

The Evangelical Quarterly

OCTOBER 15th, 1940

THE AUTHENTICITY AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

I

THE spell cast by Saul of Tarsus over minds of any moral earnestness admits of no question. Unlike his namesake, the first king of Israel, he was shortish of stature. Chrysostom styles him ὁ τρίτηχτος ἄνθρωπος, and Augustine, playing on his Roman cognomen, *paullum modicum quid*; but the extent of the shadow he has spread over posterity bears witness to the bulk of his spiritual build. Indeed, his most ardent admirers do not pay him more signal homage in this respect than those detractors from his just fame who ascribe to his influence an age-long perversion of primitive Christianity so entire as to set him at cross-purposes with his Master. Such a man's career throbs with interest to all serious thinkers.

That career, as we all know, bisects itself into two wholly discrepant halves. To explain how the hunting leopard of Pharisaism came to be transformed into one of the Good Shepherd's most docile lambs has always baffled sceptical ingenuity. The change of front is so utter, and pregnant with such far-reaching issues, that it positively demands the supernatural cause which he himself assigns for it to render the phenomenon intelligible.

But our theme restricts us to those closing days of this marvellous biography about which, strange to say, we know less than about the rest. Whatever be the verdict we pass on the Pastoral Epistles, it cannot be denied that they form a group by themselves, detached from the residue of Paul's writings and attached to one another by links of their own. Some of the older commentators, in common with Wieseler, a German theologian of the last century, have sought to isolate

Titus and the first epistle to Timothy from its twin brother, and affix on them a date prior to what are known as the "Prison Epistles". They seem to have thought that on any other supposition the apparent references to a revisit of Paul to Ephesus clashed with his declaration in Acts xx to the elders at Miletus that they should "see his face no more". But there are two or three ways of parrying this over-hasty conclusion. The expression *I know* which he there uses does not seem to imply prophetic foresight, inasmuch as Paul employs the selfsame phrase in *Philippians* (i. 25) in regard to the presentiment he had that he would regain his liberty. And in view of the unusual order of the words *ὑμεῖς πάντες*, in Acts xx. 25, placed last in the sentence, it would be possible to argue that the apostle is preparing them for the long duration of his absence by the statement, "*ye shall see my face no more*, that is to say, *all of you* will not, because of the manifold changes that will inevitably intervene". Nor is it quite certain that 1 Timothy predicates a later sojourn in Ephesus; for the two passages (i. 3; iii. 14) concerned can be otherwise explained. Miletus is the only spot thereabouts where we are sure that he had again set foot (2 Tim. iv. 20).

It is the common diction and outlook of these Epistles that militates fatally against any hypothesis that parts them asunder. They cleave together inextricably. Nor can any dexterity fit their contents into the framework of the narrative in *Acts*. The Church catholic has ranked them among her sacred writings, thus ratifying their apostolical origin; and that act involves a tacit persuasion that the Gentile apostle enjoyed a period of missionary activity posterior to the date at which Luke's narrative closes. *His* trustworthiness has been abundantly vindicated in recent years, and it is the loss of his invaluable aid in tracing the story of the early Church that leaves the final stage of Paul's labours under a veil of obscurity. Are the Pastoral Epistles not meant to fill the gap? Do they not yield us first-hand evidence on the point? Does he not himself here enter the witness-box to supplement the else unfinished tale? We think he does.

We grant, however, that the negative school of critics can make out a considerably more plausible case for their assault on these Letters than when they impugn the genuineness, for example, of the Fourth Gospel. For the vocabulary varies a good

deal from the earlier Pauline models, and the style, notably in 1 Timothy, wears a looser texture. Not that we meet with anything incompatible with Paul's authorship. All we are conscious of is less intensity of current and volume of flow, and a more circumscribed orbit of expatiation than aforesaid. In short, these documents exhibit a less majestic and commanding phase of the apostle's genius than that which storms our hearts in the sublimer and more towering flights of this celestial aeronaut.

But that is not the whole of the story. To correct our first impression, we need only note the unabated fervour they occasionally breathe, and the positive evidence forthcoming on their behalf. For they are not newly discovered papyri, without historical pedigree. Before a structure is condemned as unsound, the edifice ought to be inspected both without and within. Let us then first of all test the Pastoral fabric externally. We find it buttressed by a body of patristic testimony more substantial than we could have anticipated.¹

II

1. The second century witness to *the presence and familiarity* of the Pastorals possesses a cumulative force, even if one or two of its items should be called in question. We encounter an apparent acquaintance with them, ere the close of the first century, in Clement of Rome; for he employs the striking phrase "King of the Ages", and an expression, "ready unto every good work", which is thrice repeated in these Epistles and nowhere beside; also the expressions "serving with a pure conscience" and "lifting to Him holy hands". Both Polycarp and Ignatius stigmatize love of money as the root of all ills. Possibly the saying was proverbial, but it is likelier to be a reminiscence of *Timothy*. For Polycarp also calls Christ our Hope, and admonishes deacons not to be slanderers nor double-tongued. Justin Martyr is quoted by Eusebius, himself, of course, a voucher for the canonicity of the Pastorals, as using the unique locution "the mystery of godliness", and Hegesippus as speaking of "knowledge falsely so called"; and Clement of Alexandria cites from Heracleon, gnostic though he was, the dictum "He cannot deny Himself". Justin furthermore borrows from *Timothy* the expression τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα

¹ See the evidence marshalled in James's book, *The Pastoral Epistles*.

(1 Timothy iv. 1) and from *Titus* ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία θεοῦ (*Titus* iii. 4). Theophilus of Antioch inculcates prayers for rulers, "that we may lead a quiet life", and Irenaeus excerpts several Pastoral phrases and explicitly alludes to Paul's *letters* (in the plural) to Timothy. Moreover, the Muratorian Canon recognises them as Pauline and canonical. Their validity underlies the common ascription of 13 epistles to the apostle; nor do we hear of any dispute concerning them such as gathered round *Hebrews*. If Marcion is reported to have rejected them, and Tatian to have followed suit, with a reservation in favour of *Titus*, the reason is not far to seek. The matter of importance is that these awards were deemed subjective eccentricities by the Church catholic.

