

Durham E-Theses

*The language of the Pauline epistles considered in its
bearing on the possible Pauline authorship of the
pastoral epistles*

James McIntyre

How to cite:

McIntyre, James (1945) The language of the Pauline epistles considered in its bearing on the possible Pauline authorship of the pastoral epistles. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9651/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

A THESIS

entitled

"THE LANGUAGE OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES
CONSIDERED IN ITS BEARING ON THE
POSSIBLE PAULINE AUTHORSHIP OF
THE PASTORAL EPISTLES."

submitted by

JAMES McINTYRE

of

University College

a candidate for the

Degree of Master of Letters.

18th September, 1945.

Volume One.

LIST OF APPENDICES CONTAINING STATISTICAL AND OTHER MATERIAL ON WHICH THIS ESSAY IS BASED. THESE FORM VOLUME II BUT THE PAGES ARE DISTRIBUTED CONTIGUOUSLY THROUGHOUT BOTH VOLUMES:

- A. Table to show the extent of the Pauline vocabulary. page 170.
- B. Tables to show the comparative densities of Vocabularies. page 171.
and of Hapax Legomena.
- (1) Densities of Vocabularies: page 171.
(2) Densities of Hapax Legomena. page 172.
- C. Table to show the known literary history of the words page 173.
contained in the vocabularies of the thirteen Epistles.
- D. Table to illustrate the use or neglect of 61 common page 174.
particles in the thirteen Pauline Epistles.
- E. Table to show the methods whereby the 1368 principal sentences page 176.
of the Pauline writings are connected.
- F. The comparative volumes of the vocabularies of the Pauline and page 177.
Johannine groups of writings.
- G. Table to show the use made of the Definite Article: page 178.
- (1) The comparative frequency of the use of the page 178.
Definite Article:
- (2) The various uses made of the Definite Article. page 179.
- H. Tables to show some lesser details of grammar. page 180.
- (1) The use of καί page 180.
(2) Various lesser details of grammar. page 181.
- I. Some psychological influences possibly affecting the page 182.
literary style of S. Paul.
- J. Some characteristics of the language of the Pauline writings. page 185.
- K. Table to show the composition of the Pauline Vocabulary. page 189.
- L. An Analysis of the Vocabulary of the thirteen Pauline Epistles. page 190.
- Addendum: Statistics relating to Dr P.N.Harrison's "genuine Pauline page 230.
fragments".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. General Works.

- Anderson-Scott, C.A. Footnotes to S. Paul, 1935.
- Atkinson, B.F.C. Living Issues in the New Testament, 1933.
The Greek Language, 1931.
- Bacon, B.W. Introduction to the New Testament, 1902.
- Badcock, E.J. The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to
the Hebrews, 1937.
- Bartlet, J.V. The Apostolic Age, 1900.
- Battifol, P. Credibility of the Gospel, (Tr. Pollen), 1912.
- Bennett, W.H. and
Adeney, W.F.
- Blass, F. A Biblical Introduction, 1919.
A Grammar of New Testament Greek,
(Tr. Thackeray), 1905.
- Bowen, W.E. The dates of the Pastoral Epistles, 1900.
- Briggs, C.A. The Study of Holy Scripture, 1899.
- Burkitt, F.C. The Gospel History and its Transmission, 1911.
- Burney, C.F. The Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel, 1922.
- Burton, E. de W. Syntax of Moods and Tenses in New Testament
Greek, 1898.
- Clark, A.C. Recent Developments in Textual Criticism,
1914.
- Clarke, W.K.L.
- Conybeare, F.C. New Testament Problems, 1929.
History of New Testament Criticism, 1910.
Myth, Magic and Morals, 1909.
- Davidson, S. Introduction to the Study of the
New Testament, 1868.
- Deissmann, A. Bible Studies, (Tr. Grieve), 1903.
Light from the Ancient East, (Tr. Strachan)
1927.
- Dibelius, M. S. Paul, (Tr. Strachan), 1912.
A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and
Early Christian Literature, 1936.
- Driver, S.R. Introduction to the Literature of the Old
Testament, 1892.
- Duncan, G.S. S. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, 1929.
- Evanson, E. Dissonance of the four generally received
Evangelists, 1792.

General Works (continued)

- Fairweather, W.
Farrar, F.W.
Foakes-Jackson, F.J.
- Jesus and the Greeks, 1924.
The Gospel according to S. Luke, 1903.
The Life of S. Paul, (n.d.)
History of the Christian Church to A.D. 461.
1909.
- Gardner, P.
- A Historic View of the New Testament, 1904.
- Geldart, E.M.
- The Ephesian Gospel, 1915.
The Modern Greek Language in its Relation
to Ancient Greek, 1870.
- Giannares, A.
Goodspeed, E.J.
- (see Jannaris)
The Formation of the New Testament, 1926.
Christianity goes to Press, 1940.
- Goodwin, W.
- School Greek Grammar, 1903.
- Harnack, A. von
- Origin of the New Testament, 1925.
Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200, 1889.
- Harrison, P.N.
- Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, 1921.
Polycarp's Two Epistles, 1936.
- Hatch, E.
- Essays in Biblical Greek, 1889.
Organisation of the Early Christian Church,
1909.
- Hillard, A.E.
Hort, F.J.A.
Hoskyns, Sir E, and
Davey, N.
- The Pastoral Epistles, 1919.
Judaistic Christianity, 1894.
- Hunter, A.M.
- Riddle of the New Testament, 1931.
Paul and his Predecessors, 1940.
- Jacquier, E.
James, J.D.
- Histoire des livres du N.T. (4 vols.), 1903/8.
Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral
Epistles, 1906.
- Jannaris, A. (Giannares)
Jones, M.
- Historical Greek Grammar, 1897.
The New Testament in the Twentieth Century,
1914 and 1934, (3rd Edn)
- Jülicher, A.
- Introduction to the New Testament, (Tr. Ward)
1904.
- Kennedy, H.A.A.
Kenyon, F.G.
- Sources of New Testament Greek, 1896.
Introduction to the Textual Criticism of
the New Testament, 1912.
Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism
of the Greek Bible, 1933.
The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, 1933 etc.
The Story of the Bible, 1936.

General Works (continued)

- Klausner, J.
Knox, W.L.
- From Jesus to Paul, 1942.
Some Hellenistic elements in primitive
Christianity, (Schweich Lecture) 1944.
- Lake, K.
Lietzmann, H.
- The Earlier Epistles of S. Paul, 1930.
The Beginnings of the Christian Church,
(Tr. Woolf) 1937.
- Lightfoot, J.B.
- The Epistles of Clement of Rome, (2 vols.)
1869.
- Lightfoot, R.H.
- Notes on the Epistles of S. Paul, 1895.
History and Interpretation in the Gospels,
1935.
- Mackenzie, K.D.
Mahaffy, J.P. and
Goligher, W.A.
- The Case for Episcopacy, 1929.
- Mayser, E.
- Greeks: Hellenic Era - (part of Descriptive
Sociology - Herbert Spencer) 1910.
Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus d e r
Ptolemäerzeit, 1906.
- Meeham, H.G.
Milligan, G.
- Light from Ancient Letters, 1923.
The New Testament Documents, 1913.
S. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, 1908.
- Moffatt, J.
- Introduction to the Literature of the New
Testament, 1918.
- Moulton, J.H.
- From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps, 1916.
Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. I, 1908;
Vol. 2, J.H.M. and W.F. Howard, 1929.
The Science of Language, 1903.
- Nägeli, Th.
Norwood, G.
- Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, 1905.
Writers of Greece, 1925.
- Ottley, R.R.
- Handbook to the Septuagint, 1919.
- Peake, A.S.
- Bibliographical Notes for Students of the
New Testament, 1914.
- Pfleiderer, O.
Pitman,
- Christian Origins (Tr. Huebsch), 1905.
Shorthand Manual (New Era Edition), (n.d.)
Shorthand Reporter (New Era Edition), (n.d.)
Studies in the Language of S. Paul, 1936.
- Pope, R.M.
- Raleigh, W.
Ramsay, W.M.
- Style, 1897.
Bearing of Recent Discovery on the
Trustworthiness of the New Testament, 1915.
S. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, 1897.
The Church in the Roman Empire, 1903.
The First Christian Century, 1911.

General Works (continued)

Richards, I.A.
Robertson, A.T.

Robinson, H.W.
(see also Thomas, D.Winton)
Rutherford, W.G.
Ryle, H.E.

Sabatier, A.

Salmon, G.
Sanday, W.
Schaff, P.
Schlauch, M.
Schott, H.A.

Scrivener, F.H.

Semenov, A.F.
Simcox, W.H.
Souter, A.
Spitta, F.

Streeter, B.H.
Swete, H.B.

Swete, H.B. (and oars)

Thackeray, H. St John.

Thomas, D.Winton,
(see Robinson, H.W.)

Watkins, H.W.
Weiss, B.

Weizsäcker, C.

Westcott, B.F.

Whibley, L.
Winer, G.B.

Wrede, W.
Wright, J.

Principles of Literary Criticism, 1925.
Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the
Light of Historical Research, 1919.
Record and Revelation, 1938.

S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 1900.
Canon of the Old Testament, 1914.

The Apostle Paul, (add'l essay by G.G. Findlay)
1891.

Introduction to the New Testament, 1913.
The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, 1905.
History of the Church (2 vols.), 1889.
The Gift of Tongues, 1943.

Isagoge Historico-Critica in Libros Novi
Foederis Sacros, 1830.

Introduction to the Criticism of the New
Testament, 1883.

The Greek Language in its Evolution, 1936.
The Writers of the New Testament, 1890.
The Text and Canon of the New Testament, 1930.
Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristen-
tums, 1893.

The Primitive Church, 1929.
Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek,
1902.

Essays on some Biblical Questions of the Day,
(Cambridge Biblical Essays), 1909.

Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, Vol. I,
1909.

Record and Revelation, 1938.

Modern Criticism and the Fourth Gospel, 1890.
Manual of Introduction to the New Testament,
(Tr. Davidson), 1887.

Apostolic Age of the Christian Church,
(Tr. Millar), 1894.

General Survey of the History of the Canon
of the New Testament, 1881.

A Companion to Greek Studies, 1931.
Grammar of New Testament Greek, (Tr. W.F. Moulton)
1877

Origin of the New Testament (Tr. Hill), 1909.
Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language, 1912

Commentaries (Continued)

- Plummer, A. The Second Epistle of S. Paul to the
Corinthians, (I.C.C.), 1915.
A Commentary on S. Paul's First Epistle to
the Thessalonians, 1918.
- Rackham, R.B. The Acts of the Apostles, (Westm. Comms.), 1922.
- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. The First Epistle of S. Paul to the
Corinthians, (I.C.C.), 1914.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, 1909.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A.C. The Epistle to the Romans, (I.C.C.), 1911.
- Vincent, M.R. The Epistles to the Philippians and to
Philemon, (I.C.C.), 1897.
- Westcott, B.F. The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1892.

General Commentaries.

- Gore, C., Goudge, H.L., Guillaume, A. A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, 1928.
- Peake, A.S. and Grieve, A.J. A Commentary on the Bible, 1919.

C. Dictionaries, etcetera.

- Abbott-Smith, G. Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament,
1923.
- Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. 4, 1903.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th Edn. 1929.
- Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, 1906, 1908.
- Goodspeed, E.J. Index Apologeticus, 1912.
Index Patristicus, 1907.
- Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, 1898/1904.
- Hastings, J. Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, 1915/18.
- Hatch and Redpath. A Concordance of the Septuagint, 1894/1900.
- Liddell and Scott. Greek Lexicon, 8th Edn., 1901.
Greek Lexicon, New Edn., A-ΚΩΨ only, Parts
I - V, and VII + IX, 1925/36.
- Moulton and Geden. Concordance to the Greek Testament, 3rd Edn.,
1926.
- Moulton and Milligan. Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, 1914/29.

D. Periodicals, Pamphlets, etetera.

Bristol Diocesan Review, March, 1922.

Church Quarterly Review, October, 1922.

Church Times, 13th November, 1936.

The Expositor, Vols 5 and 7.

Glover, T.R. - The Mind of S. Paul, (Hertz Lecture), 1941.

Hibbert Journal, Vol. XIX.

Holborn Review, April 1922.

Journal of Theological Studies, October, 1923.

Marson, C. - Huppim and Muppim and Ard, 1917.

Modern Churchman, May 1922.

Revue Bénédictine, January, 1907.

Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1917/1918.

FOREWORD.

The text of this essay forms Volume I. It is followed by a second volume containing statistical material on which are based statements made in the essay. The numbering of the pages runs consecutively through the two volumes.

The Greek text used is that of Westcott and Hort published in the years 1881 and 1882. Words enclosed by these scholars in simple square brackets are included in the text. Proper names are excluded from consideration throughout the essay.

The term "Pauline Epistles" is used in two senses:

- (1) To describe those Letters which are now generally accepted as having been written by the Apostle S. Paul.
- (2) To indicate that corpus of writings which is generally associated with his name although questions are raised about the authorship of some of them.

The context is relied upon to provide a key to the sense in which the term "Pauline Epistles" is used. This course seems better than the alternative of coining some clumsy adjective based on the Apostle's name to indicate that the question of authorship is left open in a particular passage.

PART I.

THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Chapter I.

Introduction.

Our concern is with a number of letters which were written nearly two thousand years ago. They were originally addressed to various local Christian communities, or in some cases to individual members of those bodies. At an early date this correspondence was formed into a collection of Pauline letters and this in turn eventually became part of the canon of the Scriptures of the New Testament. But this destiny was clearly not present in the mind of the author and his writings bear many signs of their origin in local and temporary circumstances. On one occasion at least he bade a local church exchange letters with another, but it is certain that S. Paul had no thought that such a simple action would presently be looked upon as a step towards the formation of the canon of a New Testament. (1)

The minds of the earliest Christians were dominated by the thought that there would be but a short time before the second coming of their Master and this militated against any possible tendency to form Christian archives or to leave records of the circumstances and the personalities concerned with the writing and the circulation of letters and other documents.

(1) Col. IV/16.

The modern Christian knows that the purposes of God included a much longer historical experience for His Church and he has many reasons to deplore a lack of historical evidence due to the different anticipations of the first generations of the Church. Further loss has been due to the (1) destruction or decay of great libraries, whereby we have been deprived of invaluable evidence bearing on many unsettled questions about the documents comprising the New Testament. Men once lived who could have answered our many queries authoritatively and it is our great loss that they either left no record of their knowledge or that their jottings and notes have been lost. If any such missing memoranda were suddenly discovered today not only scholars but also the general Christian public would eagerly learn the truth about the origins of the Pauline letters or of the Johannine literature. With what interest would they learn the name of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews or how eagerly would they scan the pages which revealed the truth about the last years of the Apostle S. Paul and about his alleged authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

But such help is not at our command and we have to use the evidence and the critical weapons which are available to us in an effort to decide whether the balance of probability favours the theory that the Pastoral Epistles come to us from the pen of S. Paul.

At this point it is necessary to consider two preliminary questions which are inevitably provoked by the title of this essay. In the first

(1) e.g. The great library of Alexandria, which had once included 400,000 works, suffered from neglect and decay as well as from the fire of the Arab destroyer. (Enc. Brit. (1929) Vol. I., p 579)

place, is it important that we should know whether S. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles or whether someone else wrote them, in his name, after his death? And, secondly, is there a reasonable prospect that the evidence offered by the language of the Pauline Epistles will justify a choice between these alternatives? The writer's conviction is that both these questions can be answered in the affirmative.

Knowledge of the identity of an author is not essential to the understanding of his message, but without that knowledge our grasp of his meaning is likely to be imperfect. After all, the message is mediated to us through the personality of the writer and some knowledge of his personality is essential if we are to interpret the written word aright and draw from it the author's full meaning. Personality is the key to proper interpretation and our confidence in an interpretation will grow in proportion to our knowledge of the writer's character, experience and views. We could not read Pastoral Epistles written by an unknown author of the second century in the same sense as we should read those documents if we were certain that they came to us from S. Paul.

Happily we know a great deal about S. Paul beyond his mere identity. His friend S. Luke has given us a vivid picture of the public life and work of the Apostle and has also thrown some light upon his character.

With fascinated interest we are able to watch the growth of the personality of the Apostle as it reaches its full development in the Christian faith and we are able to study his brilliant "strategic" attacks

upon the great centres of the world's contemporary life. And S. Luke repeatedly enables us to see traits in his character which we can later recognise in his own letters.

Then, from these letters we derive new impressions of his personal and public influence. We see him as the tireless missionary, the bond-slave of Jesus Christ. We listen to him as he justifies the ways of God to man and calls man back to God. We read his discussions of ordinary daily problems in the light of eternal principles. We hear his stern words to backsliders and his bold rebuking of vice. And other aspects of his character come to us from incidental passages in his letters. His intense human feeling stands out most attractively. Even his most disappointing converts are his "children" from whom any sign of repentance is eagerly welcomed. To his trustworthy friends he opens his heart in ready natural affection and he tells them how their generosity and affection have made them partners in his work. In S. Paul great spiritual and intellectual powers are always blended with this rich human feeling and his letters make it easy for us to understand the grief of those who had to say good-bye to him with no prospect of seeing him again in this life.

(1)

(2)

All these impressions of the Apostle are aids to our interpretation of his writings and each of his letters makes its contribution to what one may perhaps term a broadly based critical instrument of appraisal.

(1) Rackham, "Acts", p 127, and cp I. Cor. XIII, Rom. XIII 8 - 10, Col. III/14.
(2) Acts, XX/37, 38.

From S. Luke's great story of the early days of the Church and from the ten accepted letters of S. Paul we may hope to deduce principles of appraisal or criticism which may enable us to make a pronouncement about the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles with a reasonable degree of confidence. And, in turn, our interpretations of those other letters will be affected by a favourable or unfavourable verdict on the claim of the Pastoral Epistles that S. Paul is their author.

Knowledge about authorship emphatically makes a difference to the interpretation of documents, and so our view as to the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles will vitally affect our assimilation of their contents. In short, it is definitely important for us today to try to discover whether S. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles or whether they must be attributed to some other, unknown, author. This affects not only our interpretation of these letters but also our conception of the character and personality of S. Paul. If we must cease to regard him as their author he may become to us a greater or a lesser man than we had hitherto supposed, but he will undoubtedly appear a different person in our estimation.

There are also certain indirect consequences to be expected from a verdict, favourable or unfavourable, on this problem. The high conception of his office held by many an Anglican priest today is ultimately indebted to the "De Sacerdotio" of S. Chrysostom. In this work the author quotes extensively from the Pastorals in support of his high doctrine of the priest's office and it is of course assumed by him that they come from

S. Paul. Many an Anglican deacon would acknowledge that he was profoundly impressed at the time of his ordination by the reading of an Epistle which he believed to contain advice first given by the great Apostle of the Gentiles to his younger colleague Titus.

The Pastoral Epistles have also exercised considerable influence upon liturgies both in the East and in the West. The prayer "for all men, kings, and rulers" which is a permanent feature of the Eastern liturgies and is found as early as Clement of Rome and Polycarp is certainly based upon the words of these writings. And a similar influence in the West is hinted at in an early direction of the Roman Mass for the proper announcement of the Lesson "si ex Epistolis Pauli Pastoralibus"⁽¹⁾.

It may thus be agreed that opinions favourable or unfavourable to the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles exercise both direct and indirect influence upon religious practice today. But one may go even further than this and point out that an urgent demand for an answer to the problem of the Pastoral Epistles may come at any time.

In our own days a suggested plan for the re-union of certain severed bodies of Christians, known as the "South India Scheme", arouses controversy about the fundamental nature of the Ministry of the Church. Naturally enough, people turn to the Pastoral Epistles for guidance on the subject and their views and actions become influenced by their belief about the authorship of these letters. A conviction that S. Paul wrote them would give high

(1) W. Lock, "The Pastoral Epistles", (I.C.C.) (1924) pp XXXVIII - XLI.

authority to the doctrine of the ministry enshrined in them. On the other hand, if we are to take it that an unknown disciple of the Apostle wrote these Epistles in the century after his death, we shall find in them indications of the practice of the second century rather than Apostolic injunctions dating from the first century.

If the Church were merely a monument of antiquity there would be no urgent need for a solution of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles. We could then wait patiently, watching the slow ebb and flow of developing scholarly opinion and observing its effects on the general consciousness of the Christian community. But, actually, the Church is a living organism with its own impact upon the contemporary world. And so at any time the busy world may break in on the calm quiet of the study with demands for a reasoned decision on one or another problem of the New Testament. Prominent among such requests may be one for a pronouncement on the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles.

So we pass to consider whether the resources of literary criticism available to us are adequate to provide a convincing answer to our question. Can we deduce from the other ten Epistles attributed to S. Paul principles of literary appraisal to enable us to reach a decision about the authenticity of this last group of three letters?

At this point two preliminary considerations are apt to daunt the student. In the first place, the mass of written material dealing with S. Paul and his letters is so great as to be intimidating to a modern

investigator. One scholar declares that a man might spend a long lifetime in forming a bibliography of literature dealing with S. Paul and that the outcome of his work would be, not a book, but a large encyclopaedia. And two other brilliant men acknowledge that the literature on the s i n g l e Epistle to the Romans is so vast that they cannot pretend to have really mastered it.

Secondly, there is the discouraging fact that a long array of brilliant scholars have dealt with the Pauline letters without reaching a convincing verdict about the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles. Indeed, contradictory opinions are held about details of evidence by equally learned men. For instance, one scholar finds that the absence from the Pastoral Epistles of favourite Pauline particles is "staggering", but to others this does not seem to be at all disturbing.

Doubtless there are certain general principles of literary criticism but these need to be reinforced with others derived from a study of the nature of the particular documents under examination. What then are the outstanding characteristics of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles?

Three features stand out prominently in the ten accepted letters. In the first place, a certain greatness of mind and heart, combined with the

- (1) F.J.Foakes-Jackson, "Life of S. Paul", (n.d.) p. 13.
- (2) Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (1911), p IV.
- (3) B.W.Bacon, "Introduction to the New Testament", (1900), p.139.
- (4) e.g.R.St John Parry, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), p.CXIV, (note)

sense of a powerful personality, seem to be qualities constantly revealed in the Apostle's writings. In this respect S. Paul's own letters agree subtly with the picture of him painted by the author of the Acts of the Apostles. And the presence of these qualities in a particular document or their absence from it, tells in favour of its authenticity or tends to suggest that it is not really written by S. Paul.

Then secondly, the teaching of the Apostle is marked by a certain high level and a particular grave dignity. It is a remarkable fact that S. Paul never seems to strike a false note. He is an emotional man and his letters deal with a wide range of difficult, and sometimes delicate subjects but there is never a falling away from an unconscious lofty dignity of thought and a corresponding level of language. We are perhaps apt to take these qualities in S. Paul's writings for granted, without reckoning how small is the number of writers on whom this same verdict could be passed.

Here it must be emphasised that we are solely concerned with the high level and grave dignity characteristic of S. Paul's writings. It is impossible to enter on any consideration of the comparative doctrinal contents of his various letters. Whole libraries have been devoted to the Apostle's teaching and from that volume of material there could not possibly be distilled any reasonably compact statement of critical principles of appraisal suited to the present problem. We are now concerned only with the level and tone of St Paul's teaching; we must rigidly eschew the consideration of its dogmatic content.

In the third, and last, place there are outstanding features of vocabulary and syntax which serve to identify the literary work of the Apostle. In fact some of the strongest arguments against the authenticity of the Pastorals are based upon the existence of marked contrasts in vocabulary and syntax between their language and that of the other letters attributed to S. Paul. No antecedent limits can of course be set to the versatility of genius, and the range and variation in language is considerable in the acknowledged writings of the Apostle. But these (1) variations are usually confined within certain limits and the question is whether the linguistic features of the Pastoral Epistles do not overpass these limits to a degree which is incompatible with belief in their Pauline authorship.

But are we really justified in using these three principal characteristics of S. Paul's acknowledged writings as a criteria whereby to judge the authenticity of the Pastoral letters?

Fortunately this challenge can be met. In the criticism of the Pauline writings a more definite approach to unanimity of scholarly opinion has been reached than in any other department of the study of the New (2) Testament. We have almost reached the position of being able to speak of (3) agreed positions in respect of these documents. And it is from the results

- (1) P.N. Harrison, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921) p.85.
- (2) M. Jones, "The New Testament in the Twentieth Century", (1914) pp 261 - 2.
- (3) In answer to direct questions the writer has received from Dr H.D.A. Major a statement that he accepts as genuine all the Pauline letters except the Pastorals. Dr A.C. Bouquet, another Liberal scholar, questions the Pauline authorship of Ephesians and Colossians as well.

of general critical opinion that justification is found for our proposed criteria. Almost identical results are obtained from general criticism and from these special tests of the personality of the writer, of the level of his teaching and of the characteristics of his vocabulary and syntax.

General criticism accepts the four Major Epistles, Galatians, I and II Corinthians and Romans. There is some degree of hesitation about II Thessalonians and greater doubt about Ephesians. "And the Pastoral Epistles still continue to form the storm centre of Pauline literary controversy."⁽¹⁾

Almost precisely the same results are attained when the Pauline letters are tested for indications of the personality of S. Paul, for the lofty dignity of their style and for their vocabulary and syntax. The Major Group of letters satisfies all these tests and subtly accords with the indications of personality revealed in the Acts of the Apostles. In the case of II Thessalonians some doubt arises over the level of its teaching; while in Ephesians both the personality and the teaching raise some doubts as to the authenticity of the letter. Finally, all the three tests give clear negative results when applied to the Epistle to the Hebrews and raise grave doubts in the case of the Pastoral Epistles.

Critical principles whose application gives results so nearly corresponding to those reached by wider general criticism are surely justified by this very correspondence.

(1) M. Jones, "The New Testament in the Twentieth Century", (1914), p.263.

Further justification of these principles of appraisal lies in their being concerned with qualities rather than with quantities. And this answers to the essential nature of literary criticism. In the physical world things may perhaps be counted and estimated in numbers, the only demand made upon the investigator being one for reasonable accuracy. But literature is an expression of life, and life can only be adequately gauged in terms of quality. The demand made upon the student in this case is for much more than mere accuracy in numbers. He has to try to attune himself to the greatness of the writer with whose work he is dealing. In fact he must grow spiritually before he can venture to appraise a particular literary work or presume to compare it with others. And so it is in a humble spirit that one enters on the task of estimating the essential greatness of S. Paul and then of proceeding to determine whether a particular writing reflects sufficient of his qualities to justify one in claiming it as his work.

Is there any room for the use of statistical methods in literary criticism? The answer is almost certainly in the affirmative. It is true that the nature of literature is primarily qualitative, but the spirit of letters finds a bodily expression in vocabulary and syntax. So, when there is doubt about the results of examinations based on the estimation of quality indications of quantity in language may avail to tip the balance of probabilities.

But clearly, statistical method can as yet only be used with reserve in literary problems for it is insufficiently developed for this purpose.

Yet there is a tendency in these days to place increasing reliance upon statistics even though they have not yet been successfully applied to the arts. Recently, however, a book has been published, entitled "The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary"⁽¹⁾ which raises hopes that authorship may eventually uncover some of its mysteries to the statistician. But the technical mathematical methods used in this volume, and the numerous sources of potential error described in it, serve to show that these hopes are unlikely to be realised in the near future.

Armed with three critical principles of appraisal and with a reserve criterion of statistical method, we may surely pass on to consider the language of S. Paul to which eventually these principles must be applied.⁽²⁾

(1) by Udney Yule, (1944)

(2) In Part II, Chapters V-VII, pp. 46-81.

Chapter II

The General Nature of the Language of S.Paul.

An attempt to compare the language of the Pastoral Epistles with that of the accepted letters of S.Paul involves the discussion of literary style, and the study of style must necessarily be preceded by some consideration of the general nature of the author's language. An important factor in the case of S.Paul is that he was bilingual. As a child he had spoken one language and as a man he was destined almost entirely to use another. His life's work demanded the power to use this second language and his genius enabled him to extract the greatest possible advantages from the educational opportunities which were offered to him by the social circumstances of his family. So it is necessary briefly to summarise his life in relation to his linguistic endowment.

Tradition asserts that the family of the future Apostle had emigrated
 (1)
 from Gischala in Galilee to Tarsus in Cilicia, a centre of education and of
 (2)
 commerce. Indeed, the University of Tarsus was said to rank with those of
 Athens and Alexandria and the city had been the intellectual home of many
 (3)
 philologists as well as philosophers. Tarsus was also a busy centre of
 trade and perhaps imagination may allow us to picture the boy Saul playing

(1) Jerome, "de vir illustr", Enc.Bib. 3606.
 (2) J.Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", (1942), p.306.
 (3) H.D.B., Vol.III, p.699, and Vol.IV, p 687.

on the quayside and reading on bales of goods the names of places to which his own letters were destined later to bring a more enduring fame.

