Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

E. Earle Ellis, "The Authorship of the Pastorals: Recent Trends," The Evangelical Quarterly 32.3 (1960): 151-161.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PASTORALS :

A Résumé and Assessment of Current Trends

by E. EARLE ELLIS

THERE was a time, not so long ago, when in many circles the case against the direct Pauline authorship of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus appeared to be so clearcut as no longer to require detailed argument. More recently, however, the question has been reopened by several New Testament scholars, and it is useful to have such a survey of the position today as Professor Earle Ellis provides in the following pages.

I

SINCE the eighteenth century, the letters to Timothy, along with Titus, have been designated the "Pastoral" Epistles in recognition of their distinct character and content. Such is their similarity that, with minor exceptions, the consensus of opinion has been that in the question of genuineness the three epistles stand or fall together. Introduced with the familiar phrase, "Paul an apostle of Christ Jesus," they give a *prima facie* claim to be written by the great apostle to the Gentiles. And from the second to the nineteenth century they were, without exception, so regarded. It is true that Marcion's abbreviated canon (*c.* A.D. 140) did omit them, most likely because they were private rather than church letters or (as his other omissions) because of doctrinal reasons. Also, one Pauline codex (P. 46) may have lacked them. But, on the whole, the witness of the patristic period is as strong as for the other Paulines with the exception of Romans and 1 Corinthians. Modern criticism has rested its case almost altogether upon other grounds. If evidence external to the letters were the only criterion no serious question ever would have been lodged against them.

The genuineness of the Pastorals was first questioned by Schmidt (1805), Schleiermacher (1807), and Eichhorn (1812) for stylistic and linguistic reasons. The spread through Germany and Holland of this type of criticism, which sought to determine authenticity on philological grounds, resulted in the rejection of

most of Paul's letters in the succeeding decades. Some scholars, discounting all of them, regarded even Paul himself as a figment of second-century imagination. The argument against the Pastorals was definitively stated in a German commentary by H. J. Holtzmann (1880), and this continues to be the standard frame of reference for the non-Pauline point of view. During this period most Anglo-American scholars, guided perhaps by Lightfoot's essay,[1] regarded the epistles as Pauline. Not until Harrison's critique (1921) of the language and style did the pendulum swing the other way. In the receding tide of radical criticism since the turn of the century only the Pastorals, the first to be questioned, are still held to be spurious by most students; and even here there are signs of a growing dissatisfaction with the methods and conclusions of the older criticism.

On the present scene four positions have commanded a significant following, including the assent and espousal of notable critical scholars. (1) Some continue to view the Pastorals as second-century writings with no Pauline content except that which has filtered through the mind of an unknown disciple imitating his master.[2] (2) In more favour — and probably the most popular viewpoint — are those who consider a number of verses to be genuine Pauline fragments but conclude that the major content is from the hand of an early second-century Paulinist.[3] (3) Still closer to the traditional estimate are a number of writers who account for the stylistic differences in the Pastorals by positing Paul's use of an amanuensis or secretary; the content of the letters, however, is genuinely Pauline.[4] (4) Finally, a small group argue anew that any changes in style and content may be adequately accounted for within the framework of a direct dictation by the apostle.[5]

II

Objections to the Paulinity of the Pastorals have focused upon

[1] J. B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays* (London, 1904), pp. 397-410.

[2] E.g., H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (Leipzig, 1880); M. Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (Tuebingen, 1931), p. 6.

[3] E.g., P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1921); B. S. Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New York, 1947); E. F. Scott, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1948), p. xxii.

[4] E.g., O. Roller, *Das Formular des paulinischen Briefe* (Stuttgart, 1933); J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (Goettingen, 1947); P. Feine & J. Behm, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig, 1950).