2. There is a second line of testification to them of a more indirect kind. The supposition of a *second Roman imprisonment* of St. Paul entwines itself with the question of their authenticity; and that supposition gains definite support from patristic sources, whilst of evidence to the contrary they supply none. *Something* must have happened to the apostle after the close of Luke's narrative, which leaves him awaiting trial for his life; and it is hard to imagine, had the crown of martyrdom hovered over his head at that juncture, that he who tells the tale of Stephen's investment with that coronet of glory so feelingly would have broken off where he does, leaving his bosom-friend's good confession a sheer blank. For few care to endorse Professor Ramsay's very precarious inference from the superlative *πρώτος* in Acts i. 1, that Luke meditated a third treatise, in completion of the story left untold.

Now all authorities are agreed that Paul suffered in the purlieux of Rome; yet Clement of Rome, writing on the spot only thirty years later, treats it as an accepted fact that he had sealed his testimony with his blood after preaching the Gospel both East and West, ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών. Moffatt and others have sought to identify this limit of the west with the imperial city itself. But that notion flies in the face of current usage. Clement's phrase can bear only one construction. Rome was not a point on the circumference of her own empire, but its proud centre, *Roma domina rerum*. The phrase τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως denotes either the whole or a specific portion of the Spanish Peninsula, entitled by Strabo *τέρμονες τῆς οἰκουμένης* and by Philostratus τὸ τέρμα τῆς Εὐρώπης. That distinguished classical scholar,

J. E. B. Mayor, cites Clement's phrase in his notes on Juvenal as clear proof of Paul's visit to Spain, pointing out how Gades, the modern Cadiz, was reckoned the frontier-line of western civilization; in the words of Velleius Paterculus, *extremus nostri orbis terminus*. Both Seneca and Pliny call Spain *terrarum fines*; and this conception reaches back as far as Pindar, and becomes a commonplace with the latter-day Roman poets. So Sir William Ramsay and Mayor and Zahn confidently, and Harnack with more hesitation, infer from Clement's phraseology a personal visit of the Apostle paid to Spain. That presumes his acquittal, a result not improbable at a moment before A.D. 64, when Christianity had not yet been branded a *religio illicita*.

However, a missionary journey to Spain is not essential to the authenticity of the Pastorals; for it obtains no mention in their pages. The total absence of any tradition associating Paul's memory with any specific locality thereabouts may render it a trifle dubious. On the other hand, the fact that he had actually mapped out an expedition to Spain as his goal beyond Rome tells in its favour; for the apostle's programmes were not purposed "after the flesh" or casually, as he reminded the Corinthians, so as to remain a dead letter. If his detention in Rome be urged as having laid an arrest on this project, we reply that both *Philippians* and *Philemon* betoken such a change in his prospects as made him no longer view recovered freedom as an event beyond hope. Besides, the Muratorian Canon, our best informant anent Roman tradition, accredits the Spanish campaign; and so do Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Jerome; while Eusebius, if he passes it over, postulates his release and re-entry into Rome for the final scene.

III

Many a superficial reader of the Epistles has carried away, no doubt, the impression of a single Roman imprisonment. For that mistake we can adduce an instructive modern parallel. The rank and file of John Bunyan's admirers credit him with one long term of confinement in Bedford Gaol. But this conclusion is erroneous. Dr. John Brown has shown that he underwent two distinct incarcerations in two distinct Bedford prisons, with a lengthy interspace of liberty between them, and that, contrary to general opinion, the *Pilgrim's Progress* was penned

during his second and shorter spell of prison life. Let us stretch the comparison for a moment, and suppose that a score of centuries had rolled between Bunyan's day and our own, and that Time's effacing fingers had cast a haze over the minor details of the immortal tinker's biography, so that an assumption that he had died in prison was widely current. How could it be best combated? By producing booklets of his—and such do exist—bearing dates subsequent to the known era of his imprisonment, and evidence of peregrinations which imply that he was once more at large and busy preaching the Word.

Now that is what the Pastoral Letters profess to furnish in Paul's own case. They purport to be his parting instructions to two of his trustiest deputies, and their whole validity depends on the truth of that claim. Of course rationalistic critics are never tired of harping on the classical historian's habit of putting speeches suitable to the occasion into the mouths of military leaders on the eve of decisive affrays, a device fostered by the current passion for rhetorical declamation, but based on the actual custom of haranguing troops on such occasions from the *suggestus*. But that usage bears a very remote resemblance to, and affords no precedent for, the cheat of palming off a bogus rule of faith and practice on the Church in the name of St. Paul, aggravated by the impiety of taking God's name in vain in the process. If the solemn avowal of these Epistles that they are the apostle's authoritative missives be not instinct with the most sterling honour and integrity, but an equivocation, or if they are a cento of truth and falsehood, they form no part of the Church's treasures, but sink to the level of pious frauds—the worst of all cajoleries—as disreputable in their line as the romance of *Paul and Thekla* in its, which cost its concoctor degradation from the priesthood, notwithstanding his protestations that he meant no harm. Viewed as the production of a charlatan personating the apostle, and parroting Paul's voice in order to facilitate their reception, these documents incur the taint of moral obliquity and deserve to be held in contempt.

Dr. Harrison, in his book impeaching their genuineness, tries to varnish the matter by asserting his factotum's "loyal devotion to Paul's name"; but how a fraudulent abuse of that name breathes the spirit of loyalty is hard to perceive. He opines that this same intriguer in making Paul his stalking-horse was "unconscious of deceiving anybody"; and that his

hocus-pocus may have been known to be such by his friends without lowering the shammer's character. We cherish a loftier estimate of the ethical standard of primitive Christianity than that. How could those who had plighted troth for evermore to Him who is Faithful and True act otherwise? Can anyone deny that the New Testament demands absolute transparency of aim and uncompromising straightforwardness of practice, and recoils absolutely from all false pretences and stage effects? Treacherous breaches of faith in the supposed interests of faith have, alas! since then been often applauded by churchmen of supple consciences, and forged decretals done Satan yeoman service in ages of crass superstition. But such sanctimonious knaveries are the antipole of the code of veracity taught by Christ and His apostles, with its drastic disavowal of all jesuitical artifices. Has not Paul himself reprobated doing evil that good may come in no measured terms? He was a sorry specimen of a Paulinist, this curvilinear Paul Pry, conjured up from a nameless grave by the magic hand of criticism to vend smuggled wares under sacred auspices with such cool effrontery.