From his own words, we know that he grew up in a devout family of the sect of the Pharisees. He calls himself a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a description which implies an Aramaic-speaking family, but at Tarsus he grew up in contact with Hellenistic Jews. He spoke Aramaic and Greek and perhaps Hebrew as well. The general atmosphere of his home life is perhaps implied by his references to his personal spiritual history. He was a zealous Pharisee and could claim to have lived in his youth a pure and blameless life. His heart and mind owed allegiance to the majestic Law and an inner serenity was for a time the reward of his entire obedience to its dictates. But later on a mental conflict betrayed the inevitable weakness of a religion in which a code had usurped the place of the spirit.

Saul was fortunate enough to be given educational advantages as great as his ability to profit by them. He had received the education proper to a good aristocratic Jewish family whose head had received the privilege of Roman citizenship, later to be inherited by his son, and an honour which implied moderate affluence as well as good social status.

(1) P¹pns, III/4.

(2) J.Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", (1942), p.305.

(3) P¹pns, III/5.

(4) op.Rom.VII, and Dic. of Apost.Church, Vol.II, p.151.

(5) R.B.Rackham, "Acts", (Westm.Comms.), (1922), p.124.e.g. Some writers suggest a somewhat less elevated status for S.Paul's family, e.g.Klausner, op.cit. p.304.

(6) W.M.Ramsay, "S.Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen", (1897), p.31.

Every Jew was bidden to teach his son a trade, a stipulation designed to secure that all classes were educated in hand as well as in mind. Saul (1) of Tarsus learned to be a tentmaker and was later able to ply his craft in order to avoid being a burden to his Christian converts.

(2)
Some time after his twelfth birthday Saul was sent to Jerusalem as a pupil of Rabbi Gamaliel, a great man and a scholar given to studies in (3) Greek. In these circumstances it is most probable that the brilliant pupil seized his opportunities of learning more of the Hebrew Bible and also of (4) developing his command of Greek. The genius of the youth was ready to be set ablaze by the encouragement of the elder man.

The finished product of this varied educational course was a man dowered with an equipment of thought and language equal to the vocation which was to be given him. At first his powers were devoted to an attempt to extirpate the Christian sect, but his conversion placed at the service of his new Faith the qualities which had been slowly acquired in the days of his earlier beliefs, and not the least valuable of his endowments was (5) his command of two languages.

(1) Acts XVIII/3.

(2) Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament", (Eng. Tr.) (1909), Vol. I, p. 50.

(3) H. D. B. Vol. II, p. 106, and Enc. Bib. Vol. II, p. 1639, for the view that S. Paul's studies under Gamaliel had been "wholly Hebraic".

(4) See Robertson and Plummer, "I. Cor." (I. C. C.), (1914), p. XLVIII. Foakes-Jackson holds that S. Paul would not have been allowed to study classical Greek under Gamaliel. ("Life of S. Paul", (n. d.), p. 76.)

(5) J. Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", (1942), pp. 305-6, inclines to the belief that S. Paul read the Old Testament in the Hebrew. Without producing evidence, he suggests that the O. T. quotations from the LXX found in S. Paul's Epistles are due to deliberate alterations made by himself or by a copyist. (p. 305)

Each of the languages which S. Paul inherited gained an international status and calls for some detailed mention. Aramaic of course traces its origins back to Semitic sources, while Greek belongs to the Indo-European family of languages. (1)

The philologists ask us to assume the probable existence of a hypothetical mother-tongue, used by all Semites when they lived together in Arabia. (2) Migrations divided up these people and from the parent language other tongues were developed in different areas. In the north-west we find the Hebrew, Aramaic, Phoenician and Moabite tongues. In the east, Babylonian and Assyrian were the prevailing languages, while Arabic and Ethiopian developed in the southern area.

The great political power of Babylon was waning during the years 1600 to 1350 B.C., a period which included the entry of the Hebrews into Palestine. In this country the newcomers found the Babylonian and Canaanite languages in use and to that partnership they brought the addition of their own Arameo-Arabic dialect. (3) The Babylonian speech shared its country's decline, but the Aramaic constituent of the language of the Hebrews grew more vigorous, and it received further accretions when the Assyrians imported (4) into the country the people who presently became known as the Samaritans.

(1) M. Schlaugh, "The Gift of Tongues", (1943), p.58, prefers this term to Indo-Germanic; the Germanic group is a sub-division of the parent Indo-European. (pp 51 - 52)
 (2) Essay by D. Winton Thomas included in "Record and Revelation", edited by H.W. Robinson, (1938), p 374.
 (3) op.cit., p 377.
 (4) op.cit., p 387.

Aramaic was not a derivative from Hebrew but rather its rival, and the struggle between the two languages was complicated by the presence of an Aramaic element in Hebrew from the first. Moreover, when they entered Palestine the Hebrew people took over so much from languages already in use there that in a sense it is true to say that their language was firmly entrenched in the country before their own arrival. It has even been said that "the Hebrew language may be appropriately termed the Israelitish dialect of Canaanitish".

But even a considerable degree of blending and inter-penetration does not destroy the identity of tongues which have separate early origins and the later books of the Old Testament bear witness to a struggle between Hebrew and Aramaic in the occasional abrupt intrusions into the Hebrew text of passages written in Aramaic.

Though it appears that Hebrew survived the Exile as a living language it gradually succumbed to its rival in its own homeland. And in the larger world, in the 500 years before the birth of our Lord, Aramaic became the dominant language of Western Asia. In the Maccabean period Hebrew as a spoken language was all but dead and Aramaic was well on its way to becoming the vernacular of Palestine. The Jews in fact had ceased to speak

- (1) Essay by D. Winton Thomas included in "Record and Revelation", Ed. by H. W. Robinson, (1938), p. 377.
- (2) H. D. B. Vol. III, p. 25, Col. 2, under "Antiquity": also for emphasis on the influence of Arabic on the Canaanitish language v article "Language of the Old Testament", H. D. B. Vol. III, especially pp 27 - 29.
- (3) Genesis XXXI/47, Jeremiah X/11, Ezra IV/8 - VI/18 and VII/12 - 26.
- (4) Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament", (1909), Vol. I, p. 4, and Enc. Bib. Vol. I, p. 277.

(1)

their own language: they were presently to read even their Bible in a third tongue. Like Greek, Aramaic seemed to possess some secret of vitality which compelled the submission of other tongues to its overriding power.

In the time of our Lord the prevalence of Aramaic over a wide area is shown by numerous inscriptions. In the Maccabaeen period Jewish patriotism had told against the use of Greek and the balance of evidence seems clearly to favour the belief that our Lord habitually spoke Aramaic, though He probably also knew Greek. Indeed, a few words of actual Aramaic spoken by Him are embedded in the text of the Gospels. Such words as mammon, talitha ousi, and abba come readily to mind as examples in point. S. Paul also provides evidence of the same kind by retaining the Aramaic expression
(4)
maran-atha.

By the time of Alexander the Great the triumph of Aramaic over Hebrew seemed to be complete. The holy scriptures were indeed written in Hebrew but even in the synagogues it now became customary to add an Aramaic translation when the books were read aloud in the public services. The dual reading appeared to express the triumph of Aramaic.

But in the same period another and a far greater language, uniquely influential in the wider world, began to make itself felt even in Palestine. While Christ and His disciples almost certainly usually spoke Aramaic their

(1) D.Winton Thomas, in "Record and Revelation", edited by H.W. Robinson, (1938) p.388, and Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament", Vol.I, (1909), p.5.

(2) Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament", Vol.I, (1909), p.5.

(3) "Language of Christ", "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels", Vol.I, pp 3 and 4.

(4) I. Corinthians XVI/22.

teaching was inevitably recorded, a few years later, in the Greek language. This apparent paradox is a symbol of the victory of the second speech which was inherited by S.Paul.

As a boy, Saul no doubt spoke Aramaic, "the language spoken in his father's house, the language in which his mother taught him to pray." But he was destined to work in a world where Greek was essential for his purposes. In Tarsus it was almost inevitable that Jews should speak Greek as well as their own Aramaic tongue and a clever boy would learn the new language at an early age. S.Paul "does not write Greek as a person would who had acquired the language with effort late in life." Moreover, we know that S.Paul was a pupil at Jerusalem of a great Jewish scholar devoted to Greek studies. And in later life he found the means of expressing himself fluently in Greek in letters which covered a wide range of human life. On one occasion he startled and placated a hostile crowd by addressing its members in Aramaic, but their astonishment at his ability to do this itself attests his ordinary custom of speaking Greek.

The remote origins of language are naturally shrouded in the mists of past time and to this rule Greek is no exception. It belongs to a family

- (1) Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament", Vol.I, (1909), p.50.
- (2) Zahn, op.cit., Vol.I., p.51, cp. pp. 182-184 of this essay.
- (3) Estimates of the probability that S.Paul studied Greek under R.Gamaliel vary considerably. e.g. Robertson and Plummer ("I. Corinthians", (I.C.C.) (1914), p.XLVIII) consider that his studies were doubtless "wholly Hebraic". W.L.Knox, ("Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity", (1944) p.31) has no difficulty in supposing that S.Paul acquired all his knowledge of Greek "at the feet of Gamaliel." cp footnote 4, page 16, (Foakes-Jackson)
- (4) Acts XXI/40.

(1)

of languages known as the Indo-European. There are at least eight other groups belonging to this family; One group includes Sanskrit and another modern English.

From the first, Greek seems to have shown a masterful character conquering the languages of the older inhabitants of many lands into which it was introduced. In nearly every case it completely supplanted these languages; its sole recorded rebuff was its failure to oust the established

(2)

Albanian language.

Here one need no more than mention that the geography of Greece, with its surface split up by mountain and sea, served to preserve and even to increase, the dialects spoken by those settlers who brought the Greek language to Greece."If ever a single parent Indo-European language was spoken, it would have been spoken for a long time in a self-contained area." The separation of the various Indo-European languages was probably complete by about 2500 or 2000 B.C. and Greek-speaking bands began to move towards the

(4)

Aegean about the same time.

At one stage of its growth the Greek language was threatened with peril from an oriental source. Colonists in Cyprus became pioneers in writing Greek, but they unfortunately based their efforts on a syllabic model derived from Hittite sources. "But nothing is clumsier than a Greek writing

(1) A term to be preferred on scientific grounds to Indo-Germanic: it includes a "Germanic" group. M.Schlauch considers that it was the spoken language of a single parent community before 2000 B.C. ("The Gift of Tongues", (1943), p.58)

(2) op.cit., p.56, and Mahaffy and Goligher, "Greeks: Hellenic Era", (1910), p.48.

(3) B.F.C. Atkinson, "The Greek Language", (1931), p.9.

(4) B.F.C. Atkinson, op.cit., pp 9 and 11.

"in the Cypriot character, and it would have been much better if they had waited longer and learned with the rest of their race the use of a finer instrument." (1) The price of perseverance in writing on a syllabic basis could scarcely have been less than a failure to develop the Greek of the Golden Age.

The battle of the dialects ended in the victory of Attic Greek, the language of Athens during her period of literary eminence, from about 500 to 300 B.C. The physicians continued to cling to the Ionic dialect and the mathematicians retained the Doric, but this was balanced by the formal adoption of the Attic dialect as the official language of the State in Macedonia. (2) It is natural that the most glorious period of the Greek language followed swiftly on the uniform adoption of the Ionic alphabet at the end of the fifth century. (3) (4)

But such was the vitality of the Greek language that decline from the standards of its golden age involved no sentence of death upon it. New human needs were met by fresh development of the language which shows an astounding vigour as the Greek of the KOINE DIALEKTOS, the language which became the vessel chosen to contain and to diffuse the Christian religion. (5)

Plato and Aristotle had prepared the way for this new form of Greek. They had gathered up previous human thought, adding to it the ideas of their

(1) Bury, quoted by Mahaffy and Golligher, "Greeks:Hellenic Era", (1910), p.48.

(2) Goodwin, "School Greek Grammar", (1903), p.2.

(3) Mahaffy and Golligher, op.cit., p.50.

(4) Mahaffy and Golligher, op.cit., p.50.

(5) Atkinson, "The Greek Language", (1931), p.265.

own great minds and then passing it on to all mankind. Plato in particular had expressed his thoughts in words of lucid simplicity. He had greatly influenced the vocabulary of the language and handed on lofty standards of literary expression to the writers of the KOINE.

The military genius of Alexander the Great soon gave new opportunities to this form of Greek. His conquests carried the Greek language to wide areas in the Eastern Mediterranean, to Syria, Palestine and Egypt. And his soldiers, drawn from many countries and constantly invading new areas, used the KOINE Greek as a common military tongue which served to break down barriers ordinarily separating different human minds. Even Rome's subsequent military conquest of Greece was balanced by a cultural victory of Greece over Rome, one which has spread the influence of Greek thought and literature among the civilisations of the West from that day to the present time.

Naturally enough, the Attic dialect, the expression of Greek genius in politics, literature, and the arts, formed the main constituent of the KOINE Greek. But it was mainly the Attic of the people, not that of the Greek literary masterpieces. The more popular Attic which had hitherto made itself felt only in comedy now spread into the words of historians and philosophers. And commerce contributed a valuable reinforcement of Ionic vocabulary to the cosmopolitan language.

The vigour of this form of Greek was shown by its resistance to the absorption of elements derived from the native languages of the countries

(1) Thackeray, "Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek", Vol.I, (1909), p.17.

which used it. Examples of such borrowing are extremely rare: "The Greek language has at all times been the giver rather than the receiver, and when it borrowed it usually clothed its loans in a dress of its own making."⁽¹⁾

To regard the KOINE as a debased and decadent Greek is to misunderstand its nature. "It does not represent the last stage of the language but a starting point for fresh development."⁽²⁾ The Attic Greek of the Golden Age, the KOINE Greek seen in the New Testament and elsewhere, and the modern Greek as "spoken today, represent merely different stages in the life story of a great language.

Saul as a young man thus became possessed of a rich equipment of language. He was born into one great language and he presently acquired another even greater tongue. He was a natural heir to the Aramaic which then dominated Western Asia and he learned the KOINE Greek which had embarked on a course of world conquest. The quality of this latter speech must be considered in connection with the literary style of S. Paul.⁽³⁾

Even secular historians have justified S. Paul's dictum that God sent forth His Son in the fulness of time. This they do by giving details of the influences, philosophical, spiritual and social which favoured the spread of the Christian faith in its earliest days. And theologians⁽⁴⁾

- the influences, philosophical, spiritual and social which favoured the spread of the Christian faith in its earliest days. And theologians⁽⁵⁾
- (1) Thackeray, "Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek", Vol. I, (1909), p. 21.
 - (2) Thackeray, op. cit., p. 21.
 - (3) The influence of the LXX on S. Paul's style is referred to in Chap. III.
 - (4) Galatians, IV/4.
 - (5) Even Gibbon's reluctant and ironical account provides such evidence: ("Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire", Vol. II, (1776-88) (edn. 1903-6), Chapter XV.)

have pointed out that various political and military elements reinforced the effect of these more elevated factors. The rule of Law in the Roman Empire, the Roman military roads and the cosmopolitan Greek speech all made it easier for missionaries to travel and for various peoples to listen to their message.

But in these present days we can realise that a not less potent influence favouring the spread of the Christian faith was the early life and education of a young man of Cilicia. Together with a matchless spiritual genius and fervour, Paul of Tarsus fortunately had a command of the one language which by its innate power and flexibility enabled him to speak and write in terms "understood of the people" of many lands. In his hands the KOINE Greek subserved spiritual purposes: can we now again use this language to throw light upon another question of spiritual import, the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles?

Chapter III

The Literary Style of S. Paul.

Behind the apparently simple act of writing a letter there lies concealed a long story of general human experience and of personal development. Some of the factors concerned in this process call for brief mention before we can attempt to identify the style of a particular writer, in this case S. Paul. And the need to do this is even greater when we attempt to compare the literary styles of two sets of documents with a view to estimating whether they present evidence in favour of a unity or a plurality of authorship.

Viewed from one angle literature is a branch of aesthetics and as such offers no hope of the discovery of any fixed canons of appraisal - *de gustibus non est disputandum*.

The difficulty and the delicacy of the task of defining literary style has been wittily expressed by a master of the subject in these terms: "Style, the Latin name for an iron pen, has come to designate the art that handles, with ever fresh vitality and wary alacrity, the fluid elements of speech. By a figure, obvious enough, which yet might serve for an epitome of literary method, the most rigid and simplest of instruments has lent its name to the subtlest and most flexible of arts. Thence the application of the word has been extended to arts other than literature, to the whole

range of the activities of man. The fact that we use the word "style" in speaking of architecture and sculpture, painting and music, dancing, play-acting, and cricket, that we can apply it to the careful achievements of the housebreaker and the poisoner, and to the spontaneous animal movements of the limbs of man or beast, is the noblest of unconscious tributes to the faculty of letters."⁽¹⁾

The wide range of elements here involved in the question of style surely hints that the art of writing itself includes a complex series of factors, both psychological and physical. The first letter written after a severe illness offers evidence of this. The convalescent remembers with distress the exhaustion of body and mind produced by what he had perhaps hitherto regarded as the "simple" action of writing a letter.

"Le style est l'homme même" now conveys a deeper truth than was in the mind of de Buffon. Since the time when he wrote we have learned more of the interaction of mind and body involved in the art of writing. We think of the mind which conceives a thought and of the hand which gives it written expression, and in their joint action see a symbol of the involvement of the whole personality of the writer.

But even this is not all. The mind which conceives the thought has itself been slowly moulded by the human instinct to pass on its experience

(1) Sir Walter Raleigh, "Style", (1897), p.1.

(2) G.L. le Clerc de Buffon, (1707-88), "Discours sur le style".

to others. "A large part of the distinctive features of the mind are due to its being an instrument for communication. An experience has to be formed, no doubt, before it is communicated, but it takes the form it does largely because it may have to be communicated. The emphasis which natural selection has put upon communicative ability is overwhelming."⁽¹⁾

May we not then justly say that literary style is communicative ability raised to the level of an art?

And once again, the very nature of words seems to correspond to both aspects of the nature of man, to his spiritual as well as his bodily powers. Words are no material "counters", each endowed with a fixed significance which cannot be changed or modified. On the contrary they correspond closely to ever changing spiritual experience. The complaint made against words could well be that their incessant movement makes it hard to assess their exact connotation at a particular moment in their history. It could hardly be justly alleged that a lack of elasticity makes them incapable of conforming to the reality of life. The defects of words point to the turbulence associated with youth rather than to the fixity characteristic of the staid sobriety of age. Indeed, it is their mercurial power continually to change their connotations which makes of words such apt instruments for the expression of the ever developing experience of human life. "Words must change to live and a word once fixed becomes useless for the purposes of

(1) I.A. Richards, "Principles of Literary Criticism", (1925), p.26.

art. Whosoever would make acquaintance with the goal towards which the classic practice tends, should seek it in the vocabulary of the Sciences. These words are fixed and dead, a botanical collection of colourless, scentless, dried weeds, a hortus siccus of proper names, each individual symbol poorly tethered to some single object or idea. No wind blows through that garden, and no sun shines on it to discompose the melancholy workers at their task of tying Latin labels on to withered sticks. Definition and division are the watchwords of science, where art is all for composition and creation. Not that the exact definable sense of a word is of no value to the stylist; he profits by it as a painter profits by the study of anatomy, or an architect by a knowledge of the strains and stresses that may be put on his material. The exact logical definition is often necessary for the structure of his thought and the ordering of his severer argument. But often, too, it is the merest beginning; when a word is once defined he overlays it with fresh associations and buries it under new-found moral significances, which may belie the definition they conceal." (1)

But even if desiccation is the danger which attends on the abuse of the "classic practice" in language, that practice has done good service to the art of writing. It has conferred on writers a power of self-criticism which makes for restraint and moderation of statement, and it has also given attention to the fundamental rhythms which seem to underlie all human life.

(1) Sir Walter Raleigh, "Style", (1897), pp 40-42.

But so long as art is practised as an expression of life and does not find its end in itself an excessive and artificial refinement is avoided. This is indeed true of the literary art, the classical rules benefit writing which is vital and sincere, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has shown that the KOINE Greek can express his living message in at least the echoes of the rhythmical cadences popularised by Isocrates. (1)

But even if S. Paul uses the same general type of Greek as the author of the Hebrews, a manifest contrast exists between the respective styles of these writers. The range of language covered by the term KOINE Greek is obviously a wide one. And that impression is confirmed when we consider specimens of the secular use of this speech. Archaeology has now ransacked the "wastepaper baskets" of the ancient world, especially in Egypt. From these it has rescued a spoil which includes wills, official reports, private letters, petitions, accounts and many other ephemeral documents. The evidence derived from these sources has been presented to us by the patient (2) scholars who have worked over this vast store of material. The normal Greek spoken by the common people is here seen to be the Greek of the New Testament and the evidence derived from fragile papyri is confirmed by many surviving carved inscriptions and by writings on ostraca or earthen sherds. The greatest discovery made about New Testament Greek is that there is no such language and that the "language of the Holy Ghost" is the speech

(1) J. Moffatt, "Epistle to the Hebrews", (I.C.C.), (1924), pp LVI-LIX.

(2) e.g. B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt, G. Milligan and J.H. Moulton in Britain; J. Rouffiac in France, and G.A. Deissmann in Germany.

used by the contemporary masses of the people.

We have, however, to account for the relative elevation of the style of the New Testament and of the Pauline Epistles in particular. Behind the Greek New Testament is the version of the Old Testament in the same language. The political wisdom of Alexander the Great had led him to invite the Jews to settle in the city of Alexandria which he founded in 332 B.C. On these immigrants he conferred the full rights of citizenship and soon "the adoption of the Greek tongue was a tribute gladly paid by the Alexandrian Jews to the great Gentile community which sheltered and cherished them." (1) So thoroughly was this process carried out that the Hebrew Scriptures had to be translated into Greek for use in the synagogues. (2) The earliest as well as the best of the surviving translations is the Septuagint Version, which has profoundly influenced the writers of the New Testament and has affected both the form and the spirit of their language. (3)

The Septuagint is in fact not less indispensable to the study of the New Testament than to that of the Old. The Alexandrian version "created a language of religion which lent itself readily to the service of Christianity and became one of the most important allies of the Gospel." (4)

- (1) H.B.Swete, "Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek", (1902), p.9.
- (2) The Law was probably first translated and the rest of the O.T.gradually followed.(H.B.Swete, op.cit., pp 16 & 25.)
- (3) The version of Aquila dates from about 130 A.D. Those of Theodotion and Symmachus from some 70 years later.(R.R.Ottley, "Handbook to the Septuagint", (1919), pp 38-40.)
- (4) Dated 3rd to 1st century B.C. (R.R.Ottley, op.cit., p.2.)
- (5) H.B.Swete, "Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek", (1902),p.450.
- (6) H.B.Swete, op.cit., p.433.

The sensitive mind of S. Paul naturally responded to the stimulus of the language of the Greek Old Testament. This can be seen not only from his quotations but also from very many passages which betray the influence of the Septuagint less directly. (1)

And though the Apostle probably had no extensive acquaintance with Greek literature and shows hardly any signs of the classical discipline he could on occasion draw from the wells of memory the technical terms of thinkers. But generally the letters of S. Paul are written in the colloquial Greek. They are the impetuous utterances of an eager missionary who never dreamed that his unstudied words would survive all the literature of his time. The quality of their language and the elevation of the thought expressed is surely due to the happy circumstance that a great creed was being proclaimed by a messenger not unworthy of his vocation. (2) (3)

But the Apostle's own personality produced important effects upon his literary style. Opinions about his state of health may differ considerably, but it is generally agreed that it was often precarious and sometimes bad. Moreover, the friend who accompanied him on some of his most important journeys was, significantly, a physician. May there not be some connection between the frustrations produced by illness, the occasional inability to (4)

(1) About 91% of the Pauline vocabulary can be traced back to the LXX. The Pastoral Epistles show the lowest average figure in the four groups of Pauline Epistles.
(2) Camb. Bib. Essays, (1909), pp 481-2.
(3) Camb. Bib. Essays, (1909), p 482.
(4) S. Paul's bad health is attributed to: Epilepsy, by Klausner, ("From Jesus to Paul", (1942), p.326), Malaria, by Ramsay, ("S. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen", (1902), pp 94-97) Nerves, not Epilepsy, by H. Lietzmann, ("Beginnings of the Christian Church", (1937), p.147) Ophthalmia, by Rackham, ("Acts", (1922), p.206) Cp. Appendix "I", p.182.

find the right word, which is the common experience of those who are bilingual, and the corresponding outbursts of language so impetuous in its course that it overflows the banks of grammar? S. Paul gives the impression at times that, while he has a command of a popular flexible Greek, his rapid thought is outpacing his powers of expression. In this connection it is significant that some passages in the Pauline letters gain in force when they are read rapidly. ⁽¹⁾ This fact throws light not only on the probable use of the services of amanuenses but also, surely, upon the linguistic powers and difficulties of the Apostle.

So far we have outlined some of the complex factors involved in the art of writing and have seen that it is an activity involving the whole human personality. Further, we have seen the general nature of the KOINE Greek in which S. Paul wrote and have referred to the special influences, spiritual and educational, which account for the relative elevation of the "common" language as used by the Apostle. An account has been taken of the possible effects produced upon his literary style by ill-health and by an occasional momentary conflict between the two languages of which his mind stood possessed.

How then can we indicate the general literary style of S. Paul?

From a great master of the classical Greek language comes a high tribute of praise: "That this Greek of his has no connection with any school or any model, that it streams as best it may from the heart in an impetuous torrent, and yet is real Greek, not translated Aramaic (like the

(1) J. Armitage Robinson, "S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians", (1909), p. 48.

sayings of Jesus) makes him a classic of Hellenism. Now at last, one can again hear in Greek the utterance of an inner experience, fresh and living." (1)

This Greek which S. Paul handles in such masterly fashion is, of course, a particular form of the KOINE Greek, modified by the ideas of the Hebrew Scriptures ~~and~~ by the language of the Septuagint and ^{by} ~~of~~ the deeply spiritual nature of the Apostle. But he is a master of the KOINE who thinks in Greek, writing in "the vernacular of a brilliant and well-educated man in touch with the Greek culture of his time, though remaining thoroughly Jewish in his mental fibre." (2)

And his language is truly powerful, though it betrays many technical faults. His sentences are often long and sometimes involved, and attention is attracted to "his participial appendages and amplifications, the irrepressible crowding of his thoughts, his imperial disregard for niceties of construction in his determination to "wreak his meaning on expression" (4)

But S. Paul must be judged primarily as a missionary and not as a literary man. He generally gained his converts by the spoken word. His letters were usually the results of personal contacts already made in that other fashion. So the quality of his writing is the incidental outcome of his personal character and education; it is not usually due to conscious

- (1) Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, quoted by Sir W.M.Ramsay, in "First Christian Century", (1911), p.106.
- (2) A.T.Robertson, quoted in "Dictionary of the Apostolic Church", Vol.II, p.140.
- (3) The average number of words per sentence in the four groups of Epistles is as follows: Group I, 30 words, Group II, 20 words, Group III, 35 words, Group IV, 24 words. Ephesians and Colossians are far above the average of the Pauline Epistles with 42 and 39 words per sentence respectively.
- (4) Article "Language of the New Testament", by J.H.Thayer, in H.D.B., Vol.III, pp 41 - 42.

literary craft. As a true missionary he thought of his converts' spiritual needs rather than of demonstrating his own literary powers. "On general principles no one would be more unlikely than he to make a display of literary culture in such of his writings as have survived. Paul was the last man who can be imagined as polishing his periods. He wrote or dictated his letters impulsively, and they reflect his mind at the moment. He is rarely logical, and sometimes scarcely grammatical. At times he rises to sublime heights of natural eloquence, at others his language is confused, sometimes he becomes almost brutal in the vigour of his vituperation. (Gal.V/12; Phil.III/2) He displays all the unevenness of inspired genius. It may safely be said that he wrote Greek as he talked it; for the literary Greek of the age was practically an unspoken language." (1)

The literary style of S.Paul is indeed a description of a manner of writing which combines a wide range of variation with characteristics which can be definitely recognised. The man has put the stamp of his personality upon the KOINE Greek which he used.

His technical knowledge of Greek was hardly equal to the expression of the rich variety and subtlety of his thought or to the intensity of his feeling. "He is ever struggling to express more than he actually says; the logical sequence is broken by the intrusion of new ideas, feeling supersedes grammar and forbids the completion of a clause." (2)

(1) F.J.Foakes-Jackson, "The Life of S.Paul", (n.d.), pp 73 - 74.

(2) Robertson and Plummer, "I Corinthians", (I.C.C.), (1914), pp XLVII-VIII. Cp. Appendix I, p.182.

But how wonderful are the results which the Apostle obtains from the use of an inadequate tool! His letters deal with a wide range of different people and different circumstances. They bring praise and blame; they carry argument expressed in terms of persuasive spirituality; they deal with the turbulent life of a great seaport and its moral and spiritual problems; they expound the majesty of the person of Christ and its reflection in the life of the Christian Church; they reveal the calm happy relations of the writer with a Church of mainly faithful converts.

The literary style of S. Paul meets the varied calls of all t h e s e different circumstances, but it also does more. He had had the loftiest mystical experience and had been rapt away into the third heaven, a fact (1) which perhaps gives us a key to the sublime beauty of his great hymn t o (2) charity. And even here his command of the Greek language does not fail him. There is no break in the consistent revelation of the personality of a great man, a born leader of men yet personally sensitive and affectionate. A n d always there is in his writings the same grave dignity of thought and diction.