[5] E.g., G. Thoernell, *Pastoralbrevens aekthet* (Goeteborg, 1931); F. Torm, *Die Psychologie der Pseudonymität im Hinblick auf die Literatur*

[Continued at foot of next page

(1) the historical situation, (2) the type of false teaching condemned, (3) the stage of church organization, (4) the vocabulary and style, and (5) the theological viewpoint of the letters. The historical allusions are not numerous. In 1 Timothy (1 : 3) Paul recently had made a trip from Ephesus to Macedonia. Titus (1 : 5; 3 : 12f.) reveals that, having been in Crete, he was acquainted with the problems there; he was soon to be at Nicopolis, a city northwest of Corinth, where he desired Titus to meet him. Tychicus and Apollos, with whom Paul had been associated during the Ephesian ministry (Acts 19 : 1ff.; 1 Cor. 16 : 12; Acts 20 : 4; cf. Eph. 6: 21 ; Col. 4: 7), are mentioned. While 1 Timothy and Titus have, on the face of it, a provenance of Achaia or Macedonia, 2 Timothy (1 : 17) is written from prison, presumably in Rome, to the Aegean area from which Paul recently had come (cf. 2 Tim. 4 : 11f., 19).

Two factors in the historical situation weighed against the authenticity of the epistles in the minds of the earlier critics. (1) They despaired of fitting the experiences into the narrative of Acts and (2) some events appeared actually to be in conflict with or an imitation of the Lucan material. For example, Acts (20 : 1, 3f.; cf. 19: 22) knows only two trips to Macedonia after the Ephesian ministry, and in neither is Timothy said to be left behind in Ephesus (I Tim. 1 : 3). There is no mention of a mission to Crete which Titus (1 : 5) presupposes. Further, the attestation of a release from the imprisonment of Acts 28 is late and hazardous to use as a setting for the Pastorals. Even if such a release is accepted, the epistles themselves appear to be a faulty imitation of Acts, citing the same cities and friends of the earlier mission.

In the positive criticism of the Tübingen School the heresies condemned in the Pastorals were identified with a second-century Gnosticism, and their true historical setting was thereby to be obtained. The church organization too was thought to reflect a type of monarchical episcopate which could not have developed in the the apostolic age. The criticisms which have been most effective in recent years relate to the language and style of the

des Urchristentums (Guetersloh, 1932) ; A. Schlatter, *Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus* (Stuttgart, 1936) ; *The Church in the New Testament Period* (London, 1955) ; W. Michaelis, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Bern, 1946) ; cf. J. de Zwaan, *Inleiding tot het Nieuwe Testament* (Haarlem, 1948) ; S. Lyonnet, "De arte litteras exarandi apud Antiquos", *Verbum Domini* 34 (1956), 3-11 ; D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids, 1957).

letters and to their theological concepts. It is not merely the large number of words lacking elsewhere in Paul: even known words often are used with a different significance, structure, and frequency. For example, "faith", which elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, signifies "trust", means in the Pastorals a body of doctrine (1 Tim. 4 : 6; Tit. 1 : 13). Good works are given a centrality unlike the writer of Galatians and Romans. Here we have, says Dibelius, a Christianity of orthodoxy and good works; and in similar vein James Denney writes, "Saint Paul was inspired, but the writer of these epistles is sometimes only orthodox."[6]

III

In recent years changing tides and countercurrents in New Testament critical studies have cast the "Pastoral Problem" in a different light. The considered opinion of so notable a scholar as W. F. Albright that "there is no longer any concrete evidence for dating a single New Testament book after the seventies or eighties of the first century"[7] flies in the face of much that has been asserted about these epistles. Bo Reicke's argument[8] that the organization of the early church, like the Jewish groups from which it sprang, was a complex structure from the beginning undermines from a new quarter the view that the "developed" ecclesiology of the Pastorals reflect a post-apostolic period. Harrison's "word statistics," long a pillar in the case against genuineness, have been subjected by Professor Metzger to sharp and telling criticisms.[9] Finally, in the light of the sketchiness of the Book of Acts[10] the *a priori* assumption that it can be used as a touchstone for Paul's life history falls considerably short of a "first principle" for critical studies.

According to Acts, Paul spent between five and six years in the Aegean area (*c.* A.D. 51-56), most of it in Ephesus and Corinth. Acts mentions only a trip to Jerusalem following the first sojourn in Corinth and the trip to Greece preceding his final

[6] Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 3; J. Denney, *The Death of Christ* (London, 1902), pp. 202 f.

[7] W. F. Albright, "Return to Biblical Theology", *The Christian Century*, lxxv (1958), 1330.

[8] Bo Reicke, "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents", *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York, 1957), pp. 143-156.

[9] B. M. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles", *The Expository Times*, lxx (1958-59), 91-94.