These Epistles *may* have been elicited in response to queries addressed to their commanding officer by his two lieutenants, but their significance extends to all generations. The prospect of Paul's speedy removal (he is now *lampada traditurus*) rendered them timely and the uprising of a visible Church made them indispensable. The exact fulfilment of the predictions of future apostasy they contain attests their author's prophetic afflatus, and their canonical status tallies with the seal of unction and authority impressed upon them, so different from the secondary tone and lifeless tenor of the products of the age of the apostolic fathers. Moffatt owns their "astonishing superiority".

IV

1. *The Internal Evidence.* Let us take a bird's-eye view of the testimony in support of their genuineness that may be culled from the Letters themselves, before canvassing the objections urged against them. It has to be borne in mind that we are scanning the veteran apostle, fagged by titanic labours and shattering trials, and that he is handling a severely practical topic, not adapted to call forth all his latent powers. He writes in a subdued vein, by this time looking wistfully backwards

rather than forging ahead at full speed; yet gleams of the old fire flash forth ever and anon to certify us of the writer's identity.

1 *Timothy*, penned confidentially and at liberty, moves at a leisurely pace which permits of sundry side-glances, yet discloses not a few mintmarks of Paul's composition. The position of a home-bird assigned to woman may surely be reckoned as one of these. And who save the apostle himself would have stigmatized his whilom self an ἰβριστής, a hectoring bully? Nor can we conceive of a Paulinist camp-follower entitling his chief of men the "chief of sinners", a trophy of mercy displayed to the uttermost. And who but Paul could have preserved that exquisite blend of authority and affection that pervades the Timothean Letters? Note too how precisely in keeping with all we know of Timothy are the exhortations given him, with their recognition of his gentle-spirited temper, weakly physique, and motley environment. And how appropriately do admonitions to the rich find place in a letter addressed to opulent Ephesus!

A cavil has been raised touching the application of the term νέος to Timothy. Holtzmann derisively remarks that he "seems to have possessed the secret of perpetual youth". But this is mere empty splutter. For there were only two recognized standards of age to the Greek or Roman, νέος and γέρον, *juvenis* and *senex*, and the former of these conveyed no such juvenile implication as our term *youngster*, with which μειράκιον or ἔφηβος would correspond. It was employed of adults in the full vigour of life and of soldiers of military age to the verge of forty. There is no more incongruity here than in the use of the word τέκνον (cf. "my lad") five times over as an endearing address to his son in the faith.

Titus was obviously of a sturdier make than his colleague, and the directory sent to him takes a more compendious shape. It is written with a special eye to the local conditions of the less developed Cretan mission, known to Paul through a recent visit. That explains why all mention of the diaconate is omitted. Need we remark how much in Paul's manner is the caustic hexameter cited from Epimenides, and still more the appositional clause, "a prophet of their own", with its subtly ironical flavour? κρητισμός is used by Plutarch as a graphic synonym for lying. Yet more characteristic of the Tarsian is the sixfold repetition of the title *Saviour*, thrice applied to God and thrice to the Lord Jesus Himself, and the inculcation of civil obedi-

ence on the obstreperous Cretans. Some surmise that Titus was Luke's brother, and find in that a reason for the suppression of his name in *Acts*. At all events he was the apostle's trusted envoy. Paul is at freedom thus far, and proposes to winter at Nicopolis, probably in Epirus, near the Egnatian route westward.

2 *Timothy* presents a changed aspect of affairs. Here we find Paul once more in duress, rated as a malefactor and under stricter custody than before; for Onesiphorus only discovers his whereabouts in Rome after painful search. Everything now forebodes his offering up, and in this touching *finale* we have what Bengel styles his swan-song. He who does not catch Paul's accents in this letter must be remarkably hard of hearing. His strongly individualizing propensity comes out in the twenty-three personal allusions, starting with the tender eulogy passed on Timothy's mother and grandmother. Some sixteen of these are unknown from other sources. Holtzmann tries to minimize this pledge of actuality with the gibe that the author was "bound to render his fiction as plausible as he could". Yes! but the taunt recoils on the taunter, for false witnesses are careful not to compromise themselves by too many specific particulars, and even more so not to reproduce old figures, like Demas, in a completely altered guise. And why should this wily dissembler be at the pains to triplicate his web of deceit? But we lose patience at the notion that we can attribute to a source like that such soul-stirring strains, once heard never forgotten, as "I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep my deposit with Him (Paul's ancient image) against that day"; or his *certavi, cucurri, custodivi*, "I have fought a good fight"—ἀγών often refers to military operations—"I have finished my course, I have kept the faith", with its triumphant sequel. In these lofty chords we hear the intrepid old warrior chant his own solemn yet serene requiem.

The *prima actio* of his trial is over (for surely Zahn errs in making the passage refer to his examination years before; what need to inform Timothy of that?); yet though all had forsaken him at need, the lone witness had been enabled to bear effectual testimony to his beloved Lord before a representative auditory. Now he awaits his exit through the gateway of martyrdom with unshaken resolution, pining only to clasp Timothy's hand once more ere the end. Who can ascribe the clarion blast

of that parting charge to any composer but him whom Donne aptly names the *fusile* apostle, of potency when fully roused to sound a bugle call fitted to "create a soul under the ribs of death"?

V

11. What then are the leading *Objections to their Authenticity*? 1. It is alleged that they disclose *too advanced a stage of Church organization* for Paul's day.