No higher tribute can be paid to the literary style of S. Paul than the observation that it never failed to answer the demands made upon it both by the greatness of the message which it was called upon to convey and by the lofty personal character of the messenger. Written long ago for the needs of other people, S. Paul's literary style today still serves the needs of these other days and of us other peoples.

(1) II Corinthians, XII/1-4.

(2) I Corinthians, XIII.

A document attributed to S. Paul need only be accused of revealing lack of spirituality, poverty of thought or stilted expression, and at once grave doubt is aroused as to whether he can really be its author. Of no one can it be said with more truth that le style est l'homme même.

Chapter IV.

The Possible Influence of Amanuenses.

A new complication is introduced into the problem of the Pauline Epistles when it is suggested that variations to be seen among some of them may be due to the influence, even to the interference, of the amanuenses who wrote down S. Paul's dictated words.

The extreme form of this theory would reduce to ruins the accepted general lines of criticism of the Pauline documents. We should be concerned not with the question whether S. Paul wrote particular documents but with endeavours to dissect out the various elements of the text and to attribute their origin to one or another of a plurality of authors. The criticism of these Epistles would then be on lines parallel to that of the Pentateuch in the Old Testament, and the vivid personality of S. Paul would be replaced by shadowy figures having as little colour and life as the "alphabetical"
(1)
hypothetical writers of the books of the Law.

But there is sufficient likeness in the vocabulary and syntax of the various Pauline documents to rule out the theory that the amanuenses were really part-authors of them.

(1) J.E.P.D. etcetera.

On the other hand, the possible influence of amanuenses on the language of the Epistles cannot be ignored and so it becomes necessary to form some theory about the part played by the actual scribes who wrote at S. Paul's dictation. Many questions at once arise and we may well ask: What is the evidence for the employment of amanuenses by S. Paul? Were these helpers his friends or paid professional writers? What literary equipment did they bring to their task? Could the Apostle have afforded to pay the fees of professional amanuenses? What degree of liberty or discretion did he allow these helpers in the actual framing of the letters?

It is the writer's belief that where the evidence on these points is not conclusive the circumstances, and particularly the temperament of the Apostle enable us to make a fairly confident choice among various possibilities.

In one case an amanuensis is allowed to reveal himself, when Tertius adds his own greetings to the Christians in Rome. And the presence of such scribes is clear from other Epistles too. Towards the end of the Galatian letter the Apostle takes the pen into a hand perhaps made callous by his tentmaking. With a touch of humour he draws attention to the large size of the characters which he writes, probably in contrast to the neat letters of the professional scribe who recorded the rest of the letter. And three other Epistles receive similar authentication, a procedure which the Apostle himself declares to

(1) Rom. XVI/22.

(2) Gal. VI/11. But Milligan suggests that this apology for writing in large characters may refer to the whole Epistle and not merely to the conclusion. He thinks that S. Paul's "exquisite tact" may have led him in this case to dispense with an amanuensis because of the delicate nature of the Galatian Epistle. ("New Testament Documents", (1913), p.24)

(1)

be his common practice. Quite clearly there is likely to be the work of an amanuensis in any Pauline Epistle and our next task is to form some estimate of the character and of the work of such a scribe,

It is, of course, impossible to say whether the amanuenses used by S. Paul were his personal friends or whether he employed paid professional scribes.

These classifications may not even be mutually exclusive. A friend may well have been a convert who, himself a professional scribe, chose to give his

(2)

services to the Apostle in his leisure hours. And the practice of S. Paul may have varied, the paid professional being called in when no voluntary worker

was available. Tertius, the only amanuensis permitted to reveal his name in

(3)

the text of an Epistle may have owed this singular honour to personal relations of friendship with S. Paul and perhaps to special services rendered to the

Church. The anonymity concealing other such scribes may be due to their being

(4)

paid professionals with no claim to such unusual distinction.

What equipment would the amanuenses probably have for their work? S. Paul's highly strung temperament would inevitably lead to his thinking and dictating at high speed. Indeed, it has been pointed out that the meaning of some passages in the Epistles is most readily felt when they are read rapidly or

- (1) II Thess. III/17-18, I Cor. XVI/21, Col. IV/18.
- (2) In modern days the clergy not infrequently receive requests for permission to take down their sermons in shorthand.
- (3) Rom. XVI/22.
- (4) Dr G. Milligan commits himself to a statement that the N.T. amanuenses were not professional scribes "but educated friends or companions of the authors." ("New Testament Documents", (1913), p.26) His authority is weighty but he does not give evidence on this point and other scholars seem convinced that S. Paul sometimes employed professional scribes. Cp. Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (1911), p. LX.

(1)
 read aloud. His amanuenses would need to be able to write at a corresponding speed. What then would their equipment be? They could not have taken down S. Paul's words accurately in ordinary longhand so they must have used shorthand or abbreviated longhand.

Evidence for the use of shorthand comes both from Greek and Latin sources. A papyrus dating from 104 B.C., now preserved in Holland, contains a line
 (2)
 written in shorthand symbols. And later examples imply a long established custom of using shorthand. A citizen of Oxyrhynchus apprenticed his slave Chaerammon to a shorthand writer, $\sigma\eta\mu\iota\omicron\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\omega$, for two years $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\iota\nu\ \sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omega\nu$, "which your son Dionysius knows." The form of contract used in this case happens to have survived and it dates from 155 A.D. A long development of the art is implied in terms providing for payment in proportion to the progress of the pupil. It is significant that the third and last instalment of payment is to be made only when the boy writes fluently in every respect
 (3)
 and reads faultlessly. From the third century A.D. we have inherited a waxed book which, from a continual repetition of the same symbols, appears to have
 (4)
 been the exercise book of a shorthand scribe or pupil.

Evidence for a Latin system of shorthand dates from the lifetime of S. Paul. Marcus Tullius Tiro published a system of shorthand about 63 A.D. In t h i s

- (1) J. Armitage Robinson, "S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians", (1909), p. 48.
- (2) G. Milligan, "New Testament Documents", (1913), p. 244. An early example of tachygraphy seen in an Athens inscription of the 4th c. B.C. may be only a case of contracted writing. (Op. cit., pp 242-3.)
- (3) G. Milligan, Op. cit., p. 244.
- (4) G. Milligan, Op. cit., p. 245.

consonants were represented by signs and the intervening vowels were indicated by different degrees in the inclination of the consonants. (1)

Occasionally effort is made to decide whether S. Paul's amanuenses made use of shorthand or of abbreviated longhand. This distinction, originally a real one, tends in practice to disappear, because both shorthand and abbreviated longhand develop into extremely contracted symbols only remotely connected with the systems from which they spring. A study of Pitman's modern English Shorthand certainly reveals such a tendency and reporters today often confess that they develop a personal shorthand unintelligible to other professional scribes. These are probably examples of general principles which we may surely assume to have prevailed also in Greek and Latin shorthand. (2)

It is clear that S. Paul's amanuenses had at their disposal efficient systems of tachygraphy enabling them to reproduce the Apostle's words with equal speed and accuracy. (3)

But could S. Paul have afforded the fees payable to the professional scribes, assuming that he had sometimes to enlist their services, perhaps even in the case of the majority of his letters?

- (1) Enc. Brit. (1929), Vol. 20, p. 576.
- (2) F. J. Badcock, ("The Pauline Epistles, etc", (1937), pp 151-168) makes much of the distinction between shorthand and abbreviated longhand, but his readers become aware that a belief in the use of abbreviated longhand is an essential support for his theory that in II Tim I/17 the text should read "Antioch" for "Rome". There is a sense of excessive ingenuity in Badcock's long argument.
- (3) Cp. Pitman's "Shorthand Manual" and "Shorthand Reporter", (n.d.)

As he came from a devout Pharisee family it is quite likely that his father disinherited and repudiated him on his conversion to Christianity. (1)
 Indeed, there are signs of his poverty at one stage of his work. Later on he again appears to be in affluent circumstances; he is able to bear the expense of a judicial appeal to the Emperor and he can afford to live in his own hired house at Rome for two years. Moreover, apart from his probable renewed affluence it is extremely unlikely that S. Paul's wealthier converts in such commercial centres as Corinth and Ephesus would have failed to provide the Apostle with financial support for his work, and among his necessary expenses would almost certainly have been the fees of professional amanuenses. The cumulative force of these considerations surely justifies the assumption that S. Paul, at least sometimes, employed paid professional scribes to write down the Epistles as he dictated them. (2) (3) (4)

But what degree of liberty or discretion did the Apostle allow to these amanuenses in the framing of sentences and the insertion of particles and other connectives? It is hard to give a convincing answer to this question because contradictory answers are proposed by scholars of equal competence. For example, one high authority contends that "in the practice of dictation, especially if it were accompanied by the use of shorthand on the part of the recording scribes, we should have a ready explanation of some of the

- (1) Cp. Sir William Ramsay, "S. Paul the Traveller etc", (1902), pp 36-37.
- (2) Cp. II Corinthians XI/8.
- (3) Sir William Ramsay, op.cit., pp 311-312.
- (4) Acts XXVIII/30.

peculiarities in language and style amongst the New Testament writings which have often caused difficulties.⁽¹⁾ Here there is a clear hint that the personal peculiarities and the professional competence of a scribe might affect his recording of a message dictated to him.

And two other scholars assign to the amanuenses definite influence upon the text of the Pauline Epistles. "Some scribes would be more expert than others, and would reproduce what was dictated to them more exactly.".... But "an inferior scribe would get down the main words correctly, but the little connecting links he may have filled in for himself."⁽²⁾ Another speculates on "how much Paul actually dictated and how far he may have given general directions."⁽³⁾

In opposition to these views we find an equal authority writing: "It is not likely that Timothy here (i.e. in II Cor.I/1), or Sosthenes in I Cor., or Silvanus and Timothy in I and II Thess., had much to do with the composition. Whoever acted as amanuenses may have made an occasional suggestion; but in every case we may be sure that the letter is S.Paul's and not a joint production."⁽⁴⁾

And the force of this contention is somewhat increased by the practice, even by those who insist on the possible influence of amanuenses on the text of the Epistles. In many cases, after declaring that this possibility must not be overlooked, they then proceed to treat the text as really coming from

(1) G.Milligan, "New Testament Documents", (1931), p.247.

(2) Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (I.C.C.), (1911), p.LX.

(3) J.Armitage Robinson at the Church Congress, 1907. (Quoted by M.Jones in "New Testament in the Twentieth Century", (1914), p.288)

(4) A.Plummer, "II Corinthians", (I.C.C.), (1915), p.2.

S. Paul. It is obvious therefore, that we are without sufficiently clear evidence to justify a definite verdict on this important point.

But it may be more easy to assess the balance of probability if we take into account the Apostle's known temperament and his experience of life, two factors naturally affecting his literary style.

S. Paul's character was obviously a complicated one, but certain features of it stand out clearly. His was a deeply spiritual nature united to a quick and brilliant intelligence. His strong, even dominant personality made him a natural leader of men and compelled him sometimes to wage warfare upon an instinct to dominate others. By inheritance a citizen of the Roman Empire, he had acquired a correspondingly wide outlook upon life.

He had thrown all his gifts into a campaign to persuade others, over wide areas of the Mediterranean world, to share his own convictions. And these Epistles are the direct product of his incessant work. They often tell of his racking anxieties about the fidelity and courage of particular churches and individuals.

"The care of all the Churches" was obviously an incessant drain upon his strength. From every quarter came appeals for advice, for interpretations of doctrine, for fresh visits from himself. And these calls came to a man whose life had been one of incessant strain, both mental and physical. Added to

(1) Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (I.C.C.), (1911), p. LIX.

(2) Even so hostile a witness as J. Klausner has to own that though "Saul-Paul was lacking in humility, exceedingly confident of himself, and boastfully "condescending", he none the less knew his own shortcomings, fought against them, and sometimes conquered them." ("From Jesus to Paul", (1942), p. 424).

(3) II. Corinthians XI/28.

this, his health had never been robust and yet he never spared himself. He had tramped the endless ribbon of the Roman roads and dared the dangers of the sea. He had known all too well the physical and mental exhaustion of ceaseless travel. He had been shipwrecked and nearly drowned, he had suffered judicial scourging and had been stoned by angry crowds. And all the time he was continually burnt up with the inner fire that consumed the devoted bondservant of Jesus Christ.

Here it may help us if we try to imagine the scene when one of these Epistles was first written. The situation in one of the churches calls urgently for a letter from the Apostle and he sends for his amanuensis. The Apostle perhaps paces up and down the room; at times, his words pour out in impetuous eloquence, at others, his course is interrupted by parenthetical remarks or by expressions of the human affection which continually rises spontaneously from his heart. Sometimes his dictation can scarcely be written down quickly enough even by a professional scribe, sometimes it is slower, but sudden breaks in sequence attest the tumult of his soul. At last the letter is ended, the final salutation perhaps added in his own hand. The Epistle is ready to go forth on a journey which was destined to be far and long, beyond the writer's utmost imagination.

But, surely, the scribe was not permitted to make a fair copy from his own shorthand and then despatch it at once, as it were upon his own immediate authority? Is it conceivable that S. Paul did not scan the fair copy with anxious scrutiny, occasionally weighing up a phrase or sentence? Were there

not occasions when he had the whole Epistle amended and re-copied before he allowed it to go out to its destination?

In fact is not the whole balance of probability against the supposition that the amanuensis was ever permitted to do more than perhaps hazard a n occasional slight suggestion?

After all, S.Paul was not only a dominant character but also a trained theologian fully aware of the need for precision in language. His experiences had brought this home afresh. A letter sent to Thessalonica had partly missed the mark and he had had to write a second letter to make his meaning clear. (1) No one had better reason to know the importance of precision and the difficulty of attaining it.

All these considerations make it very difficult to imagine t h a t any amanuensis would be allowed to assume responsibilities for the form of S.Paul's letters which could only rightly be exercised by the Apostolic writer himself.

In short, we would plead that the circumstances and the character o f S.Paul make it extremely unlikely that the style and language of the Pauline Epistles owe any debt to the amanuenses other than a proper debt of gratitude for the accurate recording of words which thereby come to us from S.Paul.

(1) The writer of II Peter III/16 was probably expressing an opinion shared by many early recipients, as well as by later readers, of S.Paul's letters.

PART II.

PATTERNS OF CRITICISM.

Chapter V.

The Search for Principles of Appraisal.

A threefold cord is not quickly broken and the proverb is one which has its consolations for the student of the New Testament. From its nature as an expression of the human spirit literature is a form of art characterised by a certain delicacy and elusiveness. It deals with qualities rather than with quantities and therefore does not easily submit to tests of a material type. The things of the spirit must be spiritually apprehended and also tested and compared on the spiritual plane. None the less it is desirable that such subjective judgements should as far as possible be buttressed by objective evidence. Where then is the necessary element to be found in literary criticism? Surely in the application to a given document of multiple tests. In every subjective judgement there is some degree of the objective, and as we increase the number of the critical tests employed we ensure the presence of some degree of that element without which sound judgement is impossible.

Fortunately the Pauline documents themselves seem to suggest at least three lines of critical approach to their problems; the threefold cord is ready to hand.

In the first place, we are confronted with the results of general criticism of the New Testament. This is as broadly based as possible, taking into account every relevant factor, whether of a chronological, linguistic, doctrinal, ecclesiastical, psychological or other kind. From a great mass of work certain agreed results have gradually emerged; particular scholars may record their dissent from some details of these but the general trends of thought are quite clear. The majority of critics now accept eight Epistles as genuine works of S. Paul. There is some hesitation about the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and somewhat greater doubt about the Epistle to the Ephesians. On the other hand, numerous scholars definitely reject the Pastoral Epistles, and many others are dubious about them. It must be acknowledged however, that the names of distinguished men, especially in England, may be quoted in their defence.

A second strand in our threefold cord is found in what we have called Pauline criticism, since it is based upon the very nature of the Apostle's letters. Certain definite characteristics of these documents were pointed out in the introductory chapter of this essay and it was suggested that they might well afford us a set of appropriate critical principles. Their presence betokens the authorship of S. Paul and their absence from a document attributed to him forms a first item of presumptive evidence against its authenticity.

The principles of Pauline criticism may be summed up under three headings: Firstly, the accepted Epistles are remarkable for a consistent revelation of

(1) Cp. P.N. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.6.

the strong and vivid personality of their apostolic author. The reader receives the impression of a man of great spiritual power and devotion, of the highest ability and of an engaging humanity. It is also evident that he has the gift of making an acquired language into a vehicle adequate for the purposes of his spiritual, intellectual, and emotional genius. The whole effect produced is sufficiently strong to invite its use as a principle of critical appraisal.

Secondly, the Pauline writings are characterised by a uniform elevation of thought and a corresponding quality of style. Each topic is treated on the highest possible level, the particular is related to the general, the material to the spiritual, the ephemeral to the eternal. Nothing could do more to emphasise the spiritual power of the Apostle than the reflection that a n y declension from these high levels or the presence of anything trite o r mean in a document would at once make us ask whether it could possibly b e attributed to S. Paul.

Again, there are certain outstanding features of language w h i c h we recognise as suggesting the work of the Apostle. This has already been dealt with in some detail and here it may suffice to recall periodic irregularities in grammar and expression just of the type which betrays the efforts o f a writer who seeks to convey his torrential thought and emotion through t h e medium of a language of which he is not fully in command. The Greek m a y be faulty at times but it is singularly powerful and successful in attaining its purposes, and above all, it has a marked individual style which elevates i t

(1) Cp. Chapter III, "The Literary Style of S. Paul", pp.26-37.

to the rank of a means of critical appraisal.

Finally, we come to the third strand of our threefold cord. The vocabulary of the Pastorals invites comparison with that of the other ten Epistles both as to its range and quality. The same is also true of many details of syntax such as the use of particles and of the definite article and the methods of connecting sentences as well as other grammatical usages.

But is it a sound procedure to apply such tests in an effort to decide the possible unity of authorship of two documents by giving attention to their language? Can the counting of words and the statistical expression of vocabulary and syntax give us any clues as to authorship? The answer probably is that this treatment of language is sound when it is used in conjunction with other methods of critical appraisal, but that it is scarcely valid if used in isolation. Its main value lies in its objective nature, enabling it to add or to deny support to judgements more liable to be affected by subjective considerations.

May we not plead that there is an "anatomy" of language? No doubt style is the soul of literature, but in this material world that soul must be expressed through a body. Nouns and verbs, adjectives and adverbs, compose that body which is indeed "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth."

(1) Some justification for this contention can be found in "The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary", by G.Udny Yule, (1944), but the highly mathematical character of this book is a grave difficulty to the ordinary reader, but it at least shows the need for extreme caution in using this approach to the study of literature. Pitfalls are numerous.

It may be objected that if we use this method of literary analysis we find ourselves dealing not with the body of language but with a cadaver. In answer to that we may surely plead the analogy of medical science in which the dissection of the cadaver is an essential preliminary to the understanding of the living subject. So long as the anatomy of language is studied in this spirit it surely has a valid if also a subordinate part to play in fashioning an adequate instrument of critical appraisal.

We thus find ourselves possessed of three sets of critical principles on which to base a study of the language of the various Pauline Epistles generally, and then in particular to enable us to make a comparison between the language of the Pastorals and that of the accepted Epistles respectively with a view to determining the probable authenticity of the former group.

Perfect certainty cannot be reached by literary criticism but results attained by the use of several different methods of approach become impressive as they appear to converge on a particular set of conclusions. They may produce such a high degree of probability that it only just falls short of a conviction of certainty. It seems reasonable to maintain that convictions of this strong character may be gained from a study of the general criticism of the New Testament combined with attention to the principles of specific Pauline criticism and in combination with the study of the anatomy of the language of S. Paul.

The application of all three sets of principles gives an affirmative answer to questions raised about the authenticity of the First Epistle to the

Thessalonians, the four Major Epistles, and three of the letters of the Imprisonment. But there is no such unanimity about the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Ephesians. Pauline criticism questions the level and type of thought found in II. Thessalonians and some doubt is suggested as to whether the personality of the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians and his literary style suggest that S. Paul is its author. But in the end the authenticity of both these Epistles, brought into question by Pauline criticism, is saved by the support of our two other sets of critical principles.

The authenticity of eight of the Pauline Epistles has been established by the concurrence of three separate sets of critical principles; the threefold cord has justified itself. But what of a possible similar complete condemnation of the Pastoral Epistles for these documents are attacked on the lines of all our three sets of critical principles?

Before the effects of those attacks can be properly assessed we must consider in greater detail the case of the two other letters which are assailed on grounds of Pauline criticism, the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Chapter VI

Two Clear Verdicts: Acceptance and Rejection.

(1)

It may safely be asserted that the Major Group of Pauline Epistles comprising a letter to the Galatians, two to the Corinthians, and another addressed to the Romans, forms the great bastion of the whole modern critical position relating to the writings of S. Paul.

These Epistles owe their unique position both to a certain inner integrity and to their undesigned correspondences to known contemporary circumstances. Moreover, this position has been maintained, and even strengthened, by the many critical assaults which have been made upon it. These letters have been tried and tested from many angles, but always in the end it has been found that the doubts and not the reputation of the documents have perished in the course of examination. And now in the opinion of the great majority of competent critics they may reasonably be treated as authentic Epistles of S. Paul. This statement is unaffected by any necessity "to inquire whether every part of the Epistle to the Romans, as we possess it, was written by S. Paul, or how many Epistles have been combined in our so-called II Corinthians, or whether the editor has added some lines of his own. The possibility of editorship including both arrangement and some additions does not materially affect the significance of the substantial and striking

(1) This title is used in preference to the term Hauptbriefe or "Capital" Epistles, used by Baur.

consistency and complementariness of the testimony of several letters to the character and career of their author."⁽¹⁾

But the principal critics of the Major Epistles call for some mention. Their work is hardly ever merely captious and good service to the cause of truth is often rendered by critics whose objections do not finally meet with general acceptance.

England claims credit for producing an outstanding radical critic in the last years of the eighteenth century. Edward Evanson, writing in the year 1792, rejected three of the Gospels and then added: "I think it my duty to add briefly my reasons for expunging also out of the volume of authenticated Scripture of the New Covenant the Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, James, Peter, John, and Jude."⁽²⁾ Of Romans he observes that the author "writes in the name of S. Paul" and of Colossians he remarks that it was "manifestly fabricated by the same opificer who composed that to the Ephesians."⁽³⁾

Evanson justly enjoys a repute as a pioneer critic but, naturally, he is a man of his age. His verdicts are largely based upon alleged historical discrepancies in the books of the New Testament and it must be owned that they often show penetrating insight. But the application of further developed principles of criticism has not confirmed Evanson's verdict on Romans.

(1) E. de W. Burton, "Galatians", (I.C.C.), (1921), p. LXVII.
(2) E. Evanson, "Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists", (1792), pp 257-268.
(3) E. Evanson, op.cit., pp 257 and 263.

(1)

Baur and many of his disciples generally known as the Tübingen School of critics perceived in these Epistles many signs of those tendencies which they believed to have been characteristic of the history of the early Church and they therefore gladly accepted them as genuine works of S. Paul. It was one of those occasions when polemical advantage coincided with critical truth. And the support so gained for these documents appeared to be all the more weighty from its contrast with the general negative tendency of these scholars. (2)

But presently there arose another school of critics who claimed to continue the work associated with the University of Tübingen. But in going beyond the position of Baur they ultimately contradicted it, at least in part. The Dutch scholar W.C. Van Manen may stand as representing this school of thought which ultimately reached a kind of literary agnosticism. In his opinion none of the Pauline Epistles could rightly be attributed to the Apostle: neither fourteen, nor thirteen, nor nine or ten, nor seven or eight, nor yet even the four so long "universally" regarded as unassailable. (3) We are invited to regard (5)

- (1) His "Paulus" appeared in 1845.
- (2) G. Salmon mentions the fact that Baur regarded these four Epistles and the Apocalypse as the sole genuine literary remains of the Apostolic age. (Introduction to the New Testament", (1913), p.20)
- (3) Enc. Bib. p. 3622, article by W.C. Van Manen, who wrote extensively in the period 1886-1900. The late Dr R.J. Knowling, sometime Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham, devoted many years to refuting the attacks of Van Manen, even learning the Dutch language specially for this purpose. Much of his work on the subject is incorporated in his books, "Witness of the Epistles", (1892), and "Testimony of S. Paul to Christ", (1906)
- (4) For the names of other members of this school of thought op. Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (I.C.C.), (1911), pp. LXXXVI-LXXXVII.
- (5) Enc. Bib. Article "Paul", p. 3625.

these Epistles as having been from the first books; "treatises for instruction and especially for edification, written in the form of letters in a tone of authority as from the pen of Paul and other men of note who belonged to his entourage."⁽¹⁾

But after reading the objections of Van Manen and some of his disciples to every single Pauline Epistle we begin to wonder whether they do not deserve the witty warning of Dr Salmon against excessive critical suspiciousness. "There are rogues in this world, and you do well to guard against them; but if you allow your mind to be poisoned by suspicion, and take every man for a rogue, why, the rogues will conspire against you, and look you up in a lunatic asylum."⁽²⁾

It is no doubt true that we owe a debt to Van Manen and his disciples, both for their sincerity and for the compulsion which they laid upon more restrained scholars to examine afresh the bases of their beliefs. It is not the first time that excessive agnosticism has caused some reaction to the advantage of truth.

The failure of the more radical attacks, including those made on the Major Epistles, is attested by the attitude of such authorities as B.W.Bacon,⁽³⁾ J.Moffatt,⁽⁴⁾ and Kirsopp Lake.⁽⁵⁾ These are not men who shrink from following

(1) Enc. Bib. Article "Paul", p. 3626.

(2) G.Salmon, "Introduction to the New Testament", (1913), p.357.

(3) B.W.Bacon, "Introduction to the New Testament", (1902), pp 56-71 and 80.

(4) J.Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), pp 83-148.

(5) K.Lake, "Earlier Epistles of S.Paul", (1930), pp 102-308.

trustworthy evidence to its logical conclusion and their belief that S. Paul wrote these letters and their adherence to Baur's opinion about the Major Epistles carries great weight. The fact that critical opinion has now remained substantially unaltered over the hundred years since Baur wrote in 1845 is also in itself a handsome tribute to the strength of the case for the genuineness of these letters.

The external evidence for all the Major Epistles is both ⁽¹⁾ early and satisfactory and it accords well with the internal evidence supporting ⁽²⁾ the belief that S. Paul is their author. There are many small undesigned coincidences to be found throughout the entire Pauline corpus and a like impression is gained when the search is extended also to the Acts of the Apostles. These provide a convincing reinforcement to arguments based on other considerations. In spite of their varied contents, these letters secure on the score of their own quality, recognition as being harmonious in character and language, at once the product of a strong and original mind and also entirely worthy of an Apostle.

A characterization of the Epistle to the Galatians might be applied with but slight alteration to the other three members of this group.

"The letter itself discloses, largely incidentally and without apparent effort or intention, a situation so complex, so vital, so self-consistent, so psychologically credible as to make it very improbable that it is a work

- (1) Cp. J. Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), pp. 107, 114-116, and 148.
- (2) Robertson and Plummer, "I Corinthians", (I.C.C.), (1914), p. XVIII, and A. Plummer, "II Corinthians", (I.C.C.), (1915), pp. XII-XIII.

of art cunningly framed to create the impression that a situation w h i c h existed only in the writer's mind was an actual one. This fact is itself a strong reason for believing that the letter is a natural product of t h e situation which it reflects."⁽¹⁾

And the same writer has said that: "Galatians has always been included in the normative group by those who have found in the New Testament collection any books that were what they professed to be."⁽²⁾

When criticism has had its say and the problem has all been weighed u p afresh, the verdict of the great majority of competent authorities today i s in favour of the belief that the four Major Epistles are genuine works o f S.Paul. This view has been aptly expressed by Professor Schmiedel, himself a radical critic, who dismisses the position taken up by Van Manen and others in these terms: "In a word, until better reasons are produced, one must really trust oneself to the conviction that one has before one writings of Paul."⁽³⁾

In the face of that declaration we are surely justified in asserting that modern critics generally pronounce clearly in favour of the contention that S.Paul wrote the four Major Epistles. These letters appear to form a solid quadrilateral, each of them strong in itself and each adding strength to the case for its fellows.

- (1) E.de W.Burton, "Galatians", (I.C.C.), (1921) p.LXV-LXVI. Cp.J.B.Lightfoot, "S.Paul's Epistle to the Galatians", (1910), pp.57-58.
- (2) E.de W.Burton, op.cit., p.LXVI.
- (3) Quoted by Robertson and Plummer in "I.Corinthians", (I.C.C.), (1914), p.XVII.

To turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews after reading the Pauline Epistles is to become conscious not only of a change of environment but of "climate" as well. From the first our impression is almost entirely one of contrast and it becomes important to define the nature of the differences between Hebrews and the letters of S. Paul.

But this sense of contrast has not always prevailed and the title, retained in the English Bible, of "the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews" bears witness to a belief long current in some parts of the early Christian Church.

