistles, can be explained by the purpose of the writers: Ignatius to gain victory for the monarchical episcopate; 'Paul' to counteract the heretical sects encroaching into the already established hierarchy.

Yet it is precisely the purpose which demands that the hierarchy is not novel. The zeal of Ignatius, as a majority of scholars will agree,⁴ is due to his desire to preserve a unified

¹Gealy, pp. 347f. Yet Goodspeed (INT, p. 337), has asserted that the threefold ministry did not become standard until about A.D. 180.

²Gealy, ibid.

³Ibid., Cf. Streeter, p. 155.

⁴So, Plummer, p. 114; Moberly, p. 193; Ehrhardt, "The Beginnings of Mon-Episcopacy, p. 115; Harrison, Polycarp, p. 262; Bernard, PE, pp. lixf.

and peaceful fellowship through a strong organization.¹ The episcopate is conceived as the only bond of unity "between local churches and in each local church itself against the disruptive tendencies of those who claim to be pneumatikoi."² Novelty will not explain the mentioning of specific Bishops by name;³ nor the episcopate's being taken for granted as existing everywhere (Eph III.2).⁴ Although the full antecedents of monarchical episcopacy are beclouded, the development reached in Ignatius must certainly have had its genesis within the preceding century.⁵

¹A similar desire earlier expressed by Paul, and appealed to on the basis of gifts of ministering (cf. R 12; I C; 2 C 10-13; Gal 5:20ff; Phil 1:27; 2:2; 3:2ff; 4:2; 1 Th 5:12f).

²W.L. Knox, The Acts of The Apostles, Cambridge, 1948, pp.98f.

³E.g. Onesimus in Eph I.3. Cf. Smyr XII.2; Tral I; Mag II.1.

⁴Since there is no mention of any organization at all, the absence of any reference to a Bishop in the Roman Epistle cannot be inserted as proof that the Episcopate had not as yet ascended to prominence in the Imperial City. In view of the Clementine Letter the Church of Rome must be recognized as having a definite Church order. Furthermore, it must be acknowledged that the purpose of the Roman Epistle is to request that they make no interference in his bid for martyrdom, and not to appeal for unity through organization. Cf., Latourette, p. 117; Moberly, pp. 195f.

⁵So, Easton, p. 178. The organizational stress in Polycarp is closely akin to that of Ignatius. Subjection of the members is expected to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ (V.3). Instructions are given to widows (IV.3) and to the virgins (V.3). Theologically there is an emphasis against docetic tendencies. The mention of bishops in Phil I:1, and their omission in this Letter, discloses the precariousness of the argument from silence. For discussion, see: Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 371f; Harrison, Polycarp, esp 283f; James, pp. 63ff; Westcott, Bible, pp. 79f. The Didache discloses a local ministry of bishops and deacons, who are elected for the purpose of conducting worship (XV.1,2). Over them are apostles (missionaries), prophets, and teachers. It is of interest as a manual of order regarding baptism, fasting, prayers, hospitality, and benevolence - injunctions conspicuously absent from the Pastorals. Specific prayers are to be uttered at the observance of the eucharist (IX-X). The power of the itinerant ministry is to be noted in its superseding the local officers. Although it would appear that such ascendancy of power is only to be attributed to the post-apostolic time, or the transition between apostolic personal rule and the mon-episcopacy,

Examination of Specific Arguments Against an Apostolic Date

If, then, it can be granted that there is a vast difference between the Ignatian and Pastoral Epistles, as well as unmistakable variations between the Pastorals and the Clementine Letter, on what basis is the organization still supposed to reflect that of the second century? Frequently it is asserted that the Pastorals represent a "stage of development beyond that for which we have any evidence in the lifetime of Paul," without any further discussion of the question.¹ When the objections are mentioned, however, they are found to be at least three in number.

a. Reputable scholars have declared that since the Pastorals are of the second century, and since that era was characterized by a clearly defined system of ecclesiastical order, then it naturally follows that the Pastorals must be interpreted in that light. In order to do this, all references in these Epistles to

Audet (La Didachè Instructions Des Apôtres, Paris, 1958, pp. 186-219) has recently suggested an A.D. 50-70 date for the writing. This is of paramount interest for any comparison of early Church-order. For evaluation of dating, see: Lindsay, pp. 171f n 2; Shaw, p. 460 (A.D. 100); Schaff, The Oldest Church Manual, Edinburgh, 1885, pp. 119ff (A.D. 90-100); yet, see more recent estimates of A.D. 120-30, so, Burkitt, "Barnabas and the Didache", JTS, XXXIII (1932), 25ff; Cabaniss, "Liturgy-Making Factors in Primitive Christianity", JR, XXIII (Jan 1943), 56f; and, J.A. Robinson, Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache, London, 1920. Hermas mentions deacons (Sim IX.26), bishops (Sim IX.27), teachers (Vis III.5,9), presiding presbyters (Vis II.4), and the Clementine duty to send the copy to other cities (Vis II.4). For date of about A.D. 100, see Goodspeed, INT, p. 265. If the Pastorals are taken at their face value, then a distinct gulf must be observed between the organizations reflected and compared.

¹E.g. Harrison (PPE, p. 7) whose only allusion to order is that "it may be accurately defined as more advanced than the state of things revealed in the Roman Clement, but less so than in the Ignatian Epistles"; and Sparks (Formation of the NT, p. 76) who observed that "the stage of ecclesiastical organization depicted is late."

organization must be regarded as "designedly ambiguous,"¹ and must disclose more "than the texts themselves reveal."² The Pastoral Epistles may well be of a second century origin, and therefore may well reflect the organization of that time; but is it proper historical investigative procedure to prejudge the Letters and then force the language to reveal more than that which the writer intended? Is it not a more normal process of investigation to inquire whether the organization as depicted by the author could not have existed as presupposed? When viewed from the second century the emphasis on the youthfulness of Timothy "may well be a way of saying that second-century ministers belong to a later generation than that of Paul."³ Yet, when viewed from the first century, the emphasis may have been because Timothy actually was young for his position; even as Ignatius had to exhort the Magnesians to reverence their leader in spite of his youth (III.1). When viewed from the second century the functions of Timothy and Titus were historically those of the bishops; but the functions were also historically those executed by apostolic delegates in the previous century (1 C 4:17; 16:10f; 2 C 8:6; 1 Th 3:6).

Although the status of Timothy and Titus may well have approached that of a monarchical bishop, it would seem that for the following reasons, it is best interpreted as that of apostolic delegate: (1) the word 'bishop' was never employed as the exclusive title of an individual; (2) they are represented not as being

¹Streeter, pp. 109-115. Cf. Carpenter, p. 150; Moffatt, HNT, pp. 556f; Von Soden, pp. 316f.

²Gealy, p. 347.

³Ibid.

but instituting or fulfilling the complement of bishops; (3) the offices were temporary, not permanent, and explainable by Paul's concern for his churches;¹ (4) their position was the result of an inward charism; and not outward recognition; (5) their commission consisted only of the transmission of Paul's instructions; (6) their discharge of these instructions was to avoid any autocratic arrogance; and (7) rather than depicting the 'ideal' bishop,² Timothy would seemingly have liked to flee from his position. Therefore, merely because there are to be found some points of analogy with later conceptions, it is by no means essential that the Pastorals' organization must be interpreted in that light.

b. The second objection is expressed by Easton when he states that "the development of the elder-system in the apostolic age proper would be just about inconceivable."³ Easton's definition of 'elders' is that they were "guardians and interpreters of the Tradition"; the fulfilment of which would be impossible until a Tradition had been established.⁴ But, assuming that the Christian conception of the presbytery was no different from that of Judaism, it does not necessarily follow that such elders did not exist within the apostolic era. As suggested in chapter five, it is quite probable that some attempt was made both to establish and to guard the Christian tradition even in Paul's day (cf. 2 Th 2:15; 1 C 11:2).

¹So, Lightfoot, Dissertations, pp. 157f; Zahn, INT, II, 89ff. Findlay, "PE", p. 400; and Burn, "PE", p. 577.

²So, Streeter, pp. 112f. Yet Scott (PE, pp. xxviiiif) observes that if Timothy and Titus were typical bishops, "the word would not have been used so indiscriminately to denote ordinary elders." Cf. Knowling, Testimony, pp. 143f.

³PE, p. 225.

⁴Ibid. Yet see the discussion of Guthrie (PE, pp. 28f) who regards Easton's definition of 'elder' as entirely too rigid.

It seems that one of the weaknesses of the Form-Geschichte School, is that it fails "to recognize the place of guarded tradition in the primitive church and tends to regard all tradition as floating and unfixed."¹

It is to be noted, further, that Easton must regard as anachronisms the statement that Paul and Barnabas "appointed elders in every Church" (Acts 14:23) and the technical title of elders in Acts 20:17.² But even if Luke³ had been so guilty, it is still a recognition that the presbyterial system thus reflected existed at the time of writing. Harnack has presented a strong case for a sixth decade writing of Acts.⁴ Yet even if the more commonly accepted later dating is demanded, the organizational level must surely disclose that of the Pauline era rather than a recent innovation.⁵ No one would contend that the order regarded as an 'anachronism' could not have existed prior to the author's literary offense.

c. The sub-Pauline atmosphere is further felt to be seen in the details of the ecclesiastical structure. Moffatt suggests

¹Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 23f. Cf. Phillips, pp. 47f, 65; Moffatt, Thrill, pp. 83, 87.

²PE, p. 266. Cf. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, MNTC, London, 1931, pp. 51f.

³Lucan authorship is generally accepted to-day. See W.L. Knox (The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 2-15), who refutes A.C. Clark, and his doubts of Lucan authorship because of the variation of particles and the like.

⁴See, The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels (pp. 90-135) where he sets forth the result of his own "slow evolution of more than fifteen years" from his view of Acts as a second century document to his present view of a A.D. 60 dating. Cf. F.F. Bruce, Acts, pp. 10-14, who contends with Goodspeed, INT, pp. 191-7, and his dating of A.D. 90.

⁵Clarke ("The Origins of Episcopacy", pp. 8f), although dating Acts about A.D. 80, asserts that the organizational level must depict that of A.D. 60-70.

that the ethical standpoint of the forbidding of second marriages for the widows, bishops, and deacons, is not only unPauline, but is "quite in keeping with sub-apostolic practice"¹ (I 3:2; 5:9; Tit 1:6). The application of a simple rule of Greek syntax discloses that the "husband of one wife" neither bars unmarried men from office, nor reflects an antipathy for digamy. 'Husband' and 'wife' are both anarthrous. That means that quality or character is being stressed and not status. Thus, the syntax is in agreement with the context in which personal qualities are under discussion. It is not that they must be married, or that they must be married only once; but that if they are married, they must be of such a character that they will have only one wife. This interpretation is substantiated by the instructions to widows which regard digamy as preferable to continued widowhood (I 4:14f)² Actually, the qualities, rather than reflecting a post Apostolic atmosphere, are an indication of primitive church structure. If these Epistles were written in the second century one would have expected a fully elaborated cultus on the authority of the bishop, rather than practical guidance concerning the moral qualities of the ministry. It is to be further noted, that these morals are of no more stringent character for the clergy than the laity. The later generation's stress on clerical celibacy is conspicuously absent.³

¹INT, pp. 410f. Cf. Baur, p. 103.

²Farrar (Paul, p. 653) and Reuss (pp. 128f) stated that the passage excludes a second marriage. Yet, see, Easton, PE, pp. 212f, and Scott, PE, pp. 31f. For discussion of the marriage question of the NT, see, Clemen, pp. 54f.

³So, Hort, Christian Ecclesia, pp. 199-202; Schlatter, NT Period, pp. 226f; Zahn, INT, II, 95f; and Ramsay, Exp, 7th series, VIII, 347-57, 408-12.

Summary of Specific Arguments for Apostolic Dating

Since most of the following points have already been examined, there is need only to present them in summary fashion. The arguments are not of equal merit, but collectively they present a strong basis for the ecclesiastical origin being within the apostolic age. To be sure, these points can be attributed to the imitator's literary skill in depicting the organization of Paul's day. Yet if this were the case, the product would scarcely have met the problems of his own day, and would thus reopen the question of the purpose of writing.¹

a. There is no portion of the organization as reflected in the Pastoral Epistles which does not have its parallel, expressed or implied, in the other NT writings.² The only difference appearing to exist is one of emphasis. As the order depicted is prior to the introduction of self-government, a date later than A.D. 80-85 is questionable.³

¹Zahn, *ibid.*, pp. 93: "How could a pseudo-Paul, writing in the year 100 or 160 with a view to exerting some influence upon the system of Church organization in his time, ignore so completely the Church life which he observed about him, and present Paul and his helpers so entirely in the dress and language of 50-70 in all that affected the essential forms of Church organization? The aim on the forger's part in this way to avoid all tell-tale anachronisms would directly contradict his other purpose, namely, in Paul's name to influence the Church of his own time."

²So, Parry, pp. lxxiiif. Sedgwick, p. 230: "if the Epistles were not otherwise suspected, they would be evidence that the state of things referred to did exist in Paul's time. To argue from spuriousness to non-credibility, and from non-credibility to spuriousness, is queer logic."

³So, Carrington, The Early Christian Church, pp. 256f, 272. Harnack ("Origin", p. 321) cautions that "many errors in investigations in the department of church history arise from identifying the time of the origin of an institution with the time at which we happen to come across it."

b. The fluid state of the Church structure is markedly different from that found within the Ignatian era. This is manifested by the plurality of presbyters; and the equality of position between the presbyters and bishops. The omission of the deacons from the Cretan Epistle, although quite natural from its presupposition of writing, is unintelligible for a second century imitator writing to meet the needs of his day. The Letters themselves were necessitated because there was not as yet a definite and well-defined order.¹

c. The total lack of exalted pretensions is without parallel in the second century hierarchical authoritarianism. There is no mention of subjection to, or status of, the ministry; only a stress upon the moral qualities to be found in both clergy and laity. Spiritual vitality, through the charismatic gifts, and not ritual, is the emphasis.

d. There is, finally, a complete lack of the later sacerdotalism. The worship service reflects the immature state of the Corinthians where the lack of ecclesiastical order led to the desecration of services. Teaching had, as yet, not been brought under autocratic control; women remained to be curbed. It is to be noted that this feminism was a significant feature of Asian Christianity long after the problem was settled in Rome.²

¹So, M. Dods, p. 176; B. Weiss, INT, pp. 402-9; Turner, The Study of the NT, pp. 20f; and Clogg, p. 118.

²Cf. Goodspeed, INT, pp. 342f.

THE UNPAULINE STRESS ON ORGANIZATION

For many scholars, the real difficulty of believing that Paul was the author of the organizational features of these Epistles is not that they imply a state of development impossible in Paul's lifetime, but that their spirit is contrary to the accepted concept of Paul. Or, in the words of Von Soden: "the idea of a rigid ecclesiastical organization is absolutely foreign to St. Paul; he builds not upon Church offices but upon the Spirit."¹ This sentiment is based upon Baur's assumption that the Pauline Hauptbriefe supply the criteria for any judgment of Paul. Since those Epistles do not reflect any extensive Pauline interest in organization, it follows that the Apostle was not concerned with such matters. This is an important issue; for if this interest in Church order is shown to be contrary to Paul's mind, then he can not be regarded as the author. Although over-lapping, the arguments can be examined under the following divisions.

Pauline Missionary Methods

Dibelius has asserted that the belief in the imminent return of Christ determined Paul's missionary methods. Time was short, and therefore his one passionate concern was to preach the Gospel; "he did not spend his time on baptising, or, in the main, on what we call organisation."² This is certainly an accurate picture of Paul's earlier lifetime as revealed in his own writings (cf. 1 Th 4:15; 1 C 15:51f). Yet there are indications, apart from the

¹Op. cit., pp. 310f.

²Paul, pp. 68f.

Pastorals, that as the hope of an early Parousia subsided, and with the realization of his own approaching end, Paul took a previously unparalleled interest in organization (cf. Acts 20:17-38). As Lock has observed, it is difficult for us to realize the effect which was produced upon the Apostles "when they first faced the probability that the Lord would not return in their lifetime, and that they must make provision for the Churches when they themselves were gone."¹ At the close of the second chapter of this present investigation, an attempt was made to show that the whole Paul was many-sided; that he was adaptable to the multiple phases through which the Church unfolded. The thought was also expressed that each extant Epistle brought into relief a totally new quality of the Apostle's disposition, character, and concept; without which one's conception of Paul would be seriously impoverished. It is therefore important to ask whether there would really be anything surprising in the Apostle, if he had taken measures to insure good order that the Gospel might continue to be preached after his departure.

Pauline Authority

Another objection which has been raised is that Paul "never claims for himself such a position of authority as do these epistles."² But surely Paul is recognized today as the "Apostle

¹St. Paul the Master-Builder, 4th ed, London, 1927, pp. 34ff. Cf. Simpson, p. 49; Gore, The Church, pp. 218f.

²Von Soden, pp. 310f.

of Subordination no less than the Apostle of Christian freedom."¹ Although always operating within the recognized freedom of the congregation, Paul nevertheless exercised authority and demanded complete loyalty. Or, as Lindsay has remarked: "the Apostle acted like a wise father, who encourages every appearance of independent and responsible action, but at the same time carefully guides it into the proper channels."² This is substantiated through a study of his First Epistle to the Corinthians. In it, his apostleship, with all of its privileges, is defended (1:1, 17; 3:6; 4:1,15: cf. I 1:1,13; 2:7); there is a delegation of authority (4:17; cf. I 1:3; Tit 1:5); an authoritarian tone is adopted (7:17; 9:17; cf 1:18; 5:21; 6:13); an assumption of the power of a disciplinarian (4:21; 5:5ff; cf. I 1:20); a commendation for holding to the παραδόσεις which he had delivered (11:2; cf. I 6:20); and, a promise to convey fuller organizational details in the future (11:34; cf. I 3:14). Paul continually pre-empted the power to guide and to expect fulfilment; he was always aware that his own life was to be copied (1 C 4:16; 10:11; cf. II 3:10). The natural anxiety for the well-being of the Church, and for the faithful discharge of duties by young Timothy, would lead to an inevitable increase in such emphasis.

¹Lock, PE, p. xxvii. J. Knox (Early Church, p. 90) observes that "for all his reliance on the Spirit, Paul clearly saw the part discipline must have in preserving the unity of the congregation."

²Op. cit., p. 148. Cf. J. Knox, ibid., pp. 92-7.

Pauline Perspective

By far the most frequently expressed objection is, in the words of Harrison, that "the whole stress and emphasis laid on matters of Church policy, is foreign to all that we otherwise know of Paul's ideas on such matters."¹ Although it is recognized that the Apostle had occasionally dealt with Church order, it is felt that he was never occupied with the questions of ecclesiastical arrangement as such. Meinertz has made the observation that the reason for the silence is because an organization can only be introduced after Christianity had taken some hold.² Thus in the early years the administration of the particular community remained in the greatest measure upon the Apostle himself, and the local organization developed very slowly. As, however, the extant Pauline letters were written only a few years after the foundation of the communities concerned, and since Acts was only concerned with the time of the great missionary journeys before the imprisonment, it is easily understood why only traces of a Church order are to be found. Actually, it is to be questioned whether the Epistles accorded to Paul are as antithetical as commonly assumed. The earlier Epistles of Paul disclose the organization as viewed from the outside; the later, from the inside. The earlier Letters reveal the Apostle as encouraging the Churches to spontaneous, yet responsible action; the later, show his missionary apprentices how carefully Paul was accustomed to guide

¹PPE, p. 7. Cf. Peake, p. 65; McNeile-Williams, pp. 194f.

²Op. cit., pp. 47-50.

the Church's action.¹ Paul was more than an evangelist; he was first and foremost a missionary. As the churches developed, Paul found himself increasingly concerned with the pastoral and administrative functions of the missionary. It was in this rôle that the one who is generally accorded the beginnings of the doctrinal formulation of the Church became also its ecclesiastical architect as well.² To achieve a complete picture of this side of Paul's activity, one must needs incorporate the work of Luke. It is impossible to gain an indefectible perspective from the Apostle's Epistles alone; for as Harnack has accurately observed:

All attempts in this direction have led to productions which true historians have ignored. For these the portrait given in the Acts of the Apostles has always remained a concurring factor, because the abundance of actual fact which is therein afforded still makes it possible to pass behind the external action to the inward motive.³

Thus, the historical picture of the Apostle's missionary endeavor is out of focus unless the perspective includes such passages as Acts 14:23 and 20:17-28 where Paul both instituted the local ministry and also gave it specific instructions. If such texts as Col 4:17 and 1 Th 3:12 were expanded, the result might well be akin to the Pastorals.

To achieve a complete picture of Paul it is also mandatory to note that each Epistle is marked by its own peculiar subject matter

¹Lindsay, pp. 141f: "the more I study these Pastoral Epistles the more evident it becomes to me that they are just what every experienced missionary has to impart to a younger and less experienced colleague when he warns him about the difficulties that he must face and the tasks, often unexpected, he will find confronting him."

²Cf. Streeter, p. 70; J. Knox, Chapters, pp. 102-7; Henshaw, p. 203; White, pp. 62f. Lock (Builder, pp. 122ff) refers to the "constructive genius of St. Paul."

³Luke the Physician, pp. 138f.

as the Apostle attempts to meet specific needs. If peculiarity of subject were to eliminate an Epistle, then Colossians must be rejected for its doctrine of Christ (a subject only implied in earlier writings), along with Ephesians, for its doctrine of the Church.¹ It must be remembered that the Pastorals do not approach the subject of Church order philosophically, but in direct relation to the concrete need for doctrinal and organizational authority. Just as the need at Colossae was a comprehensive refutation of theoretical gnosticism; the need of Timothy and Titus was knowledge regarding practical superintendence of their respective charges. Under the circumstances, it would have been valueless to have reversed the contents. The doctrinal formulation had been established; the need of the day was a plan to unite isolated individuals and communities into a comprehensive fellowship pledged to a systematic action against heretical tendencies. Even as practical disorders had earlier led the missionary-Apostle to stress a need for discipline (cf. 1 C 16:15); the state of affairs in the sixth decade called for healthy lives and maintenance of strong organization. Latourette has succinctly noted that "while the faith was spreading and winning the population, the organization of the Church and the formulation of the intellectual statements of the faith were proceeding. Here were parallel, reciprocally interacting movements."² The living picture of the Apostle must portray him as one who could rise to these exigencies of the

¹So, Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 224-233; Shaw, p. 463; Gore, The Church, p. 219.

²Op. cit., p. 112.

hour.

Scholars have also expressed the view that the Pastorals reflect an era of consolidation in contradistinction to the creative period of the Apostles.¹ Therefore, since the same contrast can be seen when the second century and the Apostolic periods are compared, it naturally follows that the Pastorals' stress on consolidation is unPauline. But does it? It was inevitable that the original enthusiasm would wane; the state of inspired spontaneity could not last. The only question is whether the transition to an organized state would come within the lifetime of the Apostles or not. It must be remembered that this question is concerned with communities which were alive with active and vital enthusiasm; and were not afflicted with the tradition of minimum living as characterizing the Church of today. It is this enthusiasm which produces rapid changes within the early and formative periods of religious movements.² In the more than thirty years since the crucifixion, the Church had grown up into a visible institution with established office-bearers; important doctrines had been formulated and vindicated. How long is it expected that she should also go on without taking steps to consolidate such momentous

¹Cf. H.A.A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, London, 1919, pp. 234f; A.B. MacDonald, Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, 1934, pp. 68ff.

²Lock (Builder, pp. 122ff) asserts that the "tendency of the Christian life to pass from enthusiastic impulse into regulated and disciplined movement" was inevitable. Cf. Simpson, p. 10. In this connection, Streeter (p. 70) has given a noteworthy definition of organization: "The reaction of the living organism to a changing environment." Cf. Scott, The NT Today, New York, 1921, pp. 42ff; Moffatt, Approach to the NT, pp. 25ff, 43, 50, 79f; and Lindsay, pp. 149f.

gains.¹ Surely the decision would have originated with the first generation, rather than being delayed some 100 years. Whenever society unites, a method of conducting business will soon follow. Paul had earlier shown how the liberty of the free assemblies had led to license (1 C 12). In order for freedom to exist, it had to be placed within a framework; freedom must be without unrestrictive individualism. As the services had become an arena of logomachies, resulting only in strife and questioning, regulations as to the proper use of this freedom were inevitable. In a sense, it was the Church and not the Apostle which had changed.