Yet surely some structural form was imperative for the consolidation of the building of God which the apostles were commissioned to rear. For the New Testament ideal of the Church is not what many to-day desiderate, a "syncretism of religious good feeling" and flabby sentiment cemented by the glue of compromise, but a symmetrical fabric, the arsenal of revealed truth and citadel of disciplined liberty. Even Forsyth has said: "a mere brotherhood has no theology, but then it has no influence. It is nothing but a sympathetic group." If a visible Church were to exist to any purpose, the "law of the house" required distinct enunciation. That is furnished to us here in a most unostentatious pattern, void of all show and officialism, given that men may "know how to behave themselves in the house of God", pillar and stay as it is of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15).

Baur's allegation that Paul cared not a straw for Church government begs the question of the genuineness of the Letters at the outset, and is palpably false to boot. Already we find him in *Acts xiv* ordaining presbyters together with Barnabas, whom Hort regards as the predecessor of Titus, in every city he revisited; and these presbyters play a prominent part in the Council of Jerusalem. The diaconate had taken shape yet earlier; and in *Philippians* the local "bishops and deacons" are greeted as an established institution. Even in *Thessalonians* we hear of those who "bear rule". The Ephesian tabulation of Church officers, ordinary and extraordinary, concludes with the mention of "pastors and teachers". Some of these ordinations were doubtless provisional, others permanent. Timothy and Titus may be classed, in Dr. Moberly's words, as "instruments of an absent rather than wielders of an inherent authority", vicars apostolic discharging temporary functions here and there. Observe that they are in no wise exalted into grandees, as a

second century *falsarius* might have been expected to glorify them, but admonished to watch heedfully over their own souls. The main emphasis is laid on the functions of the under-shepherds, with the specific flocks consigned to their charge. For the Church is now settling down to her task, and probationers for the ministry are forthcoming in proportion to the call for them.

It is not our province to touch on denominational "differences of administration" concerning which we might not see eye to eye. But we cannot fail to perceive the unpretentious type of Church rule that is here sketched, a *sodalitas* incapable in fact of coming into collision with civil authority without wanton aggression on the part of the latter. Does not this picture reflect primal conditions in contrast with later developments? Westcott holds that it is plainly anterior to Clement's *Letter to the Corinthians*. Indeed, the early date of the Pastoral Epistles can be warrantably inferred from the equivalence of the terms *bishop* and *presbyter*, which is peculiarly manifest in *Titus i*, and finds its counterpart in Clement and the *Didache*. (See Bishop Lightfoot's well-known dissertation on the Christian Ministry.) *ἐπίσκοπος* was the ordinary Greek term for a *supervisor* of any kind, whereas the noun *πρεσβύτερος*, with its Hebrew associations, denotes the office rather than the function it subserves. Long after the entrenchment of the prelatical bishop, the memory of the ancient meaning of *ἐπίσκοπος* still lingered. Chrysostom, e.g., acknowledges it in his comment on the opening verse of *Philippians*, and Augustine in a letter to Jerome writes: *secundum honorum vocabula quae iam ecclesiae usus obtinuit episcopatus maior presbyterio est*. Jerome himself likewise remarks in his Commentary on *Titus*: *idem est presbyter qui et episcopus*; and concludes his discussion of the matter: "Let the bishops lay it to heart that their superiority to presbyters arises rather from custom than from the verity of an ordination of the Lord."

Now in reality that constitution of things strongly argues in favour of the genuineness of these Epistles. "If the Pastoral Epistles contained a clear defence of the episcopal system of the second century", writes Dean Farrar, "that alone would be enough to prove their spuriousness." As it is, the ministerial portrait here drawn lays stress almost entirely on moral and spiritual qualifications. Mark too how the apostle passes without a break from the bishop or presbyter to the deacon and

deaconess and then to the church-widows. Not a vestige of sacerdotalism can be descried here. In what full canonicals that spirit would have tricked out the leading figure may be guessed from the fact that some of its devotees have been insensate enough to elevate the cloak Paul left at Troas into a priestly chasuble or dalmatic.

2. A second exception taken on similar grounds affirms that *Gnostic doctrines of a later date* incur censure in these Epistles. Baur hailed the occurrence of the word *antiithesis* at the close of 1 *Timothy* as supplying proof of a covert polemic against Marcion's treatise bearing this title. But that Aristotelian term was no novelty; and whereas Gnosticism proper is radically anti-Jewish, the parties here rebuked appertain to a semi-Rabbinical school. So nebulous a creed scarce allows of definition; but we shall not be far out if we designate Gnosticism an intellectual caste, professing an esoteric philosophy of religion, one of whose main tenets was the evil of matter. Oriental theosophies of this cast sprang up rankly in the soil of a putrid Paganism. And foreshadowings of coming cults usually precede them, even as Oken's speculations and Robert Chambers's *Vestiges of Creation* betokened Darwin's *Origin of Species*. These vaguer pretensions to superfine illumination had ascetic elements in common with the schools of Marcion and Valentinus. The term *γνώσις* may have been pillaged from Paul's own use of it; but we have no right to infuse the second century meaning, much akin to the German *Aufklärung*, into such a clause as "knowledge falsely so-called". Nor ought we to wrest prophecies of prospective heresies into descriptions of phenomena actually then present. The parties immediately chastised here are a coterie of legalists, tenacious of wire-drawn subtleties, dubbed "Jewish fables" in one passage and "old wives' tales" in another. It is only in the predictive contexts that they acquire a malignity that engenders moral contamination and is totally subversive of the faith. An incipient stage of declension has already been reached; but the inclined plane has not yet carried those launched upon it to its goal of necrosis. Only ὁ αἰρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος (Tit. iii. 10), the obstinate factionist, is to be entirely abjured, as things stand.