(1)

This letter was obviously known to Clement of Rome and it has been suggested that both Clement's letter to the Corinthians and this Epistle betrays signs of the dependence on the liturgical use of the Church of Rome. It is, therefore, the more interesting that it was at Rome that the Pauline authorship of Hebrews was most consistently denied and for the longest period.

(3)

By the third century the Church of Alexandria held this Epistle to be at least indirectly the work of S. Paul. Into the conflict of opinion on this subject confusion was introduced by the learned Origen who, though of course conscious of the distinctive style of Hebrews, once goes so far as to speak of "fourteen Epistles of S. Paul." This, however, may convey no more than Origen's suggestion that the thoughts might originally have come from S. Paul.

(1) B.F. Westcott, "Epistle to the Hebrews", (1892), p. LXII, op. J. Moffatt, "Hebrews", (1924), p. XIII.

(2) A. Nairne, "Hebrews", (1917), pp. XXXIV-XXXIX.

(3) B.F. Westcott, op. cit., p. LXIV.

(4) Hom. in Jos. VII, quoted by Westcott, op. cit., p. LXIX.

their actual expression from a disciple of his. The African Church contributed
(1)
the suggestion that S.Barnabas was the author of Hebrews.

None the less, the fact that Origen accepted this letter as carrying Pauline authority led to a gradual uncritical acceptance of Pauline authorship and in the end the dissentient voice of Rome was heard no more. It was left to Erasmus to set out critical views once again many years later, but reaction soon set in with great force and even Protestant orthodoxy accepted the Pauline authorship of Hebrews. Not till the eighteenth century, with the revival of free Biblical criticism, was the question again reopened, and now "scarcely any sound scholar will be found to accept Paul as the direct author of the epistle, though such a modified view as was suggested by Origen still claims adherents among the lovers of compromise with tradition."(2)

Naturally enough, speculation has always sought to identify the auctor
(3)
ad Hebraeos, but it is unlikely that certainty will ever be reached about the
(4)
subject. We may perhaps be satisfied with the suggestion of Dr Moffatt that "he was probably a highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian, a διδάσκαλος of repute, with speculative gifts and literary culture; but to us he is a voice and no more. He left great prose to some little clan of early Christians, but who he was, and who they were, it is not possible, with such materials as are at our disposal, to determine. No conjecture rises above the level of

(1) Tertullian, "De Pudicitia" 20, quoted in Enc.Bib., p.1991.
(2) Enc.Bib., p.1992.
(3) J.Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), pp 435-443. summarises many suggestions as to the author.
(4) J.Moffatt, op.cit., p.442.

plausibility. We cannot say that if the auctor ad Hebraeos had never lived or written, the course of early Christianity would have been materially altered. He was not a personality of Paul's commanding genius. He did not make history or mark any epoch. He did not even, like the anonymous authors of Matthew's gospel and the fourth gospel, succeed in stamping his writing on the mind of the early Church at large. But the later Church was right in claiming a canonical position for this unique specimen of Alexandrian thought playing upon the primitive Gospel, although the reasons upon which the claim was based were generally erroneous." (1)

It has been necessary to retail so much of the controversies about the authorship of Hebrews because they are the key to wider criticism of it. The decision that this is an anonymous Epistle has been reached in these days only after careful consideration of various suggested authors whose claims are based upon the nature of the letter itself.

Sturdy independence is characteristic of the author. He is "neither an imitator of Paul nor a mere borrower from Hellenistic "wisdom"." And his thought can be summarised as "a free combination of the results of Pauline theology with the current ideas of Alexandrian-Jewish philosophy, producing a genuinely new type of Christian thought." (2)

And the evidence of the literary style of Hebrews reinforces the evidence for a non-Pauline line of thought. "He has a sense of literary

- (1) An attenuated survival of Origen's suggestion may be seen in the opinion of F.J. Badcock that a group of friends wrote Hebrews, one of them being the substantial author, but that S. Paul contributed the last three verses. ("The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews", (1937), pp 199-200)
- (2) B.W. Bacon, "Introduction to the New Testament", (1902), p.142.

nicety, which enters into his earnest religious argument without rendering it artificial or over-elaborate. He has an art of words, which is more than a n
 (1)
 unconscious sense of rhythm. He has the style of a trained speaker; it is style at the command of a devout genius."Of Hellenistic writers he is the freest from the monotony that is the chief fault of Hellenistic compared with literary Greek; his words do not follow each other in a mechanically necessary order, but are arranged so as to emphasise their relative importance, and to make the sentences effective as well as intelligible. One may say that he deals with the biblical language (understanding by this the Hellenistic dialect founded on the LXX, not merely his actual quotations from it) as a preacher whose first duty is to be faithful, but his second to be eloquent." (2)

How different is the verdict which is passed upon the literary style of S.Paul: "There is a rush of words, rising repeatedly to passages of splendid eloquence; but the eloquence is spontaneous, the outcome of strongly m o v e d feeling; there is about it nothing of laboured oratory. The language is rapid, terse, incisive; the argument is conducted by a quick cut and thrust o f
 (3)
 dialectic; it reminds us of a fencer with his eye always on his antagonist."

Or again: "Equipped with a language hardly adequate to the rich variety and subtlety of his thought or to the intensity of his feeling, he is ever struggling to express more than he actually says; the logical sequence i s broken by the intrusion of new ideas, feeling supersedes grammar and forbids

- (1) J.Moffatt, "Hebrews", (I.C.C.), (1924), pp.LVI-LIX treats of the deliberate rhythmical cadences of the auctor ad Hebraeos.
- (2) J.Moffatt, op.cit., p.LXIV - the enclosed quotation comes from W.H.Simcox, "The Writers of the New Testament", (1890), p.43.
- (3) Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (I.C.C.), (1911), p.LV.

(1)
the completion of a clause."

There could hardly be a greater contrast than that between the literary styles of the four Major Epistles and of the anonymous Epistle to the Hebrews. And the contrast is expressive of entirely different, if ultimately complementary, lines of thought: "for the one the supreme contrast is between flesh and spirit, for the other between the image and the reality, the imperfect and the perfect: for the one Christ is the direct object of personal faith, for the other the fulfiller of the destiny of man."⁽²⁾

And the differences of style between this Epistle and the writings of S.Paul cannot be adequately explained by changes of subject or circumstances.⁽³⁾ "They characterise two men, and not only two moods or two discussions."

In short, the evidence which so strongly supports the case for the Pauline authorship of the Major Epistles by that very fact comes to constitute a powerful case against the belief that the apostle can also have written Πρὸς Ἑβραίους. Contrast can go no deeper than that and it seems to be ample justification for the assertion that modern criticism agrees in accepting the Pauline authorship of the four Major Epistles and in denying a similar authorship to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It remains only to consider the reaction of these documents to the canons of literary criticism proposed as being specially suitable to their nature.

(1) Robertson and Plummer, "I. Corinthians", (I.C.C.), (1914), pp. XLVII-XLVIII, (see also p.35 of this essay.)
(2) B.F. Westcott, "Epistle to the Hebrews", (1892), p. LIII.
(3) B.F. Westcott, op.cit., p. LXXVII.

The contrast in the personalities of the two authors, as revealed in their writings, is complete and the evidence for this statement has been already adduced. Two men are indicated, not varieties of mood and circumstance. The signs of the presence of S. Paul in the Major Epistles accord with the picture of him which we derive also from his other letters and from the Acts of the Apostles. Such evidence is entirely wanting from the Epistle to the Hebrews and indeed is repeatedly contradicted by it.

Again, while both sets of writings are marked by a high level of natural grave dignity of thought there is a complete contrast of atmosphere between the Pauline letters and the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is the difference between a Christianity taken into the market place and that same religion as viewed devoutly and philosophically by a student of letters in the calm of his study.

And lastly, language and style differ in the highest degree. Vocabulary and syntax here provide a contrast also found in general style. The language of S. Paul shows a limited command of Greek, made sufficient for its purpose by the powerful personality and the torrential zeal of the Apostle. In contrast with this the author of Hebrews has a delicate precise sense of style, of balance and rhythm, saved from artificiality by his sincere devotion and deep piety.

The clear verdicts of general criticism accepting the four Major Epistles as being authentic letters of S. Paul and rejecting the Pauline authorship of Hebrews thus find confirmation from the examination of the same documents by

the literary tests peculiarly applicable to them. And from this coincidence of results we may surely derive new confidence in the literary criteria which are presently to be applied to the problem of the Pastoral Epistles.

Chapter VII

Two open Questions: Verdicts of
"Acquittal" and of "Non-Proven".

If it is ever decided finally that the letters to Timothy and Titus cannot have been written by S. Paul it may well be claimed for the Epistles to the Thessalonians that they are the true heirs to the title of Pastoral Epistles of S. Paul. They are not indeed concerned with the ministry of the Church but they reveal S. Paul in a pastoral relationship with the people of what was presumably a small Christian community. There are in them many signs of that mutual affection and trust which are the invariable accompaniments of the existence of happy relations between the Christian ministry and the laity. It is true that many passages in the Major Epistles also betray the Apostle's pastoral spirit, but on the whole they are the letters of an administrator, whereas these are the letters of a pastor, loving and beloved.

Now it happens that the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians is one which still fails to command general acceptance and the question of its authenticity gains in importance from the rich human interest of the Thessalonian letters.

The problem of II Thessalonians admits of fairly easy statement but hardly of equally facile solution. During his second missionary journey, about the year 51, S. Paul had founded a church at Thessalonica, a place of strategic

(1) J.E. Frame, "Thessalonians", (1912), p.5.
(2) M. Jones, "New Testament in the Twentieth Century", (1914), p.264.
(3) G. Milligan, "S. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians", (1908), p. XXVI.

importance in the eyes of a missionary. The Acts of the Apostles suggest a sojourn there of only some three weeks but it is probable that S.Paul's visit lasted longer than that. It was brought to an end by the turbulent opposition of certain hostile Jews; there had been riots and S.Paul had to withdraw to Beroea and then to Athens. Naturally, he afterwards felt anxiety about the constancy of recent converts under continued Jewish enmity and from Athens Timothy had been sent to rally and strengthen the Thessalonians. Fortunately he was able to send to the Apostle a reassuring report of the affection and constancy of his people.

The First Epistle to the Thessalonians then came to them, a happy expression of S.Paul's relief and pride. He seizes the opportunity of refuting some allegations made against him by enemies and then goes on to warn his readers tactfully against certain moral dangers, including indolence. Their expectation of the speedy return of their Lord must not result in any pious idleness. Some of the Thessalonians were worried because friends and relations had died before the second coming of the Lord. They supposed that none would have died before then and wondered whether death would deprive them of their full reward. Bearing in mind this anxiety as well as the tendency of some of the living to be idle, allowing the community to support them, S.Paul lays great emphasis on the suddenness of the second coming of the day of the Lord,

(1) J.Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p.66.
 (2) Acts XVII/15.
 (3) I.Thessalonians, IV/13.
 (4) E.J.Bicknell, "First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians", (1932), p.XXI.

(1)
 "as a thief in the night". Let toil and vigilance mark them as Christians; let not idleness and sloth spoil their witness. But the whole first Epistle is a happy one, characterised by mingled friendliness and that extra joy which comes with the removal of anxieties previously felt.

It is, therefore, with some degree of shock that we first read the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians written soon after the earlier letter. The light of easy friendliness has somehow died out; there is in it a certain stiffness, a faint frigidity, in sharp contrast with the easy informality of the other letter. The administrator begins to eclipse the pastor.

Moreover, there seems to be at least a superficial doctrinal contradiction between the two letters. In the earlier document emphasis is laid upon the suddenness of the $\pi\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\delta\alpha$, and at least by inference it is represented as imminent. This is at once a reason for hope and for watchfulness and vigilance. The emphasis is here upon the sudden and unexpected coming of the Lord, but the faithful being ever on the alert will not be caught unprepared.

In contrast with this, the second letter declares that before the $\pi\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\delta\alpha$ there will be a falling away and the coming of the $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing.

(1) I. Thessalonians, V/2.

(2) E. J. Bicknell gives Harnack's opinion as "at the same time, or only a few days later." ("First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians", (1932) p. XXXI.)

(3) I. Thessalonians, V/2-3.

(4) II Thessalonians, II/3-10.

(1)

But apocalyptic teaching is always fluid, "signs and suddenness are not incompatibles" in it and a tendency to foreshorten time is ever one of its principal features. It seems that certain readers of the earlier Epistle had forgotten that while the παρουσία was doubtless near it might well be preceded by signs significant to the faithful if unregarded by the wicked. In these people a state of morbid fanatical excitement had been produced. They were neglecting civic duty and daily work, and their concentration on the thought of an imminent second coming was not showing good results in the spiritual sphere. A sharp corrective was called for and S. Paul's Second Epistle is designed to administer it. There is a shifting of emphasis but not a contradiction in teaching.

(2)

(3)

"In both Epistles, but especially in the second, we can see the torch of apocalyptic enthusiasm, streaming out with smoke as well as with red flame, which Paul and many Jewish Christians in the early Church employed in order to light up their path through the dark providences of the age. Paul is prophesying - none the less vividly and effectively that he does σοὶ ἐκ μέρους. The chief element of novelty which he introduces in II Thessalonians from Jewish tradition (cp. Dn. XI/36) into the primitive Christian eschatology, is the conception of a supernatural antagonist, a final pseudo-messiah or antichrist, who shall embody all that is profane and blasphemous, and who

- (1) J.E. Frame, "Thessalonians", (I.C.C.), (1912), p.44.
- (2) Cp. S. Mark XIII/5-37, with its possible double application to the fall of Jerusalem and the final end of the age.
- (3) E.J. Bicknell, "First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians", (1932), p. XXVII.

shall be welcomed, instead of repudiated, by Jews as well as pagans." (1) (2)

But even if the eschatologies of the two Epistles can be regarded as complementary there is a considerable difference of tone to be observed in them. And in this connection Harnack offers the ingenious suggestion that (3) there were two churches at Thessalonica, a main body of Gentile origin to which the first letter was addressed and a smaller body of Jews to whom the second was sent. This theory has the added advantage of also accounting for some mingled elements in the eschatologies of the two documents. Other testimony to the reality of the difficulty may be seen in the suggestion sometimes made that the order of the Thessalonian Epistles in the New Testament should be

- (1) J. Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p. 78. After some hesitation R. H. Charles ("Eschatology", (1913), p. 438) uses both Thessalonian Epistles as evidence for what he terms the first stage in S. Paul's eschatological views. But he insists that "some time" elapsed between the composition of the Epistles. The present tendency however, seems to place the two Thessalonian letters close together in time. Indeed, Harnack suggests that both letters were written on the same day, or that at the most only a few days elapsed between their despatch. (E. J. Bicknell, "First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians", (1932), p. XXXI) An interval of five to seven weeks is favoured by J. E. Frame, after a consideration of the contents of the two letters. ("Thessalonians", (1912), p. 19)
- (2) The suggestion that the "Nero Redivivus" myth lies behind II Thessalonians II/1-12, is not favoured by such authorities as Gunkel, Bousset, and Charles. Schmiedel's suggestion that these verses embody a Beliar-Neronic myth is expressly repudiated as unwarranted by the evidence. (R. H. Charles' "Ascension of Isaiah", (1900), p. LXII) (Cp. J. E. Frame, "Thessalonians", (I. C. C.) (1912), pp. 40-42)
- (3) E. J. Bicknell, "First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians", (1932), pp. XXXI-XXXII. Cp. J. Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p. 621.

(1)
 reversed, II Thessalonians being actually the earlier in date. But though this
 idea still finds some modern supporters it may safely be said that they are
 (2)
 very few.

But when every difficulty has been recognised II Thessalonians seems to
 cling to the first Epistle and, similarly, I Thessalonians seems to be
 indissolubly connected with the four Major Epistles. It has even been said of
 F.C.Baur and the Tübingen scholars generally that they were right in
 recognising the four Major Epistles of S.Paul as authentic but wrong in not
 carrying their admissions further. "Their error was not in including these
 four in this group, nor chiefly in beginning with these, but that in having
 begun with these, they excluded such other letters as I Thessalonians,
 Philippians and Philemon on insufficient grounds." (3)

The same principles of continuity of literary structure which compel
 critics to refer to the Hexateuch rather than to the Pentateuch in the Old
 Testament tend to bind the Thessalonian letters together and to the rest of
 S.Paul's Epistles. Today there are not many serious scholars who deny the
 (4)
 genuineness of I Thessalonians and a majority also accept II Thessalonians.
 (5)
 The latter has been tried, and on the whole not found wanting, so it has

- (1) J.Moffatt quotes support for this suggestion from Baur and van der Vies, on the supposition that both of the Epistles are sub-Pauline. ("Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p.75)
- (2) One of the few is F.J.Badcock, ("The Pauline Epistles etc", (1937), pp 46-52)
- (3) E.de W.Burton, "Galatians", (I.C.C.), (1921), p.LXVII.
- (4) S.R.Driver, "Introduction to Literature of Old Testament", (1892), pp 4, and 9 - 150.
- (5) H.D.B., Vol.IV, p.745, article by W.Loek, mentions Holtzmann as an exception.

been acquitted, mainly on the grounds of internal evidence already h e r e
 (1)
 indicated.

The literary connexion between I and II Thessalonians is very c l o s e indeed, so close in fact that the alleged "dependence" of the language of the later Epistle on its forerunner has been seriously urged as evidence against its genuineness. "Much more serious is the objection drawn from i t s close resemblance to I Thessalonians, amounting at times to an almost slavish dependence." (2) And the same critic indicates that a charge of such undesirable dependence can only be avoided on the supposition that S. Paul had retained and consulted a copy of I Thessalonians shortly before he added another letter to it.

As this particular charge has now been abandoned by most critics t h e evidence supplied in its favour may serve to support the very case which it was designed to disprove. A curious case of irony in the critical world.

But even if each difficulty about the authenticity of II Thessalonians can be met, if eschatologies can be reconciled, the unity of the Thessalonian Church be taken as established and the resemblances in style be quoted i n defence of this letter instead of in its disfavour, we need to find s o m e unifying principle to clear away difficulties and to offer rational support to the case in favour of II Thessalonians. This may perhaps be seen i n a

(1) External evidence is reasonably good, the second Epistle here b e i n g slightly the stronger. Both letters are included in Marcion's canon, (c.140 A.D.)

(2) Article by A.C. McGiffert in Enc. Bib., Vol. IV, p. 5044.

relatively simple explanation of the contrasts between the two Epistles. Let it be supposed that the idlers and unruly in the city were not only causing spiritual harm but were obstinate in their faults. They misunderstood or despised the exhortations of I Thessalonians and S. Paul had to recognise that he had failed to secure the effects which he had hoped to produce by that letter. He has to write a second time and naturally the tone of this letter answers to the change of circumstance. It is no longer the beloved pastor writing easily and without restraint to those who, he knows, will give ready heed to his words. It is now a somewhat alarmed Apostle who writes a second time. Self-consciousness has crept into his style, words must be chosen, not to express confident friendly admonition but to rule out the possibility of their being misunderstood or perverted by people who have already proved intractable. The balance of doctrine must be secured by warnings of "signs" which the wicked will be in danger of overlooking altogether. Increased anxiety and a sense of the failure of his earlier Epistle may perhaps account sufficiently for the change of tone to be felt in the second Epistle in comparison with its forerunner written only a few weeks earlier.

These and similar considerations probably explain why the majority of scholars seem inclined now to accept both the Thessalonian letters as coming to us from S. Paul, referring to II Thessalonians as acquitted after due trial.

- (1) E.J. Bicknell, "First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians", (1932), p. XX.
 (2) Cp. J.E. Frame, "Thessalonians", (I.C.C.), (1912), pp. 37 and 42. It is interesting also to note that so radical a work as the Enc. Bib. (p. 5041) owns that "if one accepts any of Paul's epistles there is no good reason for denying the authenticity of I. Thess." In the case of II Thess. the same writer adds this comment: "The present writer is inclined to think that the evidence points rather in the direction of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, but it must be recognised that its genuineness is beset with serious difficulties, and that it is at best very doubtful." (Professor A.C. Moffert)

The problem of the Epistle to the Ephesians presents more difficulties. These are not confined to any one aspect, such as the eschatological question in II Thessalonians, but they extend to the very nature of the whole letter. Moreover, there is no similar Epistle with which Ephesians may be compared for critical purposes.

(1)

In one of his letters S. Paul refers to the Jewish tradition that after Moses had been in the divine presence he had to veil his face when he spoke to the children of Israel. From that mysterious converse his countenance bore away an unearthly glow upon which men dared not look. And the Apostle goes on to say that his Jewish compatriots still wore a spiritual veil which prevented them from recognising that the Law found its fulfilment in Christ.

The figure of a veil which prevents speedy recognition is no bad representation of the present state of the problem of the Epistle to the Ephesians. If we read a vivid letter of S. Paul, such as Galatians, and then turn to Ephesians, we get an impression that something vague and tenuous has been interposed between the author, if he be S. Paul, and ourselves. He seems to speak in slightly muffled accents as if through a veil.

How then is this difference of style to be summarised? The letter claims to have been written by S. Paul so it invites comparison with other Pauline Epistles. It immediately becomes clear that the style of Ephesians differs greatly from what we have been accustomed to find in the earlier Pauline

(1) II Corinthians, III/12-16.
(2) Cp. Chapter III, "The Literary Style of S. Paul", pp 26-37.

writings. "The old, crisp sentences have given place to long, involved paragraphs, in which clause follows clause, and thought is drawn out of thought, as if the writer did not know how to come to an end."⁽¹⁾

⁽²⁾
Another commentator has well said of Ephesians: "We cannot speak here of vivacity, hardly of energy; if there is energy it is deep down below the surface. In its place we have a slow-moving onwards advancing mass, like a glacier working its way inch by inch down a valley. The periods are of unwieldy length; the writer seems to stagger under his load. He has weighty truths to express, and he struggles to express them - not without success, but certainly with little flexibility or ease of composition."⁽³⁾

It is only fair to say that the same writer also finds some resemblances in style between Romans and Ephesians. And another discovers almost poetical form and balance among some of the long and cumbrous sentences. This is no doubt without parallel in the other writings of S. Paul, but "it is very rash to make assumptions as to the possibilities of so mobile and powerful an intellect as that of S. Paul."⁽⁴⁾ Moreover, this Epistle has a number of characteristically Pauline expressions, including some which do not occur in Colossians,⁽⁵⁾ "and at every step genuinely Pauline turns of thought are recalled." And from a

(1) G. Milligan, "New Testament Documents", (1913), p.98.

(2) Sanday and Headlam, "Romans", (I.C.C.), (1911), p.LV.

(3) Sanday and Headlam (op.cit., p.LV) consider that Romans and Ephesians stand at opposite extremes among the literary styles of the Pauline corpus. They add that the difference is even greater than that between Romans and the Pastorals. From Dr Headlam the writer has an assurance that his opinion on this point had not altered as late as 1944.

(4) Sanday and Headlam, op.cit., p.LVI.

(5) Dic. of Apostolic Church, Vol. I, p.348 - article by L.W. Grensted.

(6) Article in Enc. Bib., by A. Julicher, p.867.

(1)

modern Jewish scholar, no admirer of S.Paul, we learn that he sees no reason to reject Ephesians as unauthentic albeit in the letters of S.Paul he always allows for possible additions to the text of verses and even of sections made by disciples of the Apostle. It is well, however, to bear in mind the principle "timeo Danaos et dona ferentes" when Dr Klausner commends any of the Pauline Epistles.

There is then little question that the literary style of Ephesians raises many doubts about its authenticity. But one particular fact has often been held to throw much light upon this type of difficulty. It has been observed that from some manuscripts of the highest reputation the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are missing from the first verse of the Epistle. This has suggested to many scholars that Ephesians is really a circular letter, perhaps sent round to a number of churches in the Lycus Valley, and that in conformity with its nature a blank space was left where some manuscripts now have the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. It is suggested that the readers filled in the space with the names of local churches such as Laodicea, Hierapolis, Ephesus, and others.

The weighty support of Dean Armitage Robinson was given to the theory of a circular letter and he declares that most of the difficulties surrounding this Epistle disappear once it is regarded as an encyclical rather than as a congregational Epistle.

- (1) J.Klausner, "From Jesus to Paul", (1942), pp.242-244.
- (2) e.g. N and B and 67^a, Lightfoot points out that a reading in S.Paul's Epistles which enjoys their support almost always represents the original text. (T.K.Abbott, "Ephesians and Colossians", (n.d.), p.1.)
- (3) But J.Moffatt holds that "the notion of copies with blanks for the local address is not true to ancient methods of epistolography." ("Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p.392)
- (4) J.Armitage Robinson, "St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians", (1909), pp. 11-13, and 292-295. Cp. Westcott and Hort, "The New Testament in Greek - Introduction." (1882), pp. 123-124.

The difficulties referred to are concerned mainly with the personality of the writer; can he really be identified with S. Paul? After all, the Apostle (1) had spent three whole years at Ephesus - and even on the theory of a circular letter Ephesus was one of the Churches addressed. (2) With his genius for gaining friends and his warm affectionate interest in his converts could S. Paul, as we know him, have written in the cold, aloof, impersonal style of Ephesians? Would not his humanity have broken irresistably through the barriers interposed by the fact that he was addressing other churches too? Would there not have been an emotional anacoluthon complementary to the syntactical anacolutha found in many of his letters?

While it is true that many authorities consider that the peculiar tone of Ephesians is sufficiently explained by its being a circular letter, others are less satisfied. An American scholar believes that the publication of S. Luke's work in two volumes was followed by the formation of a collection of S. Paul's letters, gathered from various churches which had received them. He suggests that the Acts of the Apostles had stimulated interest in the person and work of its central figure and that some Asian Christian gathered nine Epistles together and then himself wrote Ephesians as a preface to the collection on its publication. This explains its general, encyclical, nature "so unlike Paul's practice or situations, but so appropriate to his first publisher, who naturally wishes to introduce Paul as a writer, to God's people everywhere." (4)

- (1) Acts XX/31, words taken from the farewell address to the elders of Ephesus, a passage full of the deepest mutual affection. (Cp. verses 37 and 38)
- (2) J. Moffatt denies this, so far as internal evidence is concerned. ("Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p. 391.)
- (3) E. J. Goodspeed, "Christianity goes to Press", (1940), p. 53.
- (4) E. J. Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 54. Dr Goodspeed suggests that the collector of the letters and composer of Ephesians was Onesimus, Philemon's former slave and possibly later on Bishop of Ephesus. (p. 58)

This theory has gained admiration for its ingenuity but has hardly brought conviction of its truth.

Another high authority who accepts the authenticity of Colossians removes Ephesians from the list of the "correspondence of Paul" and puts it among a number of "Homilies and Pastorals"⁽¹⁾. Its tone presupposes that its Christian recipients were personally unknown to the writer and "there is no internal evidence to prove that Ephesus was the church (or even one of the churches) addressed, and much to the contrary."⁽²⁾ It is best understood as "a catholicised version of Colossians, written in Paul's name to Gentile Christendom (II/11, III/1): the solitary reference to concrete conditions (VI/21-22) is adapted from Colossians in order to lend vraisemblance to the writing, and the general traits of the homily rank it among the catholic epistles or pastorals of the early Church."⁽³⁾⁽⁵⁾

As against this it must be acknowledged that while the indications of the writer's personality are not easily reconciled with what we know of S.Paul, and while the literary style betrays marked idiosyncrasies, the theory that this letter differs from S.Paul's other Epistles in being an encyclical helps many critics to accept Ephesians. Harnack, Julicher and Deissmann all accept⁽⁶⁾

- (1) J.Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p.10.
- (2) J.Moffatt, op.cit., cites Ephesians I/15, III/2, and IV/21.
- (3) J.Moffatt, op.cit., p.391. But Dr W.Lock reminds us that we learn from Tertullian that Marcion and some other heretics had the title "a d Laodiceos", which implies the absence of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ from some copies: "but it is equally probable that the alternative title is a real fact, and that the Epistle was originally sent to Laodicea." (Article in H.D.B., Vol.I, p.718)
- (4) On the close "structural" resemblances between Colossians and Ephesians see article by W.Lock, "Epistle to the Ephesians", in H.D.B., Vol.I, p.715.
- (5) J.Moffatt, op.cit., p.393.
- (6) M.Jones, "New Testament in the Twentieth Century", (1914), p.271.

(1)

it and in England Dr H.D.A. Major who speaks for the Modernist school of thought unhesitatingly accepts it. Even Dr A.C. Bouquet of Cambridge confesses (2) to no more than "considerable doubt as to the Pauline authorship of Ephesians."

But doubts about the authenticity of Ephesians arise from two more general questions: Why does S. Paul, who generally contents himself with (3) incidental allusions to the great destiny of the Church, here devote to the subject a minor treatise of an encyclical nature? It must be remembered that to S. Paul there was no Pauline corpus of letters which together expressed his system of theology; his letters immediately served only pastoral and administrative ends.

And secondly, how is it that Ephesians presents such a sharp contrast, in style and thought, from Colossians composed a short time beforehand and (4) Philippians written only a little afterwards? The sudden complete abandonment of a recently adopted style is even harder to account for than is its temporary adoption.