Conclusion

T.W. Manson has observed that the Church has a twofold task: the apostolic, as it presents the Gospel to those outside; and

¹There are many reasons why the Church would rapidly develop in organization. The intrusion of events, e.g. poverty and persecution, has been suggested by many scholars. Cf. J.W. Falconer, pp. 81f; Lietzmann, Beginnings, p. 190; Harnack, Expansion, II 46, 61; Moffatt, HNT, p. 66; and S.C. Gayford, "Church", HDB, I, 431. Ramsay (Church in the Roman Empire, pp. 361-5, 172) discusses the influence of the state on Church-order; while Lindsay (p. 127) stresses the place of confraternities, and the knowledge of converts from these societies. Findlay ("The Apostle Paul", pp. 713f) postulates that the Roman imprisonment would have stimulated Paul's thoughts along Roman organizational methods. Recently, noteworthy parallels have been drawn between the Early Church organization, and that reflected in the Qumran texts. Jeremias, "The Qumran Texts and the NT", ET, LXX (Dec 1958), pp. 68f) regards it as an interesting suggestion that "there were some Essene priests who thereafter played a part in the shaping of the outward organization of the Early Church." For comparison of organization, see S.E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts", ZATW, LXVI (1954), 106-20; M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, London, 1956, p. 332; F.M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, London, 1958, pp. 173-7; and Reicke, "The Constitution of the Primitive Church".

and the pastoral, as it builds up the members in effective living. Manson goes on to maintain that although in some cases the one aspect is more prominent than the other, they can not be separated; "they are two aspects of a single life."¹ This dual ministry summarizes the content of the Pastorals. It is the writer's contention that the Gospel cannot be preached to those outside unless the members reflect well-disciplined lives in their internal relations. It has been shown that from the beginning, in order to facilitate this task, the Church reflected a tendency to blend the spiritual gift with an office; to the dispensation of solemn duties which are really laid by God upon every man. The question of when the transition took place, from a relative spontaneity of action to the consolidation disclosed within the Pastorals, is complicated by the lack of definite knowledge of early Church history. The degree of this consolidation must not be over-emphasized. The alleged advanced organization actually requires no ministry of women, and the distinct possibility of a threefold differentiation of an undifferentiated ministry of men. Timothy's relation to this ministry, in contradistinction to that of the later monarchical bishop, is one of teaching, recital of instructions, and arbitrating matters of discipline - in perfect decorum, humility, and recognition of the family relationship. If it is determined that this state of affairs could not have taken place until some 75 or 100 years after the birth of the Church, then the Pastorals are not apostolic, and fit within the developing framework at that later time. But

¹The Church's Ministry, see p. 259.

the scholar is then confronted with the subjective task of searching for a more advanced order within the Pastorals than is actually present, in order that the organization may conform to the known order of the second century. If, on the other hand, it can be granted that the withholding of the Parousia and the impending death of the Apostles would have hastened this transition, then these Epistles must be placed within the framework of the apostolic Church order. It would appear that the more closely the Pastorals are studied in the context of the NT and apart from the connotations of later ecclesiasticism, the more distinct is the conclusion to be drawn that they are Pauline in spirit and in level. This is not to infer that the organizational level of these Epistles cannot be viewed otherwise; but the conclusion seems justified that the order can be unconditionally accepted as being in keeping with the historical framework pre-supposed.

CHAPTER V

RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE

The title of this final chapter was chosen deliberately to exclude any suggestion that a formal systematic theology could be extracted from the Pastorals. The expressed purpose of the Epistles' author is the ordering of the existing Church in its inner structure, and in its struggle against the sectarian. Doctrinal or theological edification lay outside his scope. Yet in the fulfilment of his purpose, the author's polemic often took the shape of a formalized religious expression from which a glimpse of his theology may be examined. It is the purpose of the first section of this chapter to ascertain whether these formalizations could reasonably be expected within the Apostolic age; whether Paul would be likely to have included them in his writings; and whether the theology involved is in keeping with the Apostle's teaching. The second section is devoted to the examination of the False Religionists; to attempt their identification; and to investigate the method incorporated by the author in their refutation.

FORMALIZED RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION

PAUL AND FORMALIZED RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION

Scholars, normally at variance with one another, find themselves in agreement in the recognition of what may be designated

a liturgical formalization in the Pastorals. The presence of stereotyped words and phrases, and glimpses of liturgical formulae, make such a determination inevitable. Yet it is in the evaluation of this apparently crystallized tradition that agreement terminates. To Loisy, this fixation of form prohibits any maintenance of Pauline authorship;¹ while Goodspeed, concurring, observes that Paul was an "inspirer, a prophet"; but the writer of the Pastorals is only an "organizer, a conserver of the values achieved by the prophet."² Other scholars, however, regard the change to a stereotyped vocabulary as due to Paul's concern for conservation with the inevitable death approaching to snuff out his personal guidance;³ or, to the natural progression necessitated by the transference from the battle for the vindication of the gospel to the established situation reflected.⁴ At what period, therefore, does the question of 'guarded tradition' become a factor in the early church? When would fragments of primitive hymns, ὁμολογία, and the like, find their way into Paul's literary habits?

¹Op. cit., p. 274.

²INT, p. 335. Cf., E.F. Scott, PE, p. xxv; Sabatier, pp. 263f; and J. Denny, p. 202.

³So, James, pp. 116ff. Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, p. 410) classifies Eph 5:14 as the transition which prepares the way for the phenomena of the Pastorals. Hillard (p. xxix) regards it as inevitable "that a man who has to preach and teach the same thing over and over again, especially if it is a new truth to the world, develops a phraseology of his own which his followers come to recognize."

⁴So, Godet, "The PE, or the Closing Labours of the Apostle Paul", Exp, 3rd series, VII (1888), 55; Knowling, Testimony, pp. 146f.

Recent research by Carrington and Selwyn¹ has afforded several reasons why there may need to be a re-evaluation of any anti-Pauline charge regarding the formalized character of the Pastorals. Through an examination of the hortatory (paraenesis) and liturgical sections of the NT Epistles, they perceived a common pattern of instruction. These sections were shown to be aphoristic in character in contradistinction to the long, sustained sentences of the main body of the Epistles. This factor, together with the common relationship of materials disclosed in NT writings, its non-relevancy to the Church addressed, as well as any vital connection to the Pauline ethic, has led to the conclusion that traditional materials have been incorporated into the writings.² Although Carrington and Selwyn were not the first to recognize this NT feature,³ their works sought to isolate and differentiate this source material with methods similar to those employed by the Formgeschichte school in relation to the Gospels. Whether or not their conclusions (i.e. isolating a common persecution fragment, neo-levitical code, as well as other catechetical material) can be substantiated, must not detain us

¹Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge, 1940; and E. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, 1946.

²So, Selwyn, pp. 18-25. Cf., Rolston, pp. 164-173. Dibelius (Paul, p. 93), observes that preachers before Paul had collected maxims from the wise sayings of the Jews and Greeks, words of Jesus, and the experiences of the Churches, and that Paul shared in this work. C.F.D. Moule ("Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the NT.", JTS, I, pt I, new ser (Apr 1950), 29-41) suggests a common basis of apologetics of early Christians to answer the Jewish critics.

³Many works have contributed to this field. Cf., Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, esp p. 238, and his Fresh Approach; C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London, 1936; and Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors.

here;¹ that there are two elements based upon their work, and pertinent to our discussion is noteworthy.

FIRSTLY, the efforts of Carrington and Selwyn strengthen the contention that Paul and other Christian missionaries received (παραλαμβάνειν) and transmitted (παραδίδουαι), a common Christian Halakha, as well as a Haggada.² Possibly a Christianized product of Diaspora Judaism,³ it represents the primitive Church's attempt to supply a didache to its kerygma, an instruction to its proclamation, a catechism to its creed. A priori, this is to be expected in view of Christianity's Judaistic roots, and its early stress on teaching.⁴ It is notable that the general structure of this catechism follows the basic pattern of the ethical instruction of the time. The Didache, for example, is clearly based upon Jewish proselyte instructional material. Its demand for the transformation of moral standards and obligation to society, as well as admonitions regarding constancy and persecution, have marked parallels in the other extant Christian catechesis.⁵

¹See Dodd (Gospel and Law, n, p. 22) for doubts concerning the conclusions.

²For the stress on the technical aspect of these words, see, Dibelius, loc. cit., p. 21; Hunter, loc. cit., pp. 14-18; Cullmann, The Early Church, London, 1956, pp. 57-99.

³So, Hunter, ibid., pp. 62ff, since early Christianity was not concerned with framing a distinctive ethic in view of the early return of Christ.

⁴That instruction and worship were joined from the beginning is evident from Acts 2:42; 11:26; 13:1; and not with Phillips (p. 71) that the teaching ministry was not stressed until Paul's time onwards. For emphasis that baptism was followed by systematic instructions, see, C. Harris, "The NT and the Catholic Creeds", New Commentary, ed C. Gore, London, 1934, pp. 378-384.

⁵Dodd, Gospel and Law, p. 24: "it shows much wisdom in these early Christian teachers that they kept their converts' feet firmly on the ground by reminding them continually of the accepted fundamental obligations of society." Cf., Phillips, p. 70. Bartlet

Although it may sound anachronistic, the conclusion is inescapable: fixed didactical forms existed in the Apostolic age.

It is of note, that although Paul is distinguished as the Apostle of Liberty, in practice he was a catechist in Rabbinic matrix.¹ In an examination of 1 Th 4:1-12, C.H. Dodd has shown that the Apostle used a peremptory tone (παραγγελία), that his ethical instruction was catechetical in nature (κατηχεῖν), and that the instructions given are to be regarded as 'traditions' well known to the church.² Whether this tradition was written or oral is of secondary importance, since "the Jew of Rabbinic education had had sufficient mnemonic practice to be able to quote such texts by heart";³ a relative fixation is possible with either method of the passing on of tradition. What is important, however, is the further indication that Paul uses technical terms for the words 'receive' and 'handed down', "which are equivalent for the official Jewish terms for the taking over and passing on of tradition";⁴ and that the important elements

(Church-Life, p. 35) asserts that it is possible that the substance of the 'Two-Ways' was used by St. Paul as by other teachers in the apostolic age.

¹Cf. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, esp pp. 122-9; and Moffatt, The Thrill of Tradition, London, 1944, pp. 13-6, 53.

²Loc. cit., ch 1. Cf. Kidd, p. 116. This Pauline stress is likely to be overlooked because of its incidental character, but cf., 2 Th 2:15; 3:6; R 6:17f; 1 C 11:2.

³Dibelius, Tradition, p. 39. Cf., H.G. Herklots, A Fresh Approach to the NT, London, 1950, pp. 94-8; and Goudge, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, London, 1903, pp. 94f. Yet, see Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, London, 1958, pp. 111f, who regards the Qumran literature as showing how there was an early emphasis upon the written preservation of matter in Judaistic circles.

⁴Dibelius, ibid., p. 21. Cf., Robertson and Plummer, Corinthians, p. 333; and Phillips, pp. 47ff.

of this tradition were fixed during the fourth and fifth decades.¹

These observations are of paramount importance to the study of the Pastorals. They indicate that not only were there fixed catechetical features within the earliest of primitive Christianity, but also that Paul incorporated them into his writings. Harrison has sought to present the Pastorals as a patchwork collection from the genuine letters of Paul;² now it is clear that a significant portion of the accepted Pauline Epistles may be dependent upon common material. The aim in recognizing this significant fact is in no way to deprecate Paul; but, rather, as A.M. Hunter has noted, "to see his originality in a truer historical perspective."³ Certainly, in the appropriation and interpretation of facts, Paul was unique and original, and "no doubt his own idiosyncrasy counted for much in his presentation of the Gospel";⁴ yet to presuppose that Paul invented the doctrines or the terminology of the Church is not in accordance with the facts. Paul did not live within a self-imposed vacuum; he owed much to the common property of society.⁵ That the Apostle wrote the Pastorals cannot, of course, be deduced from this observation; but those who

¹So, Dibelius, ibid., p. 294; and Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, pp. 22f.

²PPE, Appendix IV.

³Paul and Predecessors, p. 144. E. Stauffer (NT Theology, tran J. Marsh, London, 1955, p. 237) asserts that our reluctance to accept these theories of tradition is because "tradition had been thought of as a malevolent invention of Catholicism."

⁴Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, p. 27.

⁵Cf., H.A.A. Kennedy, St Paul and the Mystery-Religions, London, 1913, esp pp. 281ff; C. Bigg, First Peter, p. 16; Hunter, loc. cit., p. 8; also his Interpreting Paul's Gospel, London, 1954, p. 19; and J. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, London, 1950, pp. 7-10.

reject his authorship must recognize that to do so on the basis of the Epistles' catechetical and formalized nature is completely unfounded. It is perhaps a subtle evidence of the apostolic date of the Pastorals that there is found such a stress on 'tradition' and 'deposit'. The anxiety regarding its conservation could suggest that as yet the authoritative Gospel records were not in circulation and there was therefore a need to guard that which they did possess.¹

SECONDLY, the parallels set forth by Carrington and Selwyn appear pertinent to a discussion of the Pastorals. Selwyn, in his development of Carrington's thesis, has demonstrated abundantly that there is a common relationship between sections of 1 Peter, 1 Thessalonians, other Pauline Epistles, and the Pastorals. To recognize these parallels is to be cognizant of a similar milieu of exhortation, emphasis, and sphere of interest on the part of the writers compared. If 1 Peter is permitted to be Petrine in authorship² then these correspondences further indicate that such concern comes within the span of Apostolic times and need not be relegated to the developing Church of the second century. It is this writer's contention that there is additional common ground with the Pastorals that Selwyn has omitted. When these parallels are recognized, a further vindication of the Pastorals' claim to apostolicity in time and content may well be afforded.

Selwyn correctly observes that there is a common basis of teaching in the following realms: Church Unity and Order (p. 416);

¹So, D. Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul, London, 1921, pp. 593f.

²Cf. J. Moffatt, The General Epistles, MNTC, London, 1928, pp. 85ff. Selwyn (p. 7) suggests Peter with Silvanus; Bigg (St. Peter, pp. 5f) observes that the style is due to an amanuensis.

Code of Subordination (p. 423); Civic Obedience (p. 427); Relation of Slaves and Masters (p. 430); and that of wives and husbands (pp. 432f). However, Selwyn has failed to include the Pastorals in the following parallels:

a. The table concerned with the Christian Holiness Code (pp. 370f). There is a similar use of key words in what the author designates the "Abstinentes clauses" (p. 372); as well as an emphatic call to holiness.¹ There is also an analogous emphasis on the effect of the Christian's life $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$ (1 Th 4:12; Col 4:5) and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ (1 Pet 2:12) in I 6:1 and Tit 2:5; and exhortations to seek love in contrast to evil (I 1:5, 19; 5:10; II 2:21; 3:17; Tit 3:1).

b. The table on Baptism: Its Basis in the Word, Truth, Gospel (pp. 390f), offers a parallel including Tit 3:5, but omits the common emphasis on $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu\ \mu\omicron\nu$ (I 1:11; II 1:8, 10; 2:8), $\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ as referring to the word of God (I 4:5; II 2:9; Tit 2:5), and the common stress on the hearing and acting upon the word of God.

c. The table on New Life - Deponentes or renunciations (pp. 394f). Although the Pastorals omit the contrasted 'putting off' and 'putting on', the Epistles' list of vices (I 1:9-11; 3:1-12), common summons to flee lusts ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon$ II 2:22), and other exhortative terms,² are suggestive.

d. The table on New Life: Faith and Worship (p. 403).

¹Although the Pastorals omit the common $\kappa\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, there is a similar use of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ (I 4:3), and the exhortative use of $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (I 6:12; II 1:9). Cf., also $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (I 5:10); $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ (II 2:21); $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ (II 3:14); $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omega\text{-}\delta\iota\acute{\omega}\kappa\omega$ (II 2:22); and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\omega$ (II 2:1).

²E.G. $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\epsilon\pi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (I 6:20); $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ (I 1:4; $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ - $\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$ (I 4:14f); $\kappa\epsilon\rho\iota\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\omicron$ (II 2:16).

There should be no need to recall the great stress of the Pastorals in this realm. (Cf., I 3:15).

e. The table on teaching Called out by Crisis (pp. 442f). Although isolated texts (e.g. I 6:12; II 1:7-12; 4:6-8, 17) may be cited as parallels, the Pastorals, in their entirety, could virtually be called crisis letters.

Therefore, although the overwhelming weight of scholarship in the past asserted that 1 Peter was dependent upon the Pauline Epistles,¹ there would now appear to be a recognition of the common material and heritage of the Apostolic Church utilized by both writers,² as well as the writer of the Pastorals. Bigg has asserted that in the Pastorals Paul was "approximating to the Petrine view," and continues, that "the inference that 1 Peter is older than the Pastoral Epistles has much to recommend it."³ Harrison, with his tabulation of Petrine phrases in common with the Pastorals, would also indicate a belief in some conscious nexus.⁴ Yet the preceding parallels would appear to indicate that no more can be assumed than a common dependence upon early

¹Sanday and Headlam, p. lxxvi: "St. Peter gives a series of maxims for which he is largely indebted to St. Paul." Cf., Spicq, p. cliii; B.W. Bacon, INT, pp. 479f; and McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p. 485.

²Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen in Urteil des Paulus, p. 18: "Wenn hier wirklich eine literarische Berührung vorhanden wäre, würde sie zuerst die Überschrift des Petrusbriefs fraglich machen, nicht die der paulinischen Briefe."

³1 Peter, p. 21. Parry (p. cliii), although maintaining a common basis of material, asserts that if dependence is demanded, the greater elaboration of 1 Peter (e.g. I 3:16 and I Pet 3:18-22) points to dependence on Titus and Timothy.

⁴PPE, pp. 175ff. Yet see Easton, PE, pp. 15f, for opposition to Harrison's contentions.

Christian manuals, or a resemblance due to the similarity of subjects.¹ Here again, in the approximation of language and content of the Pastorals with 1 Peter, there is perhaps a subtle witness to the Pastorals' authenticity and time of writing. It could be maintained that both authors were dependent upon Paul; but it can be similarly argued that both were utilizing existing sources which were available within the sixth decade of the first century.

As in the instances of varied catechetical elements, so the writings of Paul disclose an emergence of a creed which the Apostle believed to be held in common with others. Although the attempts to extract a formal 'Apostle's Creed' have failed, it can be safely ascertained that "confession formulae were recited in the early Christian service of worship."² As Cullmann has indicated, it was not a question of whether the liturgical worship would extinguish the charismatic; but rather the ability of Paul "to bring freedom of the Spirit and the restrictions of liturgy together in the self-same service because he saw everything in the light of the one aim: the οἰκοδομή (building up of the Church)."³

Varied are the reasons for concluding that the germs of later creeds were both natural and inevitable within the life-time of

¹So, Lock, PE, pp. xxivf; Selwyn, p. 462; Parry, p. cliii; and esp O.D. Foster, The Literary Relations of the First Epistle of Peter, New Haven, Conn., 1913, pp. 462ff.

²Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, tran A.S. Todd, London, 1953, pp. 22f. Cf., A.E. Burn, An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum, London, 1899, pp. 8-12; R 1:1-4; 8:31-34; 10:10; 1 C 8:6; 12:3; 15:3; 2 C 13:13; Gal 6:14, 16. That confession was evident from the beginning, see, Mt 10:32; 16:16; Acts 2:21; 8:37 (?).

³Ibid., p. 32.

Paul. Chase indicates that although Christianity was "absolutely new in its central ideas and aims," it nonetheless, "employed time-honoured machinery for their furtherance."¹ This synagogal machinery included the liturgical forms and the instinct of devotion brought about by the employment of familiar words.² In addition, Herklots has observed that creeds arose because of baptismal formulae and for the exclusion of error;³ while it has also been suggested that Paul utilized them because he regarded them "as unusually significant to the formation and education of the Christian mind."⁴ Cullmann, over and above the three of Herklots and Chase, lists two additional simultaneous causes: that of exorcism with the significant place of the Kyrios over demons, powers and authorities (cf. Acts 3:6; 3:13-16; 4:10); and persecution confessions with the opposition between Kyrios Christos and Kyrios Kaisar already within Paul's life-time (cf. Acts 17:1).⁵

Thus, it is now possible to enter the study of the Pastorals' glimpses of liturgical formalizations, realizing that such forms

¹The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church, I, n 3, Cambridge, 1891, 1.

²Cf., ibid., p. 47. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, tran J. Reid, London, 1949, pp. 24f, where the author recognizes the church's desire for a synagogal shema; also, his Early Christian Worship, p. 24, where he discusses the liturgical endings of the Pauline Epistles as being due to his knowledge that they would be read in the worship service. Cf., 1 C 16:21 and I 4:13.

³Op. cit., p. 91. Cf., Acts 8:36ff; 1 J 4:2; 1 C 8:6; 15:3-8.

⁴B.H. Bryant, The Formation and Education of the Christian Mind in Paul's Earlier Letters, unpublished doctoral thesis, Edinburgh University, 1957, p. 296.

⁵Confessions, pp. 13-34.

were prevalent within the primitive Church, and that Paul utilized them. The emergence of this early Christian literature and liturgy is no longer to be viewed with surprise when it is discovered - but only if it were not. It now remains to examine the credal terms, statements, hymns, and the oft-discussed 'faithful sayings'.

EXAMINATION OF FORMALIZED RELIGIOUS EXPRESSIONS

Phrases

Ἰγιαίνω, ὑποτύπῳσις, τὴν παραθήρηγν φύλαξον . Three terms or phrases which have been cited as indicative of a formalized body of doctrine, do not require this concept upon critical examination. The unPauline term, 'Healthy' or 'sound' (Ἰγιαίνω) teaching (I 1:10; II 4:3; Tit 1:9f; 2:1), does not necessarily carry this generation's connotation of orthodox doctrine.¹ The Pastorals' 'teaching which is in good health,' is not conventional in character, but rather that which tends to build up in contradistinction to that which only corrodes. A contextual study of its use discloses well-defined moral issues to be in question and not a theological preciseness of belief. Morality is the aim; not formality. Similarly, to assume that the use of ὑποτύπῳσις particularizes some special 'type of doctrine or teaching' fails to reckon with first century usage. Ἰποτύπῳσις, although freely translated 'pattern', has the root idea of an 'outline', 'sketch', or 'ground-plan'. Thus Timothy is exhorted not merely to repeat Paul by rote or in mechanical fashion, but rather to keep Paul's

¹For comprehensive word study, see, Bartlet, Exp, 8th series, V (1913), 256-263; Parry, p. xcv. This interpretation is contrary to that of Dibelius who makes 'Gospel' and 'sound doctrine' synonymous terms.

teaching in mind like a draftsman would with preliminary sketches which need additional amplification. In contrast with E.F. Scott,¹ Parry would have the accompanying phrase, ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ (II 1:13), to be taken with ἔχε and not with the following sentence. He would therefore translate the phrase: "keep representing wholesome utterances heard from me by faith and love."² Hence, as in the case of 'healthy' teaching, this exhortation can be viewed as a concern for character rather than creed.³ The suggestion that the phrase τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον (I 6:20; II 1:12,14) refers primarily to an accepted body of belief must also be dismissed. A judicial formula, unparalleled in Paul,⁴ it represents an appeal to the addressee to 'keep the trust'. This trust must be interpreted in the sense of I 1:18 and II 2:2. It is the charge afforded by the author, for which purpose the Epistles were written. This trust involved administrative and teaching responsibilities; it included the guidance and control of teachers; it embodied the breadth of the commission received as an Apostolic delegate; it was to be guarded by the indwelling Spirit (II 1:14). Therefore, although at first glance these phrases depict a formal shaping of tradition, it can be shown that the mere repetition of a circumscribed form of words is not

¹PE, pp. 97f.

²Op. cit., pp. xcviiff.

³It is of note that although ἐκποσίτως is a Pastorals' hapax legomenon, a cognate word τύπος (I 4:12; Tit 2:7) is not. Both here and in 1 Th 1:7, and 2 Th 3:9, is found the same Pauline stress on the recipient's character conforming to the teaching received. Selwyn (pp. 401f) suggests that the advice is for Timothy to have a written memorandum before him. See Rom 6:17 for the Pauline stress on the pattern of teaching.

⁴So, Spicq, p. cxlii. For judicial terminology, cf., Gal 3:15ff; 4:1-7; 2 C 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14. For a discussion of the ethics involved in such a deposit, see, Moffatt, The Thrill of Tradition, p. 180.

involved.

πίστις. This is not the case, however, with the frequent occurrence of the objective sense (*fides quae creditur*) of πίστις. It is a common observation that in at least nine of the thirty-three appearances of the term (I 1:19; 4:1; 5:8; 6:10,21; II 3:8; 4:7; Tit 1:13) πίστις approaches the sense of an objective body of truth. But it is one thing to recognize this connotation of the term, and still another to regard it as incompatible with Pauline authorship.¹ Now, if it is assumed that in genuine Pauline usage 'faith' "always means a personal act of trust on the part of the individual believer,"² that the term is always employed in the sense of Gal 2:20, then the Pastorals' usage is unPauline. Yet it must be recognized that although the primary usage is one of personal trust in Christ, there is great complexity in Paul's employment of πίστις.³ Pauline parallels such as Gal 1:23; 3:23; 6:10; Col 1:23; 2:7; Phil 1:25,27 can be cited that speak of 'faith' in its objective sense. Therefore, the nine Pastorals' appearances of the objective sense of πίστις might be regarded as disproportionate, and hence unparalleled in Paul, but the connotation cannot be regarded as unPauline. With the other early evidences of formalization within the Apostolic Age, it was inevitable that "faith, the watchword of Christianity,

¹Authors who use it in this way include, Gealy, p. 390; Goodspeed, INT, p. 335; Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 392f; Kennedy, Theology, p. 229; Moffatt, INT, pp. 411f.

²Sparks, Formation, p. 76. Cf., Barclay, PE, p. xviii.

