

# THE PROBLEM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES : A REAPPRAISAL <sup>1</sup>

By C. F. D. MOULE, M.A., D.D.

LADY MARGARET'S PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

**T**HE primary purpose of this lecture is simply to give further definition to the long-standing problem of the Pastoral Epistles. I am inclined to think, though this is a harsh remark, which may recoil, that there is no area of New Testament investigation where theories are proposed with greater inattention to the difficulties attaching to them. It may, therefore, be of some service—however negative—to the cause of scholarship if the difficulties can be clarified. Whether I shall be able also to contribute anything positive towards a solution I doubt (and here, indeed, my strictures are almost bound to recoil), although anyone who underlines a problem is almost under an obligation to make some attempt to find a possible way through it or round it.

It was one of my proudest moments when I received the invitation to give this lecture. Although, early in my university days, T. W. Manson examined me for a university prize and wrote me a characteristically kind note afterwards, in his beautiful hand, it was not until towards the end of his life that I began to know him personally, as a colleague in the making of the New English Bible. But even those few years were enough to kindle in me, in addition to the profound admiration I had already conceived for him as an exact scholar of great erudition, that genuine affection for him as a friend which he won, I think, from all who had the privilege of personal acquaintance with him. So, although I know that, with his clear and penetrating mind, he would quickly have found the weak spots in this little edifice of mine, I know also that, when he demolished it, it would have been in the kindest way and with a disarming smile. I know moreover that the subject,

<sup>1</sup> The Manson Memorial Lecture delivered in the University of Manchester on 30 October 1964.

if not my treatment of it, would have been congenial to him. Therefore with just that modicum of confidence and with great pride and gratitude, I dedicate this essay to his memory.

## I

I think I should like first to take you for a rapid walk round this little building that I have tried to erect, in order that you may see its shape ; and then, so far as time allows, I shall invite you to come inside and see what you think of the structural details.

First, I want to repeat an observation, made long ago<sup>1</sup> and often reiterated by scholars ever since, that there are not inconsiderable pointers to some connection between the Pastoral Epistles and the author of Luke and Acts. I think I may be able to add a few hitherto unnoticed scraps of evidence to reinforce this conclusion.

But suppose this connection were even positively established, and not merely a well-based conjecture : it is one thing to establish a connection between the Pastorals and Luke, and quite another to find any plausible explanation for it : and here we begin to run into the familiar problem of the Pastorals, which, as I say, it is my chief intention to throw into clearer relief than ever.

There are many features, particularly evident in 1 Timothy but not absent from 2 Timothy and Titus, which make it intensely difficult to believe that these letters are fully Pauline. I know that there are distinguished attempts, not least in very recent days, to rehabilitate their Paulinity.<sup>2</sup> But do they really carry conviction? Of course we know that writers change their style and their vocabulary, not only with advancing years but with changing situations ; and there is no cogent reason for denying Pauline authorship to a letter, merely because its vocabulary and style

<sup>1</sup> P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford University Press, 1921), p. 52, cites "forsitan Lucas" from H. A. Schott, *Isagoge Historico-Critica in Libros Novi Foederis Sacros* (1830), p. 325.

<sup>2</sup> Besides E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale Press, 1954), and D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale New Testament Commentary, 1957), there is now, from a quite different tradition, J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (A. and C. Black, 1963). Among Roman Catholic publications, the most noteworthy defence of the genuineness of these epistles is C. Spicq's *Les Épîtres Pastorales* (*Études Bibliques*, Gabalda, Paris, 1947).

mark it as different from others which are firmly established as genuine. It is possible, therefore, that, on such grounds, one might argue that the greetings, for instance, with which the Pastorals open are not necessarily unPauline although they are quite different from anything else we attribute to Paul. It is possible, again, that one might explain changes of emphasis in the doctrine of the person of Christ or of the Holy Spirit as due to a changed situation. I have myself recently argued that the shape of St. Paul's eschatological teaching varied not in an evolving chronological sequence but rather in relation to successive situations.<sup>1</sup> It is possible, once more, that the ecclesiastical situation which the Pastorals reflect (if that is not too lucid a metaphor for so dim an image) is not incompatible with a setting in the life of Paul. But the problem of the Pastorals is constituted primarily by much more far-reaching differences than change of phrase or change of emphasis or change of situation. It is constituted by a change of mentality. The powerful mind and the daring thought behind Romans and Galatians or even 1 and 2 Thessalonians is, in the Pastorals, replaced by a concern for orthodoxy and for decorum. And as for 1 Timothy i. 8 ff.—it is astonishing that anyone could seriously attribute to Paul at any stage of his life the definition there offered of wherein the goodness of the law lies:

We all know that the law is an excellent thing, provided we treat it as law, recognizing that it is not aimed at good citizens, but at the lawless and unruly, the impious and sinful. . . .