3. A third demur (strange in the lips of its propounders) discovers in these Epistles a *lowered theology*, shorn of the watchwords of the apostle's previous teaching. Moffatt insists much on this point, and an American critic contends that, "if they

are indeed Paul's composition, he has descended from the lofty plane on which he had moved to the level of mere piety and morality". Mere piety forsooth! These criticisms are altogether wide of the mark. For doctrinal edification lies outside the immediate scope of the Pastorals; they comprise executive counsels blended with ethical. Moreover, no chasm yawns between Christian doctrine and Christian practice. "Immortal principles forbid the sons of God to sin" (Watts). Justification and sanctification are twin-born children of grace. Are not Paul's most systematic arguments rounded off with pressing admonishments to godliness of life? "As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him." Works wrought to procure salvation Paul rates as worthless, yet makes them indispensable evidences of a gracious state. Here he is battling with barren speculations, and their inevitable aftermath, unholy living masked under the vizard of religious profession.

Besides, the allegation contravenes the facts. Occupied as he is with practicalities rather than principles, he does not wholly drop his old battle-cries. Do they not ring in our ears when we read in *Titus*: "not by works done in righteousness by us, but according to His mercy He saved us by washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, that being justified by His grace we might be made heirs according to the promise of eternal life"; or of Christ Himself as having "given Himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity" (doctrine and practice welded together)? And what can bear Paul's autograph more plainly than the unique expression *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, of 1 Timothy ii. 6, so lamely rendered by all our translators, "a ransom for all"? For it is not *λύτρον*, but *ἀντίλυτρον*, one of Paul's own coinages. The verb *ἀντιλυτροῦν* occurs but once in all Greek literature with a slightly different sense, in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, ix. 2. Here the noun must signify *counterprice*, *pretium ex adverso respondens*, as the Puritan divine Flavel well paraphrases it, setting forth the intrinsically infinite virtue of the atoning sacrifice, its equipollence when set over against human guilt. If these passing reaffirmations of his Gospel fail to satisfy critical censors, we would remind them that a tract on Church government differs from a body of divinity, and that one mark of a disciplined intellect consists in ability to keep to the subject in hand. St. Paul digresses now and then; he never rambles from pillar to post!

VI

4. But the capital objection urged against the Pastorals bears reference to their *vocabulary and style*. Dr. Harrison's assault on them relies almost entirely on this consideration, which he illustrates by an elaborate series of diagrams. It is said that anything can be proved by an array of statistics adroitly manipulated, and perhaps this may be a case in point. We are bidden to remark that we encounter here twice or even thrice as many fresh words as Paul's other writings would lead us to expect. The proportion of vocables previously unused amounts to some 168 in sum, against a total of 627 for all the rest of his Epistles.

That sounds impressive, if we make the law of averages our touchstone, but in a case of this kind computations of numerical ratios are apt to be illusive. We might rejoin that a plagiarist would not deviate from his model so extensively; but, accepting the data for what they are worth, we observe that change of vocabulary does not always imply transference of authorship. Mahaffy has noted how singularly diverse is Xenophon's vocabulary in different treatises of his; and he attributes it to his vagrancy of life and sociable propensities, an explanation that applies also to the apostle Paul. Besides, wider reasons for modifications of a writer's diction present themselves.

Both *style and diction are functions of the topic handled*. When Xenophon treats of horsemanship he employs a novel set of terms to match a novel subject. Now Paul is here dealing with the circumstantials of church organization, and with certain local heretical tendencies, rife or yet to be rife; and he uses new terms, and an unusual proportion of negative adjectives, naturally of rare occurrence, because they suit his subject-matter. Thus the sheaf of fresh epithets descriptive of the model pastor or deacon, and the disparaging terms applied to false teachers, are accounted for by their contexts. Meanwhile the staple of the vocabulary and syntax abides intact. Harrison forages assiduously in quest of grammatical innovations, but with the most insignificant results.

Having had a sum in addition, we are next favoured with one in subtraction. Stress is laid on the *withdrawal* from active service of *certain Pauline locutions* we should expect to meet. Among the *lacunae* are *νόθεωσία, πίθειν, περισσεύειν, χαρίζεσθαι,*

and certain particles of transition or inference. But were not these latter quite uncalled for in directions largely couched in the imperative mood? As to the absence of some favourite usages, as Dr. White notes in the *Exp. Gr. Test.*, "it is folly to expect a practised writer to distribute his vocabulary in the mechanical fashion of spots on a wall-paper". In another writer's words, to content our critics an author "must never break out in a new direction; having had his vision and his dream, he must henceforth be like a star and dwell apart. To be stereotyped is his only salvation". Yet the very fact that he is addressing members of his inner circle here colours the apostle's phraseology. Are Cicero's Letters to Atticus replicas of his philosophical tracts? By no means; in point of vocabulary least of all. Our opponents have insisted on making the matter a literary question; then as a literary question let it be argued. The fact of the matter is that what the critical magnates sorely need is enlargement of vision.

Microscopic verbalists are not very competent appraisers of men of genius; and Paul has a right to be judged by his peers. To content these gentlemen, an author must adopt a recitative, and reduplicate himself monotonously. Now we are too broad-minded to demand that. Believing as we do in Paul's special inspiration, we nevertheless hold that that fact does not supersede, but sublimate, his natural gifts. And in all true genius there lurks an incalculable element, refractory to strait-waist-coats of all sorts. Applied to your third-rate author who takes his ply early in life and repeats himself ever afterwards like a hurdy-gurdy, syllabic tests may answer. But intellectual powers of a higher cast pursue their own path unshackled, and exhibit plasticities and aptitudes not to be gauged by the word-fancier's ell-wand. Moreover, if ever the personal equation should count, it is in a case so anomalous as St. Paul's. For this Roman Empire ranger (aye, and besieger too!) was anything but a recluse cramped within his shell or a pedant hidebound by a quickset hedge of verbiage. He does not revolve painfully in a closed circle of dictionary-terms; his language is attempered to his surroundings and immediate design. Saul of Tarsus ranks as a Christian cosmopolite of the keenest sensibilities, fertile in resources, a rapid yet profound thinker, to whom words are not satraps but subalterns, not tyrants but thralls. Averages befit average cases; but here is a most exceptional case, that of an

adept in assimilation, pledged to become all things to all men, a brother-in-arms to bond and free, a connecting-link between Jew and Gentile, one imbued with Greek as a living speech from boyhood, and whose prolonged experience of preaching indoors and out must have given to his vigilant intellect and glowing heart a command of Hellenistic as expansive and flexible as the man himself.