³Sanday and Headlam (p. 34) indicate a minimum of six varied ways in which Paul uses the term in Romans alone, "and that he glances from one to another as the hand of a violin player runs over the strings of his violin." Cf., Stewart, p. 26; and Bigg, First Peter, pp. 38f.

may well become one of its synonyms."¹ Πίστις would soon take on the meaning of the faith itself - the religion - because the most characteristic thing about the religion was the attitude of self-commitment. Unless it is possible to conceive that a man who anathematized himself or an angel from heaven who should preach a gospel other than that which he had preached (Gal 1:8) was not solicitous about the proper transmission of this teaching, then we ought to expect that the faith which Paul would inculcate to his followers should be made objective in propositions as to the saving power of Christ.

It is still necessary, however, to examine whether the other uses of πίστις are in keeping with Paul's usage. Easton thinks not. He objects to the place of 'faith' in the triad of 'love' (II 1:13; 2:22; 3:10 et al), and 'hope' (Tit 1:1,2).² But this linking of virtues is also not without its own parallel in the accepted Paulines (cf. 1 C 12:9; 2 C 8:7; Gal 5:22 et al). It must not go unnoticed that the great Pauline hymn of love (1 C 13) places love in a superior position to faith among the triumvirate of Christian virtues. Gealy observes, in addition, that although 'faith' occurs thirty-three times in the Pastorals "it never means faith as the justifying principle in the full Pauline sense."³ Yet the subjective faith, or warm personal trust in

¹Simpson, p. 26. Cf., Richardson, Theology, p. 24. Guthrie, Mind of Paul, pp. 17f: "the use of such formalized expressions as 'the faith' was bound to increase as the more creative period of Paul's life receded. The Phenomenon would thus become not merely compatible but confirmatory."

²PE, p. 113. Cf., E.F. Scott, PE, p. xxxi.

³Op. cit., p. 390. Cf., Easton, ibid., p. 203; Goodspeed, INT, p. 335; Kennedy, Theology, pp. 225f; Scott, ibid.

Christ, is certainly not absent from the man who, amid his bonds and suffering, exclaims "I know Him whom I have believed" (II 1:12); who can speak of the 'faith' which is ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (II 1:13; I 1:14); who can proclaim "that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (I 1:15); or, who asserts that salvation was a free gift, not depending on man's works (II 1:9; Tit 3:5) but upon God's mercy. There is, assuredly, a greater emphasis on 'good works' in the Pastorals (cf. I 2:10; 5:10; 6:18; II 2:21; 3:17; Tit 2:14) than in the case of the accepted Paulines; but this must not be conceived in the sense of justification by works.¹ Faith, in the Pastorals, as with Paul (2 Th 2:17; 2 C 9:8; R 2:7; 13:3) must produce the fruits of faith, or it is barren and ineffectual for salvation. The all-important link between faith and character, religion and ethics was declared by Paul in Gal 5:6 when he dismissed the value of circumcision and uncircumcision and asserted the essential to be "faith which becomes operative through love."² The practical purpose of the Pastorals may well explain the frequent mention of the need for works. In contrast with the vain speculations and immorality of the false teachers, the author insists upon the religious and

¹So, Jeremias, pp. 4f; Parry, pp. ciii-cx. This is in sharp contrast with the theological position of the Apostolic Fathers. For stress of justification by works, cf., Clement XXX.3; XXXII.3; XXXIII.8; LVIII.2; LIX.1; Ignatius, Eph XIII.2; XIX.3; Tral IX.1; Polycarp I.1; IX.2f; XII.1f. For additional references and discussion, see H. Schrammberger, Die Einheitlichkeit des Jacobusbriefe, Gotha, 1936, pp. 41f; Lightfoot, AF, pt I, vol I, pp. 397ff; pt II, vol I, pp. 382ff; J. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, London, 1958, esp pp. 163ff; and T. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the AF, Edinburgh, 1948.

²C.A.A. Scott, Words, London, 1939, pp. 43f. Cf., Lock, Builder, pp. 100, 117.

moral fruits of 'the faith'.¹

Credal Statements

I 6:13 (11-14). This widely debated text presents at least three major problems for the critic. Firstly, there is the question of textual variation: the W and H text reading ζωογονοῦντος;² the Sinaiticus Manuscript reading ζωοποιοῦντος.³ Lock classifies the latter use as a "conscious attempt to improve the text" by the substitution of the more usual word.⁴ Although it could be maintained that both words are almost synonymous in their import,⁵ ζωογονοῦντος, being the more unusual term, and because of the special contextual appropriateness of the word, is probably correct. It is markedly fitting to stress the prevailing presence of God's witness as He 'preserves' (in contradistinction to 'creates') Timothy in his.

Secondly, there is the question of the proper translation of ἐπί and μαρτυρέω. C.H. Turner, asserting it to be a clear reference to Christ's crucifixion, stresses that ἐπί Π.Π. means "under Pontius Pilate"; that ἐπί must be used in a different

¹Spicq, p. cv: "la maison de Dieu' s'organise, ses membres sont plus nombreux et donc plus mélangés que jadis; l'Apôtre doit s'adapter à la médiocrité humaine, et après la justification initiale, se pose d'urgence le problème de l'éducation des croyants."

²Supported by: A, D, F, G, P, 17, 31, and most commentators. Cf., White, p. 146.

³Supported by K, and L. Simpson (p. 88) accepts this reading on the contention that the term is more Pauline.

⁴PE, p. xxxv.

⁵I.e., creator in the later credal sense, so, C.H. Turner, "I 6:12, 13: ἐπί Ποντίου Πιλάτου", JTS, XXVIII (1927), 270ff. Cf., G. Abbott-Smith, p. 197; Parry, pp. 42f.

collocation than the previous ἐνώπιον ; and that such a historical reference is the "sense in which the whole tradition of Christian language has used the phrase, beginning at least with Ignatius."¹ Such an exposition is supported by the Vulgate rendering, and the credal character of the text. But, the following factors would seem to weigh in favor of the translation of 'before' rather than 'under' (i.e. a local, and not temporal sense). 'Ἐπί with the genitive, is used technically in the NT for a judicial appearance;² it is the fact of confession that is being emphasized contextually, and not dying; and it is more in keeping with the probable translation of μαρτυρέω . There is no need, as does Turner, to ascribe to μαρτυρέω the later credal connotation of 'martyrdom'.³ Its use is completely in keeping with the primitive Church's reflection on Christ's faithful and courageous witness of His Messiahship (cf. Jo 18:37); it need not be forced into the distinctive meaning of the later Church. Furthermore, this conception is in agreement with the contextual stress upon the fact of confession being of greater importance than any form in which it is made.⁴

Thirdly, there is the problem of the interpretation of ἐντολήν (6:14). Cullmann, stressing the acquired meaning of

¹Ibid. Author cites Trall IX; Smyrn I; and Magn II in support of his argument.

²Cf., Mt. 28:14; Mk 13:9; Acts 23:30; 25:9, 10; 1 C 6:1; Parry, p. 42; Simpson, p. 88; Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, pp. 61ff.

³Μαρτυρέω limited to martyr; ὁμολογέω relegated to those persecuted but not put to death. The historical association is discussed by Turner, loc. cit.

⁴So, A.E. Burn, "Creeds", HDAC, I, 238; and his Introduction to Creeds, p. 13.

martyrdom for μαρτυρέω attributes the text to persecution. He maintains that "the whole context proves that we are here concerned with a judicial action, and that Timothy had appeared already for the first time before a court, and 'had witnessed a good confession before many witnesses'."¹ Although this interpretation cannot be excluded altogether, it is not required in view of the previous discussion. Horton conjectures that the word refers to "the whole truth of the Gospel entrusted to Timothy to keep and preach";² while Easton would postulate its application to 6:11, 12.³ Neither of these explanations is acceptable if Parry is correct in asserting that the word has a fixed meaning of 'the commandment of God' unless there is definite indication to the contrary.⁴ Most scholars would attribute the 'command' to the time of Timothy's baptism; when before witnesses he confessed to the truths presented.⁵ It was inevitable that credal statements would develop from the confession demanded at the time of the baptismal experience; and therefore probable that this text is intended as the parallel assurance of God's presence while linked with the summons for the candidate to follow his master's holy example. It is significant that although Dodd does not accept 1 Timothy as an authentic Pauline letter, he nevertheless lends support to the probability of the text being included

¹Confessions, p. 25. Cf. G. Baldensperger, "Il a rendu témoignage devant Ponce-Pilate", RHPR, 1922, pp. 1ff, 95ff.

²Op. cit., p. 137.

³PE, p. 160. Cf. Guthrie, PE, pp. 115f.

⁴Op. cit., p. 42.

⁵Cf., T. Zahn, Das Apostolische Symbolum, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 38-42; H. Lietzmann, "Symbolstudien VIII-X", ZNTW, XXII (1923) pp. 257-79; Bernard, PE, p. 99; Falconer, PE, p. 157; Richardson, Theology, p. 337, n 1. Meinertz (pp. 75f) conjectures that the witness was at the time of ordination.

in a writing of Paul. The text, asserts Dodd, "no doubt represents the standpoint of the Pauline circle, and the allusion to Pilate may have been derived from Paul's preaching."¹ He further affirms, that if such allusions were not found in Paul, then he departed completely from the common model of apostolic kerygma.²

II 2:8. Easton asserts that the stress on "the seed of David" in this verse is in "un-Pauline fashion";³ while Scott observes that the phrase was a "matter of indifference" to Paul, and alluded to only in Romans in "deference to the settled belief."⁴ If, however, in spite of the text's unPauline language and interest in the Davidic descent of Jesus, Romans 1:1-4 can be accepted with Dodd as a Christological formula which Paul understands "as stating the common Gospel which he and others preached,"⁵ then there is no justification for the belief that a similar summary could not be included in a Pauline letter to Timothy. The inclusion of Christ's humanity in this context is to provide the Master's example in His life for young Timothy in his. Both the example and the living power were made available to the disciple. Clearly there is a variance with Rom 1:3 where the emphasis is on the fulfilment of prophecy. This is an

¹Apostolic Preaching, pp. 61ff.

²Ibid., This recognition would meet the late credal confession contention of Falconer, PE, p. 158. E. Walder ("The Logos of the PE", JTS, XXIV (1923), 310-315) regards the text as proof of a post-Johannine date; but he fails to recognize the early Church stress on Christ's witness before Pontius Pilate. Although this emphasis is admittedly Johannine (Rev 1:5; Jo 18:37) Paul often invoked God as his witness (cf., R 1:9; 2 C 1:23; Phil 1:8; 1 Th 2:5, 10).

³PE, p. 53.

⁴PE, p. 104.

⁵Apostolic Preaching, pp. 21f.

additional example of the adaptability of the early credal forms, and to Parry, an added proof of a Pauline, rather than a pseudo-Paul origin.¹

I 2:5f. This text has been variously regarded as a hymn fragment,² and baptismal confession;³ yet it may be no more than the author's own incorporation of familiar Scriptural and Church teachings. The stress on the oneness of God is the very essence of the Jewish shema'; that on the saving work of Christ is the vital constituent of Christianity. Both emphases are to provide additional reasons for the doctrine stated in I 2:4, that all men come within the scope of God's saving purpose (cf. R 3:30; Gal 3:20).

Two peculiar descriptions of Christ's ministry must not be overlooked: *μεσίτης* and *ἀντίλυτρον*. The conception of Christ as mediator is regarded by Moffatt as being "closer to the standpoint of Hebrews than of Paul."⁴ Certainly, apart from Gal 3:19f where the term is employed in conjunction with the ministry of Moses, it is elsewhere only found in Hebrews.⁵ But in that Epistle, *μεσίτης* is always found with *διαθήκη*; in the text under consideration, it signifies simply the way of mediation (cf. Jo 14:6) which because of the death of Christ is open to all men. The representative role of Christ, insuring the universality of the Gospel, is a thought thoroughly Pauline

¹Op. cit., pp. 55f.

²So, Falconer, PE, p. 128.

³So, Gealy, p. 399; Easton, PE, p. 121; while E.F. Scott, (PE, pp. 21f) regards it not as a confessional, but as the writer's own comment on Hebrews.

⁴INT, p. 410.

⁵8:6; 9:15; 12:24. Cf., Test of Dan 6.2; Ass of Moses 1:14; 3.12; and Philo vit Mos 3.19.

(cf., R 5:15-19; 2 C 5:19). The other description of Christ's ministry peculiar to the text, is found in the phraseology: ὁ δοῦς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων . Although the compound ἀντίλυτρον is a Pastorals' hapax legomenon, the root word, prefix, and full meaning, are contained in Mark 10:45 (cf., Mt 20:28). Apart from this Gospel record the usual NT construction for the vicarious death of Christ, is ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (R 5:8; Tit 2:14). To the author of the Pastorals, Christ is conceived of as both a ransom 'on behalf of' (ὑπὲρ) and 'in the place of' (ἀντί) all men. Surely it can be agreed with Easton, that apart from the terminology, "the passage is in no way un-Pauline."¹

Hymns

I 3:16. Although this verse has been long recognized as a quotation, agreement is wanting whether the words are from a hymn or a statement of faith.² Since metrical structure was not employed until about Augustine's period, the hymns (as well as prayers, and confessionals) were all similarly marked by their exalted, rhythmical prose.³ McDonald suggests that by the time the passage under discussion was written, the words had attained the character of a credal formula which had evolved from an earlier hymn or prayer.⁴ Even though credal statements may have developed in such a manner, there is no necessity for assuming a

¹PE, p. 126.

²Simpson (pp. 60f) suggests a citation from a catechism; E.F. Scott (PE, pp. 40ff) a chanted confession.

³Cf., A.B. MacDonald, pp. 112-9; and M. Patrick, The Story of the Church's Song, Glasgow, 1927, p. 20.

⁴Ibid., p. 118.

late date in this instance. A priori we would expect an early stress on hymns. Emotion and enthusiasm were distinctive characteristics of the primitive Church; they were certain to be channeled into outbursts of song because of the ancient habit of praise derived from the temple and synagogue.¹ Col 3:16 would provide an additional incentive for Christian hymnary; spiritual instruction. The Pauline exhortation for the use of psalms and hymns (1 C 14:26; Col 3:16) and the examples of incorporation are sufficient NT evidence for their liturgical and Pauline use from the beginning.²

That the verse should be regarded as a quotation is seen by the introductory adverb (ὁμολογουμένως), rhythmical parallelism of either two or three strophes,³ scope beyond that necessitated by context, and the frequency of quotations within the Pastorals. Bernard adds that "the abruptness of ὅς at once disappears" if the text is taken as an introduced quotation.⁴ The unexpressed antecedent to the relative would be ὁ Χριστός if the text can be taken as a fragment of the same hymn quoted in Eph 5:14⁵ or

¹Cf., Cullmann, Worship, p. 21; Latourette, pp. 206ff; and C.W. Dugmore, The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office, London, 1944, pp. 80f.

²Herklots (p. 89), regarding Phil 2:5-11 and the suggestion that Paul incorporated a hymn, observes, that "if, so, the early church had an unknown poet worthy to be compared with the unknown one who wrote the servant songs in the Book of Isaiah." Cf., Hunter, Paul and Predecessors, p. 42. Dibelius (Fresh Approach, pp. 246-54) gives examples of early and later church hymns; while Pliny (Ep X ad Trajan) tells of the Christians meeting and singing to Christ as if to God.

³Humphreys (pp. 111f) suggests three strophes; while Ramsay (Exp, 7th ser, VIII (1909), 560-4) detects only two. A decision is not vital to the interpretation.

⁴PE, p. 62.

⁵So, Lock, PE, p. 44.

I 1:15.¹ Badcock has shown that the hymn is a translation from the Aramaic into Greek. Therefore, he concludes, that although the fragment is not designated as Pauline by Harrison, it is more likely that Paul, whose home language was Aramaic, would "have been acquainted with the primitive verses, even if he did not compose them, than any forger living in Rome at a later date."²

On the assumption of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, two influences may well have been involved in their more excessive inclusion of such rhythmical texts. Firstly, the possibility of Lucan influence could be enhanced by the physician's manifested interest in elaborate canticles (Luke 1:46-55; 1:68-79; 2:14; 2:29-32) and the text's emphasis on the historic Christ of Luke-Acts. Secondly, there is Paul's association with Silvanus: in prison (Acts 16), yet singing hymns. Selwyn, emphasizing the relationship of Silvanus to both Peter and Paul, indicates the close parallel of the first, second, and sixth articles of the hymn in I 3:16 with that recorded in 1 Pet 3:18-22.³ Although these parallels point to dependence, the mutual relationship with Silvanus, and the acceptance of the text as being current in the Christian community by A.D. 60, remove any difficulty.⁴

II 1:9f. The three distinctly marked stanzas, with their liturgical balance and special vocabulary (e.g. εὐαγγελίου, κλήσει

¹So, Parry, p. 22.

²Op. cit., p.126.

³Cf., pp. 324f for the linguistic parallels involved.

⁴The interpretation of the fragment is difficult without its context to clarify. Only the second strophe has apparently come under attack as being unPauline. It is Easton's assertion (PE, p. 12) that this use of 'justify' is "wholly un-Pauline." Yet, see E.F. Scott, PE, p. 41, for varied explanations which are in keeping with a Pauline authorship. For a parallel passage, if "shown to be righteous" is adopted, cf., R 3:4.

ἀγία, σώσαντος) , probably identify these verses as another hymn fragment.¹ Introduced to strengthen Timothy in his suffering by assuring him that in spite of his weakness, God's power and grace will secure, it is recognized by Gealy as furnishing "one of the finest early Christian statements of the meaning of the Christian faith."² Yet, for all of its beauty, doubt has been raised whether the theology is in keeping with Pauline authorship. Scott, for instance, observes that while the author "makes use of various Pauline texts, the writer betrays himself at every point as the representative of a later type of teaching."³ But surely the two examples given to illustrate the contention are capable of other interpretations. Scott objects to the emphasis on the effectual work of the incarnation (involving the total manifestation of Christ) rather than specifically the atonement; but this stress is not without its Pauline precedent (cf. R 8:3; Phil 2:5-11; Col 1:22). Furthermore, the 'gospel' referred to need not be regarded as itself a Divine agency; but as the channel for the revelation of God in Christ (cf. R 10:13f). The gospel involved must be understood in view of the life, death, and ministry of Christ; not the placing of a Christian's faith in approved doctrines. Significant Pauline parallels, summarizing some of the basic conceptions of the Apostle's gospel, are evident in these verses. These include: the saving activity of God (cf. 1 C 1:21); the Christian's vocation by God (cf. 1 C 1:9; Gal 1:6; R 8:28); God's grace and purpose in antithesis to

¹So, Easton, PE, p. 40; and Gealy, p. 467.

²Ibid., pp. 466f.

³PE, p. 94. Cf., Easton, PE, p. 43.

man's work (R 9:11; Eph 2:8ff); the pre-existence of Christ (Col 1:15ff; Eph 1:4ff); the accomplished work of Christ in the abolition of death (1 C 15:26); and the revelation of that which had formerly been hidden (cf., R 16:25-27; Eph 3:9). It would appear, therefore, that the theology is so positively Pauline, as to mitigate the observations of Scott.

Yet, although the theology may be acknowledged as Pauline, the terminology also has been questioned. Dibelius, and others, regard the use of ἐπιφάνεια as being most satisfactorily interpreted in light of the Hellenistic religions.¹ But the possible borrowing of ideas and terms from pagan surroundings need not detract from the Epistles' authenticity. That ἐπιφάνεια formed a part of the vocabulary of the emperor-cult to signify the emperor's birthday is not in question. But that the term was also employed by Paul in its essential LXX meaning of a sudden appearance upon a scene,² is confirmed by a unique expression in 2 Th 2:8.³ Here ἐπιφάνεια is used with παρουσία in such a way as to suggest that when applied apocalyptically they express rather different aspects of the same thing. The Pastorals' use

¹Dibelius, Pastoralbriefe, pp. 60-5; Easton, PE, p. 41; A.E.J. Rawlinson, The NT Doctrine of the Christ, London, 1926. p. 172; Gealy, p. 469; Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III 389. Yet E.F. Scott (PE, p. 93) contends that "all that can be concluded is that when the Epistles were written Christianity had become definitely a Gentile religion, and was freely borrowing ideas and terms from its pagan surroundings."

²For LXX references, see Lock, PE, p. 43. In three instances the term is used in the Pastorals with regard to Christ's first appearance (II 1:10; Tit 2:11; 3:4); while its apocalyptic use in Tit 2:13, may follow "by a natural sequence the cognate verb at the head of the sentence" (Simpson, pp. 107f).

³In view of this Pauline precedent, a case can not be made against the Pastorals' authenticity in the use of ἐπιφάνεια as does Harrison (PPE, p. 29). Cf., Jülicher, p. 185.

of ἐπιφάνεια in lieu of the customary παρουσία must therefore not dim the fact that throughout there is an expressed hope of the Parousia which reflects the sustaining concept of the early expectant Church¹ (cf., I 6:14; II 4:1, 8; 1:18; Tit 2:13). Although the term παρουσία is absent from the Pastorals, it is to be remembered that it is found only in 1 C 15:23 and seven times in the Thessalonian Epistles, and therefore can not be classified as an indispensable part of the Pauline vocabulary. In its place is found a careful balance between the purely futurist eschatology and that of the realized with its consequences in the practical sphere, a feature which Dodd regards as a characteristic of Paul's later writings.²

Similarly, Dibelius sees in the use of σωτήρ a special allusion to the legion of Hellenistic savior gods who gave the initiate life and new birth.³ Cullmann, however, in reference to the word's use in Phil 3:20, agrees with Bultmann that it was

¹For E.F. Scott (PE, p. 169) to assert that "the writer is able to speak of it in the language familiar to the previous generation" is to be aware that the author is in agreement with the early and not the later Church's eschatological concept.

²Apostolic Preaching, pp. 148-154. Cullmann, Early Church, p. 144: "it is essential to recognize the specifically temporal character of eschatology. It is vital to maintain the temporal character of the Christian hope." This was done by Paul, as Hunter (Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 51ff) indicates in noting the Apostle's change of emphasis from Thessalonians and Colossians (from the Jewish Apocalyptic to the realized eschatology). Cf., McNeile-Williams, p. 195. Thackeray (pp. 101ff) observed three Pauline stages of apocalyptic development: 1 Th; 1 C 15; and 2 Cor-Phil. This the author regards as due in part to the sufferings of Paul between 1 and 2 Cor. The Pastorals' position regarding the parousia appears to be in keeping with this evolution of thought.

³Pastoralbriefe, pp. 60ff. Cf., Gealy, pp. 469f; and Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 388.

a pre-Pauline designation.¹ Surely, since the term is used about thirty times in the LXX as a divine title (markedly in Isaiah, cf., 43:3, 11; 45:15, 21; 46:26; 60:16) and fourteen times in the NT outside of the Pastorals, it is capable of being explained as a Jewish Christian usage.² It is of interest that the relatively late application of 'savior' to Christ is regarded by Cullmann as being due to the surpassing role of the Kyrios title which put all other appellations into the background.³ The important feature of this discussion, nevertheless, is that both the theology and the terminology have Pauline precedents.

Titus 2:13. Although not as markedly a hymn as the other texts discussed, the formulated statements would suggest the possibility. The fragment provides at least one fresh problem for commentators: the precise meaning of the phrase τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν X. 'I. The Greek is ambiguous, and is capable of application either to one ("of our Great God and Savior")⁴ or two ("of the Great God and of our Savior")⁵ Persons. Preferring the first possibility, Cullmann suggests that the connection of the title 'Savior' with God "spricht dagegen, dass

¹Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1958, pp. 248f. Cf. Eph 5:23, the attribution of salvation to God in 2 Th 2:13, 1 C 1:21, and T. Zahn, INT, II, 133.

²So, Easton, PE, p. 232.

³Loc. cit. For a discussion of Cullmann's thesis, see, V. Taylor, "Professor Oscar Cullmann's 'Die Christologie Des Neuen Testaments'; ET, LXX, 5 (Feb 1959), 136-40. Taylor (Names of Jesus, London, 1953, p. 109) contends that the currency of the term 'savior' in Christian tradition was delayed because of its pagan associations.

⁴So, Bernard, Dibelius, Easton, Ellicott, Gealy, Guthrie, C.F.D. Moule, McGiffert, Simpson, RV, RSV.

⁵So, Moffatt, Jeremias, C.A.A. Scott, E.F. Scott, White, AV, RVm, RSVm. For discussion of both possibilities see, Lock, PE, pp. 144ff.

an dieser Stelle Gott vom 'Heiland J.C.' unterschieden werden soll." He emphasizes, in addition, that the final phrase in the text (2:14) points to a function which otherwise is only attributable to God; and that the simultaneous eschatological appearance of God and Christ is not in accordance with the usual expectation.¹ Gealy, concurring, would add that the natural construction of two substantives following one article; the patristic witness; and the obvious framing of language in reaction to the emperor-cult, speaks for the epithets as referring to Jesus.² It may be argued, however, that the identification of Christ as God is made nowhere else in the Epistles, nor even suggested.³ Moreover, the patristic witness is offset by that of the early versions (e.g. Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, and Armenian) which appear to prefer the meaning of two distinct persons.⁴ Furthermore, the general neglect of the article in the Epistles, and its omission before $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho$ in I 1:1; 4:10 mitigates the argument of Gealy.⁵ It should also be

¹Loc. cit., p. 322.