For the present the mystery of the authorship remains unsettled. Grave doubts are felt about its possible Pauline authorship but Ephesians has doughty defenders. No one is quite satisfied about his own case and everyone is conscious of the case opposed to his own. But the champions of Ephesians are neither so numerous nor so convinced and convincing as those who battle

(1) In a letter to the writer, April, 1943.

(2) In a letter to the writer, April, 1943.

(3) I. Corinthians, IV/17, and XV/3-11, (unity of the Church)
I. Corinthians, XII/27, (Church is the body of Christ)

(4) Cp. J. Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p. 388.

for the authenticity of II Thessalonians. The Epistle to the Ephesians is not vindicated as a genuine letter of S. Paul, but the case against it is adjudged "non-proven".

From this brief review of some features of the ten Pauline documents we have found four generally accepted Epistles and two disputed letters. We have observed the critical grounds on which the four are accepted and the reasons for varying degrees of doubt about II Thessalonians and Ephesians.

Moreover, when general criticism is supplemented by principles derived from the special nature of the Pauline writings similar results are attained. The representation of the personality of the Apostle, the lofty level of the teaching given and the type of language all agree in vindicating the authenticity of the four Major Epistles. A certain ambiguity in regard to the thought seen in II Thessalonians corresponds to a degree of hesitancy on the part of general critics. And lastly, in Ephesians somewhat greater doubt is felt whether the personality of the writer suggests S. Paul and whether the literary style can be reconciled with his. Here again general criticism answers closely to the challenges raised by principles of appraisal based on the special nature of the Pauline letters. The task now before us is to apply these same principles to the Pastoral Epistles, seeking to determine from the language of the Pauline Epistles generally whether their number is ten or thirteen.

PART III

THE RELATION OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES
TO THAT OF THE ACCEPTED PAULINE LETTERS.

Chapter VIII

The Principal Arguments: the Jury still undecided.

The criticism of the Pastoral Epistles is a subject of wide range and of long history. For the purpose of this essay it must therefore be treated on a selective basis. The outstanding critical achievements of the past may well serve as explanations of the present state of the problem.

Modern critical study has extended over a period of some 150 years and in that time a great mass of material has been accumulated. The wisest course now seems to be that of indicating the work of five or six outstanding critics of the Pastoral Epistles and then of considering the main subjects round which controversy still rages. In this connexion it should be noticed that the development of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles has been determined by the attacks made upon their authenticity. One doubt after another has been expressed and buttressed by good arguments. But in most cases defenders of the Pastorals have soon rallied their forces, often producing good defensive arguments in turn. It has been a ding dong battle with victory oscillating between two forces by no means unevenly matched.

The controversy has generally been conducted on tactical rather than on strategical lines. It is easier to appreciate the separate battles than to detect the outlines of any general campaign in which they have played, consciously or unconsciously, a necessary part. It was only in the year 1921 (1) that the publication of a book, small in compass but influential in effect, raised the problem of the Pastoral Epistles to a strategical level. To that book a whole chapter must be devoted because of its quality and influence. That is not to say that the last word has been said on this subject; the truth has not yet been demonstrated beyond all further question, but certain positions have been taken and held and it seems unlikely that they will ever again be at the mercy of the hazards of war. We at least begin to see the general lines along which the difficult problem of the Pastoral Epistles is likely eventually to be solved.

The results so far attained have been arrived at only slowly and in part this is due to the nature of the work of English critics. The national instinct of fair play finds its counterpart in a characteristic attitude to critical problems of the New Testament. This finds its expression in a determination not to be dazzled by any new piece of brilliant writing. Justice is done to it, tribute paid to its merits, but there is no tendency to minimise the strength of old positions which may be assailed in the new work. Patience and the lapse of time are usually deliberately invoked as

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921)

necessary agents to enable the new contribution eventually to make its own precipitation of agreed truth. Such a scrupulous attitude in research contributes greatly to confidence in the results finally attained. Happily these general principles find illustration in German as well as in English scholarship in the case of the Pastoral Epistles.

(1)

Credit is rightly given to Edward Evanson as the pioneer English critic of the New Testament. He often expressed his views in vigorous direct language but he deals gently with the Pastoral Epistles. Of the Epistle to Titus he says that "the very introductory address excites in my mind a strong suspicion, that it was not written by S. Paul." But he hesitates about the letters to Timothy, finally leaving the decision to the judgement of others.

(2)

(3)

The next development in modern scientific criticism came fifteen years later when Schleiermacher insisted on the great importance of collecting, sifting and analysing the lexical and grammatical facts underlying the problem of the Pastoral Epistles. He started with a study of I Timothy on these lines and finally rejected it as a compilation based on II Timothy and Titus. The supremacy thus given to I Timothy as the most "awkward" of the

(4)

(5)

- (1) 1731-1805, Vicar of Longdon, Wores, prosecuted in the consistory court for Unitarianism 1771, chaplain to the Solicitor-General 1775, opened a school at Mibham 1778.
- (2) A sample of Evanson's vigour of expression is to be seen in his "Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists", (1792), where he denounces the author of the Fourth Gospel for representing, in S. John IX/6, our Lord's use of spittle in anointing the eyes of a blind man, "an unguent worthy only of a mountebank." (p.245)
- (3) E.Evanson, op.cit., p.267.
- (4) In the year 1807.
- (5) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp 18-19.

(1)

Pastorals has often been affirmed by other critics, and by 1830 we see the influence of Schleiermacher's work in the question of another critic who asks "quo sensu Paulinae?" in reference to the "Epistolae Pastorales."⁽²⁾

Further development came with the publication, in 1880, of H.J.Holtzmann's book "Die Pastoralbriefe". This has been described as an epoch-making work which "still holds the field as a classical statement of the case against the Pauline authorship of these Epistles, and of the reasons for placing them in the second century."⁽³⁾ It is from Holtzmann's armoury that very many later critics have drawn their most effective weapons.

The chief defect of this work was the author's failure properly to account for the fact that the language and the substance of some passages in II Timothy and Titus are thoroughly Pauline in every respect. Holtzmann dismissed these passages and all the Personalia as fictions invented by an "auctor ad Timotheum et Titum" to give colour and verisimilitude to his work. The suggested sources of these passages were the Acts of the Apostles, the genuine Pauline Epistles and some scraps of second-century tradition.⁽⁴⁾ But this defect in his work does little to lessen the debt of later scholars to a great critic for his outstanding work.

The next substantial contribution to the study of the Pastoral Epistles was made by Th.Nägeli, in the year 1905. This was in the form of a new study

(1) M.Jones, "New Testament in the Twentieth Century", (1914), p.277.

(2) H.A.Schott, "Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros Novi Foederis Sacros", (1830), Chapter VI.

(3) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.19.

(4) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., pp 19-20.

(1)
of the vocabulary of S. Paul. He examined the character and the quality of the Apostle's stock of words and dissected out elements derived from the classical age of Greek and from the literary sphere generally. Among other elements treated were words to be traced to juristic sources and to Ionic poetry. Attention was also drawn to ethical terms inherited from the Septuagint.

Nägeli treated the four Major Epistles as the main source of information (Hauptquelle) about the nature of the Pauline vocabulary and measured resemblances and divergencies by that standard.

(3)
(4)
In the case of the Pastoral Epistles he came to speak of their composer, who, he declared, incorporated genuine Pauline fragments into his own work. The richer vocabulary of these letters is accounted for by his wider reading in secular literature, beyond that enjoyed by S. Paul. And Nägeli also discovered in the Pastoral Epistles signs that the composer had recently read the Epistle to the Philippians.

(5)
Another advance was made in 1917-18 when F. Torn published some articles "Über die Sprache in den Pastoral-Briefen." After commenting on a relatively infrequent appearance of the definite article in these letters and a neglect of certain particles usually much favoured by S. Paul, Torn proceeds to

- (6)
(1) Th. Nägeli, "Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus", (1905)
(2) Th. Nägeli, op.cit., pp.12-68.
(3) Th. Nägeli, op.cit., pp.76-77.
(4) "Verfasser".
(5) Th. Nägeli, op.cit., p.88.
(6) In the "Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", (1917-1918), pp.225-243.

indicate a valuable critical principle. Even among the genuine letters of a particular author there are numerous undesigned but striking divergences and this tendency is likely to have full play in the case of a writer of genius like S.Paul. It is advisable therefore, to supplement the comparison of the language of particular Epistles by an examination of the linguistic features (1) of the four groups into which the letters of S.Paul are naturally divided.

Evidence based on the language of whole groups of Epistles might well check the formation of over hasty judgements derived from the inspection of individual letters in relative isolation. (2) Torm pronounces that the transition from the four Major Epistles to those of the Imprisonment is no less abrupt than the transition from the language of the latter group to the Pastoral Epistles. (3) His work moreover, is so carefully and so judicially expressed that the English conservative scholar Dr W.Look is encouraged to claim him as an ally. (4)

In the year 1921 there came from the Oxford University Press a little book of only 200 pages which has profoundly influenced all subsequent work on the Pastorals. The author, Dr P.N.Harrison, set himself the task of studying the problem afresh, starting from the standpoint of Holtzmann, and then seeking to frame a theory which would explain, as Holtzmann's thesis

- (1) F.Torm, in "Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", (1917-18) p.228.
- (2) F.Torm, op.cit., p.239, endorses Nageli's emphasis on close resemblances between the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle to the Philippians, op. footnote 1 on page 86 of this essay.
- (3) F.Torm, op.cit., p. 233.
- (4) W.Look, "The Pastoral Epistles", (I.C.C.), (1936), p.XXX.

failed to do, the existence within some of the Pastorals of fragments of undoubted genuine Pauline material. By an additional study of the language of those second-century writers who belonged to the second and third generation after S. Paul's death, he at once broadened the basis of his study and found arguments corroborating his theories. On any estimate, Dr Harrison was largely successful in his quest and his influence is now so great as to make it necessary to devote the next chapter to an outline of his thesis.

The foregoing historical sketch has drawn attention to the salient features of the historical development of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles. More than that it is impossible to give here within a reasonable compass, but the general outline needs to be filled in by some indications of the special questions comprised in the wider problem round which controversy has been most vigorous; prominent among these are the following:

I. Was there any "second" imprisonment of S. Paul at Rome?

The Acts of the Apostles ends abruptly and affords us a last glimpse of S. Paul awaiting the trial before the Emperor which he had claimed in virtue of his status as a Roman citizen. It seems clear that while the other Pauline Epistles can be fitted into the circumstances depicted in the latter part of the Acts there is no possibility of finding room for the Pastoral Epistles.

So it has often been argued that the account given in the Acts leaves us free to assume that S. Paul was acquitted at the trial impending in

(1) P.N. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.20.

(2) Acts XXV/9-11.

S.Luke's narrative. It is then reasonable to suppose that the Apostle was set free and that he made further journeyings, perhaps in the West as well as in the East. Further correspondence would then naturally have followed and three letters from that period have survived, two sent to Timothy at Ephesus and another addressed to Titus in Crete.

In the Second Epistle to Timothy S.Paul clearly regards himself as being on the brink of death, so it is suggested that he had been arrested a second time and was enduring a second imprisonment from which only death would release him. For a long time the truth of this conjectural second imprisonment was taken to be an essential support to the belief that S.Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, so this question has been discussed in endless detail and with great ingenuity.

The names of very great authorities appear in the list of those who believe in this alleged second imprisonment. If anything could add weight to the testimony of the great German scholar Theodore Zahn it would be the verdict of the late Professor William Sanday: "it is no disparagement to other workers in the field of early Christian literature to say that Dr Zahn is the most learned of them all." Zahn argues with immense learning and endless ingenuity that S.Paul journeyed both in the West and in the East after being acquitted at his "first" trial, that he was afterwards

(1) W.Sanday, "Criticism of the Fourth Gospel", (1905),p.8.
(2) Th.Zahn, "Introduction to the New Testament",(1909),Eng.Trans., Vol.II, pp.14 etc.

imprisoned again at Rome and that II Timothy is his farewell letter written on the eve of his second trial and his martyrdom.

A similar opinion is expressed by the famous Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, Dr George Salmon. Baur's rejection of the Pastorals is met by a characteristic epigram: "Baur has given students of early Church History so many new ideas, that they would have great cause to be grateful to him, if it were not that those ideas are for the most part wrong." After giving details of the strength and consistency of the external evidence for the Pastorals Salmon argues with great force in favour of his beliefs that the language of the Pastorals does not forbid us to accept their Pauline authorship, that the controversies depicted are not those of an age later than S.Paul and that there was a second imprisonment, leaving room for the work which resulted in the writing of the Pastorals. Dr Salmon refuses to believe that S.Paul was not acquitted at his first trial: "Paul's release from his Roman imprisonment, we are told, is unhistorical; so is his non-release. In other words, Luke's history of the life of Paul breaks off without telling us whether he was released or not."

Dr A.E.Hillard holds that the Pastoral Epistles imply recent journeys in Asia and Macedonia, in Crete and Epirus. He believes that Spain and

- (1) G.Salmon, "Introduction to New Testament", (1913), p.398.
- (2) G.Salmon, op.cit., p.404.
- (3) A.E.Hillard, "Pastoral Epistles", (1919), p.X.
- (4) Cp. the hope of visiting Spain expressed in Rom XV/24 and 28. J.Moffatt ("Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p.417) points out that no tradition exists in Spain that S.Paul ever visited that country. Cp. Enc. Bib. Vol. IV, p.5088.

Crete were also visited and that S.Paul fulfilled his expressed intention
(1)
of revisiting some of the churches of Asia and Macedonia.

Sir William Ramsay adds the support of his high authority to a second imprisonment of S.Paul, between two trials. In his opinion "Philippians occupies the same place in the first as II Timothy in the second trial, but Philippians looks forward to a fresh career among the churches, while
(2)
II Timothy is the testament of a dying man."

Another Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, Dr J.H.Bernard, reposing on the strength of the early external evidence for the Pastoral Epistles warns us that "it is not a sound maxim of law that a single witness must
(3)
necessarily mislead." In fact the Pastorals may provide trustworthy evidence for a period of the life of S.Paul for which we have no other witness. Bernard accepts the tradition that when Clement of Rome refers to S.Paul's journey ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δούσεως a visit to Spain is implied and
(4)
he claims Lightfoot's support for the statement that among ancient geographers τέρμα is used to indicate the Pillars of Hercules at the Straits of Gibraltar. Bernard summarises his main argument in these words: "if the only objections to the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles were derived from the novelty of the information that they give us as to the life of S.Paul, there would be very little question as to their authorship.
(5)
The really grave objections to them are based on their style and language."

(1) Cp.Philemon, verse 22, Philippians I/25 and II/24.

(2) Sir William Ramsay, "S.Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen", (1897)p.360

(3) J.H.Bernard, "Pastoral Epistles", (1899), p.XXVI.

(4) Cp.Rom XV/23-24.

(5) J.H.Bernard, op.cit., p.XXXIV.

From a Cambridge scholar, Dr R.St John Parry, comes the claim that a second imprisonment of S.Paul is not inconsistent with his known circumstances at the end of Acts and an acknowledgement that none of the Pastorals can be fitted into the scheme of that book. (1)

Parry makes two fresh points of some importance. He argues that the use of the aorist tense in Acts XXVIII/30 must not be misconstrued: ἐνέμεινεν "describes the period as past: the verb means not that he dwelt in his own hired lodging for two whole years, but that he stayed in Rome for two whole years dwelling in his own hired lodging: and it is therefore implied that at the end of the two years he left Rome. This is the natural suggestion both of the word ἐνέμεινεν and of the order of the words in the sentence. If the fact was not so, and S.Paul never left Rome till his death there, then we should have to explain the suggestio falsi of the writer." (2) This makes a second imprisonment an almost inevitable deduction from the words of S.Luke, but surely it is a heavy weight to depend from a single verb in the aorist?

Another point made by Parry is that S.Luke is too good a literary artist to convey an atmosphere of serenity and confidence in the last chapters of Acts if it did not in fact really exist. The absence of any note of tragedy would throw the narrative completely out of gear if in point of fact the situation so calmly depicted actually ended in S.Paul's condemnation and

(1) R.S.John Parry, "Pastoral Epistles", (1920), pp XI, XII, and XIV.

(2) R.S.John Parry, op.cit., pp.XV-XVI.

(1)

death at the end of those two years. Parry shares the belief of Zahn and Lightfoot in a second imprisonment and would fit the events implied in the Pastorals and Clement of Rome into the years 62-67.

Though there is intellectually no inevitable connexion between belief in a second imprisonment and in the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, in practice that position is generally maintained. The two positions may be held separately, but they are usually conjoined. The names of such critics as Holtzmann, Bacon, Julicher, and Pfleiderer convey the implication of a dual rejection, alike of the Pauline authorship and of a conjectural second imprisonment of the Apostle.

(2)

II. Can the Pastorals be fitted into the scheme of the Acts of the Apostles?

"Filigree Criticism" is a mordant expression used to describe an over-precise literary analysis of existing documents of the New Testament, based largely on subjective grounds. But the same term may well cover the building up of elaborate critical positions with insufficient attention to the need for objective evidence. Point is given to this suggestion by several attempts made to prove that the Pastoral Epistles can be fitted into the scheme of the latter half of the Acts of the Apostles. Generally this carries with it the implication that the author of the Pastorals is S.Paul.

(3)

- (1) R.S.John Parry, "Pastoral Epistles", (1920), p.XVI.
- (2) as by Harnack, op. R.S.John Parry, op.cit., p.XVI, and J.Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p.416.
- (3) J.Moffatt, op.cit., p. 157.

In the year 1900, W.E.Bowen published a book on the "Dates of the Pastoral Epistles". In this work I Timothy and Titus are dated closely together, just after S.Paul's farewell to the elders of Miletus, Bowen declaring that I Timothy was "not likely to have been written on shipboard." And II Timothy is held to have been sent off from Rome just before the despatch of Colossians, Ephesians and Philemon. Philippians is then treated as the latest of the Pauline Epistles, written some time after II Timothy.

But even the judicial Dr W.Lock firmly rejects Bowen's contentions, declaring that "the historical situation (of I Timothy) cannot be fitted into the account of S.Paul's life in the Acts. This is true in spite of recent attempts to place it at the time of Acts XX/38."

In a study called "The Apostolic Age", J.V.Bartlet placed the writing of I.Timothy just after S.Paul's departure from Miletus and suggested that the Epistle to Titus was written at Fair Havens, in Crete, where S.Paul was sheltering from a storm. Finally he traces a descending scale of hopefulness through the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon, on to the "more dubious tone of Philippians" and finally to the settled foreboding of II Timothy as a whole.

Some thirteen years later Bartlet returned to this subject in an article on "The Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles", published in "The

(1) Acts XX/17-38.

(2) An opinion flatly contradicted by the contemporary J.V.Bartlet, who declares that I Timothy was "written on board ship soon after leaving Miletus." ("The Apostolic Age", (1900), p.180)

(3) In H.D.B., Vol.IV, p. 772.

(4) J.V.Bartlet, op.cit., p.180.

(5) Acts XXVII/8

(6) J.V.Bartlet, op.cit., p.198.

Expositor". Here he makes an elaborate attack on the suggestion that II Timothy has been built up on the basis of certain Pauline reliquiae, a position surely subsequently made untenable by the work of Dr P.N.Harrison. He also modifies his earlier suggestions as to the time and place of the writing of the Pastorals. Both I Timothy and Titus are here held to have been written in Rome, rather earlier than the four letters of the Imprisonment, and II Timothy is dated about the year 62, early in the third year in Rome. (1)

Two later attempts to bring the Pastoral Epistles within the scheme of Acts also call for notice, but it is very doubtful whether they have been accepted as more convincing than earlier attempts to support the same thesis. Both of the books in question were published in 1937, guaranteeing that the questions raised and answered at the beginning of this century have been examined again nearly forty years later.

An intricate argument is worked out by Dr F.J.Badcock in favour of his theory that S.Paul suffered an imprisonment at Ephesus in the year 54 which lasted till the next year. S.Paul then visited Crete and went on to Corinth whence he sent off the Epistle to Titus. The three letters to Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon were written slightly earlier than this, and II Corinthians and Romans a little later. I Timothy was then sent off from Philippi early in the year 57, and II Timothy and

(1) "Expositor", Eighth Series, Vol.6, (1913), J.V.Bartlet, article "Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles", p.330.

(2) F.J.Badcock, "The Pauline Epistles etc", (1937), p.74.

(1)

Ephesians from an imprisonment at Colossae later in the same year.

Badcock is immensely patient and sets out a most carefully planned argument. But it is almost too perfect and confidence in the writer is apt to be shaken by a subtle piece of special pleading in which he indulges to prove that the author of II Timothy originally wrote the word "Antioch" in Chapter I, verse 17, whereas every reputable manuscript reads the word "Rome" in that context. (2)

Criticism of the New Testament involves a delicate balancing of many probabilities. Much of it is surrounded by the gentle shadows of an uncertainty due to paucity of evidence. Consequently the glaring "certainty" produced by Badcock's methods of criticism tends from its very nature inevitably to excite suspicion of its soundness. And that suspicion is not lessened by the reflection that Badcock's effort at textual emendation is peculiarly convenient, if not essential, to the support of his very involved lines of argument.

Another study of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles was published, also in 1937, by Sir Robert Falconer, formerly President of the University of Toronto. This is a return to a preliminary study made many years earlier. The work of other modern scholars is taken carefully into account and we thus gain the advantage of watching the effects produced on a keen mind by their work.

(1) F.J.Badcock, "The Pauline Epistles etc", (1937), p.X.
 (2) F.J.Badcock, op.cit., pp.150-154.

Titus is here regarded as the earliest of the Pastorals, itself the outcome of a mission of S. Paul in Crete sometime during his two years stay at Ephesus. But surely in that case the omission of all mention of this Cretan mission in Acts is hard to explain?

II Timothy is dated before Philippians "the last extant letter of the Apostle" and in II Timothy Sir Robert finds two components, the work of a composer and other matter, some of it coming from S. Paul himself. Finally, the author of I Timothy is said to have used the other two Pastorals and in addition certain material drawn from unknown sources.

The clear signs of unity among the three Pastoral Epistles are said to be due to their having been worked over by a later writer sometime before the Epistle of Clement of Rome was sent to the Church of Corinth.

So once again, a skilful attempt to place the Pastorals within the setting of the Acts produces an impression of excessive subtlety. Sir Robert Falconer is perhaps more of a "judge" and less of an "advocate" than Dr Badoock, but will he eventually be rated as any more persuasive? Moreover, it will be very hard to convince most people that the farewell in II Timothy is of earlier date than the Epistle to the Philippians.

These attempts to find room for the Pastorals within the scheme of Acts have now lasted for nearly fifty years. The arguments have been set forth, in some cases at least, by competent scholars. But have they not all failed to produce a conviction of their truth? And do not their excessive subtleties only strengthen the belief that the solution of the

problem of the Pastoral Epistles must be found in some direction marked by less subtlety and by greater simplicity?

(1)

It must however be owned that Dr P.N.Harrison, whose work cannot well be called simple, is utterly opposed to the suggestion of a second imprisonment and brings the Pastoral Epistles within the ambit of the Acts of the Apostles. He is, of course, firmly convinced that S.Paul did not write the Pastoral Epistles and Dr Harrison is always a very weighty champion of any critical cause which wins his allegiance.

III. Can the differences between the Pastoral Epistles and the rest of the Pauline letters be explained by changes in subject-matter?

It is a serious matter to suggest that the acknowledged contrasts between the Pastoral Epistles and the other letters attributed to S.Paul can wholly be explained by changes in subject matter. That is antecedently unlikely to be a completely satisfactory answer to the problem, but on the other hand, it is a factor to be taken into account. It may explain much, it must not explain too much.

If the Pastorals are accepted as genuine they are at the same time to be dated one or two years after the latest of the other ten Epistles. If S.Paul is their author his experience has grown in the interval and perhaps his sufferings for the Gospel have also multiplied. Some time previously he had referred to himself as an old man, but that in a context which certainly betrayed none of the feebleness of old age.

(1) P.N.Harrison, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp 102-115.

(2) Philemon, verse 9.

It is true that the Pastorals deal with new subjects and new circumstances. The ministry of the Church is not dealt with in any other of the Epistles on a severely practical and administrative plane and the regulation of teachers is also a new subject. It is moreover, true that these letters are addressed to individual friends and fellow-workers of the Apostle though it must be owned that when they are read publicly we do not feel that we are violating the privacy of personal correspondence. When S. Paul writes to individuals or to churches on particular topics he is at least conscious that other eyes may scan his words, other ears listen to them being read aloud.

But the versatility of S. Paul is very great and his pen has dealt from time to time with many and varied topics without producing a sense of "difference" at all comparable to that which we feel to exist between the Pastorals and the other Epistles. Among the latter there are also differences of design leading to different topics, differences in the parties addressed and differences in the relations of the writer to those parties. But for all this the other Epistles retain their substantial identity of language. In contrast, one of the great difficulties in attributing the Pastoral Epistles to S. Paul is the large number of words in them which are not found in the other ten letters. If S. Paul is right in calling himself "the aged" it must be remembered that "it is not the

(1) A marked contrast in tone is to be seen in II Corinthians VI/3-10, and Ephesians IV/11-12.

(2) S. Davidson, "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament", (1868), Vol. II, p. 186.

(1)
 custom of old age to create a new stock of words."

It is when differences of subject matter are added to differences of style and language that it becomes harder, not easier, to believe that the Pastorals are works of S. Paul. How deep those differences go is well expressed by Jülicher's comment on the Pastorals: "their words are many (2) and their ideas few; of Paul one might say exactly the opposite."

IV. Evidence derived from a study of the Pauline clausulae.

Purely objective evidence is always a valuable ally in a controversy naturally affected by individual reactions to evidence of a more subjective type. Certain evidence of this former type has been found by Professor H.J. Rose in a study of the unstudied rhythms of S. Paul's literary style. These are unconscious preferences, unlikely to be noticed or imitated by any other writer. (3)

The rhythms of S. Paul's style are clearly marked: he uses a series of short pointed sentences, not periods, somewhat after the style of Seneca and other authors of the Silver Latin age. These short sentences are often combined into long, loosely constructed, compound sentences. Of parallelism and antithesis S. Paul makes constant use. They are outstanding features of his thought and style.

- (1) S. Davidson, "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament", (1868), Vol. II, p. 186.
- (2) A. Jülicher, "Introduction to New Testament", (1904), p. 182.
- (3) H. J. Rose, article on "The Clausulae of the Pauline Corpus", published in J. T. S. (Oct. 1923), pp 17-20 and 34.

In these ways S. Paul was conforming to a tradition of the Greek of the Hellenistic period, that good prose should be rhythmical. It should, however, be emphasised that these rhythms in S. Paul's case are largely unconscious and so to be distinguished from conscious, stylistic, rhythm.

Rose mentions the work of Zielinski on the clausulae to be seen in Cicero and adopts a like division of five classes of these features of language. The results of this objective evidence bearing on the Pastorals are interesting. On rhythmical grounds alone I Timothy is non-Pauline.

II Timothy, though shorter, comes out much better: "so far as rhythm goes, we are at liberty to believe, what I personally hold to be right, that we have here substantially a genuine Pauline Epistle, though probably edited for publication after the writer's death Titus is too short to give any very decided results."⁽¹⁾

The relation of these results to those attained by Dr P.N. Harrison is interesting and suggestive.

V. Evidence offered by the Pauline prologues to the Latin Vulgate.

The short arguments or prologues which appear in the Latin Vulgate and in many printed editions of the Bible have been minutely studied by a learned Benedictine scholar, Dom de Bruyne, who has come to the conclusion that they were originally composed by Marcion as headings for the Epistles⁽²⁾

- (1) H.J. Rose, Article on "The Clausulae of the Pauline Corpus", published in J.T.S. (Oct. 1923), pp. 31 etc.
 (2) "Revue Benedictine", January 1907.

(1)

in his Apostolicon. Dr F.C.Burkitt has drawn attention to this line of argument thereby giving it his general approval. Dom de Bruyne points out that the set does not include an argument to the Epistle to the Hebrews and also that those prefixed to the Pastoral Epistles, as well as to II Corinthians and II Thessalonians, are of a different construction from the others. Once more the Pastorals display their usual tendency towards "difference" and the variation in the disputed II Thessalonians is also interesting. May we perhaps hazard a guess that the anomalous position of II Corinthians is due to its unusual editorial history, as incorporating two letters, Chapters X-XIII and Chapters I-IX, respectively?

VI. Evidence derived from the Chester Beatty Papyri.

A modern discovery of papyri has been held to provide evidence unfavourable to the Pastoral Epistles. This comprises some 96 leaves, now known as the Chester Beatty papyri, and both Sir Frederick Kenyon and Professor U.Wilcken, the great German papyrologist, agree in dating them about 200 A.D.

Sir Frederick is of the opinion that, while the appropriate leaves might have left room for I Timothy, there is no possibility of there having been room for all the three Pastoral Epistles. He believes that actually none of the Pastorals was included but that a few leaves were

(1) F.C.Burkitt, "Gospel History and its Transmission", (1911), pp 353-354.

(2) Or "P 46".

(3) Sir F.G.Kenyon, "Story of the Bible", (1936), p.116.