The law, meant to be "lawfully" (*νομίμως*) used, as a restraint, to prevent excessive sin! In what a different world of thought this stands from the noble Pauline conception of the law as the revelation of God's will and character, liable to abuse precisely when it is used "lawfully"! It is when a change of mentality like this is added to the differences of vocabulary and expression, that the difficulty of accepting the Pastoral Epistles as wholly Pauline seems practically insuperable.

<sup>1</sup> "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms", *J.T.S.*, n.s. xv (1964), 1 ff.; cf. my "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Christological Terms", *J.T.S.*, n.s. x (1959), 247 ff.

But as soon as one has decided that the difficulties in the way of accepting these writings as entirely, if at all, Pauline, are insuperable, one is confronted with the corresponding difficulty of imagining a situation in which they could have been created. Barrett's suggestion<sup>1</sup> that the Pastorals are an attempt on the one hand to defend Paul against Judaistic detractors and, on the other, to show that he does not belong among the gnostics, is, in itself, plausible enough. But it hardly explains the peculiar features of these writings. It is these that constitute the impasse—an impasse that fragment-theories like P. N. Harrison's do little or nothing, as it seems to me, to remove.

For we are not confronted with a case of mere pseudonymity. If that were all, the problem might be more amenable. That all three epistles expressly claim to be by Paul, is, in itself, no difficulty to those who believe in what may be called well-intentioned pseudonymity. With no intention to deceive, they would say, the pseudonymist writes in the name of the apostle, genuinely believing that he is conveying a message that would have been acceptable to the master, and with the master's posthumous authority. And it may be that a writing like 2 Peter practically demonstrates that such a practice was followed at a comparatively early period—though the evidence for its being frequently followed in that period is not so convincing. But even so, the problem remains: how explain the circumstantial references in the Pastorals to the apostle's movements and plans? Critics who rightly or wrongly defend the naturalness and the honesty of pseudonymity in general, too often ignore this particular problem. 2 Peter can say that the apostle is about to die: that is an obvious and quite natural setting for weighty last words. But what would a posthumous pseudepigraph want with the cloak left at Troas, or (still odder!) with an expectation of speedy release? C. K. Barrett, although in part sharing with P. N. Harrison a view which demands belief in the insertion of Pauline fragments, rightly calls these alleged Pauline fragments "artless—and in some ways pointless—scraps" (op. cit. 11). They are worse than pointless. It seems gratuitously ironic—not to say

<sup>1</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New Clarendon Bible, Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 16 ff.

callous—for an imitator of a deceased master to say, in his name, that he is hoping soon to come and visit the recipient. And the P. N. Harrison type of theory, which finds these to be genuine Pauline fragments incorporated by the pseudonymist, has to face the difficulty<sup>1</sup> of explaining the origin of these floating scraps of Pauline messages, and how and why they were pieced together in this most extraordinary way. What evidence is there that Paul ever wrote such brief, detached messages? And who in the world would make an implausible pastiche of them with the hope of conveying verisimilitude?

It seems to me, therefore—and here I come to my own desperate effort to suggest a way through the impasse—that we are driven to a theory of free composition (in the case of 1 Timothy, very free composition) by an amanuensis during the apostle's lifetime. In this case, we have to resort, once more, to the postulate—as old as Eusebius (*H.E.* ii. 22.2)<sup>2</sup>—that Paul was released from prison and did the travelling implied by the Pastorals if they do belong to his lifetime, and was subsequently reimprisoned.

My suggestion is, then, that Luke wrote all three Pastoral epistles. But he wrote them during Paul's lifetime, at Paul's behest, and, in part (but only in part), at Paul's dictation.