²Op. cit., pp. 539f.

³This is in sharp contrast with the frequent identification of Christ as God in Ignatius (cf., Eph XV.3; XVII.2, R III.3; Pol VIII.3). For discussion, see, V. Taylor, Person of Christ in NT Teaching, London, 1958, pp. 55f; Bultmann, Theology, I, 129. Yet it must be observed that the author of the Pastorals does make the highest claim for Christ's divinity, as evidenced by the close association with God the Father (I 1:2; 5:21; 6:13; II 1:2; 4:1; Tit 1:1, 4), the representation of Christ as the object of faith (I 1:16; 3:16; II 3:15), and His being the object of adoration (I 3:16; II 2:11ff).

⁴For discussion see, Bernard, PE, p. 172.

⁵That $\eta\mu\omega\nu$ can qualify $\Sigma\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, see Winer-Moulton, A Treatise on the Grammar of NT Greek, 3rd ed, Edinburgh, 1882, p. 162; and Blass, Grammar of NT Greek, tran H. St. John Thackeray, London, 1898, p. 163. Cf., V. Taylor, loc. cit., pp. 131ff. Yet see Easton, PE, pp. 94f, for the contention that the possessive indicates but one Person.

noted that although one would not speak of the Parousia as an ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ πατρὸς , it is possible to refer to the ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης θεοῦ . By taking καί epexegetically, another possible translation is, "awaiting the blessed hope and the manifestation of the glory of the great God, namely, our Savior Christ Jesus." It must be observed that the question is not of doctrinal significance, nor does it involve a determination of Pauline authenticity; but is one of exegetical import. With either interpretation both God and Christ are placed on an equal footing; while Paul not only makes the highest claims for Christ's divinity, but also refers to Christ as God.¹ The final determination is difficult, but it may be concluded that in view of the application of the title "great God and Savior" to deities in contemporary Hellenistic circles, the words would probably have been understood in reference to one person.

Doxologies. The doxologies in I 1:17; 6:16 and II 4:18, characterized as they are by rhythmical prose, are here regarded as hymn fragments. As previously noted, primitive Christianity and Paul utilized the stereotyped liturgical formulae of Judaism; it is therefore not surprising to find such fragments incorporated within writings claiming Pauline authorship. Only two accepted Pauline doxologies are substantially identical in form;² thus indicating a great freedom of expression which virtually prohibits a Pauline comparative study.

¹E.g., R. 9:5. Cf., 2 Th 1:12; Acts 20:28. That Christ is called God is surely the most logical interpretation of R 9:5. So, Sanday and Headlam, ad loc.; Guthrie, PE, p. 200. For doubt, however, see V. Taylor, loc. cit., p. 55.

²I.e., Gal 1:5 and Phil 4:20. So, B.F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 2nd ed., London, 1892, ap.

The phrase, τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων , (I 1:17), is unparalleled in Paul, but was common in Jewish and Christian circles;¹ while the ascriptions ἀφθάρτῳ and ἀοράτῳ although appearing to be more Hellenistic than Jewish, find Pauline parallels in R 1:23 and Col 1:15. Other forms, traced ultimately to the OT by Chase, were similarly incorporated in the early Church worship experience and were therefore available to Paul.² The impulsive explosion into doxological expression is so characteristically Pauline (cf., Gal 1:5; R 11:36; 16:27; Phil 4:20), that Falconer, who rejects total Pauline authorship, asserts that the doxology "was written by one who had caught the tone of Paul."³

The austerity of the titles ascribed to God in these doxologies creates a sense of awe and absoluteness which is objected to by Kennedy and others.⁴ It is true that the aspect of God's remoteness and majesty is emphasized in these verses. Yet it must be remembered that doxologies are characterized by a desire to magnify God; that throughout the NT, its doctrine of God assumes the OT Jewish concept.⁵ Furthermore, these appellations must be counter-balanced by the remainder of the Epistles. Here,

¹Cf., Rev 15:3; Tobit 13:6, 10; Sir 36:22. C.C. Oke ("A Doxology Not to God but Christ", ET, LXVII (1955-6), 367f) places the stress on the anarthrous use of the article, and contends, contrary to Easton, Scott, and others, that this doxology is not to God, but to Christ.

²Lord's Prayer, pp. 176f. Cf., MacDonald, p. 107; and Cullmann, Worship, pp. 23f.

³PE, p. 125.

⁴Theology, p. 238; Easton, PE, p. 13; Moffatt, INT, pp. 411f.

⁵For observation that awe and the sense of God's utter power and majesty remained after Paul's conversion, see, S. Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul, London, 1928, pp. 82-94. For recognition of OT concepts of God in the NT see, F.C. Grant, pp. 99-116. Cf., Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, ch III.

in keeping with Paul, God is characterized as: living (I 3:15; cf. 1 Th 1:9); a God of love and peace (I 1:2; 2 C 13:11); One who knows His people (II 2:19; 1 C 8:3); as the giver of gifts (II 1:6; 1 C 12:28); the source of the Gospel (I 1:11; R 1:1); and as the One who affords salvation by His grace (Tit 2:11; Col 1:6) and therefore provides eternal life (Tit 1:2; Gal 3:21). If, in spite of these orthodox Pauline characterizations of God, the omission of the title 'Father' is objected to,¹ it is noteworthy that apart from salutations and benedictions, the designation is virtually absent from the accepted Paulines as well. Markedly unPauline in vocabulary, the doxology contained in I 6:15f must surely be based upon a Christian hymn, modelled on a formula in use in synagogue worship. Analogies are to be found in the Later Jewish literature and the OT for the titles ascribed to God,² which magnify the majesty of God in contrast to the heathen gods, and earthly kings.

Faithful Sayings

Problem. The final category for examination under the 'Pastorals' formalized body of doctrine, is that of its peculiar, oft-discussed, five times repeated $\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{o}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. Exegetes, both ancient and modern, are virtually unanimous in their interpretation that the phrase signifies the introduction or conclusion of a specific quotation from an early Christian hymn or credal statement. That comparable citations have been incorporated

¹As do Easton, PE, p. 25, and Kennedy, Theology, p. 238. Yet see Guthrie, Mind of Paul, pp. 24f.

²For references see Parry, p. 43; Lock, PE, pp. 72f.

into these writings has previously been indicated. Furthermore, that a collection of λόγοι πνευματικοί (or, ὁδὴ πνευματικῆ) analogous to the collected λόγοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (Acts 20:35) is certainly probable. In addition, strong argument favoring such a view can be presented.¹ But that the phrase is to be so identified is at least subject to question.

Several factors have led a small number of commentators to seek for another solution. The difficulty of establishing with any confidence or unanimity a specific literary allusion, the lack of the expected terse, pregnant, and perhaps rhythmical character, and the suitability of application to expressions on each side of the phrase, have contributed to this decision. Therefore, E. Walder, radically departing from the accepted theories, applied the λόγος not to any known impersonal saying, but rather to the personal Johannine Logos.² Falconer, on the other hand, asserts the phrase to be an editorial addition;³ while C.H. Turner, although maintaining Pauline authorship, contends it to be the work not of an editor but an annotator,

¹E.g., the use of ὅτι in its introductory capacity, rhythmical character, and near unanimous consent (cf., Origen, adv Celsus, Bk 1, lxiii) of commentators, speak in favor of the attribution to some extant hymn or creed. But the anonymous author in "The Authorship of the PE", CQR, LXIII (1906-7) 344-358, applies the phrase to a teaching of the Lord; Humphreys (pp. 249f) suggests a prophetic saying. Thus not all who regard the phrase as introductory in character, make the application to a hymn or creed.

²Op. cit., pp. 310-315, citing Jo 1:9; 12:46; et al; but see Lock, PE, pp. 155f, for his objection of the limited appropriateness of this theory. Walder also fails to recognize the quotations contextually present.

³PE, p. 115. Bernard, PE, p. xxxviii; and Bowen, pp. 37f, postulate that the phrase was a catch-word from the religious phraseology which would naturally evolve from parenetic tradition.

who as an appreciative reader, inserted a marginal note of "very true".¹ J.G. Duncan disagrees, and postulates that it was a current expression which served as a rhetorical device emphasizing the truth expressed in the author's statements.²

Excluding Walder, each writer has a common attitude toward the phrase: it is an insertion, applicable not to an identifiable quotation, but to the truth of the discussion. This, perhaps, is a position which leads to a possible solution of the enigma. Yet the assumption would appear faulty in at least three aspects: there is the failure to see the phrase as a justifiable Pauline literary device; the failure to examine other Pastorals', Pauline, and NT usage of both πιστός and λόγος ; and the failure to provide an adequate explanation for the quotations obviously involved.

Observing these deficiencies in order, it can be noted that Paul frequently inserted varied asseverations regarding the genuineness of a statement, and/or other ejaculations.³ A noteworthy example is Paul's χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ . Confined as it is to the Romans-Corinthian Letter group, it discloses the occasional use of catch-phrases in the Pauline vocabulary.

¹The Study of the NT, p. 21. Cf., Lock, PE, p. xxxi, This, however, would call into unwarranted question the integrity of the text.

²" πιστός ὁ λόγος ", ET, XXXV (1924), 141. This appears to be an expansion of White's thesis (p. 98) that I 1:15 and II 2:11 were definite quotations; while in the other instances it had reference to the general truth involved.

³Cf., Gal 1:20 "Before God I lie not." Also 2 C 11:31; R 1:9; 1 Th 2:5. Cf., Tit 1:13. For the contemporary authors who also used such asseverations, see, H.B. Swete, "The Faithful Sayings", JTS, XVIII (1917), 1-7.

It is pertinent also to note that although πιστός , as applied to λόγος , is here peculiarly joined, the adjective was applied to God in the Corinthian Epistles (I 1:9; 10:13; II 1:18), and to the Lord in Thessalonians (II 3:3; cf., I 5:24). Πιστός , employed seventeen times in the Pastorals, appears to be too well integrated textually to be deemed a later insertion. The writer (I 1:12), women (I 3:11), Timothy (I 4:12), men (II 2:2), Christ (II 2:13), and the word (Tit 1:9) have all been accorded this objective connotation of πίστις .

It is in this last cited reference, as applied to "the word", that the key to the understanding of the phrase may be found. In that text, a bishop is characterized as one ἐντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου . This is in keeping with similar exhortations to 'labor in' (I 5:17) and 'preach' (II 4:2) the word. This 'word' is delineated as the 'word of God' (I 4:5; II 2:9; Tit 1:3; 2:5), 'words of faith' (I 4:6), 'the word of truth' (II 2:15), and the healthy words of Christ (I 6:3) in contradistinction to the words of the errorists (II 2:17). The 'faithful word', then, may not be a 'saying' in the English sense, but the Word of God, the Gospel which was received and delivered by the author.

This is not without Pauline precedence. Paul, addressing the Corinthian Church, described the Gospel, consisting of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ on behalf of the sin of man, as the λόγος which had been preached, delivered, received, and to which they must hold fast (I C 15:1ff). Similarly, the Apostle reminds the Thessalonian Church that they had received

the λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ from him οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθὼς

ἔστιν λόγον θεοῦ

¹ Rather than being a Johannine phrase,

the Apostle is found frequently writing of the 'word of God' (R 9:6; 2 C 2:17; 4:2; Col 1:25), 'word of the cross' (1 C 1:18), 'word of truth' (2 C 6:7; Col 1:5), and 'word of Christ' (Col 3:16). It is therefore not in the least inconceivable that Paul could have written of the Gospel as containing the death of Christ, that this Gospel is the 'word of God', and that it is a 'faithful' dependable guide which alone could successfully contend with the corrupting influence of false doctrine and degenerate morals.

A glance at the five sections involved may tend to confirm the theory that the phrase refers not to a specific quotation, but to the word of God enunciated. This contention is enhanced when it is noted that the subject discussed in each instance is that of salvation and/or eternal life. The discussion is pronounced 'faithful', is followed in three of the five instances by a phrase of introduction, and then may or may not be buttressed with a quotation prefaced by γάρ . This citation, therefore, is to be viewed not as an essential element of the previous statement, but as an additional argument in its support. The theology of the texts will be discussed following this examination.

I 1:15. If ὅτι is taken as a causal conjunction (cf., Lu 6:20) rather than as introducing a direct quotation

¹ 1 Th 2:13. Cf., 1 Th 1:6,8, where the word of the Lord is identified with the received word.

(recitative), as is usually the case, the 'quotation' becomes the interpretation or definition of the 'word'. The trustworthiness of the word (the word that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners), is interjected because of the author's recognition of God's grace towards him in spite of his unworthiness. It is indeed conceivable that ὅτι introduces a quotation; yet the credal statement need not be the word, but further confirmation of the Word.¹

I 3:1. The author's instructions to men and women includes a restriction of feminine teaching (2:12) which involves a discussion of the reasons for this prohibition. As it is based upon the exegesis of the Genesis account of the fall and its resultant curse, the author is led to interject that women too shall be saved - but only if 'she' remains in faith. The very thought of the universality of the Gospel extorts another acknowledgment of the faithfulness of God's Word. The author then reverts to his instructions of the men by a citation of what many believe to be a contemporary aphorism. The necessity for such identification is diminished when a 'saying' is not demanded.²

¹Easton (PE, p. 117) observes that the phrase 'I am the chief of sinners', is "purely formalized" and that the "Pauline writers exalt their hero by exaggerating his humility"; while E.F. Scott (PE, p. 14; cf., Gealy, p. 391) regards the language as morbid. Yet to suggest that Paul could, or would not have so confessed seems unwarranted in view of the superlatives of self-abasement in 1 C 15:9 and Eph 3:8. Such humility was unlike a later imitator who would tend to exalt his hero. This was not formal devotion, but devout conviction. Cf., Schlatter, Die Kirche, pp. 61f.

²The hopelessness in trying to decide the contextual merits of the 'saying' as applicable to the preceding or following verse is seen in the array of expositors for each. Preceding: Chrysostom; Brown; Goudge; Hillard; Lock (perhaps); Moffatt; Parry; Schlatter; White. Following: Theodor v. Mops; Alford; Bernard; Dibelius; Easton; Falconer; Guthrie; Horton; Humphreys; James; Jeremias; Meinertz; E. Scott; Simpson; Spicq; Swete; AV; RV.

I 4:9. Both the verses preceding, and those following the parenthetical exclamation have qualities which might distinguish them as the 'saying' in question. Verse 8 is more proverbial and contains the conjunction γάρ which can be introductory in function; while verse 10 is more credal and theological. Depending upon the extent of the citation, verse 10 has, in addition, either the γάρ or ὅτι to be taken in the recitative capacity. The expositors have become hopelessly deadlocked in their claims regarding the respective merits of each verse warranting the 'saying' designation.¹ Would it not be wiser to acknowledge the ejaculation as emanating from the recognition of God's promise of eternal life? - 'oh, faithful is that Word of God'. This asseveration is closely followed by a complementary acknowledgment of the worth of this Word, and a formula introducing a citation prefaced by ὅτι concerning the Saviorhood of God. Here again, then, a quotation is found to be inserted as an expansion of the discussion of God's Word, and not as the identification of a word.²

II 2:11. Note carefully the verses preceding the phrases in question:

¹Expositors attributing the 'saying' to the preceding principally because of the proverbial ring: Bernard; Brown; Dibelius, Falconer; Gealy; Goudge; Horton; James; Lock; Parry; Schlatter; E. Scott; Spicq; Swete; von Soden; Wace; Weiss; White. Following, principally because of the natural sense: Easton; Guthrie; Hillard; Holtzmann; Humphreys; Simpson.

²Easton (PE, p. 148) observes that "the thought of the citation is perfectly Pauline, but Paul would not have added the ungraceful 'especially of believers'." Yet, see E. Scott, (PE, pp. 50f) who contends that the objected phrase reinforces the thought. Thus, he observes, that "those who have expressly put their faith in God can be certain of the mercy which is extended to all."

Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel (εὐαγγελίόν μου) wherein (that is, the gospel) I suffer hardship unto bonds, as a malefactor; but the word of God (ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ) is not bound. Therefore (that is, because the word of God is not bound) I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. Faithful is the Word. (that Word which is not bound and which supports Paul in his)

This interplay of words, with its inclusion of the summary content of the received Gospel, is followed by a quotation intended to enhance the author's assertion regarding the faithfulness of that Word. The antithetical and pronounced rhythmic clauses of the verses, as well as the doctrinal emphasis on the death, resurrection, and reign of the Lord, have forced almost unanimous acceptance of the fact that the citation is an early hymn fragment. Most scholars regard the text as Pauline in phraseology and theology,¹ and questions arise only regarding the length² and purpose³ of the fragment.

Tit 3:8. There is again virtual unanimity in attributing the verses preceding the phrase as the faithful 'saying';

¹Swete ("The Faithful Sayings") contends that although the first part of the hymn is manifestly Pauline, the second part (ἀρνεῖσθαι onwards) is from the Matthaean-Lucan tradition. In view of the earlier discussion in this chapter, that does not weigh heavily against the verse as being Pauline in usage or origin. Falconer (PE, p. 82) observes that "if the Apostle did not compose the verses, he easily adopted them as suitable for his purpose."

²Only Chrysostom, Horton (perhaps), Spicq (verse 8 only; so Lock, perhaps), and White (verses 4-11) regard the fragment as preceding. While most other expositors include verses 11-13 as the hymn, the following differ: Dodd (According to the Scriptures, London, 1952, p. 68) only 11-12; Easton (PE, p. 52) only through verse 12a; and James (p. 135) to verses 11-13a. See Herklots (p. 90) for a three versed English paraphrase.

³Baptism: so, Easton, Parry, E. Scott, Wace; persecution: Lock; martyrdom: Brown, Herklots; confession of faith: Dodd.

but there the agreement terminates. Commentators are at variance regarding the length of the 'saying', and its rhythmical qualities. Swete,¹ includes verses 5-7 in the saying; Easton, verses 5b-7;² Lock, possibly only verse 5, with verses 6 and 7 serving as its expansion;³ E.F. Scott, if preceding, then only verse 7 is applicable;⁴ Dibelius, verses 3-7;⁵ and Meinertz, verses 4-7.⁶ Furthermore, although the section maintains a solemn and somewhat rhythmical or catechetical character it is doubtful whether it would be adjudged as a Christian hymn fragment if it were not for the need to establish a 'saying'. If, with Moffatt, the 'faithful saying' ought to be a "condensed and pregnant statement,"⁷ then only the conjectures of Scott and Lock would be acceptable. White, recognizing the problem, maintained that it is the truth contained in verses 4-7 that is being stressed, and not any particular identifiable quotation.⁸ Is not this a closer approximation to the truth than to attempt the impossible

¹"Faithful Sayings", pp. 5f. Cf. Goudge, p. 595.

²PE, pp. 98f. Cf., Jeremias, ad loc;

³PE, pp. 155f.

⁴PE, pp. 177f. Scott is unusual in his application to the following verse, which he regards as lending emphasis to the charges given to Timothy.

⁵Pastoralbriefe, ad loc.

⁶Op. cit., ad loc. Cf., Brown, PE, p. 113; Guthrie, PE p. 207; Moffatt, translation.

⁷"Timothy and Titus (Epistles)", Encyclopaedia Biblica, IV, col 5086.

⁸Op. cit., p. 200. Cf., H. Wace, "Timothy and Titus", The Speaker's Commentary Series, ed F. Cook, III, London, 1881, p. 816.

task of establishing a specified saying? Surely the answer may be found in the fact that the author's discussion of the effectual activity of the Trinity in working out man's salvation has once more extracted an exclamation concerning the dependability of the revealed Word of God. The writer, following the introductory formula once more appends an aphorism which serves to endorse his discussion of the Word. This practical exhortation insists that they who believe God (God's Word?)¹ ought to "make it their business to do good."² It is, therefore, a typically Pauline insistence upon a true Christian walk as well as talk, and is the concomitant of the discussion of salvation which occasioned the ejaculation, regarding God's Word.

This study therefore suggests that the phrase 'πιστὸς ὁ λόγος', refers not to a specific quotation, but to the word of God enunciated; that the subject discussed concerns salvation and/or eternal life; and that a citation may or may not be used to buttress this discussion. This citation, therefore, may well be viewed not as an essential element of the previous statement, but as an additional argument in its support. It only remains to examine any theological problems of the 'sayings' which involve a question of the Pastorals' authenticity.

Theology. Regarding I 2:15, Easton queries whether Paul could have written that "Christian women are saved by childbear-

¹Rather than 'in God', as does E.F. Scott, PE, p. 178.

²So Abbott-Smith, p. 381, for: φροντίζουσιν καλῶν ἔργων προϊστασθαι.

ing."¹ There is no doubt, but that Easton has raised one of the most perplexing problems for the interpreter. The meaning of the phrase, σωθήσεται δὲ/τῆς τεκνογονίας ^{διὰ} is obscure;² it has resulted in a variety of interpretations, of which Easton's is but one. If διὰ was only capable of being translated 'by means of', then Paul could not have written this verse. The Apostle could never have made τεκνογονίας the meritorious cause of woman's salvation; for the faith involved in the following conditional clause would then be apparently valueless unless a woman happened to be a mother.³ Scott's thesis should also be rejected. It is his contention that διὰ is to be taken not in its usual sense of 'by means of', but as denoting a condition: "She shall be saved even though she must bear children."⁴ Such an interpretation accords well with the context, which, in spite of the penalty of sin, brings women as well as men within the scope of salvation. But this is a completely unnatural meaning of the preposition. Lock, by emphasizing the article (τῆς) arrives at a Messianic interpretation.

¹PE, p. 13. Cf., Falconer, PE, pp. 131; Goodspeed translation. The balance of Easton's statement is "or that Timothy by steadfast moral endeavor will save himself (I 4:16)?" Yet cf., 1 C 9:27 and the danger confronting the minister that "in his concern for those he works for, he should take himself for granted" (E.F. Scott, PE, p. 54). Cf., Simpson, pp. 71f; Phil 2:12. For objections to Chrysostom's attempt to give τεκνογονία the meaning of τεκνοτροφία, see Bernard, PE, p. 49.

²As evidenced by the following translations: AV, "shall be saved in childbearing"; Eng RV "through the childbearing"; ARV, "through her childbearing"; Goodspeed, "through motherhood." For a good discussion of the possibilities of interpretation, see Ramsay, Exp, 7th ser, VIII, 339-347.

³Cf., I 5:5f, and the case of the childless widow; E.F. Scott, PE, pp. 27ff.

⁴Ibid. Yet see Guthrie, PE, p. 78.

For him, it is the great childbearing of Mary, (which has undone the work of Eve) that is being alluded to in the verse.¹ But surely the article is to be taken in its generic sense rather than as definitive of a particular birth. Furthermore, additional explanation would have been needed to make such an interpretation valid.

It is possible that Moffatt's translation is correct. He would translate the phrase, "woman will get safely through childbirth," and thus convey encouragement to women in their natural sphere.² This is certainly in accord with the context, and could well be designed to offset the advocacy of abstinence taught by the errorists. Yet, if this is the explanation, this verse is the only one involved in a *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* discussion which is not concerned with the subject of eternal life. It therefore appears that the simplest, and perhaps the most probable interpretation, is that woman will receive her spiritual salvation through her divinely appointed sphere of activity - but only if she abides in faith and love.³ A woman's salvation will be worked out (in the sense of Phil 2:12) not by assuming public duties, but by fulfilment of that activity which has been

¹PE, pp. 32f. Cf., Ellicott, ad loc. Yet, see Bernard, PE, pp. 49f; Parry (p. 15) who regards the theory as too "obscure and cursory"; and Guthrie, ibid.

²Cf., Simpson, pp. 48f; Hillard, pp. 23f.

³Cf., Barclay, PE, p. 61; Gealy, pp. 406f; Bernard, PE p. 49; Humphreys, p. 100; White, pp. 109f; Parry, p. 15. Closely allied is the theory of Plummer (Brown, PE, p. 22) that women are to be saved in the sense of being preserved from sin. By remaining in her appointed sphere, woman would be kept free from the temptation and deception to which Eve had been afflicted.

assigned to her. This is the sphere of a woman's mission; this is the 'good work' which is assigned to her in 2:10. This interpretation is in keeping with Pauline authorship, and provides the most natural transition to the good work of 3:1.

Perhaps no more pregnant summary of the Pauline Gospel could be found than that contained in Titus 3:4-7. The entire section is permeated with the redemptive activity of the Trinity. Salvation by the grace of God, renewal through the Holy Spirit, and justification through the work of Jesus Christ, is the undeniably Pauline theology of the section.¹ Yet the Pauline thought appears to come to an abrupt end with the phrase:

διὰ λουτροῦ καλυπνεσεῖας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου . Salvation by faith is the distinctive teaching of Paul; but here, instead of faith, baptism is detected as the effectual means of salvation. "The Church," asserts E.F. Scott, "is now on its way towards a magical estimate of baptism."² If this is true, then the commentator must assume that the passage is not from Paul and agree with Moffatt, that "it unites the older Pauline view of justification by grace with the popular idea of rebirth

¹Easton (PE, p. 103) objects that Paul would not have omitted 'faith' from such a context of justification. Yet in 1 C 6:11 there is a similar mentioning of 'being washed', 'sanctified', 'justified', and stress on the work of the God-head, without an explicit mention of faith.