Great souls are not their own mimes. How wide the interval betwixt Horace's roughest-hewn Satires and his stateliest Odes, or between the sepulchral pomp of Tennyson's *In Memoriam* and the money-grubbing jingle of his *Northern Farmer*! What a contrast between the ornate luxuriance of the more sonorous cadences of *Paradise Lost* and the tragic austerity and loin-girt athleticism of Milton's latest work, the *Samson Agonistes*! In minds of the finest texture strands of likeness and unlikeness intertwine.

It is well to reflect that St. Paul's whole extant writings occupy only some 150 octavo pages of letterpress and comprise in all about 3,000 main vocables. Surely that scanty total does not represent the entire Greek exchequer of this student by predestination and speaker by vocation. Think of the compass of his instrument at its full *crescendo*, and you will have to own the ample linguistic reserves at his command, instinctively adjusted to his immediate theme. In this connection our myopic critics would do well to ponder the sentence of a great Continental classical scholar, Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, who in his manual of Greek literature styles Saul the Tarsian "a classic of Hellenism", and remarks that his Greek is indebted to no particular school or model, but is his own, "not translated Aramaic but real Greek, the utterance of a fresh and living experience".

VII

Since such emphasis is laid on verbal dissimilarities, let us come to close quarters with this verbal bogey. Harrison spies in the *Pastorals* a new literary tone and less "grip and verve" than in the other Pauline Epistles, and Peake borrows from his German prompters the paltry insinuation of senility. A diminution of momentum we should expect after the tremendous "Marathon-race" Paul had been running. On the other hand, the immense strain and pressure of those earlier years must have

precluded study, whereas the comparative inactivity of the imperial prisoner may have yielded him breathing-space for reading or being read to. There are traces of such an influence at work in his later letters. If an influx of literary Hellenistic be alleged, that tallies with these conditions. What then are the facts about the new ingredients?

(i). Among the novel features we note a sprinkling of the older literary strata. For instance, such words as *ἀνδραποδίστης* and *αἰσχροκερδής* belong thereto. *ἀπαίδευστος* (2 Tim. ii. 23) at once recalls Plato; but that verbal adjective belongs to all stages of literary Greek, as do plenty of the other verbal innovations of these Epistles, such as *ἀναξωπύρειν*, *γυμνάζειν*, *μελετᾶν*, *ὀρέγεσθαι*, *πειθαρχεῖν*, *στεφανοῦν*, *φροντίζειν*, *φλύαρος*, *ὑπόνοια*.

(ii) Of purely vernacular usages, for example, *αἰθεντεῖν* (1 Tim. ii. 12) in the sense of *having authority over*, the list is very brief. Hardly another can be found.

(iii) But of course a much larger percentage of the new terms consist of samples of ordinary *literary Hellenistic*. Take a few specimens. There is the interesting verb *ἀστοχεῖν*, thrice used in the sense of *missing the mark, going astray*; a Polybian, Plutarchian and Lucianic expression, which obviously took the place of *ἀμαρτάνειν* in proportion as that word acquired an ethical significance. *ἀνανήφειν* (2 Tim. ii. 26), was passing through the same process; and so was *κακοπαθεῖν* (2 Tim. ii. 3, 9), "*to rough it*", opposed by Plutarch to *ἠδυνάθεια*, which answers to our "*mollycoddling*". Another Polybian phrase twice repeated greets us in *ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίος*, and in *ἀγωγή*, "*training*", "*upbringing*", first thus used in Aristotle. *οἱ ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντες* is another Aristotelian phrase for "*the authorities*". *κατάστημα*, "*demeanour*", "*carriage*" (Tit. ii. 3), occurs in Josephus and Plutarch, the latter employing the adjective *καταστηματικὸς* for "*staid*". *καταστολή* (1 Tim. ii. 9), "*decorum*", is a kindred term found in the same authors and in Epictetus. *κοινωνικός* (1 Tim. vi. 18), "*sociable*", has much the same provenance. *περίστασθαι*, twice meaning "*to shun*", appertains to Josephus, Philodemus of Gadara, a first-century B.C. Palestinian text-book writer, and Marcus Aurelius. *πορισμός* (1 Tim. vi. 5), "*livelihood*", has also the sanction of Philodemus, Plutarch and Vettius Valens; and so has *ῥητῶς* (1 Tim. iv. 1), "*expressly*", used by Polybius and Plutarch to introduce word-for-word quotations. The metaphorical *ναναγεῖν*

(1 Tim. i. 19) and *περιπέριρειν* (1 Tim. vi. 10) are figures characteristic of literary Hellenistic; as much may be said for the military image, *στρατολογεῖν* (2 Tim. ii. 4). The new vocables *σωφρονίζειν*, *σωφροσύνη*, *σωφρονισμός*, descriptive of "self-command", are favourite terms with Plutarch. *Ὑποτύπωσις* carries two meanings; in Galen that of *conspectus* or "*synopsis*", as here apparently in 2 Timothy i. 13; but in a passage of Quintilian (ix. 2. 40) it clearly signifies a "vivid picture", and that sense suits best in 1 Timothy i. 16.

(iv) We cannot pause longer over these accessions to the apostle's word-lists. Lest we make too much of them, let it be observed that the Pastorals likewise contain plenty of old friends to form connecting links with his other Epistles. We can only specify a batch of Paulinisms taken almost at random. Paul's favourite verbs, *ἐνδυναμοῦν*, "to empower", and its antithesis *καταργεῖν*, "to nullify, render nugatory", duly reappear, and his distinctive phrase *παραστῆσαι τῷ θεῷ* recurs; and so do his favourite adjectives, *εὐάρεστος* and its counterpole *ἀδόκιμος*, and his designation *κήρυγμα* for the Gospel message. Grammatical hallmarks, such as the threefold *ἠλπικένας*, "to fix one's hope on", in place of *ἐλπίζειν*, as in Corinthians (cf. *κεκραγένας* for *κράζειν*), and his well-known *πεπίστευμαι* and *ἐπιστεύθην*, recur in like manner. Of Hebraic Greek the tokens are very slight.