[10] Cf. G. S. Duncan, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (New York, 1930), pp. 95-107.

visit and arrest in Jerusalem. But from the Corinthian and "Captivity" letters other trips are to be inferred. The whole province of Asia was evangelized (Acts 19 : 10), and it is most natural to suppose that not only the work in the Lycus Valley but also missions (or embassies) to Crete and Nicopolis occurred during this period (cf. Tit. 1: 5 ; 3: 12).

It is more difficult to date the letters themselves during the Aegean ministry. One need not interpret Luke's phrase, "day and night" (Acts 20 : 31), in literalist fashion, but is there room for a winter at Nicopolis (Tit. 3 : 12)? And the detailed instructions of 1 Timothy indicate more than a temporary absence from Asia. The implication in 2 Timothy (4 : 13, 20) that Paul recently had been in the East does not fit the framework of Acts (21 : 29; 24 : 27; 28 : 30). It is not impossible to place 1 Timothy and Titus in the period following Paul's final departure from Ephesus (Acts 20:1) as Duncan tentatively suggests.[11] But the traditional post-Acts dating of all three letters is more probable, and most critical questions have been addressed to this view.

The abrupt close of Acts has been understood by some to indicate the release of Paul, by others his immediate martyrdom; either view seems more supported by the particular writer's mood than by any persuasive inference from the text. The tradition of a release, which is attested at least by A.D. 170-190 [12] (1 Clement 5 : 5-7 is uncertain), is not of the highest evidential value; but to discount it as imaginary reflection on Romans 15 : 24, as Harrison does,[13] is simply second guessing. If released, would Paul have journeyed east to the same Aegean cities, with the same associates, and in similar circumstances? Harrison answers, "impossible repetition"; Guthrie replies, "more surprising if otherwise."[14] As the above discussion indicates, the historical situation presupposed by the letters poses some questions whose answers must remain problematical. The questions are not, in and of themselves, such as to raise serious doubt; and in the case against genuineness this argument bears at best only a supporting role.

The type of false teaching and the stage of church organization, in past years strong arguments against the Pastorals, have less weight today. Baur's identification of the heresy with second century Gnosticism is now generally recognized to be mistaken,

[11] G. S. Duncan, "Paul's Ministry in Asia—The Last Phase", *New Testament Studies* 3 (1956-7), 211-218.

[12] The Muratorian Canon ; The Acts of Peter III.

[13] Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 111 ; Guthrie, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

and even Dibelius[15] concedes that this argument can no longer be used to show the spuriousness of the letters. Actually the error seems to reflect a gnosticizing Judaism (cf. 1 Tim. 1 : 7; Tit. 1 : 10, 14 f.; 3 : 9) not unlike that in Colossians (2 : 16 ff.). R. McL. Wilson's[16] recent study has shown that these tendencies were wide-spread in the Jewish *diaspora* of the first century; and according to Albright, "Gnosticism had already developed some of its most pronounced sects well before the Fall of Jerusalem."[17] If Zahn's[18] older (but relevant) appraisal is accepted, there is nothing resembling this Jewish heresy in the post-apostolic period.

Heretical tendencies and movements were present from the beginning in the Pauline churches. If one assumes the early date of Galatians, churches of that area were infected with the Judaizing heresy within months of their founding. Scarcely had the echoes of the apostle's voice died away when some at Thessalonica went astray in a false teaching akin to that mentioned in 2 Tim. 2 : 18 (cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 2). The heresy in Colossae made serious inroads within a very few years. Even when Paul was present in Ephesus some professing Christians continued their "magical arts," and as he left, he feared that the wolves were ready to pounce (Acts 19 : 18f.; 20 : 29f.). Considering the type of heresy revealed in the Pastorals and the character of the apostolic age, it is quite gratuitous to interpret this apostasy as a gradual departure of long established churches.

The church organization of 1 Timothy (3: 1 ff.) and Titus (1: 5 ff.) refers to the offices of bishop, elder, and deacons ; the first two terms appear to be used interchangeably as they are in Acts (20: 17, 28; cf. Tit. 1: 5, 7). There is also an official 'service order' of widows. This function is not specifically mentioned elsewhere in the apostolic literature although it may possibly be inferred from such passages as Acts 6 : 1; 9 : 39, 41 (cf. Luke 2 : 37). The reference to bishops and deacons in Phil. 1:1 (cf. 1 Thess. 5 : 12) corroborates the evidence in Acts (14 : 23; 20 : 17, 28) that the officers of Pauline churches were not unlike those mentioned in the Pastorals. Of course one can, as Easton does,[19] simply excise

[15] Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[16] R. McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem* (London, 1958), pp. 74, 176.