²PE, p. 176. Yet, see Guthrie, PE, p. 205; and Simpson, pp. 115f. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the subject of baptism beyond its direct association with the text. However, for recent works on the subject, see: Cullmann, Baptism in the NT, London, 1950; T. Torrance, Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism, Church of Scotland, 1956; and K. Barth, The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, London, 1948.

and renewal through baptism as the saving process."¹ Yet, like other passages found within the Pastorals, if the text is viewed not from the angle of the externalization of later thought, but from the position of the writer, a different concept is gained.

It is possible that the entire clause in question is governed by the genitive expressing the agency of the Holy Spirit.² Since there is no specifying article before *λουτροσ* it is necessary to determine the washing involved by the words which follow. The phrase is then capable of being translated: "He (God) saved us through a washing of regeneration and renewal which is the work of the Holy Spirit." Thus regarded, the passage finds a ready parallel in Jo 3:5-8, where Christ couples the water and the supremacy of the Spirit together.³

Another interpretation is gained by having *διδ* govern only

¹Grace in the NT, London, 1931, pp. 308ff. Cf., T.G. Soares, "Regeneration", HDAC, II, 310-14; Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 392; Gealy, p. 544. Cf., also, Plummer, p. 285; Bernard, PE, p. 178. Pierre Dornier, Les Epitres de Saint Paul à Timothée et à Tite, Paris, 1958, p. 18.

²So, Horton, pp. 189f; Shaw, pp. 453f. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the NT, London, 1909, pp. 247f: "no context in the NT exhibits more clearly the place of the Spirit in the economy of human salvation; its relation to the justifying grace of God, the redeeming work of our Lord, the sacramental life of the baptized, the eternal life of the saved." It is significant that *codd. D EFG* repeat *διδ*, thus assuming two separate acts or processes. For Chase (Confirmation in the Apostolic Age, London, 1909, pp. 98-102) this second act is confirmation.

³Cf. Acts 2:38; 22:16; 1 C 6:11; Heb 10:22; Cullmann, Early Worship, pp. 75f. Ambrose, On the Holy Spirit, 1.6: "If, then, there be any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of the Holy Spirit."

λουτροῦ,¹ and regarding the following terms in the sense of a qualitative genitive. Παλιγγενεσίας² and ἀνακαινώσεως are substantives, not adjectives. Hence, the text does not speak of a regenerating and renewing baptism, but rather a baptism which is characterised by those substantives. Mark 1:4 relates John's repentance baptism (βάπτισμα μετανοίας), but the precise relation of repentance to baptism is not defined. Whether the baptism is based on and preceded by repentance or to induce repentance, the context, and not the genitive must determine. Even so, in Tit 3:5, whether the baptism is based on and preceded by regeneration or to produce regeneration, the context of God's wondrous grace must determine.

Furthermore, although commentators have always regarded this text as referring to baptism, this might not have been the author's original intention. It is significant that the only other use of λουτρόν in the NT is in Eph 5:26 where it is explained by the added ὕδωρ. Therefore, in this instance, a cleansing by baptism in the name of Christ is the obvious interpretation.³ But, if λουτρόν required the meaning of baptism in

¹Support for the translation of 'laver' for λουτρόν is slight. For defense, see Lilley, pp. 170f. Yet after an examination of the LXX and patristic references J.A. Robinson (St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1903, pp. 205f) selects 'washing' as the best translation. If 'vessel' or 'laver' had been intended, λουτήρ would undoubtedly have been employed.

²Dibelius (Pastoralbriefe, pp. 94f) and Easton (PE, p. 103) associate this term with the mysteries. Yet, although this is an unPauline term, Easton proceeds to note that "everything implied in it is seen in his teaching about the effects of baptism in R 6:3-6; Col 2:11-13; andeed, in his stress on the mystical union his teaching ascribes deeper effects to the sacrament than does the Pastorals."

³The only question in Eph 5:26 is the interpretation of ῥήμα, and not λουτρόν. Most commentators regard the term as a formula of baptism. Cf. T.K. Abbott, p. 169; J.A. Robinson,

and of itself, why was the explanatory ὕδωρ required? Theophilus (ii.6) provides an interesting parallel when he writes of the forgiveness of sin διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας. Here the most obvious interpretation is to distinguish between the λουτρόν and ὕδωρ. It is therefore possible that in Tit 3:5 the reference is not to a water washing, but to a washing or cleansing of God's Spirit.¹ If, as is probable, the text refers to baptism, this much is certain: faith and baptism, the Spirit and the water are here, as in NT thought, united. No antithesis between faith and baptism exists. In view of the alternative interpretations, there would appear no need to discover any unPauline occult qualities of a pagan conception of baptism.

This investigation of formalized religious expression must therefore conclude that such formalizations were prevalent within the primitive Church and that Paul utilized them. The stress on 'tradition' and 'deposit', rather than indicating a later age, could suggest that as yet the authoritative Gospel records were not in circulation and would therefore be in keeping with a first century dating of the Epistles. Although, in certain cases, the theology of and stress on the credal fragments are unparalleled in Paul, arguments can be presented to retain Pauline authorship.

pp. 206f. Yet, see Beet (Ephesians, London, 1890, pp. 360f), who regards the term as synonymous with the Gospel, and the instrument of sanctification.

¹Cf. Jo 13:8,10; Rev 1:5 (textual variant of λουσάντι); Heb 9:14.

FALSE RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION

In 1910 J.D. White could write that the marks of affinity between the error described in the Pastorals, and that of the heresies dominating the second century, are "not now insisted on by many of the antitraditional school."¹ More recently, however, J. Knox has declared that it is a "conclusion all but universally shared among students of the epistles" that the Letters took shape in the second century; and, further, that "it is almost certain" that one of the doctrines attacked is Marcionism.² Has scholarship so completely shifted in its position? Can the heresy be identified with such positive assurance as Marcionite, and consequently contemporary in date and therefore non-Pauline? Other scholars, although not as adamant in their identification of the error, would agree with Moffatt that the method of denunciation of the errorists incorporated by the author is one of the "numerous and decisive proofs that Paul did not write the Pastorals."³ If investigation tends to confirm either that the heresy is the developed Gnosticism of the second century, or that the method of refutation is out of keeping with what is known of Paul, conclusive proof is afforded against Pauline authorship. Thus an investigation into these enquiries is mandatory for a correct understanding of the Pastorals.

¹Op. cit., p. 58. Cf., Shaw, p. 449.

²Marcion, pp. 73f. Cf., Loisy, p. 276: "there can be no doubt that in the passage before us (I 4:1-5) the Spirit is aiming at Marcion."

³INT, p. 409.

FALSE RELIGION SUMMARIZED

The three Epistles afford nothing in the nature of a direct account of the tenets of the Ephesian or Cretan errorists. The allusions, although vague to us, would have been much clearer to the readers, who, along with the author, were well aware of the error. There was no need to present the position of the opponents in order to denounce it; they would be acquainted with every nuance and catch-phrase. Yet for us, without this knowledge, it is difficult, if not impossible, to weave the stray references¹ into a coherent system. Several distinguishing features can be marshalled, however, before an attempt is made at identification.

Membership

The errorists were lay members of the Church and were therefore subject to the command of cessation and disciplinary measures accorded to Timothy and Titus. Since an appeal is made that they become sound in faith (I 1:16), the false teachers can be assumed to have at least professed such faith (Tit 1:16).² As yet no schism had resulted through their teaching; no sectarian church had been established. Divisions, or cliques, yes, but there is no hint of the elaborate separatist organizations under the

¹I 1:3-10, 19, 20; 4:1-10; 6:3-5; II 2:14-26; 3:1-9; Tit 1:9-16; 3:9-11.

²Two additional indications are: the errorists' spiritual life is in peril (II 2:23); and the implication of the epithet ἀνυπότακτοι in Tit 1:10. As White (p. 188) observes, "we cannot call those persons 'unruly' on whose obedience we have no claim."

tutelage of the second century heresiarchs.¹ In this connection, it must be noted that the acquired theological meaning of 'heresy' or 'heretic' does not belong in the Pastorals. On the presupposition of a second century date, Gealy suggests that as the Pastoral Epistles were concerned with 'sound doctrine' it is almost certain that when αἱρετικός is used in Tit 3:10 it would include its later sense of heretical.² Yet surely, when αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπων is taken in context, it is a further description of the errorist who engenders strife and fightings; who is, with Simpson, "a cliquist or opinionative propagandist who promotes dissension by his pertinacity."³

¹So, Schlatter, The Church in the NT Period, p. 229. Lilley (p. 30) observes that the errorists arose from four areas. Yet the language is so similar in all three Epistles that it would appear unwarrantable to discover separate errors in the Ephesian and Cretan Letters. Among that which is in common is: description as 'myths' (Tit 1:10; I 1:3f); combination of 'questions' with 'genealogies' (Tit 3:9; I 1:4); adjective 'foolish' attached to 'questions' (Tit 3:9; II 2:23); strivings about the Law (Tit 3:9; I 6:4) and 'logomachies' (Tit 3:9; I 6:4); both disciples are told to shun the error because of its uselessness (Tit 3:9; II 2:16). They are a unity too from the pseudepigraphical standpoint since the three letters would then have been written for one purpose. So, Libelius, Pastoralbriefe, p. 41.

²Op. cit., p. 548. Cf., E.F. Scott, PE, pp. 179f, where he expresses the view that 'heretic' is beginning to have the later ecclesiastical ring.

³Op. cit., p. 117. Cf., 1 C 11:19; 1:10, 11; R 16:17; Acts 5:17; 24:5, 14. Αἱρετικὸν is still an adjective in Tit 3:10; it does not convey the later (Irenaeus and Tertullian) substantive meaning of one who is outside the orthodox church because of his holding false doctrine. Cf., Lock, PE, p. 157. See also C.A.A. Scott, Words, p. 52, for his discussion of the term in Gal 5:20 and 1 C 11:19. For the evolution of αἱρέσεις as a technical designation and its NT relation to σχίσματα, see Wace, p. 817.

Matter

The errorists delved in theosophic speculations. Claiming true knowledge (γνῶσις , I 6:20), they were actually ignorant of their subject (I 1:7, 6:4; II 3:7) and destitute of any common sense (II 2:23). Their words were empty (I 1:6; Tit 1:10; 3:9), meaningless (I 6:20; II 2:16), and consequently worthless (Tit 3:8, 9; I 4:8; II 3:16). It is the irrelevancy of the 'vain jangling' (ματαιολογίαν , I 1:6; Tit 1:10), the pointless sophistry and absurd craving for arguments (I 1:4; II 2:23; I 6:4; Tit 3:9), rather than any specifically heterodox teaching, that is denounced. This is a fact which has been all too often ignored or overlooked in the evaluation of the errorists. "The objection to their teaching," observes Scott, "is not so much its falsehood as its futility."¹ It was trivial, apparently, but not traitorous.

It would appear that this pseudo-intellectualism was also characterized by a mystical exclusiveness. It is possible that the Pastorals' stress on the universality of the Gospel (cf. Tit 2:11; I 2:4), was to counteract the intellectuals' claim to the exclusive possession of the knowledge of God. The only direct reference, however, to a specific doctrinal error is that of the denial of the resurrection on the part of Hymenaeus and Philetus. Such personal perversions of doctrine on the part of persons ostracized from the fellowship must not be regarded as normative for the others remaining with the Church.²

¹PE, p. 7. Cf., M. Dods, pp. 174f; B. Weiss, INT, pp. 390ff; Carrington, The Early Christian Church, I, 263.

²So, Hort, Judaistic Christianity, Cambridge, 1894, p. 132; T. Zahn, INT, II, 99f. This tendency to allegorize the belief in the resurrection was seen at Corinth (1 C 15) as well as in literature of the second century, e.g. 2 Clem IX; Poly VII; Acts of Paul XIV.

Jewish 'myths' (μύθοις, Tit 1:14), and 'genealogies' (γενεαλογίας, Tit 3:9) which are linked with disputatiousness of the Law, comprise the material of the errorists. Furthermore, they sought to be νομοδιδάσκαλοι (I 1:7), although manifesting more interest in novelties than in the true moral significance of the Law (I 1:5, 8). They are identified as ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς (Tit 1:10); but since the requirement of circumcision as a basis of salvation is omitted, it is possible that they were not Pharisaic Jewish Christians.¹

Methods

The author foreshadows a more acute declension in the future,² but the contemporary phenomenon deplored is the manner in which the teachers conducted themselves. The tendency was to thrust the personality of the teacher to the fore, rather than the person of Christ. Self-exultation; not the Saviour's. The stress was on the power of words; not The Word. In their pride (II 3:2) and quest for personal profit (I 6:5; Tit 1:11) they concentrated their attack upon the women of the congregation (II 3:6); overthrowing the faith (II 2:18) of entire households (II 3:6;

¹So, Lock, PE, pp. 132f.

²I 4:1ff; II 3:1ff; II 4:3. The distinction between a future and a present phenomenon is emphasized strongly by Hort, loc. cit., p. 132; followed by Peake, INT, p. 66, and Simpson, p. 143. Those who reject Pauline authenticity would with Easton (PE, p. 64) explain the use of the future because "post-Pauline conditions are being described by 'Paul'." Cf., Gealy, p. 497; E.F. Scott, PE, p. 130. Many traditionalists see in the prophetic utterances that which is already operative in the present. So Guthrie, PE, pp. 91f; White, p. 120; Lock, PE, p. 104; Bernard, PE, p. 129. Parry (p. 62) regards II 3:1 as actually alluding only to critical times, and therefore to the immediate difficulties confronting Timothy.

Tit 1:11). Although they believed in God, their lives were manifestly contrary to their profession (Tit 1:16). Their capricious meddling with secular questions, questions completely destitute of any moral or religious value, could only produce harm. The harm observed is that of envy (φθόνος , I 6:4), dissension (ἔρις , I 6:4; Tit 3:9; II 2:23), evil slander (βλασφημῆσαι) and insinuations of rivals (ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί , I 6:4), mutual irritations (διεφθαρμένων , I 6:5), and ungodliness (ἀσεβείας , II 2:16).

Morality

The error, which began intellectually, resulted in concomitant tendencies of asceticism and libertinism. It is significant, that only in the two apocalyptic passages (I 4:1ff; II 3:1ff) are the extreme forms of these tendencies evidenced. Continued intercourse with 'seducing spirits' (I 4:1) would inevitably lead to an insensitivity¹ to the difference between truth and error (I 6:5) with its resultant impact upon morals; but it seems unwise to confuse the warning with the contemporary perversity or error. The ascetic tendencies had not led, as yet, to the abandoned life forecast. This prognostication, however, may be an intimation of a not uncommon tendency in the religious and philosophical movements of the time to a dualistic view of matter; a concept which found its culmination in the heresiarchs of the second century. To what extent this immoral, ascetic apostasy was in reality future to the author is unknown. The

¹Here regarding κεκαυστηριασμένων (I 4:2) as meaning 'burned into insensitivity' (so Gealy, p. 424; Parry, p. 25); rather than 'branded as a slave' (so Lock, PE, p. 48; Scott, PE, p. 45; Bernard, PE, pp. 65f; Easton, PE, p. 140).

germ of the future must at least have been present.

From this summary, it would appear, that the error was centered in Christians still in fellowship with the Church; there was a propensity towards Jewish trifling; irrelevancy, rather than heterodoxy is denounced; specifically mentioned doctrinal error is regarded as extreme perversity; and there was a tendency to asceticism and libertinism.

FALSE RELIGION IDENTIFIED

Is there any heresy which suitably incorporates the material assembled? A number of scholars have refrained from identifying the tenets with any particular sect, and see only tendencies of thought which were represented by no special party; as the soil prepared for, rather than a developed heresy.¹ If one could be certain that the phrases within the Epistles which seem to indicate a propaganda more positively erroneous and mischievous were actually the writer's apprehensions of the future, then such a determination may yet prove to be correct. Yet, although W.L. Knox has dismissed the Pastorals' author as being "so muddle-headed that it is impossible to say what form of error (if any) he had in mind,"² most commentators seem disposed to suggest either a Gnostic or a Jewish-Christian nexus.

¹So, Stevens, The Pauline Theology, p. 94; Shaw, p. 450; and the many commentators who regard the error as being 'incipient' in form.

²The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 98f.

Gnosticism

It is generally assumed by those who deny the Epistles' authenticity, that the error attacked was some form of the Gnostic heresy which occupied the attention of such apologists as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus.¹ In examining the heretical views described by these heresiologists many elements of comparison have been noted to substantiate this assumption. The following may be cited as typical examples.

Dualism. The religious and philosophical basis of Gnosticism is dualism. The attempt to reconcile the paradox of a good God with the problem of evil by the postulation of a lower creator God (i.e., Demiurge), and a higher savior God, is seen to be met by the affirmation of the unity of the Godhead (I 2:5), and assertion of His goodness (I 4:4). The 'genealogies' are therefore viewed as the speculations concerning a succession of emanations from the Divine Pleroma; an

¹Iren Haer II.14; Tert de Praes VII.30; Hippol ref praef VIII. The term 'Gnosticism' is therefore used here as a "label for a large and somewhat amorphous group of religious systems" attacked by and known from second century Church apologists (Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953, p. 97). Cf., R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, London, 1958, p. 68; F.C. Burkitt, Church and Gnosis, Cambridge, 1932; R.P. Casey, "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the NT", The Background of the NT and its Eschatology, eds Davies and Daube, Cambridge, 1956, pp. 52-80. For discussion of the difficulty in defining Gnosticism, see, H.A.A. Kennedy, Mystery-Religions, pp. 26-29; and J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, pp. 22-28. For study of the basic Gnostic concepts from which the following comparisons are made, see, R.P. Casey, "The Study of Gnosticism", JTS, XXXVI (1935), 45-60; Gealy, pp. 354-360; Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 413ff; S. Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, London, 1929, pp. 376-397; and Lightfoot, Colossians, London, 1892, pp. 75ff.

aeon hierarchy mediating between God and the world (Tit 3:9; I 1:4).

Doceticism. This Gnostic contempt for material existence resulted in a Christology that was generally Docetic. Thus, the stress on the reality of the incarnation (I 3:16), and of the resurrection is viewed as a pointed refutation by the author. The affirmation that there is but "one Mediator between God and man, Himself man, Christ Jesus" (I 2:5) asserts on the one hand the divine dignity of Christ, and on the other contends with the imagination of a hierarchy of angelic mediators.

Intellectualism. Ἐνδοξα , the mystical illumination which insures salvation for a select intellectual aristocracy is counteracted by the Pastorals' stress on faith and good works. Whether 'pneumatikoi', 'psychikoi', or 'hylikoi', Christ gave His life a ransom for all (I 2:1-6; 4:10; Tit 2:11).

Asceticism. The Gnostic asceticism which took the form of prohibiting marriage and certain foods is found to be opposed by explicit instructions for members and ministry alike (I 3:2, 12; 4:3; 5:4, 9, 14; 5:23). The libertinism (I 4:3) of certain Gnostic sects which resulted from their cosmological salvation theories and antinomian tendencies was met by a renewed emphasis upon morality.

These, and other comparisons which have been advanced,¹ are striking; but they are not conclusive. There are principles which can be set forth that are incompatible with a definite

¹For the most complete discussion of comparisons, see esp Gealy, pp. 354-60; Goodspeed, INT, pp. 334-8; Loisy, pp. 276-9, who distinguishes between the first draft of the Epistles as anti-Gnostic, and the canonized edition which is anti-Marcionite; D. Smith, p. 592; Rist, pp. 39-62.

designation. In this connection, it should be remembered that the errorists apparently did not deny God (Tit 1:13-16) nor teach any demiurge concept. They accepted the God of the Church; it was their lives which did not conform to this profession. The author was concerned with that which was described as 'old-wives' tales'; only in predictive passages was any malignity foreshadowed. Again, the argument is too vague to be polemically effective against an alleged "coherent and powerful heresy."¹ Indefiniteness of language, and inability to fasten the error precisely, may well argue for an incipient stage of heresy, rather than any alleged subtlety on the party of the author. This intellectual arrogance with its imaginative speculations was certainly not confined to any one particular age.² Furthermore, it can be shown that many of the alleged comparisons have interesting counterparts in the accepted works of Paul.³

Using the Colossian heresy to illustrate this last point, the following similarities can be discerned:⁴ Judaistic tendencies

¹Easton, PE, p. 3.

²So, Barclay, PE, pp. 143f; Lock, PE, pp. 75, 119.

³The question of dualism is an interesting example. One must not interpret every set of opposites as dualistic. J.A. Fitzmyer ("The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature", The Scrolls and the NT, ed K. Stendahl, London, 1958, pp. 215ff) states that "it should be obvious that the principle of contradiction, being a basic metaphysical principle, could be made the support for many sets of opposites which are not specifically 'dualistic'." Fitzmyer proceeds to illustrate the point by such obvious opposites as the Levitical contrast of clean-unclean, heaven and earth, the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

⁴Numerous authors have detected similarities between the Pastoralists' and Colossians' heresy. Cf., Bowen, pp. 51-7; Lightfoot, Colossians, pp. 72-110; Dornier, p. 10.

(C 2:16, 20-22; Tit 1:10, 14); intellectual pretension (C 2:8; I 6:20); stress of the Eternal Son, because of the successive emanation doctrine (C 1:13 sq; I 2:5); diety and humanity of Christ emphasized to offset Docetism (C 2:9; 1:19; 3:1; I 2:5); evil of matter and resulting asceticism (I 4:3; C 2:20-23, 16; 3:5); libertinism, and the stress on good works in contrast with evil (C 1:10,21; I 4:1-8); mystical exclusiveness (C 1:26f; I 2:6); stress on the redemptive and high-priestly act of Christ (I 2:5f; C 2:13); need to continue in the faith (C 1:23; I 3:9) and the Pauline Gospel (C 1:23; I 4:6) to offset error; and a similar characterization of the heresy as promulgating doctrines foreign to the gospel (C 2:22; I 1:3), by men who are vain (C 2:8; Tit 1:10), 'puffed-up' (C 2:18; I 6:4), and concerned with cleverness of speech (Tit 1:10f; C 2:4). These comparisons should serve to guard against the proclivity of asserting dogmatically that the Pastorals are concerned with the developed heresy of the second century.

Be that as it may, ever since the days of F.C. Baur (1835) there has been a persistent attempt of an extreme school to recognize in the Pastorals' error, not only Gnosticism, but Marcionism in particular.¹ One of the modern exponents of this theory, Goodspeed, asserts that "Paul is being made a tool of Marcionism and he must be rescued, and recovered for the uses of the Church."² In addition to the previously mentioned comparisons,

¹E.g. W. Bauer, Barnett, Gealy, Goodspeed, J. Knox, Loisy, Riddle, Rist.

²INT, p. 338. Cf., W. Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum, Tübingen, 1934, pp. 228f, where he regards the Pastorals "als einen Versuch der Kirche, Paulus unmissverständlich in die antihäretische Front einzugliedern und den Mangel an Vertrauen zu ihm in kirchlichen Kreisen zu beheben."

the oft-quoted phrase ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως (I 6:20) is regarded as one that can "hardly be questioned" as Marcionite.¹ Admittedly, Marcion employed the term 'ἀντίθεσις' as the title for his book; but the application is decidedly different. Marcion's 'antithesis' was the result of his dualism which led to the rejection of the OT. His contradiction was between the Law and the Gospel.² The Pastorals' ἀντίθεσις, which is under the same article as νενοφανία,³ is contextually concerned with contentious men. Thus the term could well mean either a 'controversy',⁴ or 'rival thesis',⁵; a concern to put an end to the attempts at intellectual cleverness in the interest of salvation. This Aristotelian rhetorical term was not novel to Marcion, for as Easton has noted, "every orator was equipped with a stock of 'antitheses' as part of his common-places."⁶

Although discussion must be limited, there are other reasons why, irrespective of the analogies, the errorists cannot be Marcionite. If the Jewish character of the Pastorals' error is

¹J. Knox, Marcion, p. 73.

²So, Tert I.19; II.28, 29; IV. 1,4,6. Jeremias (pp. 40f) has summarized the argument thus: "Die Antithesen der Gnosis, die dabei erwähnt werden, haben mit den um 140 geschriebenen 'Antithesen' Marcions nichts zu tun; denn die in den Pastoralbriefen bekämpfte Gnosis ist judaistisch, während die Gnosis Marcions scharf antijüdisch war." Cf., Harnack, History of Dogma, tran N. Buchanan, I, London, 1905, p. 271.

³So, Parry, p. 45. But this argument is taken exception to by White (p. 150) when he notes that the general anarthrous character of the Greek of these Epistles would prohibit such stress.

⁴So, J.W. Hunkin, The NT. A Conspectus, London, 1950, pp. 108f; Meinertz, p. 79; Horton, p. 139.

⁵So, Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 140; Lock, PE, p. 76; Falconer, PE, p. 159; Barclay, PE, pp. 143f.