(1)

left blank at the end.

This evidence is not conclusive against these Epistles as a whole since it may only amount to signs of a local "fluidity" of opinion about canonical books. We know that in the second century various Eastern Churches accepted the Apocalypse but that a century later it was questioned at Alexandria and definitely rejected in Asia Minor. In the West there was a long hesitation about II Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and, on the other hand, the Epistle of Clement to the Church of Corinth nearly gained entry to the canon; it is actually attached to Codex A, though in an inferior position.

(2)

It is clear that local acceptance of particular books might precede their general acceptance. But naturally an omission of books from a particular manuscript gives added weight to any other objections raised against them on critical grounds. The exact weight to be attached to the absence of the Pastorals from the very early Chester Beatty papyri may be disputed, but it cannot be deprived of all significance, and that is of a kind unfavourable to the early acceptance of these letters. Signs of hesitation cannot altogether be disassociated from doubts about their Pauline authorship.

- (1) Sir F.G.Kenyon, "Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible", (1933), p.61.
- (2) P.Gardner, "The Ephesian Gospel", (1915), p.45.
- (3) F.J.Foakes Jackson, "History of the Christian Church", (1909), p.109.

In this chapter we have reviewed briefly the chief landmarks in the developing history of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles and have also dwelt upon the outstanding aspects of it which are still debated today. The main question, that of the possible Pauline authorship of the Pastorals is still undecided. The jury has not yet returned its final verdict, it still hesitates.

Three further matters perhaps here call for notice. In the first place it must be remembered that in the 150 years of the development of the criticism of the Pastoral Epistles the critics have constantly been given new and better tools for their task. Really trustworthy texts of the New Testament have been produced in this time, based upon the best manuscripts and the finest scientific principle.⁽¹⁾

Then there has been an immense advance in the science of philology, especially in the comparative study of languages. We have been enriched with much knowledge of the history and the quality of the Greek of the New Testament.

And lastly, that form of Greek has been properly estimated as the contemporary language of the masses of the people after the careful scientific study of vast numbers of papyri and other similar material.

It must not be overlooked that the long delay in the solution of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles has had its natural consequence. In default of convincing proof the verdict has been slowly going against the authenticity

(1) Dr. F.J.A.Hort's own estimate of the margin of possible error in the Westcott and Hort text is 1/1000 th of the text - one tenth of one per cent. ("The New Testament in Greek", (1881-2), Introduction, p.2.)

of the Pastorals. A number of critics in despair of being able definitely to prove what they none the less felt to be true have omitted the Pastorals altogether from their reckoning of the books of the New Testament.

"No modern critic is quite happy in treating these letters as Pauline in their present form" is the judicial verdict of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns. And Professor Anderson Scott, in a book dealing with S. Paul, writes: "That the Pastoral Epistles are not dealt with is due in part to these considerations of space, but also to the fact that these portions of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus which can with any confidence be attributed to the Apostle add little or nothing to our knowledge of his teaching." And then in another book, dealing with "Living issues in the New Testament", he omits even to mention the Pastoral Epistles.

A Scottish Bishop writing in defence of Episcopacy is bound to mention the Pastoral Epistles but he owns that he cannot make much use of them because their authenticity is disputed; he then passes on to consider other evidence. An incidental comment made by Dr Percy Gardner is that he cannot attach much weight to a certain passage because, though it occurs in a Pauline Epistle, "it is the First Epistle of Timothy which cannot be regarded as fair evidence for the views of Paul himself."

(1) Hoskyns and Davey, "Riddle of the New Testament", (1931), p.287.

(2) C.A.Anderson Scott, "Footnotes to S.Paul", (1935), p.VIII.

(3) C.A.Anderson Scott, "Living Issues in the New Testament", (1933)

(4) Dr K.D.Maackenzie, Bishop of Brechin, "The Case for Episcopacy", (1929), p.20.

(5) P.Gardner, "Myth, Magic and Morals", (1909), p.XVII.

From a list of "letters" of S. Paul, Dr G.A. Deissmann omits all mention
 (1)
 of the Pastorals, and his fellow-countryman, Professor Pfleiderer, distinguishes
 between genuine Pauline Epistles and those addressed to Timothy and Titus which
 (2)
 he cannot reckon as genuine.

For many years the problem of the Pastoral Epistles thus appeared to most
 students to be a baffling one. The swaying battle of attack and defence had
 gone on so long with no very decisive results. These letters indeed showed
 many characteristics which made it hard to accept the claim, expressly made in
 each of them, that S. Paul was their author. But there was little difference,
 if any, in the ability and critical equipment of attackers and defenders. It
 seemed that little progress was possible unless new evidence was discovered to
 clear up the mystery of the style and language of these Epistles, for that
 (3)
 appeared to be the crux of the problem. But such a convenient discovery was
 unlikely and in its absence the problem of the Pastoral Epistles seemed to be
 left in a state of inevitable stagnation.

There was one other remote hope of progress being made. Was it possible
 that, some day, someone might make a fresh survey of the evidence already so
 often sifted and draw out from it hitherto unsuspected truth? Or might such an
 one perhaps arrange existing knowledge in new patterns, so giving light where

(1) G.A. Deissmann, "S. Paul", (1912)

(2) O. Pfleiderer, "Christian Origins", (1905), p. 281.

(3) J.H. Bernard, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1899), p. XXXIV.

darkness had so long reigned? These somewhat exacting conditions were suddenly and unexpectedly fulfilled in Dr Harrison's small book whose general nature has already been indicated but which must now be considered in some detail in the next chapter.

Chapter IX.

The work of Dr P.N.Harrison.

It would be difficult to find any competent scholar willing to deny that Dr Harrison has made a contribution of outstanding importance to the study of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles. In fact, so great has been his influence on all subsequent work in this department that it is necessary to devote this chapter to an outline of his work.

With engaging frankness Dr Harrison tells us at the outset the general results of his prolonged research in the Pastorals. This procedure betokens his own confidence in the soundness of his methods and at the same time enables his readers to scrutinise his work step by step. Their foreknowledge of the conclusion enables them the better to appreciate every detail of the process by which it is finally reached. The whole series of intricate arguments reaches its climax in three stages:

In the first place, the alleged release of S. Paul after his trial at Rome, followed by another period of work during which the Pastorals were said to have been written, must be definitely dismissed as a legend without valid historical basis. This is the case despite the ingenious arguments of the great scholars who favour the theory. In Harrison's opinion the Personalia in the Pastorals provide conclusive evidence against the supposed second imprisonment and other theories founded upon it.

Secondly, a comprehensive triangular comparison of the language of the Pastorals with that of the ten Pauline Epistles on the one hand, and that of the Apostolic Fathers and early Apologists on the other hand, inevitably attaches them to the latter group and to a great extent detaches them from the ten Pauline Epistles. The case in favour of this conclusion is stronger than has hitherto been supposed either by attackers or defenders. The style of the Pastorals is radically different from that of S. Paul and they reveal the vocabulary of early second-century Christendom as known to us from writings of that period. At the same time the Personalia in II. Timothy and Titus when examined in isolation and subjected to the same tests are found to be thoroughly Pauline in vocabulary, idiom, and style.

Lastly, Harrison declares it to be psychologically inconceivable that S. Paul could have addressed Timothy and Titus in the terms which the Apostle uses in these Epistles.

(1)

According to Harrison's estimate the author of these letters was a fervent admirer of S. Paul devoted to his name and memory, but his character

- (1) P.N.Harrison, ("Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.7) here adds "for purposes of orientation and as an expression of personal opinion" his conviction that:
 - (a) The false teaching seen in the Pastorals was not a danger to the Church in the 50 years or so after S. Paul's death.
 - (b) That the positive doctrine of these Epistles is the Paulinism not of S. Paul but of the second and third generation of Christians. Certain elements betray this date and other elements vital and central to the Pauline gospel are missing.
 - (c) The ecclesiastical organisation implied and the stress laid on Church polity are foreign to S. Paul's known ideas on such matters; they belong to a state of affairs later than Clement of Rome but earlier than the Ignatian Epistles.

These points are not developed because the evidence on which they are based falls beyond the scope of Harrison's purpose.

and spirit were very different from what we see in the genuine Pauline Epistles. This author too had great qualities and high gifts but he was not S. Paul. He was in fact a devout, sincere, and earnest Paulinist, who lived at Rome or Ephesus and wrote during the later years of the Emperor Trajan and perhaps also in the early years of Hadrian. He had a close knowledge of S. Paul's genuine letters and had access to several brief personal notes written by the Apostle to Timothy and Titus on various occasions and still preserved after their deaths. In addition there survived S. Paul's last letter and farewell to Timothy perhaps written on the very day of his martyrdom.

The author ad Timotheum expanded this last letter of S. Paul, adding to it three genuine shorter notes written at earlier dates, and this resulted in our II. Timothy, the first of the three Pastorals, at once an amalgam and an expansion of early material.

Next came the Epistle to Titus which includes another genuine note of S. Paul's, dating from about the time of II. Corinthians.

Finally came I. Timothy. Apparently the author had used up all his store of genuine Pauline notes and had not the ability to frame similar documents for himself. In this Epistle there is a marked advance in the picture of Church organisation and of the opposition to heretics.

(1) Trajan, 98-117, A.D.

(2) Hadrian, 117-138, A.D.

(3) Titus III/12 etc.

(4) P.N. Harrison cites I/3, III/14, V/23, as half-hearted experiments in this direction. ("The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.8.)

The author of the Pastorals knew the Synoptic tradition and also perhaps Acts, I. Peter and I. Clement. He believed the Pauline gospel wholeheartedly, as he understood it, but inevitably though unconsciously he had been affected by those contemporary influences favouring formal creeds and a developed ecclesiastical organisation. He himself still believed that he was passing on the teaching of S. Paul.

The conditions around him were enough to cause anxiety to such a man of genuine piety. He might well have felt that a desperate situation called for desperate remedies. Christianity was being buffeted from without by both pagan and Jewish influences. Ascetic tendencies were at war with pagan licentiousness. Within the Church speculation in doctrine was leading to quarrels and eager propagandists were teaching Jewish myths and ceremonial restrictions based on a dualistic philosophy. Lastly, the practice of occult arts had become a means to making money. All this made for despair in the heart and mind of a devoted follower of S. Paul. Moreover, insubordination and moral laxity in the Church were not likely to be overlooked by jealous enemies outside and continually invited scandalmongers and persecutors to do their fell work.

Either the author's own devoted impulse or even possibly the demand of other anxious Christians led him to work up S. Paul's farewell letter together with some other such fragments into a "tract for the times". Presently the author had to compose more freely and here inevitably he fell out of the

(1) J.H. Newman's "Tracts for the Times" were also the outcome of fightings within and fears without.

(2) The ethics of pseudonymity are discussed in P.N. Harrison, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp. 12-13, and J. Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), pp. 40-43.

Pauline style and phraseology and into his own looser, less nervous, less rugged style, and into the current vocabulary of his own day. The facts of the literary origin of the Pastorals may have been well known among Christians at first but were speedily forgotten with the lapse of some years. (1)

Such are the conclusions at which Dr Harrison has arrived after long intensive research into the language and style of the Pastoral Epistles and our present task is to estimate the value of these results by considering the methods by which they were originally attained. This is the more important because of the generally favourable verdict passed on Harrison's work whatever qualifications may be expressed by particular critics. But even if this were not the case, tribute would have to be paid to the quality of his scheme of research. It resembles a beautifully articulated military plan and seems to advance irresistably towards a successful conclusion made all but inevitable by its own breadth of conception and attention to detail. The whole "plan of campaign" unfolds itself in the establishing and maintenance of four main propositions, each strongly based on objective evidence and each lending additional strength to a greater whole. These are the propositions in question:

I. Certain un-Pauline elements are revealed in the Pastoral Epistles when their language is compared with that of the accepted Pauline letters.

(1) This undermines the force of Ramsay's citation of the degradation from office of the Asiatic presbyter who composed the "Acts of Paul and Thecla". Ramsay maintains that this was definitely punishment for having attributed to S. Paul sayings which were not really his. ("First Christian Century", (1911), p.81) Harrison thinks that the true authorship of the Pastorals was in the earliest days no secret kept from the knowledge of local Church circles.

- II. None of the explanations usually suggested for the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles really makes it possible for us to believe in their Pauline authorship.
- III. When a triangular comparison is made between the language of the Pastoral Epistles and that of the accepted Pauline letters on the one hand, and that of certain early second-century writers on the other hand, the Pastorals tend to attach themselves to the latter and to detach themselves from the language of S. Paul.
- IV. The linguistic tests already used reveal the presence within the Pastoral Epistles of passages written by S. Paul and this fact, together with the three previous propositions, shows the way to a solution of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles.

To appreciate the strength of Harrison's case it is essential to consider these four propositions in some detail.

I. Certain un-Pauline elements are revealed in the Pastoral Epistles when their language is compared with that of the accepted Pauline letters.

Like his great predecessor Holtzmann, Dr Harrison first turns his attention to the numerous hapax legomena to be seen in the Pastorals which are often the first source of suspicion about their genuineness. (1)

The main facts can be simply stated.

- (1) G. Udney Yule shows the high proportion of "once-words" to be found in most literary works. The significance of the hapax legomena of the Pastorals lies both in their nature and in their number. ("The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary", (1944), pp. 286, 289, 292 etc.)

A count of the hapax legomena in the ten Pauline Epistles shows a small proportion of these words in the earliest letters and a gradual increase to a modest total in Philippians, the latest of them. On the whole the r i s e in frequency approximates to the chronological order of the appearances of these Epistles, but the correspondence is not exact. For each page of II.Thessalonians there are 3.3 hapax legomena, whereas the highest figure is 6.2 for each page of Philippians. When these facts are shown in a graph they are expressed by a line rising gently and evenly from II.Thessalonians to Philippians. Between no pair of these Epistles is there an increased frequency of even one word per page.

But the moment that the Pastorals are included in the comparison the whole picture changes abruptly. From the highest figure for the other group, of 6.2 hapax legomena per page of the Epistle to the Philippians the figures jump up to 12.9, 16.1 and 15.2 for each page of II.Timothy, Titus and I.Timothy respectively. The actual increases over the figures for Philippians are 9.0, 6.7 and 9.9 per page respectively. The line on the graph suddenly breaks off at the end of one series and starts a new series on a much loftier mathematical level. The whole impression given by this comparison is one of abrupt contrast.

Moreover, this sense of contrast continues even when we turn to words used in common by the ten Epistles and the Pastorals. When we disregard the commonest words, nouns, verbs, and prepositions without which it would be impossible to write at all, liberal discounts in respect of the reconciliatory significance of the residue have to be made. Some of them which make a single appearance in only one of the Pastorals are found in passages which Harrison h i m s e l f

acknowledges to be genuinely Pauline. They thus lose their itenic p o w e r. Others of these words used in common similarly lose their influence because they are used in the two sets of documents with different and even contrasting meanings. For example, in Titus I/14, the word κοινός has a "good" meaning referring to the universal faith of the Church, whereas in the other group, in Romans XIV/14, it has the "bad" sense of leuitically unclean. There are numerous (1) examples of a similar variety of connotations.

A complementary process is seen in a tendency to use different words t o (2) express the same idea. Thus S. Paul consistently uses εὐχαριστέω to express his thankfulness to God, whereas in the Pastorals the "Latin" expression χάριν ἔχω is used with equal consistency. The impression made by this is only deepened by the discovery that these "new" words and phrases used in the Pastorals t o express Pauline ideas are frequently also found in the works of the Apostolic (3) Fathers and of the early Christian Apologists.

Not less significant of contrast in language is the absence f r o m the Pastorals of numerous Pauline terms, even of whole groups of such terms. No writer uses all his vocabulary in each of his works but questions are naturally raised when his characteristic expressions are suddenly absent from certain writings attributed to him. Harrison declares that grave significance must be attached to these facts: "Not only does it go far and away beyond anything for which the variations in the ten Paulines had prepared us; it implies a change

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp.27-28.

(2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., pp.28-30.

(3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p. 28.

of perspective, a shifting of horizons, a profound modification of the whole mental and spiritual outlook for which two or three, or even five years would hardly be sufficient in any man, least of all an old man, such a one as this Paul the aged, with such deep-rooted conceptions, and so definite a system of thought and expression as we know him to have reached, for all his receptivity and versatility.⁽¹⁾"

The contrasted uses of particles, enclitics, prepositions and pronouns in the ten Epistles and the Pastorals respectively have long been a subject of comment. But Harrison maintains that the contrast is more startling than has hitherto been recognised. He examines 112 of these words and then asks us how are we going to reconcile their total absence from the Pastorals with the fact that they constitute a vital part of S. Paul's habitual modes of thought and expression as seen in the ten Epistles? One or other of these 112 words "has hitherto appeared on the average nine times to every page that Paul ever wrote"⁽²⁾, yet they are totally absent from the Pastorals.

Corresponding grammatical contrasts lend force to the evidence derived from vocabulary,⁽³⁾ but more important still are signs of differences of style of a radical kind. The ten Epistles have taught us the literary style of S. Paul. We look for his irregularities and abruptness, "the tendency to fly off at a tangent, the sudden turns and swift asides, the parentheses and anacolutha, the frequent incursions of the unexpected - which mark the products of a mind carried along, and sometimes carried away, by the intensity of its own

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.34.

(2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.35.

(3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.38.

(1)
 thoughts." Such writers tend to be oblivious, rather than scornful, of grammatical rules and precedents as such. But the strong thread of logical and reasoned argument characteristic of S. Paul is bound together into an articulate unity by the unobtrusive but faithful service of particles and prepositions.

Contrast goes even deeper when we survey the style of the Pastorals. It reminds us less of a living organism, and more of an edifice. It is in comparison sober, didactic, static, conscientious, domesticated. In place of the Pauline impetus and surge of thought we have the words of a man "greatly concerned to preserve intact the correct pattern of sound words, which must be diligently memorised, and faithfully recited, and so passed on from lip to lip as the one duly authorised expression of saving truth." From this writer's work the Pauline term *συναρμωσις* and its cognates are significantly entirely missing.

When the Pastorals show the use of Pauline prepositions and connectives there is a vagueness and looseness in their use. S. Paul always has a firm grip of his language even where it is most unconventional. Even an apparent anacoluthon such as that in I. Timothy I/3 etc, is as unlike the true Pauline

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.41.
 (2) Cp. E. Jaquier, "Histoire des livres du N.T." 4 vols, (1903-8). This Roman Catholic scholar examines the language of the Pastorals in minute detail, characterising it in these words: "il n'a pas la vigueur et la force, la vivacité et l'impetuosité, la vie et la variété l'âpre rudesse de celui des épîtres aux Romains ou aux Galates. Il est lent, monotone, pesant, diffus, décousu; en certaines parties, terne et incolore." (Vol. I, p.366) With amazing ingenuity Jaquier summarises all that can be said in favour of a Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, but he pays involuntary tribute to the great contrasts between their style and that of the ten Epistles by falling back on the suggestion of "un autre secrétaire" for the former. (Vol. I, p.364)

type as the slow windings of a stream through flat country contrast with
 (1)
 the headlong rush of a mountain torrent."

Another idiosyncrasy of the author of the Pastorals is his liking for certain types of compounds involving prefixes such as α- privative and φιλo-, both of these are also to be found in the ten Epistles but infrequently, whereas here they appear with marked frequency.

A careful consideration of the force of these massed arguments compels an acknowledgement that Harrison has justified his first contention that an examination of the language of the whole thirteen Epistles attributed to S. Paul reveals the presence of certain un-Pauline elements in the Pastorals. So he now seeks to convince us of the truth of his second proposition.

II. None of the explanations usually suggested for the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles really makes it possible for us to believe in their Pauline authorship.

Harrison takes no less than ten of these suggestions, considers them one by one and rejects them all. This calls for a brief summary of this part of his work.

Progress and modification are naturally to be seen in the three
 (2)
 groups of letters constituting the ten accepted Epistles. It has been argued that a period of two to five years then elapsed before the Pastorals

(1) P.H. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.43.

(2) (a) I and II. Thessalonians:

(b) Galatians, I. Corinthians, II. Corinthians, Romans:

(c) Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians:

were written. These added years and further experience naturally affected the Apostle's diction, but there is a continuous process to be seen at work through all the four groups of letters. The fourth group it is suggested, does not in any way constitute a breakaway from the earlier Epistles.

Harrison doubts whether room can be found in the Apostle's life for this
(1)
development, but for the moment he waives the point and contends that the extent of the departure from S.Paul's manner is too great to be explained in this fashion.

The wonder of S.Paul's style is that he made his limited command of the Greek language suffice for his unlimited spiritual purposes. But in language he moves, consciously or unconsciously, within certain limits, obeying certain "laws" which constitute his style and enable it to be recognised. Even genius knows its limits of variation and those limits are definitely observed in the first three groups of Epistles and as definitely exceeded in the fourth group.

S.Paul's mind is very versatile but not in such a way as to allow him suddenly at the end of a lifetime to discard a host of his favourite expressions and to introduce into his letters a mass of new and unfamiliar terms. Test after test of the language of the whole thirteen Epistles shows that the Pastorals bring one series of characteristics to an end and start a new one with its own quite definite features.

If we depend on the evidence of language alone the contrasts between the accepted Epistles and the Pastorals suggest two distinct writers and not two

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.45.

stages in the development of the mind of one and the same writer. Can a change of circumstances explain the differences to be seen in the Pastoral Epistles? No, says Harrison. After all, the ten Epistles also show many changes of circumstances and one of them at least reveals some of the painful vicissitudes of the Apostle's life. Heresies and controversies are dealt with in Galatians and Corinthians, yet neither heresies nor other circumstances there produce effects in any way similar to those observed in the Pastorals.

If defenders of these Epistles put forward, as constituents of the alleged changed circumstances, such features as false teachers, new heresies, developments in ecclesiastical organisation, discipline and liturgy, Harrison neatly counters by declaring that these specific circumstances occupy high places among the grounds of objection to the alleged Pauline authorship.

Or again, can the situation be met satisfactorily by the suggestion that new topics, derived from changes of circumstances, compelled S. Paul to use many fresh terms? The answer comes at once: a wide range of topics produces no similar discrepancies among the accepted Epistles.

Moreover, the technical terms seen in the Pastorals are dealt with vaguely and in a manner unlike S. Paul's, and where some terms are used with exactness they are precisely those which coincide with the terminology of writers of the second century. The missing particles are by no means normally confined to passages of argument and dialectics.

(1) II. Corinthians XI/23-28.

(2) R.S. John Parry argues in exactly the opposite direction about the missing particles. ("The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), p. CXIV.)

Defenders of the authenticity of the Pastorals have sometimes suggested that S. Luke acted as S. Paul's amanuensis in their writing. The implication is that as an accomplished literary artist and a close friend of S. Paul the Evangelist would have been allowed an unusual degree of influence upon the exact form of the language of these letters. It is in fact suggested that the presence of S. Luke is the explanation of the differences with which we are concerned.

Unfortunately for this theory the hapax legomena of the Pastorals are as foreign to S. Luke as to S. Paul. The vocabulary most characteristic of S. Paul and the particles most favoured by S. Luke are alike missing from these documents. There is a great gulf fixed between the peculiar grace, the literary charm and finish of S. Luke's work on the one hand and the stylistic divergencies of the Pastorals from the manner of S. Paul on the other hand. Why, asks Harrison, should the co-operation of two such men as S. Paul and S. Luke lead to the introduction of many terms utterly foreign to them both? Briefly, the affinity between S. Luke and the author of the Pastorals is as indisputable as their identity is incredible on linguistic grounds alone.

Again, the recipients of these letters have been invoked as explanations of their literary character. These documents are, unlike most of S. Paul's Epistles, addressed to individuals. But Philemon is also addressed to a single man and it keeps within the limits of the observed "laws" of S. Paul's style whereas the Pastorals ignore such discipline.

(1) Cp. J. Moffatt, "Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p. 414 and F. J. Badcock, "The Pauline Epistles, etc", (1937), p. 108. Sir R. A. Falconer, in his article "Timothy and Titus, Epistles", in "Dictionary of the Apostolic Church", (Vol. II, p. 591) discusses a less intimate relation with the Lucan writings.

It would scarcely do to argue that the higher literary style of the Pastorals is the result of a superior education enjoyed by Timothy and Titus. The evidence for that supposition is meagre and it can hardly be maintained that these letters show signs of being addressed to people of a higher mentality than the first readers of the Epistle to the Romans.

But there is also a serious psychological difficulty about believing that S. Paul wrote these letters to Timothy and Titus. They were his old assistants and familiars and yet Timothy seems to be addressed as if he were an immature youth. On the other hand, it is hard to understand why Timothy's old master and friend should protest to him so vigorously his own apostleship and personal (1) veracity. Something seems vaguely to be interposed in these letters between the personality of S. Paul and those of Timothy and Titus. Perhaps it would be more correct to say somebody than something? In that circumstance rather than in any special peculiarities in the readers of the Pastorals it is probable that we must seek the solution of our problem.

It has been argued ingeniously that the contrasts between the language of the Pastorals and the accepted Pauline letters tell in favour of the former. A forger would have copied S. Paul's style slavishly and laboriously; only the Apostle himself could boldly indulge in these anomalies. Harrison refuses to invoke the sinister figures of falsarius or Falscher. These terms suggest a moral depravity which contrasts with the lofty motives of his pseudonymous author and a secrecy in sharp contrast with the probable public contemporary

(1) I. Timothy II/7.

(1)

knowledge of the identity of the author. To judge the literary ethics of early Christian days by standards applicable to today is to be guilty both of an anachronism and of an injustice to a worthy man. It should also be remembered that concordances were not then available and that the successful commission of a crime is even more difficult than the neatest planning of one.

In the early Church books secured admission to the canon of the Scriptures more for their power of edification than in virtue of any guarantees of their authenticity. Such facts as the absence of Pauline particles were only revealed to the colder scrutiny of other eyes in later centuries.

Literary analogies have been used to justify belief in the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. May there not for example be seen in the acknowledged works of Shakespeare variations in language as great as those existing between the Pastorals and the other letters of S. Paul?

A detailed examination by Harrison of a study on this subject written by W.P. Workman results in a drastic demolition of this particular theory.

The Pauline Epistles show a gradual gentle rise in the proportion of hapax legomena included in them. The earliest letters contain the lowest numbers, the latest the largest totals. The rise in these numbers corresponds fairly closely to the chronological order in which the Epistles were written.

(1) Cp. p. 112 of this essay.

(2) Cp. P.N. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p. 58.

(3) The passing of the years naturally tends to emphasise authorship as a guarantee of authenticity.

(4) P.N. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

(5) P.N. Harrison, op. cit., p. 60.

(6) Cp. p. 114 of this essay.

There is no corresponding process in the works of Shakespeare. Chronological development has there little or nothing to do with the variations in the numbers of hapax legomena. "The latest play stands lower than the earliest, and the play with the largest number stands next in order of time to that with the smallest number." (1) A complete contrast to the case of the writings of S. Paul.

Again, if for the moment we treat all the thirteen Epistles as written by S. Paul the difference between the lowest and highest numbers of hapax legomena contained in single letters is more than twice the difference to be seen in Shakespeare's works. (2)

Lastly, the increase of hapax legomena among the 37 plays of Shakespeare (3) is at once slight and regular, whereas in the Pauline Epistles there is a regular slight rise through the ten earliest letters, but in contrast an extremely violent and completely contrasting rise directly the Pastoral Epistles are included in the comparison. In fact, the alleged analogy with Shakespeare entirely breaks down; two contrasting processes are revealed in the works of the two writers and in the hapax legomena of Shakespeare's plays there is no corresponding feature to the sudden violent contrast in numbers which reveals itself when the Pastorals are compared with the other Epistles of S. Paul.

It has also been argued that many of the hapax legomena are found in the Septuagint and must therefore have been known to S. Paul. But critics have never asserted that S. Paul was necessarily unacquainted with all these words. (4)

- (1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.61.
- (2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.64.
- (3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.64.
- (4) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.65.

On the other hand, it is not likely that he knew every word comprised in the vocabulary of the Greek Old Testament. This argument in fact cannot prove much since its basis is ultimately conjecture.

Among the hapax legomena of the Pastoral Epistles are many classical (1) words and defenders of their authenticity have urged that this well accords with the Pauline authorship; the Apostle may well have studied the classics during his second Roman imprisonment. The force of this argument is decreased by the fact that there was a marked revival in the study of the classics, and in the use of classical words, in the early years of the second century, the very period to which Harrison would assign the composition of the Pastoral Epistles. This theory about S. Paul's use of his leisure in a hypothetical second Roman imprisonment suffers the usual disadvantage that a case built up on a double conjecture is even weaker than one based on a single guess.

Dr Harrison finds that no less than ten lines of argument used in defence of S. Paul's authorship of the Pastorals are insufficient to reconcile the linguistic peculiarities of these documents with that theory of their origin. It is now time for him to establish the positive aspect of his theory and he begins by putting forward his third proposition:

III. When a triangular comparison is made between the language of the Pastoral Epistles and that of the accepted Pauline letters on the one hand, and that of certain early second-century writers on the other hand, the Pastorals tend to attach themselves to the latter and to detach themselves from the language of S. Paul.