[17] W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John", *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies (Cambridge, 1956), p. 163.

[18] T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1953 [1909]), II, 115.

[19] Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

as "anachronisms" those portions of Acts which counter his theory; but this procedure can hardly yield a satisfactory solution. Some remain convinced that the singular "bishop" (1 Tim. 3 : 2), the ban on "neophytes" holding office (1 Tim. 3 : 6), and the local leaders' function as tradition-bearers (2 Tim. 2 : 2; Tit. 1 : 9) witness to a second-century monarchical episcopate. But in the light of 1 Tim. 5 : 17 the singular "bishop" probably should be interpreted as a generic term, [20] and 1 Tim. 3 : 6 would apply to any church over a few years old. Nor does the idea of local leaders as tradition-bearers require a post-apostolic setting. Cullmann's essay, "The Tradition,"[21] once more has pointed out that 'tradition' was not something which succeeded 'charismatic gifts' in the Church; both were present in the earliest period as co-ordinate functions. It would be quite fitting for the apostle at the close of life to make such provisions as are indicated in the Pastorals. In view of Professor Reicke's article mentioned above, it is no longer adequate to view ecclesiastical organization of the early Church as an unilinear development from democracy to episcopate; there seems to be no strong 'ecclesiastical' argument forbidding an early date to these letters. Michaelis[22] is convinced, rather, that the omission of certain questions (e.g., baptismal practices, the observance of the Lord's Supper) important for the Church in the post-apostolic times is an argument for a date consistent with genuineness.

In the rising cloud of doubt overshadowing earlier reconstructions, the arguments of 'language and style' and 'theological concepts' have continued to jut out in the minds of most students as clear and present obstacles to a verdict of genuineness. Harrison, whose *Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* has been most influential in Anglo-American scholarship, based his case against genuineness quite squarely upon language and style. (1) Of some 848 words in the three letters, 306 are not found elsewhere in the Pauline literature, (2) 175 in no other New Testament writing. (3) Many words and phrases characteristic of the apostle are missing (e.g. the righteousness of God, the body of Christ), and (4) the grammar and style of the letters varies considerably from the other Paulines. Moreover, (5) some sixty of the 175 Hapaxes (words found only in the Pastorals) occur in the second-century Fathers.

Although Harrison's arguments were for the most part favour-

[20] Cf. Michaelis, *op. cit.*, p. 254.
[21] O. Cullmann, *The Early Church* (London, 1956), pp. 59-99.
[22] Michaelis, *op. cit.*, pp. 254 f.

ably received in the English speaking world, they found a different reception on the Continent. Dibelius,[23] no friend to Pauline authorship, questioned the adequacy of the statistical method as an argument against authenticity. Michaelis,[24] in a well-reasoned critique, argued that Harrison produced the results he did simply because his faulty and arbitrary methodology demanded those results. For example, Harrison found an excessively high number of 'Hapaxes per page' in the Pastorals; but he neglected to mention that these letters have a high total number of 'words per page'; and that in proportion to 'words per book' the percentage of Hapaxes in the Pastorals was not greatly different from other Pauline letters. In Britain, Montgomery Hitchcock[25] made the rather embarrassing discovery that the vocabulary of second-century writings shows a closer relationship to I Corinthians (and to Colossians and Ephesians for that matter) than to the Pastorals. Most recently Donald Guthrie, in a "penetrating critique of Harrison's linguistic argument"[26] sums up the latter's grammatical and stylistic conclusions : "The same arguments could equally well prove the non-Pauline character of undisputed Pauline epistles, and secondly ... these statistics take no account of mood and purpose."[27] Professor Bruce Metzger[28] has called attention to a volume by a professional statistician which, if its results are accepted, has serious consequences for Harrison's whole hypothesis. The Cambridge professor,[29] after careful investigation into the use of vocabulary-style comparisons to determine authorship, concludes that to obtain reliable data the treatise under study must be at least 10,000 words long. The Pastorals fall far short of this minimum.