⁶PE, p. 170. Cf., Simpson, p. 11.

granted, it is strangely incongruous to associate it with that which was fiercely anti-Jewish. Furthermore, to make the error Marcionism is to assume the Epistles' pseudepigraphic character; this has been shown in chapter three to be at least questionable. Again, the second century apologists regarded Marcionism as a serious threat to the orthodox church. Surely the postulated pseudo-Paul would have chosen terms more stringent than those incorporated and more in keeping with those of his contemporary heresiologists to stigmatize the error. Moreover, although his opponents viewed him as a Gnostic, Marcion's gnosticism is recognized as being confined to his belief in certain dualistic tenets.¹ The heresiarch spurned the syzygies of the Gnostic systems; stressed the necessity of faith rather than knowledge; omitted the Gnostic docetic pluralism;² and although ascetic, was scrupulous in morals. It must therefore be observed with Easton, that "much of the polemic in the Pastorals is wholly irrelevant" as far as Marcion is concerned.³ Finally, as chapter one has sought to indicate, a most serious objection to making the Pastorals' error that of Marcionism is one of chronology. With the Epistles' acknowledged use by Polycarp, universal acceptance by A.D. 180, version status by mid-second century, and acceptance by later Marcionites, any theory of

¹So, J.F. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, London, 1903, pp. 81f; Harnack, loc. cit., p. 267; Burkitt, Church and Gnosis, p. 25.

²Cf., Tert adv Marcion, I.19. Although Marcion regarded the Lord's body as phantasmal, and his Christology was therefore docetic, he believed in the reality of Christ's passion and death. Cf., Kelly, Doctrines, p. 141.

³PE, p. 8.

authorship involving a mid-second century polemic would appear to be out of the question.

Jewish-Christian

Following the lead of Hort in his Judaistic Christianity, it is generally assumed by those who accept the Epistles' authenticity that the error attacked had some Jewish nexus.¹ There is wide variance in the precise designation of this connection;² but the following evidence is cited in its support.

It has already been observed that the errorists are of the circumcision (Tit 1:10), quarrel about (Tit 3:9) and seek to be teachers of the law (I 1:3ff), and are concerned with Jewish myths (Tit 1:14). The 'myths and interminable genealogies' of I 1:4 are viewed not as Gnostic syzygies, but as referring to the legendary history of the patriarchs and the descendants of early

¹Even Dibelius (Fresh Approach, p. 233) who rejects the Pastorals' authenticity, concludes that the great Gnostic systems of the middle of the second century are not taken into account in the Epistles. Dibelius accepts a Jewish connection in stating that "der Zusammenhang unserer Gnostiker mit dem Judentum ist also nicht unbedingt sicher zu stellen..." (Pastoralbriefe, pp. 42f). So also most Fragmentarians, e.g., Falconer, PE, p. 47; E.F. Scott, PE, pp. 43, 158; Moffatt, HNT, p. 556. P. Bläser (Das Gesetz bei Paulus, Münster, 1941, p. 88) regards the heresy as the same Judaizing error as found in the accepted Pauline Epistles.

²Designations include: Essene Judaism - Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 416; Pseudo-Hellenic Judaism - F.H. Colson, "'Myths and Genealogies' - A Note on the Polemic of the PE", JTS, XIX (1918), 265-271; Rabbinic speculative Judaism - Kidd, p. 32; Judaistic traditionalism - Lilley, pp. 34f; Jewish and Gnostic tendencies - Lock, PE, p. xvii; Jewish Gnostics - Lietzmann, Beginnings, p. 289; and, Jewish trifling - Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 133-146, followed by Parry, pp. lxxxvi-vi.

Jewish life as seen in the Book of Jubilees.¹ The Pastorals' errorists appear to have employed the same dialectic methods, if not the same didactic themes, as are exhibited in such literature. Spicq regards the 'myths and genealogies' as being nothing else but the Jewish Haggadoth in content, sometimes fantastic and in form always original, rare, and piquant, which entice the simple Christians and withdraw them from the unique end of Scripture which is Christ Jesus.²

In such a theory, the 'antitheses' are regarded as the endless contrasts resulting from endless distinctions which made up the casuistry of the Scribes in their interpretation of the law. "It would thus designate frivolities of what was called the Halacha," asserts Hort, "as the *μῦθοι* and *γενεαλογίαι* designate frivolities of the other department of Jewish learning, the Haggada."³ The falsely-called knowledge would, in this instance refer to Rabbinical pride in knowledge of the law.⁴ The elaboration of an ethical code, asceticism in food, drink, and marriage, as well as the distinction between 'clean' and 'unclean', and the commandments of men (Tit 1:14), are all seen to

¹Here Hort (*ibid.*) is taking his lead from a similar combination of 'myths and genealogies' (I 1:4) found in Polybius (IX.2.1) and use of 'genealogy' in Philo (de Vita Moys II.8) as referring to historical and legendary matter. R.H. Charles (*The Book of Jubilees*, London, 1902, p. lxxxv) regards the Pastorals' phrases in I 1:4; 4:7; Tit 3:9 as a just description of a large portion of Jubilees, with its Midrashic tendency to incorporate traditional lore with history. Cf., *Pseudepigrapha*, II, p. 1; Lilley, p. 72; Meinertz, pp. 18f.

²*Op. cit.*, p. lxii.

³*Loc. cit.*, p. 140.

⁴Spicq (p. cxlvii) notes other connections with the Pharisees, e.g., *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* only in Lk 5:17; Acts 5:34; I 1:7; same greed (Lk 16:14; II 3:2), and pride of riches (Lk 16:15; I 6:17); and application of *ἄνοτα* (Lk 6:11; II 3:9).

be typically Jewish.

The Jewish-Christian theory of error has the distinct advantage, both of finding a parallel within the presupposed time of writing, and of accepting the error as described by the author instead of seeking for hidden subtleties. Exception has been taken to it, however. Gealy, although admitting that Jewish elements cannot "with certainty be completely excluded from the heresies," suggests that the myths are described as Jewish in order to designate them as "belonging to an old dispensation now superseded."¹ Easton attempts to remove the Jewish nexus by suggesting that it might be due to the author's "desire for a Pauline coloring."² Such conjecture, however, necessitates a degree of literary subtlety on the part of the postulated post-apostolic pseudo-Paul that is most unlikely to have existed in that age.³ Furthermore, it would have proven as worthless as the talk of his opponents, for the pseudo-Paul to combat the known errorists of his day by inventing a description of the ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι which did not exist, and which was without precedence in the earlier Epistles of the Apostle. For the author to suggest a genetic connection with Judaism on the part of the Marcionites, even though they were violent opponents of the OT and Law, would have exposed him to severe counter ridicule. The Jewish character to heresy still existed at the time of Ignatius (cf. Rome VI.1; Magn VIII.1; X.3); there is therefore no need to make the Jewish allusions products either of the writer's

¹Op. cit., p. 532.

²PE, p. 104. Cf., E.F. Scott, PE, p. 179.

³Gealy (p. 353) even admits that a conjecture like Easton's is "forced and over-ingenious."

imagination, or his ingenuity.

Further exception to the Jewish connection of the Pastorals' error is taken in a very interesting statement by Gealy. Since the Pastorals "are almost certainly pseudonymous and second century," he states, "and since the thought world reflected in them is so surely Hellenistic," the attempts to identify the heretics as Jewish Christians are "as unwarranted as they are unsuccessful."¹ The first objection which seeks to dismiss the Jewish connection with the error on the basis of a presupposition of dating, need not detain us here. Such prejudging of the heresy is surely faulty in critical judgment. That the attempts at identification are unsuccessful may also be dismissed as a statement unproved. The criticism regarding the failure to recognize the Hellenistic elements in the error is more serious, however, if the observation is correct. It is true, that Hort's theory of 'Jewish trifling' is faulty in this regard;² but it is not true that Spicq's theory regarding which the statement was made, is similarly deficient. What Spicq (and many others) now see, is that the error attacked need not be either Jewish or Gnostic, but may well prove to be a fusion of rabbinical methods and Hellenistic conceptions.

Jewish-Gnostic-Christian-Syncreticism

Cullmann, in Stendahl's The Scrolls and the New Testament

¹Ibid.

²It would appear that Hort's theory places an unwarranted stress on the future references. Humphreys (pp. 245f) suggests that the warnings are too solemn to be regarded merely as a barren and mischievous error.

has observed that it was formerly the contention that as soon as Hellenistic elements were detected in a NT writing, it was believed that a very late origin was proved. This false conclusion was based upon what he terms the too "schematic conception of the origin of Christianity: namely, the idea that at first Christianity was merely Jewish, and then later became Hellenistic." Further errors resulted, such as the supposition that Gnosticism originated at a later time in Hellenistic circles outside Palestine. In contradistinction, Cullmann concludes that "there was a Jewish Gnosticism before there was a Christian Gnosticism, as there was a Jewish Hellenism before there was a Christian Hellenism."¹ This growing awareness that Gnosticism was a religion sui generis of a part of religious thought, as old as or older than Christianity, is of paramount interest to the study of the Pastorals' error. When Gnosticism is recognized as a phenomenon found not only in the guise of Christianity, but widely prevalent in the Mediterranean world into which Christianity was ushered,² then there is no longer a need to look to the second

¹Op. cit., p. 19. H.J. Schoeps (Urgemeinde Juden-Christentum Gnosis, Tübingen, 1956, pp. 30f) asserts that the entire nineteenth century from Baur to Harnack was in error in following the lead of the Church Fathers in assuming Gnosticism to be a Christian heresy of the second century. Cf., E. Haenchen, "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" ZTK, XLIX, pt 3 (1952), 317; Burkitt, Church and Gnosis, p. 40; E.F. Scott, Colossians, MNTC, London, 1930, pp. 7-12; Henshaw, p. 322. The Jewish character of first century Gnosticism was earlier noted by Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 411-8; Plummer, pp. 33-49; Kennedy, Theology, p. 251; G. Murray, Five Stages of Greek Religion, Oxford, 1925, pp. 196f.

²Reicke ("Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?", NTS, I (1955), 137-41) regards the DSS as confirming the existence of a pre-Christian Jewish and Jewish-Hellenistic Gnosticism. For an interesting classification of those passages which are concerned with 'knowledge' in the DSS, see, W.D. Davies, " 'A Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matt 11:25-30, HTR, XVI, n 3

century heresiarchs for the error revealed in the Pastoral Epistles.

It was in a world where a cross fertilization of thought existed that the Gospel was preached. In that era of syncretism Dodd has shown how Judaism had a larger part than is generally recognized in "shaping the higher thought of paganism."¹ This is confirmed by the recognition that first century Gnosticism, in contrast with the later developed form, combined Jewish practices and thought, with their pagan theosophy and ascetic discipline. As Christianity bore the aspect of a peculiar type of Judaism, the propensity to syncretize would be extended. It is significant too, that as Haenchen has observed, this pre-Christian Gnosis was mythological, and that "die philosophische Gestalt ist erst das Ergebnis einer langen Entwicklung."² It is therefore misleading to identify the error of the Pastorals' as being 'incipient Gnosticism', or 'Jewish Gnosticism', as is so frequently done. The distinction ought rather to be between the first century Gnosticism within the Church, which was a syncretism of paganism, Judaism, mythology, and asceticism, and that of the second century Gnosticism which had broken from the Church, and was anti-Jewish, and philosophical. It was incipient only

(1953), 113-139. There is great need, of course, to recognize that the later pursuit of a special conception of Gnosis is not to be found in the DSS. So, F.F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, London, 1956, pp. 103f.

¹The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1935, pp. 243-8. Cf., Wilson, p. 97.

²Op. cit., p. 349. Burkitt (loc. cit.; p. 40) distinguishes not between pre-Christian and Christian Gnosticism, but between two classes. Thus, he states, "there is a Gnosticism which is mainly a philosophy, and there is a Gnosticism which is mainly a mythology. In the first class the terms are mainly Greek, in the second class the terms are largely pseudo-Hebraic, akin to the names used in magic."

in contrast with the form assumed in the second century; but it was an established movement in its own right within the first century. The description herein given of first century Gnosticism is applicable to the Epistles' error; that of the second century is not.

With this recognition of first century syncretism it is no longer important to determine precisely whether the error was of Jewish or Hellenistic origin - it was both. Strictly speaking, the Pastorals do not combat Jewish heresies, Gnostics, Marcionites, or other systems; nor even rigorously speak of a heresy properly so called - but of a method or mentality. The Epistles represent a defense of the primitive Church against the syncretistic movement which found ready soil especially among the Jews of the Diaspora, for its intellectual and often frivolous speculations. If it is remembered that it was in Asia Minor that the fusion of the religious and philosophical ideas of the East, West, and of Judaism reached its peak, then it is possible to conceive of the Pastorals' errorists as being Jews converted to Christianity, who were familiarized with the art and methods of the philosophers and the rhetoricians. With this background of hollow dialectic, moral pretensions, and love of fables and traditions, these converts would soon also incorporate the allegorical method that the Greek grammarians put to work in their commentaries to Homer, in their interpretation of the OT.¹

Such an identification of the errorists removes the valid

¹So, Spicq, pp. lxi-lxx, following Colson, pp. 265-71.

criticism of the Jewish-Christian theory which failed to detect the Gnostic tendencies; retains the advantages of finding a parallel within the presupposed time of writing;¹ and accepts the author's precise establishment of Jewish origin. But, although it would not appear possible to draw a conclusion adverse to Pauline authorship from the tone of the error refuted, there is still the vital question of the way in which it was handled by the author.

PAUL AND FALSE RELIGION

For Moffatt, and many writers before and after the writing of his Introduction, the indiscriminate denunciation incorporated by the author to combat the heresy, is one "of the numerous and decisive proofs that Paul did not write the Pastorals."² The

¹It is noteworthy that many scholars have observed that certain NT passages are best understood in the light of some form of Gnosticism. Bultmann (Gnosis, tran J. Coates, from TWNT, London, 1952, and Theology, II) is to be acknowledged as the foremost illuminator on this question. There is, of course, controversy over such sweeping analogies with Gnosticism (so, Richardson, Theology, pp. 41-8), but some form of first century Gnosticism must be admitted as refuted in the NT. So, Schoeps (p. 42) who observes Gnostic coloring in Phi 2:6ff; 1 C 2:7ff; and Eph; Dibelius (Tradition to Gospel, pp. 279ff) regarding Mt 11:25-30; Kelly (Doctrines, p. 23) regarding 1 Jo; E.F. Scott (Apologetic of the NT, London, 1907) sees Gnosticism more or less expressly mentioned in Acts, Rev, Eph, Col, 1 and 2 Jo, Jude, and 2 Pet; S. Angus (pp. 392-7) cites many examples of how Paul formulated a Christian Gnosis with his ethical dualism, Christ-mysticism, and revolutionary attitude toward Judaism. W.F. Albright ("Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John", Background of the NT, eds Davies and Daube, pp. 153-171) cites many examples of why he insists that the Gospel of John was written before A.D. 66-70. Albright regards the DSS as confirming that there were proto-Gnostic influences behind John's Gospel, "which, without being in any way specifically Gnostic, provided the soil in which Gnosticism could grow in the second half of the first century A.D."

²Op. cit., p. 409. Cf., McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 401f; Sparks, Formation, p. 76; Clogg, p. 121.

Apostle's keen penetration and logic of argument as disclosed in refuting the Colossian heresy is missed; authoritative contradiction and condemnation is alone discovered. To ascribe to Paul the references to error is considered to be a serious injustice to him; for, with McNeile-Williams, "a lesser mind can contradict and denounce, while it is not equal to the task of refuting."¹ Then again, the vagueness and generality of the allusions to error is seen to be out of keeping with the manner of the real Paul in dealing with error.² And, finally, there is difficulty in conceiving that Paul would need to warn his disciples against embracing this error.³

If this indictment of the methodology of the author is completely accurate, it would perhaps be conclusive against Pauline authorship. If it were the purpose of the author scientifically to define and refute the theologies or theories of the errorists then there is obviously a chasm between the method here adopted and that of the author of Colossians. But the author must be judged not by what the twentieth century readers desire, but by his obvious intentions. The author was concerned with the practicalities of the error, rather than the principles; the fruits and not the roots are the issue. He is concerned with what Carrington describes as "men and women with brilliant gifts, unbalanced temperament, fantastic imagination, personal ambition, and dubious morals; undisciplined men, Paul calls them;

¹Op. cit., p. 193.

²So, Harrison, PPE, p. 7; Gealy, p. 383; and McGiffert, loc. cit.

³So, Peake, INT, p. 67.

evil men and imposters."¹ With such a purpose and type of error, the author discloses a marked degree of wisdom in his ability to strike at the heart of the issue. Certainly the practical suggestions which the author makes would be inappropriate if concerned with the systematized and philosophic heresy of a later age; yet they are most suitable for the indefinite and incipient type disclosed in the Epistles.

Very efficient safeguards against this type of error are the commended blameless and holy life, and a strong, pure Church order. To controvert questions and empty assertions originating from argumentative and contentious teachers, would only serve to embroil the disciples in counter arguments and result in Church strife (II 2:23; I 4:7). The author was impressed with the futility of the error; vain talk does not lend itself to logical refutation. 'Old wives' tales' are better to be dismissed than regarded too seriously, thereby gaining recognition.² The logic of this approach from a Pauline standpoint can be shown historically. The problems with which the author is here concerned would not have arisen at the time of Paul's earlier writings. In those letters there was first a need for his doctrinal position to be understood; later, for a disclosure of theories which were fundamentally false. There is now, in this stage of Church

¹The Early Christian Church, p. 263. Cf., Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 134; Chase, Acts, pp. 268ff; R 16:17f.

²So, Burn, "PE", pp. 576f; B. Weiss, INT, p. 392. It is significant that where specific error is identifiable, the author has attacked it formally. For instance, the teachers' failure to set forth the moral purpose of the Law (I 1:5), or to unfold its true significance (I 1:8); and the question of asceticism, which is refuted, with Christ (Mt 23:26), by the stress upon inward and not outward piety (I 4:7-10). Cf., C.A.A. Scott, Words, p. 72.

development, the need to rebuke, correct, and punish converts who persist in false tendencies.¹ What more natural approach could the author take in quasi-private Epistles than to assume that the disciples were already aware of the truth of the matter and needed only to be reminded of how best to handle contemptible characters, and to advise as to the proper precautions to take?²

Finally the observation of Ramsay is appropriate. He regards Paul as being concerned that Timothy might not be able to cope with the errorists who were "clever in specious reasoning, fluent in words, and confident in their own powers, whereas Timothy was rather timid and distrustful of himself." There was concern that since the errorists were not open enemies, were not opposed to the fundamentals of the faith, and were obeying the early Church admonition to spread the Gospel, Timothy might have difficulty both in seeing the danger and in coping with their educated intellects.³

This investigation of false religious expression must therefore conclude that the error involved finds its most suitable context in the syncretistic tendencies of the first century;

¹It is to be observed that the Corinthian offender delivered unto Satan (1 C 5:3-5; 2 C 2:5-11) is a ready comparison to the treatment afforded the extreme errorists in the Pastorals (I 1:20; II 2:25f; Tit 3:10). In both instances the punishment is not merely vindictive, but reformatory. The instructions given, namely, to admonish, deal kindly, hope for reconciliation, but reject continued perversity, are completely in harmony with the Pauline spirit.

²So, Shaw, pp. 450f; and Guthrie, PE, p. 38. Yet see Wood (p. 366), who, although in agreement, regards such an attitude as also being natural in a pseudo-Paul who sought to crush opposition by an appeal to authority rather than reason.

³Exp, ser 7, VIII (1909), 170f.

and that although at first glance a decision might be made to the contrary, a case can be presented for the contention that the author chose his weapons skilfully for the expressed purpose at hand.

The origin, literary character, and the historical and religious significance of the Pastoral Epistles. The following general conclusions have been made:

1. Literary Relationships. Because of their acknowledged use by Polycarp, universal acceptance by A.D. 180, and Version status by mid-second century, any date within the second century for their composition would appear to be out of question. The extensive use of these Epistles by the early Church writers seemingly carries the authorship back into the first century, a time when any mistake as to authorship is unlikely. The author, moreover, was found to be steeped in the canonical and non-canonical writings of Judaism; while any Hellenistic affinities may be explained through other associations.

2. Literary Character. A re-examination of the vocabulary and style of the Epistles reveals that it is extremely hazardous to attempt to determine mathematically what the Apostle could or could not have said and how he would have said it in every year of his life. Arithmetic cannot allow for the component influences exerting their own proportion of impact upon an author's literary habits. If the Epistles were written late, under unknown conditions which prohibit exposition along the traditional lines, peculiarities would naturally arise which would provide critical problems.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this investigation has been to inquire into the origin, literary character, and the historical and religious significance of the Pastoral Epistles. The following general conclusions have been made:

1. **Literary Relationships.** Because of their acknowledged use by Polycarp, universal acceptance by A.D. 180, and Version status by mid-second century, any date within the second century for their composition would appear to be out of question. The extensive use of these Epistles by the early Church writers seemingly carries the authorship back into the first century, a time when any mistake as to authorship is unlikely. The author, moreover, was found to be steeped in the canonical and non-canonical writings of Judaism; while any Hellenistic affinities may be explained through other associations.

2. **Literary Character.** A re-examination of the vocabulary and style of the Epistles reveals that it is extremely hazardous to attempt to determine mathematically what the Apostle could or could not have said and how he would have said it in every year of his life. Arithmetic cannot allow for the component influences exerting their own proportion of impact upon an author's literary habits. If the Epistles were written late, under unknown conditions which prohibit exposition along the traditional lines, peculiarities would naturally arise which would provide critical problems.

3. Origin. Each theory of origin is seen to have its own particular set of problems. It would appear to be far more difficult to frame a rational historical picture of the Pastorals' origin in terms of the unparalleled literary procedure demanded by the pseudepigraphical and fragmentary theories, than it is to grant the plausibility of a release and second imprisonment of the Apostle.

4. Ecclesiastical Organization. The frequently alleged advanced ecclesiastical organization actually requires no ministry of women, and only the distinct possibility of a three-fold differentiation of an undifferentiated ministry of men as paralleled in the NT. The revealed Church-order fails to conform to that which is known to exist in the second century. If it can be granted that the withholding of the parousia and the impending death of the Apostles would have hastened the transition from a relative spontaneity of action to the consolidation disclosed within the Pastorals, then these Epistles must be placed within the framework of the Apostolic Church-order.

5. Religious Significance. Both the formalized and the false religious expression disclosed in the Pastorals are found to be in keeping with an early rather than a late date. Formalizations are found to be prevalent within the primitive Church, and are evidenced within the writings of the Apostle. The error involved is probably a form of the Jewish-Gnostic-Christian syncretism revealed in the first century.

It is freely admitted that there are some remarkable peculiarities in these Epistles; yet the main objective arguments

against their authenticity can be fairly met. Whether it is possible to take the further step and assert unqualifiedly that they are the work of Paul will inevitably depend not upon objective criticism but subjective acumen. If the situation has been shown to be conceivable, and if the Apostle may have spoken as indicated in the Letters, then it is the 'ring' of the Epistles alone which will be the determining factor.

Although there are difficulties regarding the Pastorals' apostolic authorship, their apostolic authority is vindicated by the potent dynamics of the content. The Epistles' true significance is to be determined not by the erection of tests - but by their use. Down through the centuries they have exercised a more practical influence on Church-life than have the genuine Letters of Paul. The religious realities contained provided a spiritual treasure for men; a vade mecum for the 'good soldier' of every age; the missionary's manual. It is urged, therefore, that the contents be practised - not proved. They are, and will remain, within the authentic canon of the Church. To this author, in spite of all that can be said to the contrary, the more deeply he delves into the spirit of their contents, the more the Epistles' own account of authorship appears to be vindicated.