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.66.

The position so far reached is this: Harrison regards himself as having established his contention that the Pastorals, when compared with the other Pauline Epistles reveal many strongly marked peculiarities. Clearly this situation calls for explanation, but Harrison has already rejected all the suggestions commonly put forward. He has now to build up his own case, that the Pastorals are the work not of S. Paul but of a second-century disciple of the Apostle. The first step towards this is to demonstrate that when the language of the Pastorals is closely compared both with that of the ten Pauline Epistles and with early second-century Christian writers the general marked tendency is for them to draw away from the style of S. Paul's writings and to show that their true literary affinities are found in the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists. (1) If the language of the Pastorals proves to be unmistakably the common Greek of the second century it cannot be maintained, on grounds of literary evidence, that S. Paul is their author.

Harrison's intricate arguments designed to show the affinity of the language of the Pastorals to that of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists of the second century can perhaps be summarised in tabular form:

- (1) The author of the Pastorals speaks the language of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, but diverges from that of other writers of the New Testament to a degree which finds no parallel in the ten Pauline Epistles. Among words not found elsewhere in the New Testament the Pastorals share with either the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, or with both these groups,

(footnote (1) It must be emphasised that in the vast majority of cases in which the Pastoral hapax legomena appear in the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists the context is such as to exclude any thought of a quotation or direct reference to these Epistles. (P.N. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp. 68 and 82) It must also be remembered that these early Christian writers possessed, studied and revered S. Paul's genuine Epistles. (P.N. Harrison, op.cit., p. 81.)

from 7.5 to 8.6 words per page. The corresponding figures for the Pauline Epistles range only between 1.6 and 3.2 per page, a marked and most significant contrast. Moreover, most of the words in question appear repeatedly in these writers of the second century. (1)

- (2) Besides his hapax legomena, the author of the Pastorals naturally uses many words not found in S. Paul's Epistles, but which are used by other writers of the New Testament in documents covering about forty years from the death of S. Paul.

Each genuine Pauline Epistle has its own hapax legomena shared with the Apostolic Fathers. These range from 4 to 7 per page, but directly the Pastorals are introduced into the comparison their figures are found to be 13.6 to 18.7 per page. (2) Another break-away on the part of the Pastorals.

If the comparison is made with the Apologists similar results are obtained. Here the genuine Paulines show a range of 4.2 to 6.6 per page, whereas the figures for the Pastorals are 13.3 to 16.5 per page.

In summary, it may be said that of the 848 (3) words contained in the Pastorals 211 (24.9%) are foreign to the vocabulary of S. Paul's Epistles and at the same time are found to be part of the working vocabulary of Christian writers between the years A.D. 95 and 170.

- (3) When the question is approached from an opposite direction it is found that there are only 18 words foreign to the vocabulary of these second-century writers which are common both to the Pastorals and to the accepted Pauline Epistles. As 7 of these words appear elsewhere in the New Testament there is a residue of only 11 such words shared exclusively by the writer of the Pastoral Epistles and S. Paul.

- (4) If we take into consideration four classes of words found in the Pastorals a very high proportion is found, in each case, either in the works of the Apostolic Fathers or the Apologists, or in both classes:

- (a) 50 words found in S. Paul and the Pastorals, but nowhere else in the New Testament (78%)

- (b) 492 words common to S. Paul, the Pastorals and other books of the New Testament (98.9%)

(footnote (1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles" (1921), pp 69-70.
(2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.70.
(3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.73, (Harrison's own count.)

(c) 106 words found in all three Pastorals (99%)

(d) 542 words common to S. Paul and the Pastorals (96.7%)

(5) There are 634 out of a total of 2177 words used in the ten Pauline Epistles which have vanished from the current speech of Christendom as seen in these second-century writers, (29.1%). Of these 92.3% are absent from the Pastorals.

It has been remarked that the Pastorals do not use many particles commonly used by S. Paul. There is a distinct tendency among Christian writers of the second century to neglect these same particles, though to a less extent than that seen in the Pastorals.

(6) If we consider three groups of post-Pauline Christian writings:

(1)

(a) the non-Pauline books of the New Testament,

(b) the Apostolic Fathers,

(c) the Apologists,

the remarkable facts emerge that:

(a) the largest group and the one nearest in time to S. Paul has the smallest number of words in common with the Pastorals:

(b) the smallest of the groups, but the one coinciding with the period to which Harrison assigns the Pastorals, has in common with them easily the largest number of words.

"If therefore the Pauline authorship of our Epistles is still to be maintained, some explanation has to be produced for the curious fact that the other works not only of the same period, but of the same author, have considerably less in common with the Epistles to Timothy and Titus than have those of the next three generations, and that too, in a degree which increases steadily as time goes on, till a climax is reached in the writings of the next generation but one after the death of their supposed author."

"While we ransack the literature of the first century in vain for many of the characteristic expressions used by this author, we find most of them

(1) If we represent the volume of the ten Pauline Epistles by the figure "1" the volumes of these other works must be represented as follows:

(a) 4, (b) nearly 2, (c) 3.

in the Greek literature of the first half of the second century. To find the rest, all that is necessary.....is to extend our researches to a point still further away, by twenty years, from Paul's lifetime - i.e. to the year A.D.170." (1)

- (2)
- (7) Of 113 words in the Pastorals which are not found in Dr Goodspeed's Indices we find cognates of fully half that number in these Christian writers of the second-century.
- (8) Under the tests already applied to the language of the Pauline Epistles and the Pastorals, the former have repeatedly emerged as a connected series with none of its members appearing in an anomalous isolation throwing doubt upon its common origin with the rest. The Pastorals, however, stand persistently outside this series - by a greater distance than that extending between the most widely separated pair of the ten Epistles.

The question now arises whether under similar tests of language the Pastorals fall within or without the series of Christian writings to which on Harrison's theory they rightly belong? When a table is constructed showing the number of words per page found in only one of the Apostolic Fathers the extreme range of variation is between 6.3 and 14.6. Under examination the Pastorals fall well inside this series with an average of 13.6 words per page.

Harrison finally takes his stand on the statement that he has "found nothing in the vocabulary of the Pastorals to conflict with the opinion that their author lived and wrote between the years A.D.95 and 145." (3)

- (4)
- (9) There is a residue of 82 words which are not found elsewhere in the New Testament, nor in the Apostolic Fathers, nor in the Apologists - in fact in no Christian writing prior to A.D. 170.

At least 57 of the words occur, some of them with great frequency, in non-Christian writings of this period. Indeed, the vocabulary of the Pastorals, especially its non-Pauline constituents coincides with that of non-Christian contemporary writers. (5) Their language in fact is the Greek of the first half of the second-century.

- (1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp. 78-79.
 (2) E.J.Goodspeed, "Index Patristicus" (1907) and "Index Apologeticus", (1912)
 (3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.81.
 (4) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.82.
 (5) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.86.

Having stated this formidable case in favour of his theory that the language of the Pastoral Epistles finds its natural affinity with that of the ecclesiastical and secular spheres of a time after the death of S. Paul, Harrison proceeds to consider what he terms genuine Pauline elements in the Pastorals. In so doing he does not feel that he is merely an honest scholar dealing with an awkward boulder marring the otherwise smooth surface of the Christian landscape, an obstacle to which candour compels attention. On the contrary, he makes abold attack upon it and the reward of his courage is his discovery of new evidence supporting and strengthening his general theory about the authorship of the Pastorals. Another satisfactory feature is an explanation of the Pauline reliquiae embedded in the Pastoral Epistles, one of a kind more satisfying to the mind and to the conscience than Holtzmann's cruder suggestion of forgery. Here Harrison seems definitely to excel his great German predecessor.

This stage of the inquiry can be expressed in the terms of our fourth proposition:

- (1) The Pastorals are linked with writers of the early second-century by phraseology as well as by vocabulary. In his "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), (p.165) Harrison gives ten such examples of phraseology all found in non-Christian writers, but since then he has found at least twenty more examples drawn both from Christian and non-Christian sources. In a letter sent to the writer in 1943 he gives these facts and adds the pertinent comment: "words have a long life and it is hard to say when they were coined. But a dozen phrases like "up against it", "getting the wind up", "in off the deep end" would make us open our eyes if they appeared in as many pages of books or letters purporting to have been written in Queen Victoria's day."
- (2) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.19.
- (3) Holtzmann reconciled his belief in "a perfectly naive and innocent pseudonymity" in respect of the Pastorals as a whole with a suggestion that the Personalia are "mere fiction invented by the auctor ad Timotheum et Titum", (P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.100 and p.19)

IV. The linguistic tests already used reveal the presence within the Pastoral Epistles of passages written by S. Paul and this fact together with the three previous propositions shows the way to a solution of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles.

The Pauline factors undoubtedly present in the Pastorals comprise two distinct elements - in the first place a number of Pauline phrases and, in the second, the Personalia.

Harrison finds in the Pastorals an "extraordinary number" of phrases each of half a dozen or more words coinciding more or less closely, some of them exactly, with S. Paul's most characteristic expressions in the ten (1) Epistles. Do these indicate merely the normal correspondences which we should expect to find between different writings by the same author, or do they rather indicate the intervention of another mind? In other words, do they betray the hand of S. Paul or the literary skill of the auctor ad Timotheum?

Closer examination reveals the interesting fact that these coincidences (2) of phraseology exist between the Pastorals and the four Major Epistles to a much greater extent than between the Pastorals and another group nearer to them in time, the letters of the Imprisonment. The conservative theory would have looked for signs of the prison-house as a common influence affecting the Pastorals and the third group of Pauline letters. There is no such natural nexus to be expected between them and the Major Epistles.

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.87.

(2) Particularly I. Corinthians, II. Corinthians and Romans. (P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.88.)

But this does not provide evidence for a Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. These verbal agreements are so numerous and striking as to make us ask: would S. Paul have quoted himself to this extent; indeed, would his memory have been equal to reproducing so much of what he had written, to other people, seven or eight years previously? Instructions conveyed naturally and fittingly to the churches of Thessalonica, Rome, Corinth, Philippi and Colossae would scarcely be given to S. Paul's colleagues Timothy and Titus in precisely the phraseology which was so suitable for letters directed to those communities. On the other hand a later Paulinist writing the Pastorals might betray himself by this very psychological inconsistency.

Then again, the parenthesis ἀλήθειαν λέγω οὐ ψεύδομαι entirely natural in its former settings in Romans, Galatians and II. Corinthians immediately sounds a jarring note when we encounter it in I. Timothy. "Now the Apostle is writing neither to strangers who have never set eyes on him, nor to foolish and unstable minds bewitched and misled by influences foreign to the gospel but to his true and trusted friend, the loyal comrade of so many years. What was the point, and where the necessity of assuring Timothy, of all people in the world, that he really was speaking the truth, and not telling lies, when he asserted that he, Paul, had been appointed an Apostle and teacher of the Gentiles? By what conceivable possibility could it have occurred to Timothy to have denied or doubted that? But as addressed to the Timothys of our author's time this solemn reminder, in the familiar phrase of the Apostle, has edge and

(1) Romans XI/1; Galatians I/20; II. Corinthians XI/31.

(2) I. Timothy II/17.

point. It was needed and there was some hope that it would not prove altogether
 (1)
 ineffective."

This borrowed Pauline phraseology is not distributed evenly. In some places there is a mosaic of Pauline expressions only occasionally revealing the composer's hand. In other passages the Pauline element recedes and the style, syntax and grammar is that of the composer. Here we find the maximum numbers per page of words foreign to the genuine Pauline Epistles. And lastly, there are places where Pauline phrases borrowed from the genuine letters and non-Pauline terms in common use among writers of the second-century alike disappear and we find ourselves back in the authentic world and language of
 (2)
 S. Paul. This brings us to consider the Personalia for it is in those passages that these characteristics reappear.

Harrison chooses to start his argument from an agreed basis; practically all critics are of the opinion that the personal details and messages contained in II Timothy IV/6-22 and Titus III/12, etc, are authentic. Holtzmann, however, ultimately rejected these passages, but it is important to notice that he did so on one sole ground "the impossibility of finding any one situation in to
 (3)
 which they can all be fitted." Harrison agrees to this statement but denies that the inference drawn from it by Holtzmann is a necessary one; these passages may still be genuine and Harrison is prepared to defend them on a hypothesis of his own. They are too vivid to be forgeries and cold objective

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.91. Other examples of such psychological inconsistency are to be seen in II Timothy I/3, II Timothy II/11 etc.

(2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.93.

(3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.94.

tests of their language, both of vocabulary and phraseology, bring them into the class of authentic Pauline writings. These passages include the smallest number of non-Pauline words in any complete page of the Pastorals and they contain a high proportion of words occurring in the Pauline Epistles which are found in no other parts of the Pastorals. Language and style join these passages to the ten accepted Pauline Epistles and it is their influence alone which brings II. Timothy consistently nearer to the genuine letters of S. Paul than the other two Pastorals.

Had these Personalia been forgeries we should have found them distributed fairly evenly through all the Pastoral Epistles. An author capable of inventing such life-like imitations of S. Paul's manner in one Epistle could have repeated his feat in two more as well. ⁽¹⁾ Moreover, no forger would have perpetrated the psychological blunder of representing S. Paul as solemnly proclaiming his impending immediate death and of then proceeding at once to give to Timothy a series of small commissions which he could not have carried out till too ⁽²⁾ late.

Some other explanation than forgery must be found, but the theory of a second Roman imprisonment following a period of renewed freedom does not meet the case adequately. This theory depends upon a report of Eusebius, a writer whose "judgement was decidedly inferior to his erudition" ⁽³⁾ and who seems to have argued that the "first defence" of II. Timothy IV/18, not only allowed

(1) P.N. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.99.

(2) P.N. Harrison, op.cit., p.100.

(3) Harrison (op.cit., p.103) here gives an opinion of Dr William Bright, "Introduction to the Historia Ecclesiastica", (1872)

but actually compelled belief in a second defence after an acquittal at the earlier trial.

Harrison rejects these suppositions and prefers to think of S. Paul as having been immured for a longer or shorter time in a Roman prison cell after his trial before Caesar. The end was death, not further journeyings and the writing of more letters all of which have disappeared. Similarly, Clement of Rome's reference to a journey to the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ implies Rome not Gibraltar. This view is strengthened by the context of Clement's words which imply a martyrdom following swiftly upon the attainment of this Western goal.

Harrison now boldly attacks the position of Zahn and Harnack which he says is based upon two inferences drawn from the Personalia themselves. Apart from them, Harnack's arguments based on chronology and on Clement's $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ would not survive very long. The inferences in question are these, that the Personalia in II. Timothy and Titus are genuine and that S. Paul cannot have written them at any earlier time in his life. On this depends, ultimately, the whole theory of a release, further journeys and a second imprisonment.

But, argues Harrison, "on what grounds are we obliged to suppose that these disjointed sentences were all written at the same time or from the same place? Why should they not have been written indeed by Paul, but at different times?" Here we reach the crux of Harrison's theory: "Several brief personal notes addressed by the Apostle at various times to one or another of his friends, are

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.106.

(2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., pp.107-108.

(3) Th.Zahn, "Introduction to New Testament", (1909), Vol.II, pp.43-54.

(4) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.109.

(5) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.109.

preserved by them and are still in existence half a century or so after his death. These are eventually copied out from the scattered scraps of papyrus on to a single sheet, either by our author himself or by some other scribe, and so incorporated at the end of his first two Epistles. ⁽¹⁾ "There were probably no headings or explanatory notes attached and he had not at his disposal modern methods of analytical criticism."

Harrison acknowledges that this is the part of his case most easily attacked. But it must be remembered that his hypothesis is not a mere guess for which admittedly there is no evidence. It is a reasoned hypothesis designed to explain the capricious appearances and disappearances of recognised Pauline characteristics of language in two of the three Pastoral Epistles. It is based on textual criticism, a foundation which is not enjoyed by the alternative theory of a second Roman imprisonment.

It is not Harrison's way to avoid challenges and he boldly acknowledges that this crux of his argument stands or falls with his success or failure in finding a place for each of these literary fragments within the known lifetime of S. Paul as recorded in Acts and the other Pauline Epistles.

Further, not only is there no historical evidence for a second imprisonment after a release and more journeys, but that hypothesis would involve us in a series of discordances once we turned to the Personalia themselves. We should have to explain an extremely improbable close repetition in the Pastorals of circumstances already recorded in Philippians. It is almost incredible that an interval of several years should have passed after the writing of Philippians

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.109.

and that then the Apostle should have had to write again and deal with precisely the same situation, reproduced in minute detail but dated several years later. The coincidences are too close altogether. But if the Pastorals actually refer to circumstances only a short time after the writing of Philippians - as they do on Harrison's theory - then the resemblances in language and conditions become entirely natural. In contrast with this "Paul's second Roman imprisonment, if he ever had a second, must have been in an astounding number of details an exact duplicate of the first."⁽¹⁾

(2)

Harrison then proceeds to dissect out "the five genuine notes, their several dates, birthplaces and occasions."

These passages have been broadly marked out by their survival of literary tests designed to separate the "wheat" of genuine Pauline language from the "chaff" of the language of the composer of the Pastorals. The latter generally bases his work carefully on authentic Pauline Epistles but in response to Harrison's linguistic tests he betrays his presence in those passages which he did not inherit from the Apostle. It is a great claim to make that Harrison's methods, summarised in the first three of our propositions, enable him to separate off the Pauline elements in the Pastorals from the work of the composer, but we can hardly doubt that this success has been achieved to a large extent.

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.114.
 (2) (a) Titus III/12-15, (b) II.Timothy IV/13-15, 20, 21a, (c) II.Timothy IV/16-18a (18b), (d) II.Timothy IV/9-12, 22b, (e) a complicated piecing together of "Paul's last letter":- II.Timothy I/16-18, III/10 etc, IV/1, 2a, 5b; IV/6-8, 18b, 19, 21b, 22a.

But tests of language alone cannot enable Harrison to complete the last part of his task, the fitting in of the Pauline reliquiae to the known circumstances of S. Paul's life recorded in Acts and the ten Epistles. These fragments, it will be remembered, are on Harrison's theory not preserved in chronological order, but were copied somewhat fortuitously on to a single sheet of papyrus just as they came to hand.

(1)

So Harrison devotes some twenty pages to a subtle exegetical study of the occasions in the Apostle's recorded life into which the contents of the genuine Pauline fragments can be fitted. This part of his book is beyond the range of the present essay, which is confined to the linguistic aspect of the problem, but no reader can withhold a tribute of admiration from an obviously brilliant piece of constructive criticism. It is hard to deny that Harrison largely establishes his claim that "for every personal reference in the paragraphs with which we have just been dealing, there is at least one moment in Paul's life as known to us from Acts and the other Paulines, which fits it like a glove."⁽²⁾

It is now time for us to leave Harrison with his task impressively accomplished. No final verdict has yet been passed on the problem of the Pastorals but Dr Harrison has achieved the rare distinction of diverting the course of the stream of critical history and theory. He may be open to criticism, particularly as he himself acknowledges, in the constructive part of his essay, but it is fairly certain that henceforth further investigation will be conducted in the new channel which he has hollowed out for the literary stream and that it will be the scene of any further progress in work on the problem of the Pastoral Epistles.

(1) P.N.Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), pp.115-135.

(2) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., p.110.

Chapter X.

The Language of the Pastoral Epistles compared with that of the other Pauline Letters.

Considerable significance is surely to be attached to the course taken by almost every discussion of the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles. At first disputants are concerned with resemblances and contrasts in language, particularly in vocabulary and grammar. Then imperceptibly the level of the discussion rises until finally controversy centres round the question whether the authentic note of the greatness of S. Paul can be detected in the Pastorals. It seems that some influence emanating from his personality raises the discussion from one of grammar to the level of the highest spiritual issues. Anything less than this would itself raise doubts about the authenticity of a document attributed to the Apostle.

There could hardly be a more concrete or less emotional study of the problem of the Pastoral Epistles than that published by Dr P.N. Harrison yet that scholar is repeatedly found to be relating vocabulary and grammar to the sublime spiritual elevation of S. Paul. It is obvious therefore, that a discussion of the influence of the evidence provided by the language of the Pauline Epistles must be conducted on the broadest possible lines. Literary style, the spiritual aspect of language, must be considered as well as the details of vocabulary and grammar which serve to make possible the higher expression of language. As always, the corporeal must serve the purposes of

the spiritual.

As has already been shown, for our purposes we can draw on three kinds of principle, the general criticism of the New Testament, Pauline criticism based on the study of the nature of the Pauline writings, and lastly, the purely objective study of the "anatomy" of language. Any concurrence in the results attained by this threefold system of criticism will derive additional force from their variety of origin. Similarly, any divergence on the part of one or two of these factors will introduce a corresponding degree of doubt into conclusions drawn from them. The distinctions made between these three types of principle cannot always be strictly maintained - they tend in practice sometimes to overlap - but they help us towards an orderly treatment of the problem of the Pastorals.

General criticism of the New Testament undoubtedly raises grave doubts as to the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. The majority of scholars reject these Epistles; others hesitate but generally show a negative tendency. On the other hand, there are still some defenders of the Pastorals as genuine letters of S. Paul.

When we turn to Pauline criticism three principal questions call for examination and answer:

- I. Does the personality of the author as revealed in the Pastorals suggest that he is to be identified with the writer of the accepted Pauline Epistles?

(1) See Chapter VIII, "The Principal Arguments", pp. 82 - 107.

- II. Do we discover in the Pastorals generally evidence of that elevation of thought and a corresponding grave dignity of expression which we have learned to associate with the Pauline writings?
- III. Is the literary style of the Pastorals similar to that of the other letters of S. Paul or does it diverge from it so widely as to suggest a plurality of authors?

These questions must be examined in order and in some detail:

- I. Does the personality of the author as revealed in the Pastorals suggest that he is to be identified with the writer of the accepted Pauline Epistles?

An answer to this question will be found more easily if we can find among the ten Epistles one in which S. Paul is confronting circumstances not altogether dissimilar from those implied in the Pastorals.

That requirement seems to be met by the Epistle to the Galatians which was also written in a mood of deep anxiety and in the face of similar dangers. The Galatian Christians were Gentile converts made by S. Paul and he had been joined with them in mutual affection and esteem. He had given them the spiritual liberty of an untrammelled approach to God through Jesus Christ and they had been enthusiastic in their faith. But presently emissaries from conservative religious circles had come and taught them a more complicated scheme of salvation. Many of S. Paul's Galatian disciples had become convinced that obedience to the ordinances of the Law was a necessary adjunct to the Christian faith.

S. Paul then had the agonising experience of seeing his beloved Galatians making shipwreck of the vital spiritual principles which he had taught them and also of realising that the new dissentient teachers had had some degree of success in their attempts to discredit him in the eyes of his whilom disciples. So dangerous was the work of οἱ ὑπερβίβλους that it provoked in the Apostle a rare lapse from that charity which was to him the essence of Christ's religion. (1)

The Epistle to the Galatians is S. Paul's reaction to this critical situation and, as we should expect, it is rich in its revelation of important aspects of his personality. A desperate danger leads the Apostle to call on the whole resources of his strong character and this Epistle is indeed an impressive document. What then does it tell us of his personality?

The first characteristic which we observe is his sublime confidence in his gospel and in his own commission to preach it. There is no faltering in the face of danger, no pleading, no self-justification. Paul an Apostle, not of men but of Jesus Christ and God the Father, refuses to recognise any hazard to the gospel which he proclaims but sternly warns the Galatians against the dangers in which their fickleness is involving them. His handling of the situation is perfectly sure and unhesitating. Rebuke is called for and he administers it sternly and with no sign of weakening. The lawful authority of an Apostle is implied in every line of this Epistle.

(1) Galatians V/12.

Indeed, that authority is emphasised by a narrative of his equal dealing in early days with James and Peter and John at Jerusalem. No Jewish intervention was for a moment permitted to induce him to waver about the practice of circumcision. Compromise was ruled out because if righteousness came by the Law then Christ had died in vain.

(1)

The folly of the Galatians is denounced unsparingly as they incline to throw away those very elements in which the faith of Christ showed its superiority to the Law. Then affection begins to battle in the heart of the Apostle with his exercise of stern authority. They are his children in the faith, but he insists again that as such their duty is to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free. The Law would indeed turn them from the works of the flesh but he has for them a more excellent way which leads in human life to the growth of the richer fruits of the Spirit, against which there is no law. Repent they must, amend their ways they must, and he then translates spiritual religion once more for them into terms of daily life. Finally, the Apostle takes the pen from the hand of the amanuensis and adds a few words to the text, perhaps with fingers gnarled with the rough work of tentmaking. Affection is now his motive but even that is combined with an unbending stern warning against compromise with dangerous false teaching.

What then do we here learn of the personality of the Apostle? Surely in the face of anxiety and peril he is seen as a man wielding authority with an assurance based on profound confidence in his message and his own commission.

(1) Galatians II/21.

He has no thought of compromise and calls his converts unhesitatingly back to the principles of his gospel. He shows courage, conviction, and affection, but never for a moment does he incline to weakness or hesitation. Confidence, conviction and strength are the hall-marks of his personality.

The Pastoral Epistles are also written by one who faced similar dangers. Jewish and pagan forces alike threatened the purity and spirituality of Christian belief and conduct and these letters are addressed to two colleagues of S. Paul who had to face the resulting difficulties. But they are not private letters; the author writes with Christian communities as well as his younger disciples in his thoughts. He deals both with present false teaching and practice (1) and also with impending developments. Wandering teachers, generally self-commissioned, were involving Christians in a maze of questions and controversies based upon the lore of canonists and casuists of the Law. (2) A false asceticism, insisting on abstention from marriage and from certain foods, was being widely taught and accepted. The outcome was that many Christians were abandoning their faith and it was becoming clear that a general apostasy was more than a possibility of the future.

The situation with which the writer of the Pastorals sought to deal was as menacing as that revealed in the Epistle to the Galatians. Moreover, apostasy on the part of Christians due to false teaching of a Jewish type and origin is a factor common to both sets of documents. Can it be said that the personality of the writer of the Pastorals suggests S. Paul, the writer of the Epistle to

(1) Cp. R. S. John Parry, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), pp. LXXXI - CX.

(2) R. S. John Parry, op. cit., p. LXXXIV.

the Galatians? The answer is surely in the negative.

Where in the Pastorals are we to find that confidence, conviction and strength which we found in S. Paul? In the Galatian Epistle the term Apostle is a proclamation, in the Pastorals it is a description. The unhesitating confidence in his sacred commission and the bold sweeping attack made on the false teachers of Galatia are wanting here. The writer tends to become involved in the details of heresies instead of boldly enunciating basic Christian principles. And we also miss the constant Pauline appeal to the words and deeds of the Christ as the impelling motive for present Christian action. The writer is at pains to identify himself by recalling details of his past travels; a slightly nervous apologetic element creeps into his words here, something in complete contrast to the style of S. Paul.

One of his statements is particularly startling. Writing in defence of the reality of his apostleship the writer of the Pastorals assures his familiar colleague ἀλήθειαν λέγω οὐ ψεύδομαι. S. Paul certainly uses these words in solemn asseverations but surely Timothy is the one person to whom it is difficult to imagine that he could have made such a statement. Had he been a distant acquaintance or had he stood in a cold official relation to S. Paul he might have been addressed in such terms but it seems psychologically incredible that the Apostle wrote thus to his close companion and dear colleague. Is not this passage an example of a pseudonymous author's betrayal of his presence by using a characteristic Pauline expression in impossible circumstances?

- (1) I. Timothy II/7.
- (2) e.g. Romans IX/1.
- (3) P.N. Harrison, "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.
- (4) Was the writer wholly or partly ignorant of the circumstances related by S. Luke in Acts XVI/1-3?

There are also other incompatibilities. It is worthy of note that S. Paul does not usually mention the names of his theological opponents. They are indicated by such expressions as οἱ ταρασσόντες or their identity is concealed beneath the anonymity of φησί⁽¹⁾. It seems as if S. Paul forgot the heresiarch in combating the heresy, but in the Pastorals such names are freely given, Phygelus and Hermogenes, Hymenaeus and Philetus. The sinner is remembered as well as his sin. There seems once more to be a departure from the methods of S. Paul.

At times there is also a "prudential" atmosphere in the Pastorals in contrast with the bold offensive spirit of S. Paul. There is a certain nervousness in the author's attitude to the coming perils which he foretells. And how great the difference in the mental attitude expressed in the injunction to Timothy to keep that which is committed to his trust and in the charge to the Galatians to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free.

It is often argued that a comparative feebleness of language in the Pastorals is due to S. Paul's increasing years. In the Epistle to Philemon, at an earlier date, he had referred to himself as "Paul the aged", but that charming little letter shows no sign whatever of any declining powers. It is in fact full of a delicate social skill and is remarkable for an unusual

(1) Galatians I/7; II. Corinthians X/10.

(2) II. Timothy I/15, and II/17. The mention of Alexander in an acknowledged Pauline fragment, II. Timothy IV/14, is scarcely an exception, since he seems to owe his inclusion to the "testamentary" nature of S. Paul's farewell message. He is also mentioned with Hymenaeus in the non-Pauline passage I. Timothy I/20.