Some 25 years ago Otto Roller investigated the nature and practice of letter writing in the Roman world and gave birth to a new hypothesis. He found that an author often employed an amanuensis who was given a variable degree of freedom in composing the final document from dictated notes. The author then corrected it and added a closing greeting (cf. Gal. 6 : 16). If

[23] Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[24] W. Michaelis, "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 28 (1929), 69 ff.

[25] F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Tests for the Pastorals", *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxx (1928-29), 279.

[26] Metzger, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[27] Guthrie, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

[28] Metzger, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[29] G. U. Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary* (Cambridge, 1944).

Paul employed a trusted amanuensis in writing the Pastorals (the affinity with the language of Luke has long been noted), this 'secretary hypothesis' may be the answer to the stylistic peculiarities found there. It has proved persuasive to some writers (e.g. Jeremias, Behm) although others (e.g., Michaelis) contend that Paul's unique style elsewhere indicates a direct dictation and that the style of the Pastorals may be fully accounted for within this framework. In any case, this hypothesis is free from some of the disabilities of the 'fragment theory,' and it seeks to found itself in known literary habits of the first-century world.

The major theological concepts of the letters are recognized by all to be 'Pauline', and those rejecting their genuineness posit a devoted disciple as the author. The writer "declares that Christ gave himself for our redemption, that we are justified not by our own righteousness but by faith in Christ, that God called us by his grace before the world was, and that we are destined to an eternal life on which we can enter even now. These are no mere perfunctory echoes of Pauline thought" (cf. 1 Tim. 6 : 11ff.; 3 : 16; 2 Tim. 1: 8ff.; 2: 11ff.; Tit. 2: 11ff.; 3: 5).[30] The personal references also appear to be of Pauline coinage (cf. 1 Tim. 1 : 12ff.; 2 : 7; 2 Tim. 1 : 3ff.; 2 : 8ff.; 4 : 6ff., 17f.), as are the teaching on baptism (Tit. 3 : 5-7; cf. Eph. 5 : 26) and the state (Tit. 3 : 1; 1 Tim. 2:1ff.; cf. Rom. 13:1ff.). The absence of the 'body' concept (in its theological significance also lacking in Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians) is thought by Robinson[31] to be decisive against Pauline authorship; but the presence of the intimately related 'Temple typology' would seem to weaken any argument of this sort (1 Tim. 1 : 4mg.; 3 : 15; 5 : 4; 2 Tim. 2 : 19; cf. John 2 : 20f.; 1 Cor. 3 : 16f.; 2 Cor. 6 ; 16; Eph. 2 : 19ff.).

Different concepts occur mainly in the use of terms not found in Paul and the absence of others characteristic of the apostle. For example, God pictured as Saviour, the Immortal One, Light (1 Tim. 1 : 17; 2 : 3; 4 : 10; 6 : 16; Tit. 2 : 13) reflects Hellenistic cultic terminology as does the use of 'appearing' for Christ's incarnation and *parousia* (1 Tim. 6 : 14; 2 Tim. 1 : 10; Tit. 2 : 13; cf. 2 Cor. 4 : 10; Col. 3 : 4; 2 Thess. 2 : 8; 1 Peter 5 : 4; 1 John 2 : 28; 3 : 2). Behm and Guthrie, who examine the doctrinal question in some detail, rightly emphasize that the terms used cannot be divorced from the subject-matter and purpose of the letters (e.g., combating Gnostic influences). As Colossians and

[30] Scott, *op. cit.*, p. xxx.
[31] J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (London, 1952), p. 10.