APPENDIX A

HAPAX LEGOMENA PER WESTCOTT AND HORT PAGE

EPISTLE	HARRISON'S AVERAGE	CHAPTER OR SUBJECT	LINES	HAPAX LEGOMENA	AVE.
Group I					
1 Thess	3.6	1	25	2	2.5
		2	41	9	6.8
		2:17-4:12	59	7	3.8
		4:13-5:28	53	7	4.0
		5:12-27	21	5	7.4
2 Thess	3.3	1:3-10	19	5	8.15
		1:11-3:5	51	0	0
		3:6-14	18	5	8.6
Group II					
Galatians	3.9	1 - 2	84	12	4.4
		3 - 4	102	11	3.3
		5 - 6	71	9	3.9
1 Cor	4.1	1 - 4	162	16	3.1
		5 - 6	61	5	2.5
		1 - 6	224	21	2.9
		7	72	14	6.0
		8	24	1	1.3
		7 - 16	520	77	4.6
		9 - 11	155	24	4.8
		8 - 11	179	25	4.3
		12 - 14	138	22	5.0
		15	93	14	4.6
		16	38	4	3.26
		2 Cor	5.6	1 - 7	270
8 - 12	217			55	7.8
11	56			17	9.4
13	27			1	1.1
Romans	4.0	1:1-3:20	149	34	7.0
		3:21-8:39	270	24	2.7
		8	71	8	3.5
		9 - 11	133	27	6.3
		9 - 10	67	8	3.6
		11	66	19	8.9
		12 - 15	169	15	2.7
		12:3-20	30	7	7.2
		15	66	8	3.7
		13- 14	69	0	0
16	51	3	1.8		
Group III					
Colossians	5.5	1:1-2:7 and 4:2-18	108	10	2.9

		2:8-4:1	79	23	9:0
Ephesians	4.6	1 - 3	122	10	2.5
		4 - 6	155	30	6.0
		6:10-20	24	8	10.3
Philippians	6.2	1	57	4	2.17
		2 - 4	129	36	8.65
		4:8-20	25	8	9.9
Group IV					
1 Timothy	11.8	1 - 2	62	21	10.5
		3 - 4	57	13	7.1
		5 - 6	84	41	15.1
2 Timothy	10.3	1	35	6	5.3
		2	43	15	10.8
		3	30	21	21.7
		4	42	6	4.4
Titus	11.25	1:1-2:15	56	24	13.28
		1:5-2:15	48	24	15.5
		3	28	6	6.6
		1:5-3:11	69	30	13.5

APPENDIX B

PERCENTAGE OF PAULINE AND PASTORALS' HAPAX LEGOMENA
IN SECOND CENTURY ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS

	AF & Apol	Percentage
Ephesians	14 of 40	35.0
Colossians	13 of 33	39.4
2 Corinthians	37 of 92	40.2
Galatians	15 of 32	46.8
Romans	50 of 103	48.5
2 Thessalonians	5 of 10	50.0
1 Thessalonians	10 of 20	50.0
Titus	15 of 30	50.0
1 Timothy	38 of 75	50.6
Philippians	19 of 37	51.3
Pastorals	93 of 175	53.1
1 Corinthians	54 of 98	55.1
2 Timothy	27 of 48	56.4
Philemon	3 of 5	60.0

APPENDIX C

PASTORALS' HAPAX LEGOMENA HAVING CLOSE PAULINE COGNATES

Pastorals' Hapax Legomena	Pauline Cognate	Pastorals' Hapax Legomena	Pauline Cognate
1. ἀκαίρως	ἀκαιρέομαι	10. μονόω	μόνος
2. ἀνάλυσις	ἀναλύω	11. ὀργίλος	ὀργίζω
3. βδελυκτός	βδελύσσω	12. ὁμολογουμένως	ὁμολογέω, -για
4. ἔλαπτον	ἐλαπτονέω, ἐλάσσω	13. πιστόω	πιστός
5. ἐλεγμός	ἐλέγχω	14. πραγματία	πράγμα
6. ἐνδύνω	ἐνδύω, ἐπενδύνω	15. πρεσβῦτις	πρεσβύτης
7. εὐκαιρως	εὐκαιρέω	16. σωτήριος	σωτήριον
8. Ἰουδαϊκός	Ἰουδαϊκῶς	17. σωφρονίζω	σωφρονέω
9. κοινωνικός	κοινωνός, -νια, -νεω	18. χρήσιμος	χρήσις

APPENDIX D

PASTORALS' COMPOUND HAPAX LEGOMENA HAVING
CLOSE PAULINE COGNATES

Pastorals' Compound Hapax Legomena	Pauline Compound Cognate
1. ἀποκατάκριτος	κατάκρισις, κρίνω
2. ἀνεπαίσχυντος	ἐπαισχύνομαι
3. ἔκδηλος	δῆλος
4. καλοδιδάσκαλος	Only other NT compound with καλός = καλοποιέω
5. ματαιολόγος, -ια	μάταιος, ματαιόω
6. μηδέποτε	μηδέ, ποτέ
7. ὀρθοτομέω	Only other NT compound with ὀρθο = ὀρθοποδέω
8. περιφρονέω	Pauline propensity for περι, -τίθημι, -τέμνω, -φέρω, -φρονέω

APPENDIX E

PAULINE WORDS OMITTED WITH PASTORALS' COGNATES

Missing Word	Cognates Present	Missing Word	Cognates Present
1. ἀδικέω	ἀδικία	20. κενός	κενοφωνία
2. ἀκαθαρσία	καθαρίζω, καθαρός	21. κοινωνία	κοινός, κοινωνέω, κοινωνικός
3. ἄλλος	ἄλλως, ἄλλότριος	22. κόπος	κοπιᾶω
4. ἀνάγκη	ἀναγκαίος	23. μέσος	μεσίτης
5. ἀξιώς	ἀξιόω, ἄξιος	24. νουθετέω	νουθεσία
6. ἀποθνήσκω	συναποθνήσκω	25. πλεονάζω	ὑπερπλεονάζω
7. ἀσθενής	ἀσθενέω, ἀσθένεια	26. πλήρωμα	πληρόω
8. γνωρίζω	γνώσις, γινώσκω	27. πνευματικός	πνεῦμα
9. δέχομαι	παρα-, προσδέχομαι	28. πόρνευα	πόρνος
10. δοξάζω	δόξα	29. σοφία	σοφίζω
11. ἐνδύω	ἐνδύνω	30. στήνω	ἔστηκην
12. ἐξέρχομαι	ἀπ-, περι-, προσ-, ἔρχομαι	31. συνεργός	ἔργον, ἐργάτης
13. εὐαγγελίζω	εὐαγγέλιον	32. σῶμα	σωματικός
14. εὐχαριστέω	εὐχαριστία	33. τέλειος	τέλος, τελέω
15. ἔρω	λέγω	34. ὑπακούω	ἀκούω
16. ζῆλος	ζηλωτής	35. ὑπάρχω	ἀρχή
17. κατα-, παρα- λαμβάνω	ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἐπι-, μετα-, λαμβάνω	36. ὑστέρημα	ὑστερος
18. κατ-, εργά- ζομαι	ἐργάτης, ἔργον	37. φοβέομαι	φόβος
19. κατέχω	ἀν-, ἀντ-, ἀπ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, προσ-, ἔχω	38. φρονέω	κατα-, περι-
		39. χαρίζομαι	χάριν, χάρις, χάρισμα

APPENDIX F

PAULINE SYNONYMS PRESENT IN PASTORALS

Omitted Pauline Word	Pauline Synonym Present
1. βλέπω	ὄρω
2. δοκέω	ἡγέομαι, νομίζω
3. θλίψις	διωγμός
4. παράπτωμα	ἁμαρτία
5. παρουσία	ἐπιφανεία
6. περιπατέω	ἀναστρέφω
7. περισσεύω	ὑπερπλεονάζω
8. πλεονεξία	φιλάργυρος, (ια)
9. πράσσω	ποιέω
10. ὥρα	καιρός

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Acta Pauli et Theclae. Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha. ed. C. Tischendorf. Lipsiae: Avenarius and Mendelssohn, 1851.
- Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers. eds. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.
- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT, The. ed. R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Apocryphal Acts of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew, and Thomas. ed. B. Pick. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1909.
- Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter, The Akhmîm Fragment of. ed. H. B. Swete. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- Apocryphal NT. ed. M. R. James. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.
- Apostolic Fathers, The. LCL. tran. K. Lake. eds. T. Page and W. Rouse. 2 vols. London: Heinemann, 1912.
- Augustini. In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus XCVIII. Opera Omnia. vol. III. Paris, 1836.
- Babylonian Talmud. ed. I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1936.
- Biblia Hebraica. text by R. Kittel. Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Book of Enoch or First Enoch. ed. R. H. Charles. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis. ed. R. H. Charles. London: A. and C. Black, 1902.
- Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. LCL. vol. I (1926) tran. K. Lake. vol. II (1932) tran. J. Oulton and H. Lawlor. London: Heinemann.
- Midrash Rabbah. vol. I: Genesis. tran. and ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- Mishnah, The. tran. and ed. H. Danby. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Mopsuesteni, Theodori. Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii. ed. H. B. Swete. vol. II. Cambridge: University Press, 1882.

- Muratorianus, Canon. ed. S. P. Tregellis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867.
- New Testament in the Original Greek, The. eds. B. F. Westcott and F. J. Hort. London: Macmillan, 1890.
- Novum Testamentum Graece. ed. E. Nestle. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1952.
- Old Testament in Greek, The. ed. H. B. Swete. 3 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1925.
- Origenes. De Principiis. ed. P. Koetschau. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1913.
- Patrologiae Graecae-Latinae. ed. J. P. Migne. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Athanasii. Epistola ad Dracontium. vol. XXV (1857).
- Athenagorae. Legatio Pro Christianis. vol. VI (1857).
- Clementis Alexandrini. Stromata. vol. VIII (1857).
- Cyrilli Hierosolymitani. Catechesis. vol. XXXIII (1857).
- Epiphani. Adversus Haereses. vol. XLI (1858).
- Hieronymi (S. Eusebii). Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Titum. Latin vol. (XXVI), 1884.
- Hippolyti. Demonstratio adversus Judaeos. vol. X (1857).
- Irenaei. Contra Haereses. vol. VII (1857).
- Justini (Martyr). Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo. vol. VI (1857).
- Origenis. Matt 117. vol. XIII (1857). Contra Celsum. vol. XI (1857).
- Theophili E. Antiocheni. ad Autolycum. vol. VI (1857).
- Pistis Sophia. tran. from Coptic by C. Horner. introduction by F. Legge. London: SPCK, 1924.
- Pliny. Letters. LCL. tran. W. Melmoth. rev. W. Hutchinson. 2 vols. London: Heinemann, 1915.
- Seneca. Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales. LCL. tran. R. Gummere. vol. III. London: Heinemann, 1925.
- Tertulliani. Adversus Praxean and Adversus Marcionem (V). Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. vol. XLVII. ed. A. Kroymann. Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1906. De Baptismo. eds. A. Reifferschied and G. Wissowa, 1890.

Tertulliani. De Praescriptione Haereticorum. ed. T. H.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. ed. R. H. Charles.
London: A. and C. Black, 1908.

Secondary Sources

- Abbott, T. K. Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians.
ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon. 3rd ed. Edinburgh:
T. and T. Clark, 1950.
- Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. Cambridge:
University Press, 1st series, 1917. 2nd series, 1924.
- Albright, W. F. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel
of St. John" , The Background of the NT and Its Escha-
tology. eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge:
University Press, 1956, pp. 153-171.
- _____. "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology (1932-
1952)" Religion in Life, XXI (1951-2), 537-550.
- Alexander, J. P. "The Character of Timothy" ET, XXV (1913-
14), 277-285.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament. vol. III. Cambridge:
Deighton, Bell, 1865.
- Angus, S. The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World.
London: Murray, 1929.
- Argyle, A. "Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q"
ET, LX (1948-9), 318-20.
- Askwith, E. "On Two Points in First Timothy 1" Exp, 8th
series, VII (1914), 377-382.
- Audet, Jean-Paul. La Didachè Instructions Des Apôtres. Paris:
Gabalda, 1958.
- "Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, The" CQR, LXIII
(1906-7), 63-86, 344-358.
- Bacon, B. W. An Introduction to the NT. New York: Macmillan,
1902.

- Bacon, B. W. The Story of St. Paul. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905.
- Bacon, F. D. Women in the Church. London: Lutterworth Press, 1946.
- Badcock, F. J. The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews in their Historical Setting. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- Baldensperger, G. "Ill a rendu témoignage devant Ponce Pilate" RHPR, 1922, pp. 1-25, 95-117.
- Barclay, W. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Printed for the Church of Scotland by McCorquodale, Glasgow, 1956.
- _____. The Mind of St. Paul. London: Collins Press, 1958.
- Barnes, E. W. The Rise of Christianity. London: Longmans, Green, 1948.
- Barnett, A. E. Paul Becomes a Literary Influence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- _____. The NT, Its Making and Meaning. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946.
- Barth, K. The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism. tran. E. A. Payne. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Bartlet, J. V. Church-Life and Church-Order During the First Four Centuries. ed. C. J. Cadoux. Oxford: Blackwell, 1943.
- _____. The Apostolic Age. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900.
- _____. "The Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles" Exp, 8th series, V (1913), 28-36, 161-7, 256-63, 325-47.
- Bauer, W. Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum. Tübingen: Mohr, 1934.
- Baur, F. Paul. The Apostle of Jesus Christ. tran. A. Menzies. vol. I. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1875.
- Beckmann, J. Quellen zur Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1956.
- Beckwith, C. "Lion" HDAC. vol. I (1915), pp. 702f.
- Beet, J. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1890.

- Bengel, J. Gnomon of the NT. vol. IV. 7th ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1873.
- Bernard, J. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1899.
- _____. "The Historical Value of the Acts of the Apostles" Criticism of the NT. St. Margaret's Lectures. London: Murray, 1902, pp. 208-230.
- Bethune-Baker, J. An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon. London: Methuen, 1903.
- Bevan, E. Hellenism and Christianity. London: Allen and Unwin, 1921.
- Beyer, H. "δέξαρονος" TWNT. vol. II (1935), pp. 88-95.
- _____. "ἐπίσκοπος" TWNT. vol. II (1935), pp. 604-617.
- Bigg, C. The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- _____. The Origins of Christianity. ed. T. B. Strong. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Bindley, T. "The Pastoral Epistles" The Interpreter, IX (1912-13), 184-197.
- Bisseker, H. "The Pastoral Epistles" A Commentary on the Bible. ed. A. S. Peake. London: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1936, pp. 881-8.
- Black, M. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam" SJT, VII n. 2 (June, 1954), 170-9.
- Blackman, E. Marcion and His Influence. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Bläser, R. Das Gesetz bei Paulus. Münster: Aschendorff, 1941.
- Blass, F. Grammar of NT Greek. tran. H. St. John Thackeray. London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Bonhöffer, A. Epiktet und das Neue Testament. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1911.
- Bornkamm, L. "πρέσβυς" TWNT. vol. VI (Apr 1958), pp. 651-80.
- Bowen, W. The Dates of the Pastoral Epistles. London: Nisbet, 1900.

- Brooke, A. "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles" JTS,
XXIII (1922), 255-262.
- Brown, E. The Pastoral Epistles. Westminster Commentary
Series. London: Methuen, 1917.
- _____. "The Pastoral Epistles" Exp, 8th series, XIII
(1917), 212-221.
- Bruce, A. St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. Edinburgh:
T. and T. Clark, 1894.
- Bruce, F. Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London:
Paternoster Press, 1956.
- _____. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.
- Bryant, B. The Formation and Education of the Christian Mind
in Paul's Earlier Letters. Unpublished doctoral
thesis. Edinburgh University, 1957.
- Bultmann, R. Gnosis. tran. J. Coates from TWNT. London:
A. and C. Black, 1952.
- _____. Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting.
tran. R. Fuller. London: Thames and Hudson, 1956.
- _____. Theology of the NT. tran. K. Grobel. 2 vols.
London: SCM Press, 1952, 1955.
- Bunn, L. "2 Timothy 2:23-26" ET, XLI (1929-30), 235ff.
- Burkitt, F. Christian Beginnings. London: University of
London Press, 1924.
- _____. Church and Gnosis. Cambridge: University Press, 1932.
- _____. "Barnabas and the Didache" JTS, XXXIII (1932), 25ff.
- _____. "The Ancient Versions of the NT" Criticism of the NT.
St. Margaret's Lectures. London: Murray, 1902,
pp. 68-95.
- Burn, A. An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum.
London; Methuen, 1899.
- _____. "Creeds" HDAC. vol. I (1915), p. 238.
- _____. and H. Goudge. "The Pastoral Epistles" A New
Commentary on Holy Scripture. eds. C. Gore, et al.
pt. III. London: SPCK, 1934, pp. 573-595.
- Burrows, M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Secker and Warburg,
1956.

- Burton, E. de Witt. The Epistle to the Galatians. ICC.
New York: Scribner's, 1920.
- Cabaniss, A. "Liturgy-Making Factors in Primitive Christianity"
JR, XXIII (Jan 1943), 43-58.
- Cadbury, H. "The Speeches in Acts" The Beginnings of
Christianity. eds. K. Lake and H. Cadbury. pt. I.
vol. V. London: Macmillan, 1933, pp. 402-427.
- Candlish, J. "Moral Character of Pseudonymous Books" Exp,
4th series, IV (1891), 91-107, 262-79.
- Carpenter, H. "Minister" TWBB. ed. A. Richardson. New
York: Macmillan, 1956, pp. 146-152.
- Carrington, P. The Early Christian Church. vol. I.
Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- _____. The Primitive Christian Catechism. Cambridge:
University Press, 1940.
- Casey, R. "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the NT" The Background of
the NT and its Eschatology. eds. W. Davies and D.
Daube. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.
- _____. "The Study of Gnosticism" JTS, XXXVI (1935), 45-60.
- Cave, S. The Gospel of St. Paul. London: Hodder and Stoughton,
1928.
- Chadwick, H. "Episcopacy in the Second Century" The Office
of a Bishop. London: Church Book Room Press, 1948.
- Chadwick, W. The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul. Edinburgh:
T. and T. Clark, 1907.
- Chase, F. Confirmation in the Apostolic Age. London:
Macmillan, 1909.
- _____. The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church. vol. I n. 3.
Cambridge: University Press, 1891.
- Chase, F. N. "The History of the Canon of the NT" Criticism
of the NT. St. Margaret's Lectures. London: Murray,
1902, pp. 96-144.
- Cheetham, F. "Language and Style in the NT" CQR, XCIV
(Apr-July, 1922), 302-321.
- Clark, A. The Acts of the Apostles. Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1933.

- Clarke, W. The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- _____. Concise Bible Commentary. London: SPCK, 1952.
- _____. "The Origins of Episcopacy" Episcopacy Ancient and Modern. eds. C. Jenkins and K. Mackenzie. London: SPCK, 1930, pp. 1-46.
- Clemen, C. Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources. tran. R. Nisbet. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912.
- Clogg, F. An Introduction to the NT. London: University of London Press, 1937.
- Colson, F. " 'Myths and Genealogies' - A Note on the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles" JTS, XIX (1918), 265-271.
- Connolly, R. "The Didache in Relation to the Epistle of Barnabas" JTS, XXXIII (1932), 237-255.
- Conybeare, F. Myth, Magic, and Morals. London: Watts, 1909.
- Conybeare, W. and J. Howson. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, 1877.
- Cross, F. The Ancient Library of Qumrân. The Haskell Lectures, 1956-7. London: Duckworth, 1958.
- Cruttwell, C. A Literary History of Early Christianity. vol. I. London: Griffin, 1893.
- Cullmann, O. Baptism in the NT. Studies in Biblical Theology 1. tran. J. Reid. London: SCM Press, 1950.
- _____. Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments. Tübingen: Mohr, 1958.
- _____. Early Christian Worship. tran. A. Todd and J. Torrance. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- _____. The Earliest Christian Confessions. tran. J. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____. The Early Church. ed. A. Higgins. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- _____. The State in the NT. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- _____. " 'KYPIOC' as a Designation for the Oral Tradition Concerning Jesus" SJT, III (1950), 180-197.
- _____. "The Significance of the Qumrân Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity" The Scrolls and the NT. ed. K. Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 18-32.

- Daube, D. The NT and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athlone Press, 1956.
- _____. "Participle and Imperative in 1 Peter" The First Epistle of St. Peter. E. Selwyn. London: Macmillan, 1946, pp. 467-488.
- Davies, W. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: SPCK, 1948.
- _____. "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matt 11:25-30" HTR, XLVI, n. 3 (July 1953), 113-139.
- Deane, A. St. Paul and His Letters. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1942.
- Deane, W. Pseudeipgrapha. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1891.
- Deissmann, A. Bible Studies. tran. A. Grieve. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1923.
- _____. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- Delling, G. Der Gottesdienst im Neuen Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952.
- Denny, J. The Death of Christ. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902.
- Dibelius, M. Die Pastoralbriefe. Tübingen: Mohr, 1931.
- _____. A Fresh Approach to the NT and Early Christian Literature. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1936.
- _____. From Tradition to Gospel. tran. B. Woolf. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
- _____. Paul. ed. W. Kümmel. tran. F. Clarke. London: Longmans, Green, 1953.
- Dobschütz, E. von. Christian Life in the Primitive Church. ed. W. Morrison. tran. G. Bremmer. London: Williams and Norgate, 1904.
- Dodd, C. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- _____. Gospel and Law. Bampton Lectures, 1950. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
- _____. New Testament Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953.
- _____. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.

- Dodd, C. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- _____. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- _____. The Meaning of Paul for To-day. London: Allen and Unwin, 1920.
- _____. The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach (1933). Change and Development (1934). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- _____. The OT in the New. London: Athlone Press, 1952.
- Dods, M. An Introduction to the NT. 5th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.
- Dornier, P. Les Epitres de Saint Paul. A Timothée et a Tite. Paris: Cerf, 1958.
- Drummond, R. The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900.
- Dugmore, C. The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Duncan, G. St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.
- _____. "Paul's Ministry in Asia - The Last Phase" NTS, III (May, 1957), 211-218.
- Duncan, J. "πιστὸς ὁ λόγος" ET, XXXV (1923-4), 141.
- Easton, B. The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus. Cambridge: University Press, 1934.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles. London: SCM Press, 1948.
- Edersheim, A. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 5th ed. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1890.
- Edmundson, G. The Church in Rome in the First Century. Bampton Lectures, 1913. London: Longmans, Green, 1913.
- Ehrhardt, A. The Apostolic Succession. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- _____. "The Beginnings of Mon-Episcopacy" CQR, CXL (1945), 113-126.

- Ellicott, C. Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. 4th ed. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1869.
- Ellis, E. Paul's Use of the OT. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Fairbairn, P. The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1874.
- Falconer, J. From Apostle to Priest. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900.
- Falconer, R. The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- _____. "Epistles to Timothy and Titus" HDAC. vol. II (1918), p. 592.
- Farrar, F. The Life and Work of St. Paul. 1 vol. ed. London: Cassell, 1885.
- Farrer, A. Rebirth of Images. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949.
- _____. "The Ministry in the NT" The Apostolic Ministry. ed. K. Kirk. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946, pp. 113-181.
- Farrer, J. Literary Forgeries. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- Findlay, G. The Epistle to the Ephesians. 6th ed. Expositor's Bible Series. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.
- _____. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle. London: Kelly, 1895.
- _____. "Appendix on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus" The Apostle Paul. A. Sabatier. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899, pp. 341-402.
- _____. "Paul the Apostle" HDB. vol. III (1900), pp. 696-731.
- Fitzmyer, J. "The Qumrân Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature" The Scrolls and the NT. ed. K. Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 208-231.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. The Acts of the Apostles. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.
- Foerster, W. "Εβραϊκά in den Pastoralbriefen" NTS, V. n. 3 (Apr 1959), 213-218.
- Foster, O. The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter". New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1913.

- Frere, W. "Early Forms of Ordination" Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry. ed. H. B. Swete. London: Macmillan, 1918, pp. 263-312.
- Gardiner, E. The Later Pauline Epistles. London: SPCK, 1936.
- Gayford, S. "Church" HDB. vol. I (1898), pp. 425-439.
- Gealy, F. "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus" The Interpreter's Bible. vol. XI. eds. G. Buttrick et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, pp. 343-551.
- Gieseler, J. A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. tran. S. Davidson. vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1846.
- Gifford, E. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. London: Murray, 1886.
- Godet, F. Introduction to the NT. tran. W. Affleck. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1894.
- _____. "The Pastoral Epistles, or the Closing Labours of the Apostle Paul" Exp, 3rd series, VII (1888), 45-72.
- Goodspeed, E. A History of Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- _____. Index Patristicus. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1907.
- _____. Introduction to the NT. New York: University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- _____. New Solutions of NT Problems. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- _____. Problems of NT Translation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- _____. The Formation of the NT. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- _____. The Meaning of Ephesians. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Gordon, A. "Quotations" HDAC. vol. II (1918), pp. 293-7.
- Gore, C. The Church and the Ministry. ed. C. Turner. London: Longmans, Green, 1919.
- _____. "The Origin of the Christian Ministry" Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 411-425.

- Goudge, H. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. London: Methuen, 1903.
- _____. The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul. London: Arnold, 1913.
- Grant, F. An Introduction to NT Thought. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Gregory, C. Canon and Text of the NT. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.
- Guthrie, D. The Pastoral Epistles. London: Tyndale Press, 1957.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul. London: Tyndale Press, 1956.
- _____. "Tertullian and Pseudonymity" ET, LXVII (1955-6), 341f.
- Gwatkin, H. "Ordination" HDB. vol. III (1900), pp. 631f.
- Haenchen, E. von. "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" ZTK, XLIX, pt. 3 (1952), 316-349.
- Harnack, A. Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius. vol. I. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1897.
- _____. Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius. vol. I. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1893.
- _____. History of Dogma. vol. I. tran. from 3rd ed. by N. Buchanan. London: Williams and Norgate, 1905.
- _____. Luke the Physician. tran. J. Wilkinson. ed. W. Morrison. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.
- _____. Marcion: das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1921.
- _____. Sources of the Apostolic Canons. tran. L. Wheatley. Introductory Essay on the Organisation of the Early Church and the Evolution of the Reader's by J. Owen. London: A. and C. Black, 1895.
- _____. The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries. Crown Theological Library (XXXI). London: Williams and Norgate, 1910.
- _____. The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels. tran. J. Wilkinson. London: Williams and Norgate, 1911.
- _____. The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. tran. J. Moffatt. vol. I (1904), vol. II (1905). London: Williams and Norgate.