We meet the reassertion *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ ἀπόστολος* in 1 Timothy i. 1; also a lowly term for his apostolate *διακονία*, as elsewhere, not likely to have been chosen, if only to avoid confusion, except by himself. The noun *χάρισμα* and the phrase *ἀφορμὴν διδόναι* (1 Tim. v. 14) are highly characteristic, and so is the compound *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ* (1 Tim. v. 19).

(v) To my mind, however, underlying watermarks of the apostle of the Gentiles are discernible more convincing than these verbal correspondences, which are chiefly of value as a set-off against paraded verbal discrepancies. I refer to his stylistic mannerisms. In this respect the Pastoral Epistles conform thoroughly to type.

VIII

1. The figures carry his monogram upon them. They are, as a rule, drawn not from the physical but the human realm. Who does not recognize his badge in the image of the martial aspirant to fame, or the competitor at the games, or in the figure

of the seal, or the steward, or the outpoured libation, or vessels unto honour? If the similitudes of a gangrene and a cauterized conscience, or of sound and sickly doctrine, wear a novel air, may these medical images not be traceable to Luke's comradeship?

2. Another delicate token of Paul's sign-manual, which he shares with Luke, comes to light in the employment of *meiosis* or understatement. In other contexts we have heard him dub himself a citizen of no mean city, and aver that he was not ashamed of the Gospel nor "disobedient to the heavenly vision". Paul likes to leave some scope for the exercise of his reader's or hearer's faculties, for he was not one to suffer fools gladly! This former trait re-emerges here. "I am suffering thus; yet am I *not ashamed*", we hear him exclaim. Onesiphorus, he tells us, was *not ashamed* of his chain, and Timothy is *not to be ashamed* of the Lord's testimony, nor of me *His prisoner*, the selfsame appellation he had taken in *Ephesians*. Or again: "the word of God is *not bound*." The very phrase δ ἀψευδῆς θεός, whencesoever derived—it occurs in Euripides—embodies a *meiosis*.

3. *Apposition* is another figure to which he was partial, not of single words so much as whole clauses. We all remember two classical instances in *Romans*, "what the Law could not do", and so on, in chapter viii and the opening sentence of chapter xii, where the entire statement is poised against the concluding clause, "your reasonable service". Of this feature we find several examples in the Pastorals. To name only two in *1 Timothy*, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους (*1 Tim. ii. 6*), "the testimony for its own seasons", in reference to Christ's redemptive work just named, and in iii. 15 the famous στῦλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, "a pillar and stay of the truth", where it is not quite certain whether the appositional clause relates to the church or the ensuing sentence. These specimens of Paul's condensed style may be compared with the elliptical δ ἐξ ἐναντίας of *Titus ii. 8*, the frequent omission of the copula, not without its bearing on the translation of *2 Timothy iii. 16*, and the zeugma, "forbidding to marry, bidding (understood) to abstain from meats", in *1 Timothy iv. 3*. We could almost stake the authorship of *1 Timothy* on the wording of iii. 5: "if one know not how to rule his own house, how shall he care for the church of God?", a compressed form of interrogation exclusively

Pauline, of which there are four examples in 1 Corinthians xiv alone.

4. The apostle's fondness for *compendious compounds* is well known to all careful students of his style. We at once recall previous instances of this, such as *ἐξιχνίαστος*, *ὀφθαλμοδουλεία*, *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν* (the last found both here and in *Romans*). Now in the *Pastorals* we meet with at least a score of such new shorthand verbal formations, some of them *ἄπαξ εἰρημένα*. For example, *αὐτοκατάκριτος*, *self-convicted*, found once in Philo; *διαπαρατριβαὶ* (unique), "*mutual altercations*", *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* (twice, unique)—so *ἐτεροζυγεῖν* in 2 Corinthians; *εὐμετάδοτος*, "*generous*", elsewhere only met with in Vettius Valens and Marcus Aurelius; *καταστρηγιῶν* (unique), "*to wax lusty against*"; *λογομαχεῖν*, *λογομαχία*, the title of a satire of Varro, *ὀρθοτομεῖν*, a figure probably drawn from cutting a straight furrow (cf. *ὄδον τέμνειν*), which at once recalls *ὀρθοποδεῖν* in *Galatians*, *πραπάθεια*, the Latin *mansuetudo*, once used by Philo; *φρεναπάτης*, of which the papyri furnish one instance, reproducing the *φρεναπατῆ* of Galatians vi. 3. The very rare, but important epithet, *θεόπνευστος*, "God-breathed" (2 Tim. iii. 16) occurs nowhere beside save once in Plutarch's *Morals*, where it is applied to dreams, once in Vettius Valens, who terms man a *θεόπνευστον δημιούργημα*, "a God-breathed piece of workmanship", and as an epithet of wisdom in the probably Jewish hexameters of the pseudo-Phocylides. These conglomerates fully accord with Paul's manner.

5. His proclivity for *enumerations*, especially of moral or immoral qualities, is another marked trait, shared in a minor degree by the apostle Peter. Who can forget the awful catalogue of pagan vices in *Romans* i, or the counterlists in *Galatians* v of the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit? This hallmark of his meets our gaze here likewise. In 1 *Timothy* there fronts us the inventory of the delinquents who fall under the lash of the law, and of the graces to be cherished by the man of God. Here and in *Titus* we have a table of the virtues befitting bishops and matured saints and of the contrary vices that are tabooed. Notice how convincingly Pauline is that touch, "once we were such" (*Titus* iii. 3), by which the writer classes himself with his readers and their guilty past. In 2 *Timothy* we encounter another list of the corrupt practices of future seducers of unwary souls.

6. Paul cannot refrain from *plays on words*. Herein the Pastorals follow precedent. "The Law is good, provided it be used lawfully", he writes. Another paranomasia meets us in the οἱ πλούσιοι . . . πλουσίως of 1 Timothy vi. 17. In 2 Timothy we can count at least three: φιλήδονοι μάλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι (iii. 4); ἄρτιος . . . πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρισμένος (iii. 17), and εὐκαιρῶς ἀκαιρῶς, like *fanda nefanda* (iv. 2).