Ephesians show, this would not be the first time that Paul had turned the religious vocabulary of his opponents against them. If the Pastorals speak of the Law as good (1 Tim. 1 : 8; cf. Rom. 7 : 12ff.) or stress good works (1 Tim. 2 : 10; 5 : 10; 2 Tim. 2 : 21; 3 : 17; Tit. 2 : 14; cf. Rom. 2 : 7; 2 Cor. 5 : 10; 9 : 8; Eph. 2 : 10; 3 : 23ff.; 2 Thess. 2: 17) or equate faith with orthodox doctrine (1 Tim. 3: 9; 4: 1, 6; 5: 8; 2 Tim. 3: 8; Tit. 1: 13; cf. Rom. 16 : 17; Gal. 1 : 23; Eph. 4 : 5; Phil. 1 : 27; Col. 2 : 7) or stress the preservation of tradition (1 Tim. 6 : 20; 2 Tim. 1:12, 14; 2 : 2; cf. 1 Cor. 11 : 2, 23; 15 : 3; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6), they may not be entirely in accord with the emphases of the other Paulines; but neither is there an incredible contrast. In attempting to restrict genuine Pauline thought patterns to the emphases of the *Hauptbriefe* we may be influenced more then we realize by the ghosts of the Tübingen School. Certainly, good works are viewed not as in the later 'merit' theology but, as in Paul, to show forth the genuineness of one's faith (cf. 2 Tim. 1 : 9; Tit. 3 : 5; cf. also 2 Tim. 2 : 19 with Phil. 2 : 12f.). The Pauline concept of faith as trust or belief is also present (cf. 1 Tim. 1: 5, 14; 2: 15; cf. Col. 1 : 23; 2 Tim. 1 : 5; 3 :15); and although the Holy Spirit is mentioned only infrequently, he is named in Colossians (1 : 8) and 2 Thessalonians (2 : 13) only once and in Philemon not at all. All in all, the problem of theological peculiarities may be stated in one question : Are the divergencies so great that they cannot reasonably be explained as the product of the mind of Paul? Perhaps the balance of authority still answers yes. There is, however, a growing negative opionion which is persuaded otherwise.

There are problems involved in accepting the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral epistles. Within the framework of a 'secretary hypothesis' some of these are alleviated, although variations in theological emphasis and expression remain. On the other hand one wonders if the advocates of the 'fragment theory' and the 'later Paulinist theory', in dethroning the tradition, have fully faced the problems besetting their own views.[32] It is difficult to understand why the Pastorals should be so superior to other second-century pseudepigrapha. What motivated just these letters of just this type to just these recipients? If from Pauline fragments, how and why were the fragments preserved? — they appear to have no coherence. How could such a hodge-podge be so smoothly integrated into the letters that even now there is no agreed identification of the fragments ? Is there any parallel

[32] Cf. Guthrie, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 f., 44, 49 ff.

elsewhere in the patristic Church for fragments being so utilized ? What is the genius of the Paulinist which enables him to portray so precisely the psychological traits of advancing age?[33] Hypothetical answers to these questions come easily — perhaps too easily. For many inquirers the questions remain unanswered.

A final problem for those rejecting the Pastorals is the question of pseudepigrapha itself. One cannot, of course, place, any blanket condemnation over pseudepigrapha as a proper literary form. But Torm, one of the few writing at length on this question, reminds us that the question cannot be ignored. Certainly a 'pious fraud,' produced to invoke apostolic authority upon the views of a later writer, raises ethical questions; fragments gathered and expanded to express the apostle's thought would be nearer the line of ethical propriety. The deposing of the Asian elder for his innocent romance of *Paul and Thecla*, the emphasis upon emphasis upon apostolicity as a trest for canonicity, and the mass of rejected 'apocryphal New Testament' literature suggest that the patristic Church was not nearly so bland towards the ethics of pseudepigrapha as some modern writers have supposed. Any final conclusion that the Pastorals are pseudonymous must face anew the propriety of their canonicity. This is not an improper question; in fact, as Professor Filson admonishes us,[34] it is always the Church's duty to re examine its heritage. But it is not a question that those rejecting Pauline authorship can lightly dismiss or brush aside.

It is not likely that the question of authorship of the Pastorals will find a unanimous answer in the near future. Among those favouring their genuineness are scholars representing a considerable variation of theological viewpoint: Zahn (1906), Torm (1932), Thoernell (1933), Schlatter (1936), Michaelis (1946), Spicq (1947), Behm (1948), de Zwaan (1948), Jeremias (1953), Simpson (1954), and Guthrie (1957). For a minority report this roster is not unimpressive and, if a conjecture is to be made, it may be that the future trend will lie in their direction.

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Louisville, Kentucky.

[33] Cf. C. Spicq, *Les épîtres pastorales* (Paris, 1947), pp. lxxxix ff.
[34] F. V. Filson, *Which Books Belong in the Bible?* (Philadelphia, 1957), pp. 131 ff.