(3) e.g. I. Timothy VI/17-19.

(4) e.g. II. Timothy III/1-9.

(5) I. Timothy VI/20; Galatians V/1.

(6) Accepting the contention that the rendering "ambassador" does not seem quite appropriate to a private letter. (M. R. Vincent, "Philippians and Philemon", (I.C.C.), (1902), p. 184.

felicity of language. Men are moreover, most ready to call themselves aged when their inner conviction is that the description is still premature and inaccurate, and S. Paul was probably no exception to this general rule.

May it not be maintained that any comparative feebleness in the language of the Pastorals is more reasonably explained by a difference in authorship than by a decline in S. Paul's mental and bodily powers? A study of the revelation of personality made respectively in the ten accepted Epistles and in the Pastorals certainly lends some force to this question. And when this is added to evidence derived from other sources its influence becomes considerable.

It is now time to turn to the second question raised by the principles of Pauline criticism.

II. Do we discover in the Pastorals generally evidence of that elevation of thought and a corresponding grave dignity of expression which we have learned to associate with the Pauline writings?

Of some people it is said that they view everything, even the trivialities of daily life "sub specie aeternitatis", and it is often assumed, perhaps over readily, that this is an attitude to life which is incontestably worthy of commendation, perhaps even of imitation. It might be argued that a less consistently grave outlook would result in a better balanced human nature and that a wholesome attitude to life must pay attention to the whimsical and to the ephemeral as well as to the serious and the eternal.

But whatever our opinion of this grave outlook on life, there is no doubt that it sets a strong mark on certain personalities, among whom is S. Paul. We may therefore reasonably look for signs of it in the Pastorals if they are rightly to be attributed to the Apostle.

The Christian ministry is inevitably an important subject both in the Pastorals and in some of the ten Epistles. The treatment of a common subject in these two sets of documents fortunately provides an opportunity for ascertaining whether there is also an equal elevation of thought and expression in the treatment of it.

No one can read S. Paul's letters without realising that his ⁽¹⁾solemn commission to office derived from the experience of his conversion was to him supremely important and a source of spiritual strength and consolation. This naturally comes out strongly when his work is under severe criticism and he is personally attacked.

Writing to his friends in Corinth the Apostle does not hesitate even to compare his work to one aspect of the divine processes. God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, and S. Paul and Timothy are as it were God's ⁽²⁾ambassadors to whom it has been given the ministry of reconciliation. Such a lofty commission lays upon its recipients an almost overwhelming responsibility. The loftiest standards of conduct are required if the ministry is not to be vilified. A long list of essential spiritual qualities follows and the amazing experiences and the profound sufferings of the Apostle are recognised as being

(1) Acts IX/6, 15, 17. Cp. Galatians I/15-16.
 (2) II. Corinthians V/18-20, op. I/1.

more than worth while so long as they are part of the price paid for t h e
 faithful performance of the ministry conferred on him. He had already once
 (1)
 challenged the Corinthians in these bold words: "Let a man so account of us
 (2)
 as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." And the
 subsequent iniquities and misrepresentations which he had suffered only served
 to emphasise S.Paul's unswerving loyalty to this sublime conception of t h e
 ministry. He proclaims that the judgement of men upon his work matters little
 to him since the judgement ever before his mind is that of our Lord.

In the encyclical Epistle to the Ephesians when he writes of the wonderful
 revelation of God's purpose of uniting Jew and Gentile S.Paul spontaneously
 rejoices that he was given a share in the ministry charged with the duty of
 (3)
 preaching among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. And t h e
 splendour of the plan is matched by the rich variety of possible response by
 humanity - some are called to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists,
 some pastors and teachers. And in serving God in the ministry of the Church
 they are all to benefit mankind by promoting the perfecting of the saints till
 men find their testing and their full stature in a unity of faith in the Son
 (4)
 of God.

S.Paul thus appears as a man almost overwhelmed by the privilege and the
 responsibility attaching to the ministry to which he has been called. T h i s
 work is part of the very scheme of salvation and he will willingly endure all

(1) II. Corinthians VI/3-10.
 (2) I. Corinthians IV/1-3.
 (3) Ephesians III/2-8.
 (4) Ephesians IV/11-13.

things on its behalf. But it makes him happy too, for he is fulfilling his glorious destiny and quite naturally he bids his young friend Archippus, a t Colossae, give heed to his lofty calling and fulfil it to the uttermost. (1)

If we pass swiftly from these writings of S. Paul and read those considerable sections of the Pastorals which deal with the ministry of the Church we seem to pass from the rare atmosphere of a mount of Transfiguration to the mundane circumstances proper to the valleys at its foot. What a change it is to pass from reading the sublime conceptions of the ministry given us by S. Paul to the somewhat pedestrian directions about the qualifications for office and the style of life appropriate to bishops and deacons. These men are indeed bidden to strive after high moral standards and to conduct themselves with dignity and gravity. The deacons are reminded that the faithful performance of their work will bring them opportunities for wider service, and they and their families must conduct themselves with proper piety and sobriety. (2)

Similar directions are given for the Church in Crete. The Bishop's domestic life must be above reproach. He must be a man self-controlled and calm, not self-willed, neither over fond of drink or of money. His life must be a holy one and he is to be given to hospitality. The picture is one of a man of solid qualities, sound in life and doctrine, perhaps not one to take risks or to be adventurous but decidedly a man on whom others may depend. (3)

(1) Colossians IV/17.

(2) βαθμός (I. Timothy III/13) can refer to promotion to higher office. Both R. St John Parry and W. Lock in their commentaries prefer a less "material" conception (pp. 19-20 and 41 respectively) but when every allowance is made in this sense the use of βαθμός jars on an ear attuned to the language of S. Paul.

(3) Titus I/5-9.

But as we read on in the Pastorals we suddenly come upon two expressions which sound more like the earlier more exalted attitude of S. Paul to the ministry. He exhorts Timothy: "do the work of an Evangelist, (1) make full proof of thy ministry." A little further on with characteristic delicacy of feeling he cements his reconciliation with one who had once deserted him in these words: "Take Mark and bring him with thee: for he (2) is profitable to me for the ministry."

But the discovery of these words redolent of the earlier Epistles gives no support to belief that S. Paul is the author of the Pastorals for they both occur in a section which critics agree to be one of the genuine Pauline fragments incorporated in the Pastorals. They were indeed written by S. Paul, the critics would say, and you notice a contrast with the rest of the Pastorals precisely because the latter documents are for the most part written by someone else.

May we not then claim that the essentially mundane view of the ministry made possible by the Pastorals is an indication of their having been written by someone other than S. Paul? This verdict is based on the belief that at least in this part of the Pastorals the elevation of thought and expression characteristic of the Apostle seems to be lacking.

We now come to the question based upon the third principle of Pauline criticism:

(1) II. Timothy IV/5.

(2) II. Timothy IV/11.

III. Is the literary style of the Pastorals similar to that of the other letters of S. Paul, or does it diverge from it so widely as to suggest a plurality of authors?

Differences of literary style are always difficult to estimate in a convincing fashion because there is inevitably a large subjective element in any judgement formed on the subject. But opinions on literary style gain in weight when they are associated with a consideration of other factors involved. The different elements then reinforce one another to their mutual gain in strength and in the power to convince.

It must be acknowledged that even the style of the ten Epistles is by no means homogeneous. The Epistle to the Romans, for example, includes argument, exposition and appeal, each in varied form. S. Paul there seems sometimes to be addressing a group of people, at other times in the same letter to be appealing to an individual. And such variety of style can be found in many others of the ten Epistles. In fact, homogeneity of style may be said to be characteristic of the Pastorals in contrast with the constant and great variety to be seen in the style of the other groups.

No doubt it is true that the character of the recipients of letters often provides clues to variety in literary style. Dr St. John Parry argues that the encyclical character of the Epistle to the Ephesians accounts for a certain coldness and impersonality so different from the other Pauline Epistles. He then proceeds to defend the Pastorals urging that the different literary style seen in them is due to their being addressed to

(1) Cp. R. St John Parry, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), pp. CXI-CXIV.

(1)
 individuals. Moreover, as the recipients were close friends and disciples much could be taken for granted and mere allusions would convey that which ordinarily would have required explicit statement. These are among the factors which in Dr Parry's opinion explain the contrasts between the style of the Pastorals and that of the other Pauline letters.

But adaptation to the mind of their readers is instinctive in all who practice the literary art; it is part of the craft. This skill is repeatedly shown by S. Paul in all his writings. Doubtless there are special features in the Pastorals, but the same is true of the Major Epistles and of other letters too. This adaptation as seen in the Pastorals is thus a particular example of a general principle, not a phenomenon peculiar to three particular Epistles.

When every allowance has been made for a skilful writer's adaptation to the character of his prospective readers there must also be a residual constant element which expresses his own personality. In this a writer's style surely consists.

In S. Paul this setting of his own stamp upon his writing is clearly marked. The mention of his name in connexion with a given Epistle is enough to set us looking for signs of a certain quick instinctive response to circumstances, a sensitiveness to criticism or hostility, energy in the face of threat or danger, and above all, a tendency to swing off at a tangent in his torrential rush of thought. "The tangent pervades his writing."⁽²⁾

- (1) But J. Moffatt bluntly states: "The Pastorals are not private letters." ("Introduction to Literature of New Testament", (1918), p. 407). G.A. Deissmann calls them Epistles but considers that fragments of genuine letters of S. Paul may have been worked into them. ("Bible Studies", (1903), p. 54.)
- (2) T.R. Glover, "The Mind of S. Paul", Hertz Lecture, (1941), p. 14.

But these vivid characteristics of S. Paul seem to be dulled and subdued in the Pastorals. It cannot be said that there are no signs of the Apostle in these Epistles, but blurred outlines have taken the place of clearly defined personality, apprehensiveness has replaced audacity, a certain triviality of detail has taken the place of the broad sweeping principles of a master mind. It is specially significant that the paragraphs in the Pastorals which deal with the ministry, a central theme in these letters, show unmistakable signs of divergence from the standards characteristic of S. Paul.

It is indeed possible to trace resemblances between the style of the Pastorals and that of some of the less controversial and more practical sections of other Epistles. A tendency to adapt the language of the Old Testament, certain personal touches and the habit of basing practice on doctrine are common to the Pastorals and to some parts of Romans and Corinthians. But those features occur in the quieter sections which least suggest the character of S. Paul.

These however are minor details and their lesser defences seem repeatedly to be overwhelmed by the force of broad sweeping principles of criticism. In particular, differences of style support the contention, developed in this chapter, that the Pastorals betray a personality contrasting with that of S. Paul and a level of thought and dignity of expression inferior to his.

Support for this view is also offered by a special type of criticism which is based on literary criteria. Form Criticism depends largely on the sensitiveness of the critic's eye and ear to every refinement of literary style. And a great exponent of this type of criticism has passed this verdict on the

(1) W. Look, "The Pastoral Epistles", (I.C.C.), (1936), p. XXVIII.

Pastoral Epistles: "In my view the character of the language, which can only be demonstrated in the Greek text, is decisive for the unauthentic character of the Epistles."⁽¹⁾ ~~(2)~~

May we not pause for a moment at this point to claim that Pauline criticism of the Pastoral Epistles has shown a general tendency to reinforce the doubts about their authenticity which spring from the application to them of the general criticism of the New Testament? It remains to consider whether a third line of critical principles, those based upon what we have called the anatomy of language, serves to increase those doubts still further.

Justification for considering this anatomy of language as a critical principle comes from high authorities. Professor A.C.Clark lays it down that vocabulary inevitably owes some of its variations to change of subject-matter and that therefore too much importance should not be attached to Hapax Legomena. "The most valuable evidence is that furnished by the use of particles, prepositions, conjunctions and other small parts of speech - also by variations in the use of common words and in the choice between synonyms. Especial attention should be given to archaic idioms which tended to pass out of use in the KOIVH, but survived in elegant writers."⁽²⁾

The study of the anatomy of style is not at first sight an inviting one. Nearly 150 years ago Schleiermacher told the readers of his study of the First Epistle to Timothy that as the first course of their critical banquet

- (1) M.Dibelius "A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature", (1936), p.232. He had previously argued against the Pastorals, on grounds of vocabulary, in his commentary "Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus I,II, an Titus", (1913), pp. 134 etc.
- (2) A.C.Clark, "The Acts of the Apostles", (1933), p.395.

he had to offer them no piquant hors-d'oeuvre to whet their intellectual palate,
 (1)
 but a dry list of words. And Dr Harrison summarises his valuable study with an apology for having involved his disciples in the sifting of "many bushels of the dryest sand that ever drifted - collecting Particles, Prepositions, Hapax Legomena, passing these through a sieve - calculating percentages, poring over diagrams, and striving to wrest from arid pages of statistics their l o s t
 (2)
 secret."

Fortunately Dr Harrison has done his work so thoroughly that much of it has been generally accepted. But he has set us an example and has encouraged us to feel that the study of the anatomy of language derives a real value as well as some degree of interest from its power of reinforcing arguments of a character at once wider and more humane.

So we may ask whether an examination of the "skeleton" of the language of the Pauline Epistles suggests that there are fundamental differences of usage and structure underlying the more delicate and spiritual contrasts in style between the Pastorals and the other ten letters.

It is obvious that the whole evidence available on a given point must be considered and that discretion in its use is also required. For example, the need for a cautious use of statistical evidence is shown in the case of *νομος*. This word occurs 115 times in the ten Epistles and only twice in the Pastorals, but its distribution in the former group is very uneven. It is not found in the Thessalonian Epistles; in the Major Epistles it appears 111 times;

(1) Quoted by Dr P.N.Harrison in his "Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921), p.18.

(2) P.N.Harrison, *op.cit.*, p.135.

in the letters of the Imprisonment it makes only 4 appearances, and 2 in the Pastorals. This shows the importance of bearing in mind the fact that vocabulary (1) is inevitably largely dictated by the nature of the subject under consideration. But the evidence of the anatomy of language is distinctly valuable if it is used with a consciousness of its limitations. We may now turn to consider how far this line of study suggests similarity or contrast in the structure of the Pauline Epistles.

There is a marked difference in what we may call the "density" of vocabulary. This expression is used for the relation between the total number of words in a given letter and the number of distinct words, that is the relation between (2) volume and vocabulary. Thus I. Corinthians includes 6656 words and a total vocabulary of 933 words; this may be expressed roughly as a ratio of 7.1 : 1. So we may say that the density of the vocabulary of I. Corinthians is 7.1 : 1, it has one "new" word for every 7.1 words in its text. A comparison of all the (3) thirteen Epistles reveals that the Pastorals individually and as a group have the highest density of vocabulary. The figures are as follows:

I. Timothy 2.9 : 1
 II. Timothy 2.8 : 1
 Titus 2.2 : 1

The Epistle to Titus thus has a "new" word for every 2.2 words in its text.

The average densities of the four groups of Epistles also set the Pastorals apart as far the most richly endowed in respect of vocabulary.

(1) Cp. R. St John Parry, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), p. CXIV.

(2) Cp. Appendix B, p. 171.

(3) The whole of the figures will be found in Appendix B, p. 171. The Epistle to Philemon has the high density of 2.4 : 1, but its brevity greatly decreases the value of its statistical evidence. It offers too small a field of investigation.

The average density of the Thessalonian Epistles is	3.6 : 1
" " Major Epistles is	6.0 : 1
" " Epistles of the Imprisonment is	3.5 : 1
" " Pastoral Epistles is	2.6 : 1

Here then is a distinct contrast between the Pastorals and the other Epistles.

Again, there are marked differences among the Epistles in the relative densities of Hapax Legomena. This is a matter of importance because it is usually the starting point of criticism of the Pastorals from the standpoint of language.⁽¹⁾

Dr Harrison finds a first hint of the eventual solution of the problem of the Pastorals in a table of these words showing a constant gentle rise in their number corresponding roughly to the chronological order of the ten Pauline Epistles. A much higher figure distinguishes the Pastorals in this respect. The average number of Hapax Legomena on each page of Westcott and Hort's text ranges from 6.0 for I.Thessalonians to 11.2 for Philippians. The corresponding figures for the Pastorals are 20.1 for I.Timothy, 17.4 for II.Timothy, and 16.9 for Titus.⁽²⁾ It is thus obvious that the Hapax Legomena of the ten Epistles form one series, those of the Pastorals an entirely new one. Harrison's own comment is that "the ten Paulines are seen to form a distinct group by themselves. And the Pastorals stand right outside that group at such a distance as to create at once very serious doubts indeed, regarding the hypothesis of their common authorship with the rest."⁽³⁾

(1) Cp. Chapter IX "The Work of Dr P.N.Harrison", pp.113-114.

(2) Cp. Diagram II, p.23, in P.N.Harrison "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles", (1921).

(3) P.N.Harrison, op.cit., pp.23-24.

Another serious indictment is brought against the authenticity of the Pastorals on the ground of their neglect of many particles which appear constantly in the Epistles of S. Paul. The extent of this contrast is made clear in a diagram showing the use or neglect of 61 particles in common use. (1) Everyone of these is used in the four Major Epistles, 12 are missing from the Thessalonian letters and 6 from the Epistles of the Imprisonment. But when we turn to the Pastorals no less than 24 Pauline particles are missing.

The effect of this wide contrast in the use of particles is shown both by the proclamations of the critics and by the ingenuity of the defenders of the authenticity of the Pastorals. One critic declares that the contrast is "staggering", (2) another argues that many of the missing words are suited only to vividly dialectic or argumentative passages which abound in the four Major Epistles and occur less frequently in the other letters, and he declares that there is no significance in the absence of other particles. (3) No doubt there is some force in this contention, but when every allowance is made for this line of argument it can hardly be said to remove the sense of contrast in the use of these words which is strikingly apparent to every reader of the Pauline Epistles.

An attractive feature of the Greek language is its practice of linking one sentence to another, often by the precise, delicate, means of particles some of which defy translation into another language. But their presence is testimony to the Greek sense that language needs to possess "architectural "

(1) Appendix D, pp. 174-175.

(2) B.W. Bacon, "Introduction to the New Testament", (1902), p. 139.

(3) R. St John Parry, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), p. CXIV.

form as well as the power of clear expression. Even the opening sentence of a letter or a book is usually provided with a connective particle which, like a filmy tentacle, is ready to catch on to some idea already present in the reader's mind.

If we omit a few rare connectives, classifying them as merely "miscellaneous", there are 13 others used with the 1368 principal sentences of the thirteen Pauline letters. All of these appear in the Major Epistles, 5 are not found in the Thessalonian letters, 3 are missing from the Epistles of the Imprisonment, and 5 from the Pastorals.

And it must also be acknowledged that one of the details in which the KOINE is inferior to classical Greek is in its tendency to omit connectives from many sentences. This feature, known as asyndeton, is a marked characteristic of the Pastorals in contrast to most of the ten Epistles. More than 57% of the sentences in the Pastorals are left without any form of connective, whereas the Thessalonian letters show an average of only 30% of such sentences and the figure for the Major Epistles is about the same. There is thus a decided and abrupt rise in the percentages when we turn from the ten Epistles to the Pastorals.

(2)

St Paul uses the definite article freely, with infinitives, numerals, adverbs, participles, particles, and with whole clauses as well as with nouns. The Pastorals, on the other hand, use the definite article only with nouns,

(1) Colossians and Philemon form an anomalous case, their percentages being 61.5% and 64.5%. The figures for the Pastorals are I. Timothy 55.6%, II. Timothy 56.5%, Titus 59.3%. For details see Appendix E, p.176.

(2) For details see Appendix G, pp.178-179.

(3)

(1)
adverbs and participles; and are particularly lavish in their use of the definite article with the last of these. Once more there is seen a tendency for this fourth group to separate itself from the rest of the Pauline Epistles.

Again, there are a number of contrasts in vocabulary between the Pastorals and the other Epistles. (2) It is of course true that in a brilliant writer the last thing we should look for is consistency in his vocabulary. As has already been emphasised, no man uses all his vocabulary in even a series of writings and we cannot look for other uniformities of practice in a writer who, like S. Paul, is quick and sensitive to the challenge of other personalities and to variety of circumstances.

But when every allowance of this kind has been made we do find that a given writer unconsciously submits to certain laws of his own practice. He may vary his custom, and vary it with wide bounds, but there are certain limits which he does not usually overpass. Examples to the contrary may reasonably be treated as items in an indictment in a case of disputed authorship, and this of course applies to particularly marked deviations of the Pastorals from the other Epistles in matters of vocabulary.

No doubt variety of subject and readers may play a great part in determining vocabulary, but it is surprising to find that the idea of the Church as the Body of Christ is not found at all in the Pastorals. Indeed, the word $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ makes 90 appearances in the first three groups of Epistles and none in the fourth. And while we cannot expect even S. Paul continually to refer to the cross of

(1) A peculiarity which they share only with Colossians and Philemon.

(2) For a detailed analysis of vocabulary see Appendix L, pp.190-229.

Christ it is somewhat startling to find that while σκαυρός and its cognates appear 20 times in seven out of the ten Epistles it is entirely missing from the Pastorals.

Moreover, a considerable number of the favourite words of S. Paul disappear from the Pastorals, examples of this are ἀποθνήσκω, βλέπω, εὐαγγελίζομαι, καυχάομαι, πνευματικός, σοφός, χαίρω.

In a number of cases an expression characteristic of S. Paul is replaced by another, or it is retained but is slightly altered. Thus παράδοσις is replaced by παραθήκη. ὁ αἰὼν αὐτός becomes ὁ νῦν αἰὼν and for τύπος is substituted ὑποτύπωσις.

Peculiar phrases in the Pastorals suggest new lines of thought: εὐσεβῶς ζῆν διώκειν δικαιοσύνην, φυλάσσειν τὴν παραθήκην and many new terms are used with reference to heresies.

The Hapax Legomena have always been an "awkward boulder" in the path of defenders of the Pastorals and great ingenuity has been shown in efforts to overcome the difficulties caused by them. Dr Parry, for example, divides the words peculiar to the Pastorals into no less than eight classes and establishes his contention that at least some of them must be regarded simply as the results of the introduction of particular themes. Among these subjects are heresies, the Christian ministry, Church order and discipline. But these matters are not entirely peculiar to the Pastorals and while Dr Parry gives us a valuable caution, not to exaggerate the significance of the Hapax Legomena, it is not his purpose to deny them their proper critical significance.

(1) For more details see Appendix H, p.

(2) R. St John Parry, "The Pastoral Epistles", (1920), pp. CXXVIII-CXXVI.

Other attempts to reduce the significance of the Hapax Legomena in the Pastoral Epistles have been less impressive and less successful. Excessive ingenuity in this direction gives an impression of what we may perhaps call "linguistic casuistry", and that defeats its own end.

The evidence of the "anatomy" of language would not carry great weight by itself but its effects become impressive when they coincide with those produced by other lines of investigation. Moreover, they cover a wide field including the relative density of vocabulary and of Hapax Legomena, the methods whereby sentences are linked together, the use made of particles and of the definite article, and finally, the comparison of outstanding features of vocabulary.

We inherited from the general criticism of the New Testament certain doubts about the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Some of these arose from questions of their language.

Specific Pauline criticism added weight to those doubts by revealing evidence that the personality of the author of the Pastorals is not easily identified with that of S. Paul. And considerable contrast was discovered in the level of thought and dignity of expression seen in the ten Epistles and in the Pastorals respectively whenever the subject dealt with was the ministry of the Church. And similar differences can be observed with other subjects. Lastly, we have seen considerable contrasts in the literary style of the two sets of documents under consideration. The style of the ten Epistles is certainly not uniform, but the widest limits of its variation are consistently exceeded by the Pastorals.

(1) Cp. F.J. Badoock, "The Pauline Epistles etc", (1937), pp. 116-120.

And now an examination of the anatomy of language has revealed corresponding difficulties in accepting the belief that the Pastorals as a whole come to us from the pen of the writer of the ten generally accepted Pauline Epistles.

Our threefold types of critical principles appear to unite in establishing the authenticity of eight Epistles of S. Paul and the balance of evidence seems (1) to favour the addition of two more to this number.

But the case alters directly we seek to include the Pastorals in the Pauline canon. Two other types of evidence told against them and now a review of the anatomy of the language of the Pauline corpus has revealed considerable contrasts between the Pastorals and the accepted Epistles of S. Paul.

It remains now to summarise the effects of our evidence and to state a conclusion.

(1) Cp. Chapter VII, "Two Open Questions: Verdicts of "Acquittal" and of "Non-Proven", pp. 67-81.

Chapter XI.

Summary and Conclusion.

A final word must here be said to summarise the work embodied in this essay and to suggest the general verdict to which it points.

An effort is made to determine whether the evidence derived from a study of the language of the writings of S. Paul justifies the belief that he wrote the three Pastoral Epistles as well as the other ten letters in the New Testament which bear his name. (1)

General criticism of these documents has accepted eight Epistles definitely and the majority of scholars regard two more as being authentic. But most critics refuse to accept the three Pastorals as letters of S. Paul, though they acknowledge that genuine fragments of his work are included in the text of the Second Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus.

Differences in language play a large part in the objections raised to the Pastorals though many other types of evidence also tell against them. It seemed, therefore, that it might be a profitable exercise to examine the language of the Pauline documents in temporary isolation from other relevant considerations. It could then be observed whether the evidence derived from their language told on the whole in favour of a unity or a plurality of authorship. Language is, of course, regarded as including literary style as well as vocabulary and

(1) Only in the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews is S. Paul's name associated with that letter and the title is, of course, no part of the text.

grammar.

Literature is an expression of the human spirit and the way of the spirit is proverbially hard to determine. As a form of art literature is characterised by a certain delicacy and elusiveness. It cannot be weighed or measured since it is concerned not with quantities but with qualities. It calls for appreciation and appraisal, not for measurement.

Where then could we find in the language of the Pauline documents critical principles whereby to assay the comparative qualities of the Pastorals on the one hand, and of the other ten Epistles on the other hand? Fortunately there are outstanding characteristics of style in the latter group which may serve as principles of appraisal.

The strong personality of S. Paul leaves a deep impression on his authentic work. We are always aware of the man as well as of his message. Again, a certain unconscious grave dignity and elevation of thought is found in all his writings. And both these two factors, the personality and the thought of the Apostle, combine to produce a vivid and powerful literary style which we can safely regard as characteristic of S. Paul.

Does the application of these three critical principles tend to unite the Pastorals to the other ten letters or to separate them from them? It can hardly be denied that contrast and not similarity is the impression produced by a study of the personality of the author of the Pastorals, his levels of thought and his literary style.

So far the evidence of "Pauline" criticism thus reinforces the verdict of general criticism of the New Testament; it is unfavourable to the authenticity

of the Pastoral Epistles.

But can we find a third type of test for these documents? A study of the "anatomy" of style provides this reinforcement. The contemplation of the dry bones and sinews of language may involve the study of a very "cadaver" of language, but that may well provide clues as to the nature of the living body of literary style. Moreover, this furnishes an objective type of evidence which is of value as a check upon the accuracy of conclusions reached upon more subjective grounds. Here again the evidence of the range and number of the words employed, and various details of grammar such as the use of the definite article and of connectives, leaves on our minds a general impression that contrast prevails over resemblance whenever the Pastorals are compared with the other Pauline Epistles.

Great attention has been paid to the brilliant work of Dr P.N.Harrison who seems able to give a satisfactory account of what had been considered the "erratic boulders" of clear Pauline material incorporated in the Second Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. These blocks of material cannot be fitted into any one section of S.Paul's life, but Harrison meets this by a clever conjecture. He believes that a number of separate notes were copied somewhat fortuitously on to a single sheet of papyrus. By a brilliant piece of exegesis he then proceeds to identify each several piece of material and to attach it to its appropriate episode in the life of S.Paul.

Dr Harrison is conscious that this constructive section is the part of his work most open to attack since it includes a distinctly conjectural element.

(1)

But even conservative scholars pay tribute to the value of Harrison's general case built up as it is upon a careful analysis of the evidence of language. It must be emphasised that Harrison's verdict is completely unfavourable to the theory that S. Paul can have written the Pastorals. In his view they were written by someone else in a period after his death. The same evidence of language which tends to separate the Pastorals from the other letters of S. Paul tends equally clearly to attach them, in a relation of literary kinship, to certain Christian writings of the earlier part of the second century.

What exactly then is the conclusion at which we arrive after a study of the language of the Pauline Epistles considered in its bearing on the possible Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles? Surely the verdict is that, while no single item of the evidence is altogether convincing when taken by itself, the convergence of three sets of critical principles gains a cumulative force from their number and their variety. General criticism of the New Testament, "Pauline" criticism and a study of the "anatomy" of language are at one in suggesting that contrast rather than similarity is the proper description of the relations existing between the language of the Pastorals and that of the other ten Epistles.

In fact a study of the linguistic aspects of the Pastoral Epistles seems to reinforce the objections raised against their authenticity by general criticism of the New Testament. The results obtained seem scarcely to call for formal

(1) e.g. W. Lock, "The Pastoral Epistles", (I.C.C.), (1936), p. XXIX.

correlation, they dovetail one into another. The whole effect of a study of the language of the Pauline writings is to make it harder than ever to believe that the Pastoral Epistles come to us from the pen of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

THE END.