7. Finally, *Latinistic influences* are more legible than heretofore in the apostle's Greek. Holtzman enlists this circumstance in the cause of scepticism; but the argument is double-edged; for Paul's susceptibility to his environment was abnormal. Sir William Ramsay holds that the Gentile apostle must have cultivated a knowledge of Latin as part of his equipment for his task, and detects Roman suffixes *Illyricum* and *Philippenses* in the Greek of *Romans* and *Philippians*. Surely when his steps drew nigh to the world's metropolis, if not before, this must have been the case, just as a British missionary in Belgian Congo or Madagascar has a stimulus to acquaint himself with French. In 2 Timothy we come across two Latin terms, *paenula* and *membrana*, transliterated; nor could anything be more natural than this phenomenon.

The truth is, Greek and Latin had now reached that stage of interpenetration when mutual loans wax inevitable. At a much earlier date Polybius introduces a sprinkling of Latin vocables into his text, and his Greek occasionally reflects Latin usages, much as we take over French phrases like "thinking furiously" or "the defects of his qualities". The reflex influences of a Roman environment are thus mirrored in the Pastorals. χάριν ἔχειν is twice substituted for the usual εὐχαριστεῖν, echoing *gratiam habere*, and ματαιολογία *vaniloquium*, ἐδραῖωμα recalls *firmamentum*, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν *quamobrem*, πρόσκλισις *inclinatio*, πρόκριμα *praeiudicium*, ἀδηλότης *inceritudo* (a Plutarchian usage), and σεμνότης that choicest fetish of the Roman mind *gravitas*. The adoption for the first time of the word εὐσέβεια and its cognates seems due to the vogue of *pietas* in Latin lips, and the replacement of κύριος by δεσπότης to the similar prominence of *dominus*. οἱ ἡμέτεροί for "our folk" (Titus iii. 14), like the Latin *nostri*, occurs in Philodemus (*Rhet.* iii. 8) and Strabo. The phrase *cumulatae peccatis* corresponds with σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίας (2 Tim. iii. 6), and the unique δίλογος, "double-tongued" of 1 Timothy iii. 8 seems modelled on *bilinguis*, purposely varied because δίγλωσσος

already signified *bilingual*. And a phrase that puzzled Bentley and nonplussed Moulton and Milligan, *προσέρχεται τοῖς ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις* (1 Tim. vi. 3) is best elucidated by the Tacitean expression: *Galba suadentibus accessit*.

IX

We have seen how St. Paul's profile may be clearly discerned in these pages. Here is his practical sagacity, his love for generalizations (e.g. *To the pure all things are pure*); a bold assertion, as in *Romans*, of his commission against its impugners, chastened by a vivid feeling of personal unworthiness; his unshaken loyalty to his Lord coupled with an acute sense of the loyalty or disloyalty of fellow-workers. Here are three of his irrepressible doxologies breaking in on the thread of his discourse, and here is that wave of tremulous emotion which invariably comes over him when he recalls the wonder of his conversion. But the figure is that of a scarred campaigner, forced to husband his debilitated strength.

So signally Pauline are some of the touches in 2 *Timothy* that many of the negative critics have to hedge a little here, and further complicate their cross-word puzzle by the surmise that sundry genuine utterances of his have been pieced into these Epistles. This concession goes far to compromise their position; for they have to admit that the seams in the patchwork defy demarcation, and that the resultant text must be attributed to a single hand, underhand of course, yet a dove-tailer of the finest talent. The second century must have been the golden age of fancy work, barring the incomparable twentieth!

Dr. Harrison labours to discover affinities of diction with latent remains of the second century; but no watertight compartment labelled second century Greek can be isolated from the rest. He also loftily pronounces it "an impossibility that the apostle should have given these instructions to his evangelists". But it is a vastly greater one that a Mr. By-Ends, craftily personating his patron-saint for interested ends, should have denounced liars and impostors so trenchantly, and stickled so earnestly for a conscience void of offence. "A genuine Paulinist," says Dr. Shaw incisively, "at once so skilful and obtuse, inventing unreal situations with the utmost *sangfroid*, yet breathing an air of profoundest reverence for truth, is an absolute chimera."

The word faithful (*πιστός*), seventeen times repeated, forms the very keynote of these Letters. The phrase *πιστός ὁ λόγος* may be fresh, though we have had *πιστός ὁ θεός* in *Thessalonians* and *πιστός ὁ κύριος* in *Corinthians*; but its fivefold recurrence seems to indicate either snatches of catechetical lore or prophetic canticles current in the Church. Nor is the objective sense of *πίστις* a novelty. It occurs in *Romans* and would naturally arise as soon as Christians were called *believers*.

We cannot help feeling that it is the rebukes dealt in these Epistles to some of the fondest shibboleths of the modern mind that that mind really chafes at. The stress laid on soundness of doctrine built on a fixed deposit of inspiration cannot but give offence, and the sinister portraiture of the last days kindle a spark of resentment. Such an epithet applied to seducers as *τερυφωμένος*, which is the Greek equivalent of *swollen-headed*, or *consequential*,¹ must rankle in circles where this spirit is not unknown. Epictetus uses it of the airs of a slave promoted to be a Jack-in-office.

But let us end on a suaver note. How affecting the spectacle of the Old Ironside's unblenching constancy as his day dies darkling in the west; and how grand the contrast between its louring storm-clouds and the cerulean lustre of that heavenly dawn that was soon to ensphere his homesick spirit, when he crossed the line of mortality and was translated at once into the presence and resemblance of his beloved Lord.

EDMUND K. SIMPSON.

Malvern, England.

¹ The new edition of Liddell and Scott just completed inclines to the rendering *crazy, demented*, involving a still stronger condemnation; but we think that evidence could be produced in favour of the older interpretation of arrogant assumption (cf. *ἀνυψος, ἀνυψία*).