- Harnack, A. The Origin of the NT. tran. J. Wilkinson. London: Williams and Norgate, 1925.
- _____. "Der Marcionitische Ursprung der Ältesten Vulgata-Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen" ZNTW, XXIV (1925), 204-217.
- _____. "On the Origin of the Christian Ministry" Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 321-343.
- Harris, C. "The NT and the Catholic Creeds" A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. eds. C. Gore, et al. London: SPCK, 1934, pp. 378-384.
- Harris, J. Testimonies. pt. I (1916). pt. II (1920). Cambridge: University Press.
- _____. "Dr. Sanday on the Christian Ministry" Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 225-235.
- _____. "St. Paul and Epimenides" Exp, 8th series, IV (1912), 348-353.
- _____. "The Cretans Always Liars" Exp, 7th series, II (1906), 305-317. "A Further Note on the Cretans" III (1907), 332-337.
- Harrison, P. Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians. Cambridge: University Press, 1936.
- _____. The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: University Press, 1921.
- _____. "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered. III. The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles" ET, LXVII (1955-6), 77-81.
- _____. Review of Saint Paul Les Epitres Pastorales, by C. Spicq. JTS, XLIX (July-Oct, 1948), 204-210.
- _____. "The Pastoral Epistles and Duncan's Ephesian Theory" NTS, II (1955-6), 250-261.
- Hatch, E. Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.
- _____. The Organization of the Early Christian Churches. Bampton Lectures, 1880. London: Longmans, Green, 1909.
- Headlam, A. The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion. Bampton Lectures, 1920. London: Murray, 1920.
- _____. "The Dates of the NT Books" Criticism of the NT. St. Margaret's Lectures. London: Murray, 1902, pp. 145-207.

- Heard, R. Introduction to the NT. London: A. and C. Black, 1950.
- Hellier, B. "The Pauline Usage of the Names for Christ" The Theological Monthly. III-IV (1890), 17-32, 73-85, 239-251.
- Henshaw, T. NT Literature in the Light of Modern Scholarship. London: Allen and Unwin, 1952.
- Herklots, H. A Fresh Approach to the NT. London: SCM Press, 1950.
- Hervey, A. "The Pastoral Epistles" Commentary on Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon. ed. H. Spence. Pulpit Commentary. London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909.
- Hillard, A. The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. London: Rivingtons, 1919.
- Hincks, E. "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles" JBL, XVI (1897), 94-117.
- Hitchcock, F. "Classical Allusions in the Pastoral Epistles" Theology, XVII (1928), 62-71.
- _____. "Latinity of the Pastorals" ET, XXXIX (1928), 347-52.
- _____. "Philo and the Pastorals" Hermathena. LVI (1940-1), 113-135.
- _____. "Tests for the Pastorals" JTS, XXX (1929), 272-9.
- _____. "The Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul" ET, XLI (1930), 20-23.
- Holtzmann, H. Die Pastoralbriefe. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1880.
- Hort, F. Judaistic Christianity. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1894.
- _____. Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians. London: Macmillan, 1895.
- _____. The Christian Ecclesia. London: Macmillan, 1897.
- _____. and J. Mayor, eds. Clement of Alexandria. Miscellanies. BK. VII. London: Macmillan, 1902.
- Horton, R. The Pastoral Epistles. Century Bible Series. Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1901.
- Hug's Introduction to the NT. tran. D. Fosdick. notes by M. Stuart. Andover: Gould and Newman, 1836.

- Humphreys, A. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1895.
- Hunkin, J. The NT. A Conspectus. London: Duckworth, 1950.
- Hunter, A. Interpreting Paul's Gospel. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- _____. Interpreting the NT (1900-1950). London: SCM Press, 1951.
- _____. Paul and His Predecessors. Hastie Lectures, 1939. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940.
- _____. "The Pastorals" ET, LX (1948-9), 171.
- Huther, J. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus. Tran. D. Hunter. Meyer Commentary Series. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1881.
- James, J. The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. London: Longmans, Green, 1906.
- Jeremias, J. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. 6th ed. rev. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1953.
- _____. "The Qumrân Texts and the NT" ET, LXX (Dec 1958), 686f.
- Johnson, S. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts" ZATW, LXVI (1954), 106-20.
- Johnston, J. "The Message of the Epistles" ET, XLV (1933-4), 270-4.
- Jones, M. The NT in the Twentieth Century. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Jowett, B. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans. London: Murray, 1894.
- Jülicher, A. An Introduction to the NT. tran. J. Ward. London: Smith, Elder, 1904.
- Kelly, J. Early Christian Creeds. London: Longmans, Green, 1950.
- _____. Early Christian Doctrines. London: A. and C. Black, 1958.
- Kennedy, H. Philo's Contribution to Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.

- Kennedy, H. St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
- _____. St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.
- _____. The Theology of the Epistles. London: Duckworth, 1919.
- Kenyon, F. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasciculus III. Supplement Pauline Epistles. London: Walker, 1936.
- _____. The Paleography of Greek Papyri. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- Kidd, B. A History of the Church to A. D. 461. vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.
- King, G. A Leader Led. A Devotional Study of 1 Timothy. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1957.
- _____. To My Son. An Expository Study of 2 Timothy. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1956.
- Kittel, G. "Die γενεαλογίαι der Pastoralbriefe" ZNTW, XX (1921), 49-69.
- Klausner, J. From Jesus to Paul. tran. W. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Knowling, R. The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. Boyle Lectures, 1903-5. 3rd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.
- _____. The Witness of the Epistles. London: Longmans, Green, 1892.
- Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.
- _____. Marcion and the NT. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- _____. The Early Church and the Coming Great Church. London: Epworth Press, 1957.
- Knox, W. St. Paul. Edinburgh: Davies, 1932.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

- Knox, W. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge: University Press, 1948.
- Khhler, K. "Jannes and Jambres" SJE. vol. VII (1904), p.71.
- Kruger, G. History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries. tran. C. Gillett. London: Macmillan, 1897.
- Kuhn, K. "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament" ZTK, XLVII (1950), 192-211.
- Lake, K. Review of Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians, by P. Harrison. JBL, LVI (Mar 1937), 72-75.
- _____. "What was the End of St. Paul's Trial?" The Interpreter, V (1908-9), 147-156.
- _____. "Your Own Poets" The Beginnings of Christianity. eds. K. Lake and H. Cadbury. pt. I. vol. V. London: Macmillan, 1933, pp. 246-251.
- Latourette, K. A History of Christianity. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1954.
- Lauterback, J. "Tannaim and Amoraim" SJE. vol. XII (1906), p. 49.
- Leonard, W. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Burns, Oates, Washburn, 1939.
- Liddell, H. and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. rev. by H. Jones. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Liddon, H. Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. London: Longmans, Green, 1897.
- Lietzmann, H. Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1928.
- _____. The Beginnings of the Christian Church. tran. B. Woolf. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1937.
- _____. "Symbolstudien I-VII" ZNTW, XXI (1922), 1-34.
 "Symbolstudien VIII-X" XXII (1923), 257-279.
 "Symbolstudien XIII" XXIV (1925), 193-202.
 "Symbolstudien XIV" XXVI (1927), 75-95.
- Lightfoot, J. Biblical Essays. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- _____. Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. London: Macmillan, 1892.

- Lightfoot, J. Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- _____. On a Fresh Revision of the English NT. London: Macmillan, 1891.
- _____. Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. London: Macmillan, 1892.
- _____. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. 8th ed. London: Macmillan, 1888.
- _____. The Apostolic Fathers. pt. I. vol. I (1890). pt. II. vol. I (1889). pt. II. vol. III (1889). London: Macmillan, 1889.
- Lilley, J. The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- Lindsay, T. The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.
- Linton, O. Das Problem der Urkirche in der Neueren Forschung. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1932.
- Lock, W. St. Paul the Master-BUILDER. 4th ed. London: Methuen, 1927.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924.
- _____. "First Epistle to Timothy" HDB. vol. IV (1900), pp. 768-774. "Second Epistle to Timothy" pp. 774-778. "Epistle to Titus" pp. 783-785.
- _____. "The Epistle to Titus and its Practical Teaching" The Interpreter, VII (1910), 149-157.
- Loisy, A. The Origins of the NT. London: Allen and Unwin, 1950.
- Lutoslawski, W. The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic. London: Longmans, Green, 1897.
- McClymont, J. The NT and Its Writers. London: A. and C. Black, 1893.
- MacDonald, A. Christian Worship in the Primitive Church. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1934.
- McGiffert, A. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.

- McGiffert, A. The God of the Early Christians. New York: Scribner's, 1924.
- Mackenzie, D. "Widows" HDAC. vol. II (1918), pp. 676f.
- Maclean, A. "The Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church in Relation to the Episcopate" Episcopacy Ancient and Modern. eds. C. Jenkins and D. Mackenzie. London: SPCK, 1930.
- McNeile, A. An Introduction to the Study of the NT. 2nd ed. rev. by C. Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Macpherson, J. "Dr. Sanday on the Origin of the Christian Ministry" Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 282-303.
- Mack, E. "Presbyter" ISBE. vol. IV (1955), pp. 2437f.
- Manson, T. The Church's Ministry. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948.
- Marshall, J. "Jannes and Jambres" HDB. vol. II (1899), pp. 548f.
- Matheson, G. Spiritual Development of St. Paul. Edingurgh: Blackwood, 1890.
- Maxwell, W. An Outline of Christian Worship. Oxford: University Press, 1936.
- Mayor, J. The Epistle of St. James. London: Macmillan, 1892.
- Meinertz, M. Die Pastoralbriefe des heiligen Paulus. 4th ed. Bonn: Hanstein, 1931.
- Merrill, E. Essays in Early Christian History. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Metzger, B. An Introduction to the Apocrypha. Oxford: University Press, 1957.
- _____. "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles" ET, LXX (Dec 1958), 91ff.
- Michaelis, W. Das Alttestament der christlichen Gemeinde im Lichte der Heiligen Schrift. Bern: Berchtold, 1953.
- _____. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Bern: BEG, 1946.
- _____. Pastoralbriefe und Gefangenschaftsbriefe zur Echtheitsfrage der Pastoralbriefe. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930.

- Michaelis, W. "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistick" ZNTW,
XXVIII (1929), 69-76.
- Michel, O. Paulus und seine Bibel. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann,
1929.
- Milligan, G. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians.
London: Macmillan, 1908.
- Milligan, W. "The Origin of the Christian Ministry" Exp,
3rd series, VI (1887), 339-358.
- Mitton, C. The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters.
London: Epworth Press, 1955.
- _____. "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered VII. The Author-
ship of the Epistle to the Ephesians" ET, LXVII
(1955-6), 195-198.
- Moberly, R. Ministerial Priesthood. 2nd ed. London:
Murray, 1899.
- Moffatt, J. An Introduction to the Literature of the NT.
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1911.
- _____. Grace in the NT. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.
- _____. The Approach to the NT. Hibbert Lectures, 1921.
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1921.
- _____. The General Epistles. London: Hodder and Stoughton,
1928.
- _____. The Historical NT. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T.
Clark, 1901.
- _____. The Thrill of Tradition. London: SCM Press, 1944.
- _____. "Timothy and Titus (Epistles)" Encyclopaedia Biblica.
vol. IV (1903), cols. 5079-5096.
- Moule, C. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the NT"
JTS, pt. I. vol. I. new series (Apr 1950), pp. 29-41.
- _____. "The Origins of the Christian Ministry" The Office
of a Bishop. London: Church Book Room Press, 1948,
pp. 7-14.
- Moule, H. The Epistle to the Romans. Expositor's Bible.
London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894.
- _____. The Second Epistle to Timothy. London: The Religious
Tract Society, 1905.

- Moulton, H. "Scripture Quotations in the Pastoral Epistles" ET, XLIX (1937-8), 94.
- Murray, G. Five Stages of Greek Religion. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Nägeli, T. Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1905.
- Neander, A. History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles. tran. J. Ryland. vol. I. London: Bell, 1883.
- New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, The. By a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Nineham, D. "The Case Against the Pauline Authorship" Studies in Ephesians. ed. F. Cross. London: Mowbray, 1956, pp. 21-35.
- "Notes of Recent Exposition" on Dr. Moule's article in the Churchman (June, 1906). ET, XVII (1905-6), 433f.
- Nunn, H. "The Background of the Epistle of Clement of Rome" EQ, XVIII (Jan 1946), 39-45.
- _____. "The Epistles of Ignatius" EQ, XVIII (Oct 1946), 262-272.
- _____. "The Shepherd of Hermas" EQ, XVIII (Apr 1946), 109-122.
- Oke, C. "A Doxology Not to God but Christ" ET, LXVII (1955-6), 367f.
- "On the Early History and Modern Revival of Deaconesses" CQR, XLVII (1898-9), 302-341.
- Otto, C. Die geschichtlichen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe. Leipzig: Leubner, 1860.
- Parry, R. St. John. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge: University Press, 1920.
- Patrick, M. The Story of Church's Song. Edinburgh: Turnbull and Spears, 1927.
- Peake, A. A Critical Introduction to the NT. London: Duckworth, 1909.
- Pfleiderer, O. Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology. tran. E. Peters. vol. II. London: Williams and Norgate, 1877.

- Pfleiderer, O. Primitive Christianity. Its Writings and Teachings in their Historical Connection. tran. W. Montgomery. vols. III, IV. London: Williams and Norgate, 1910, 1911.
- Phillips, G. The Transmission of Faith. London: Lutterworth Press, 1946.
- Plummer, A. The Pastoral Epistles. Expositor's Bible. 4th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894.
- Plumptre, E. "St. Luke and St. Paul: An Inquiry into their Mutual Relations!" Exp, 3rd series, IV (1876), 134-156.
- Pope, R. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to Timothy and Titus. London: Kelly, 1901.
- Quasten, J. Patrology. vol. I. Brussels: Spectrum, 1950.
- Rackham, R. The Acts of the Apostles. 5th ed. London: Methuen, 1910.
- Ramsay, W. St. Paul the Traveller. 7th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.
- _____. Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.
- _____. The Church in the Roman Empire. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.
- _____. The First Christian Century. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.
- _____. "Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy" Exp, 7th series, VII (1909), 481-494; VIII (1909), 1-21, 167-185, 264-282, 339-357, 399-416, 557-568; IX (1910), 172-186, 319-333, 433-440; 8th series, I (1911), 262-273.
- Rankin, O. "The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service Upon Christian Worship" The Journal of Jewish Studies, vol. I. n. I (1948), pp. 27-32.
- Rawlinson, A. The NT Doctrine of the Christ. Bampton Lectures, 1926. London: Longmans, Green, 1926.
- Reicke, B. "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents" The Scrolls and the NT. ed. K. Stendahl. London: SCM Press, 1958, pp. 143-156.
- _____. "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" NTS, I (1955), 137-141.

- Reid, J. "Honour" HDAC. vol. I (1915), p. 583.
- Renan, E. The History of the Origins of Christianity. Bk. III. London: Mathieson, 1889.
- Rendall, F. "Faithful is the Word" Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 314-320.
- Reuss, E. History of the Sacred Scriptures of the NT. tran. from the 5th rev. ed. by E. Houghton. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1884.
- Reynolds, H. "The First Epistle to Timothy" Exp, 3rd series, II (1875), 59-71, 131-146, 209-226, 317-323, 396-404, 465-471; III (1876), 74-80, 142-151, 224-235, 380-398; IV (1876), 47-55, 191-212.
- Richardson, A. An Introduction to the Theology of the NT. London: SCM press, 1958.
- Rist, M. "Pseudepigraphic Refutations of Marcionism" JR, XXII (1942), 39-62.
- Robertson, A. and A. Plummer. The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1911.
- Robinson, C. The Ministry of Deaconesses. London: Methuen, 1898.
- Robinson, J. Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache. Donnellan Lectures, 1920. London: SPCK, 1920.
- _____. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London: Macmillan, 1903.
- _____. "The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Periods" Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry. ed. H. Swete. London: Macmillan, 1918, pp. 59-92.
- Robinson, T. "The Syriac Bible" The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions. ed. H. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940, pp. 83-99.
- Robinson, W. "Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon" ET, XXXIV (1922-3), 89ff.
- Roller, O. Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Rolston, H. Consider Paul. Apostle of Jesus Christ. Richmond, Virginia: J. Knox Press, 1951.

- Ross, J. "The Disciplined Life: An Ideal of the Pastoral Epistles" ET, XXI (1919-20), 410-413.
- Rutherford, J. "Praetorian Guard" ISBE. vol. IV (1955), pp. 2427f.
- _____. "The Pastoral Epistles" ISBE. vol. IV (1955), pp. 2258-2262.
- Ryle, H. Philo and Holy Scripture. London: Macmillan, 1895.
- Sabatier, A. The Apostle Paul. tran. A. Hellier. 4th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899.
- Salmon, G. Introduction to the NT. 7th ed. London: Murray, 1894.
- _____. "The Christian Ministry" Exp, 3rd series, VI (1887), 2-27.
- Sanday, W. Inspiration. Bampton Lectures, 1893. London: Longmans, Green, 1894.
- _____. and C. H. Turner. Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- _____. and A. C. Headlam. The Epistle to the Romans. ICC. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1945.
- _____. "Bible" Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. ed. J. Hastings. vol. II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909, pp. 562-579.
- _____. "The Criticism of the NT" Criticism of the NT. St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902. London: Murray, 1902, pp. 1-30.
- _____. "The Origin of the Christian Ministry" Exp, 3rd series, V (1887), 1-22, 97-114.
- Sanders, J. "The Case for the Pauline Authorship" Studies in Ephesians. ed. F. Cross. London: Mowbray, 1956, pp. 9-20.
- Schaff, P. The Oldest Church Manual Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885.
- Schamberger, H. Die Einheitlichkeit der Jacobusbriefe im anti-gnostischen. Gotha: Klotz, 1936.
- Schlatter, A. Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus. Stuttgart: Verein, 1936.

- Schlattör, A. The Church in the NT Period. tran. P. Levertoff. London: SPCK, 1955.
- Schoeps, H-J. Urgemeinde Judenchristentum Gnosis. Tübingen: Mohr, 1956.
- Schürer, E. History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. div. I. vols. I, II (1890). tran. J. Macpherson. div. II. vols. I, II (1885), vol. III (1886). tran. S. Taylor. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.
- Schweitzer, A. Paul and His Interpreters. tran. W. Montgomery. London: A. and C. Black, 1912.
- _____. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. tran. W. Montgomery. London: A. and C. Black, 1931.
- Scott, C. Christianity According to St. Paul. Cambridge: University Press, 1927.
- _____. Words. A Brief Vocabulary of the NT. London: SCM Press, 1939.
- Scott, E. The Apologetic of the NT. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.
- _____. The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- _____. The NT Today. New York: Macmillan, 1921.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- _____. The Spirit in the NT. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.
- _____. The Varieties of NT Religion. New York: Scribner's, 1943.
- Scott, R. The Pauline Epistles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909.
- Sedgwick, W. "The Authorship of the Pastorals" ET, XXX (1918-19), 230f.
- Selwyn, E. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Shaw, R. The Pauline Epistles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1903.

- Simcox, G. "The Origin of the Christian Ministry" Exp,
3rd series, VI (1887), 198-215.
- Simcox, W. The Writers of the NT. London: Hodder and
Stoughton, 1890.
- _____. "The Pauline Antilegomena" Exp, 3rd series, VIII
(1888), 180-192.
- Simpson, E. The Pastoral Epistles. London: Tyndale Press,
1954.
- Simpson, W. "The Constitution of the Church in the NT"
A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. eds. C. Gore
et al. London: SPCK, 1934, pp. 385-394.
- Smith, D. The Life and Letters of St. Paul. London: Hodder
and Stoughton, 1921.
- Soares, T. "Regeneration" HDAC. vol. II (1918), pp. 310-14.
- Soden, H. von. The History of Early Christian Literature.
tran. J. Wilkinson. London: Williams and Norgate,
1906.
- Souter, A. The Text and Canon of the NT. 2nd ed. rev. by
C. Williams. London: Duckworth, 1954.
- _____. "The Pastoral Epistles" Exp, 8th series, VI (1913),
424-438.
- Sparks, H. The Formation of the NT. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- _____. "The Latin Bible" The Bible in its Ancient and
English Versions. ed. H. Robinson. Oxford: Claren-
don Press, 1940, pp. 100-127.
- Speaker's Bible, The. The Pastoral and Johannine Epistles.
ed. E. Hastings. Aberdeen: The Speaker's Bible Office,
1942.
- Spicq, P. Saint Paul Les Epitres Pastorales. Paris: Gabalda,
1947.
- Stanton, V. "NT Canon" HDB. vol. III (1900), pp. 529-542.
- Stauffer, E. NT Theology. tran. J. Marsh. London: SCM
Press, 1955.
- Stevens, G. The Pauline Theology. London: Dickinson, 1892.
- _____. The Theology of the NT. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. and
T. Clark, 1911.

- Stewart, J. A Man in Christ. London: Harper, 1935.
- Still, J. St. Paul on Trial. London: Student Christian Movement, 1923.
- Stonehouse, N. The Areopagus Address. London: Tyndale Press, 1949.
- Strack, H. and P. Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. vol. III. München: Beck, 1954.
- Streeter, B. The Primitive Church. Hewett Lectures, 1928. London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Swete, H. An Introduction to the OT in Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1900.
- _____. The Holy Spirit in the NT. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- _____. "The Faithful Sayings" JTS, XVIII (1917), 1-7.
- Tasker, R. The OT in the NT. London: SCM Press, 1946.
- Taylor, V. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan, 1953.
- _____. The Person of Christ in NT Teaching. London: Macmillan, 1958.
- _____. "Professor Oscar Cullmann's 'Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments' " ET, LXX (Feb 1959), 136-140.
- Tenney, M. The NT. A Historical and Analytic Survey. London: The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1954.
- Thackeray, H. St. John. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- Theron, D. Evidence of Tradition. London: Bowes and Bowes, 1957.
- Torm, F. "Über die Sprache in den Pastoralbriefen" ZNTW, IV (1917-18), 225-243.
- Torrance, T. The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.
- _____. "Consecration and Ordination" SJT, XI (1958), 225-252.
- _____. and J. Heron. Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism. Church of Scotland. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1956.

- Toy, C. Quotations in the NT. New York: Scribner's, 1884.
- Trench, R. Snyonyms of the NT. 9th ed. London: Macmillan, 1880.
- Turner, C. Studies in Early Church History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- _____. The Study of the NT. 1883 and 1920. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on October 22, 29, 1920. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920.
- _____. "Patristic Commentaries" HDB. extra vol. (1904), pp. 489-530.
- _____. "1 Timothy vi.12,13: ἐπὶ ΠΟΝΤΙΟΥ ΠΕΛΙΑΤΟΥ " JTS, XXVIII (1927), 270-273.
- Turpie, D. The NT View of the Old. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1872.
- _____. The OT in the New. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1868.
- Vanstone, W. "The Ministry in the NT" The Historic Episcopate. ed. K. Carey. London: Dacre Press, 1954, pp. 23-40.
- Vincent, B. The Pastoral Epistles for To-Day. London: Skeffington, 1932.
- Vincent, M. The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Wace, H. "Timothy and Titus (Epistles)" The Speaker's Commentary Series. ed. F. Cook. vol. III. London: Murray, 1881, pp. 749-818.
- Wake, Archbishop. The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers. London: Routledge, 1899.
- Walder, E. "The Logos of the Pastoral Epistles" JTS, XXIV (1923), 310-315.
- Weiss, B. A Manual of Introduction to the NT. tran. A. Davidson. vol. I. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887.
- _____. Biblical Theology of the NT. tran. from the 3rd rev. ed. by D. Eaton. vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.

- Weiss, B. Die Briefe Pauli and Timotheus und Titus. Meyer's Commentary series. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1902.
- _____. "The Present Status of the Inquiry Concerning the Genuineness of the Pauline Epistles" AJT, I (1897), 328-403.
- Weiss, J. Jesus von Nazareth Mythus oder Geschichte. Tübingen: Mohr, 1910.
- _____. The History of Primitive Christianity. completed by R. Knopf. ed. F. Grant. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- Westcott, F. A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the NT. 7th ed. London: Macmillan, 1896.
- _____. The Bible in the Church. London: Macmillan, 1901.
- _____. The Epistle to the Hebrews. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1892.
- Whitaker, G. "In Season, out of Season" ET, XXXIV (1922-3), 332f.
- _____. "2 Timothy 3:10f" Exp, 8th series, XVIII (1919), 342ff.
- White, J. "The Pastoral Epistles" The Expositor's Greek Testament. ed. W. Nicoll. vol. IV. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910, pp. 57-202.
- Williams, R. Authority in the Apostolic Age. London: SCM Press, 1950.
- _____. The Acts of the Apostles. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Wilson, J. "The Translation of 2 Timothy 2:26" ET, XLIX (1937-8), 45f.
- Wilson, R. The Gnostic Problem. London: Mowbray, 1958.
- Windisch, H. von. "Zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe" ZNTW, XXXV (1936), 213-238.
- Winer, G. A Treatise on the Grammar of NT Greek. tran. and ed. W. Moulton. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.
- Wood, C. The Life, Letters, and Religion of St. Paul. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1925.
- Workman, H. Persecution in the Early Church. 2nd ed. London: Kelly, 1906.

- Workman, W. "The Hapax Legomena of St. Paul" ET, VII
(1896), 418f.
- Yule, G. The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary.
Cambridge: University Press, 1944.
- Zahn, T. Das Apostolische Symbolum. Leipzig: Böhme, 1893.
- _____. Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Bk I.
pt. 2. Erlangen: Deichert, 1889.
- _____. Introduction to the NT. tran. M. Jacobus et al.
3 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles. London: Oxford
University Press, 1953.