The least Pauline of the three is 1 Timothy. It would be tempting, therefore, to place this last of all, at the end of the apostle's life and at a time when he was preoccupied with his trial, or even after his death. Indeed, I have suggested elsewhere<sup>3</sup> that the Christological titles of the Pastorals collectively may

<sup>1</sup> This difficulty remains, even when the number of scraps is reduced and their size correspondingly increased, as in *Paulines and Pastorals* (Villiers Publications, 1964), p. 10 (cf. Harrison's article, "The Pastoral Epistles and Duncan's Ephesian Theory", *J.N.T.S.* 2, 4 (May, 1956), 250 ff.). The same difficulty attaches to G. S. Duncan's suggestion of a *Sitz im Leben* for 2 Tim. iv, "Paul's Ministry in Asia—the Last Phase", *J.N.T.S.* 3.3 (May, 1957), 211 ff., and "Chronological Table to illustrate Paul's Ministry in Asia", *J.N.T.S.* 5.1 (Oct. 1958), 43 ff.

<sup>2</sup> I have not been able to see J. McRay's "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles", *Restoration Quarterly*, vii (1963), 2 ff., which, I understand, is relevant here. Eusebius's own speculations, it must be admitted, are expressly deduced only from the text of 2 Tim., apart from his mere mention of tradition (λόγος ἔχει).

<sup>3</sup> "The Influence of Circumstances on Christological Terms", *J.T.S.*, n.s. x (1959), 247 ff., see p. 262.

suggest a situation in which emperor worship had developed further than in Paul's lifetime. But perhaps this is not a necessary conclusion. Though, admittedly, the Pastorals' terms are more specialized,<sup>1</sup> rivalry with the Emperor is already implied in Luke's Gospel (e.g. ii. 11, "a Saviour . . . Christ the Lord") and in Acts xvii. 7 ("They all flout the Emperor's laws, and assert that there is a rival King, Jesus")—and Luke and Acts are seldom placed as late as the open clash between Christianity and the imperial cult. And, on the other side, there is also Titus iii. 1 to be remembered ("Remind them to be submissive to the government and the authorities . . .").<sup>2</sup> But, in any case, the two references in 1 Timothy (iii. 14 and iv. 13) to Paul's impending visit to Timothy would, as I have said, be a sort of mockery if 1 Timothy were posthumous. Perhaps, instead, 1 Timothy was written just as Paul, about to be temporarily released, was busy with the negotiations involved in the release. This would admirably fit the allusions, and the epistle's ending without autograph. Might it not be that Luke wrote it for the apostle and in his name but very much in his own, not the apostle's, manner of thinking; and, finding a suitable messenger just leaving for Ephesus, sent it off before the apostle had read, corrected, or signed it? There was no time to be lost, if Paul himself was really so soon to follow. The other two epistles would then be also by Luke as amanuensis, but with more apostolic control, though, again, without Paul's autograph.

I cannot pretend that an amanuensis' freely drafted and uncorrected letter is an easy thing to conceive of; but I do not find it impossible; and I find it less difficult to imagine than either that the whole of these epistles was written at the direct dictation of Paul or that they are artificial, posthumous compositions with genuine Pauline fragments set into them like a mosaic.

<sup>1</sup> For the incidence of such phrases in ruler cults, see A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (Eng. trans., Hodder & Stoughton, 1927), pp. 343 ff., and C. D. Morrison, *The Powers that Be* (S.C.M., 1960), pp. 131 ff.

<sup>2</sup> O. Roller, *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe* (*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament*, ed. A. Alt, R. Kittel, 5 Folge, Heft 6, Stuttgart, 1933), p. 97, who suggests placing Titus before both 1 and 2 Tim., thinks that the most likely moment for this sentiment would be just before Paul's presumed release from his first imprisonment, and before the Neronian edicts.

I find it easier to believe that the personal messages were actually given by Paul to Luke.

Perhaps the hardest feature to fit into the setting I am proposing is the portrait of Timothy himself. Defenders of the genuineness of the Pastorals have little difficulty in this respect with his youth, for they are able to show that *νεότης* is a relative term.<sup>1</sup> But the real problem was well expressed by B. S. Easton when he wrote<sup>2</sup>: “. . . to these years of close and affectionate intercourse [between Timothy and Paul] there is not the slightest allusion in 2 Timothy. Timothy is said, indeed, to have witnessed Paul's sufferings—but the sufferings (3.11) are those at Antioch, Iconium and Lystra, all of which occurred before Timothy's call!” The only answer I can propose to that is that, if Luke was responsible for the drafting of these epistles, it is, perhaps, intelligible that, in his reverence for Paul, he magnified the apostle's authority and seniority over against the younger man in a way in which Paul himself would not have.

If one could concede this much, then one might perhaps be ready to take one further step, which concerns the Pauline *corpus*. My proposal is that after Paul's death, Luke, who knew better than most how many letters the apostle had written, set to work to collect these—his companion's and leader's authentic writings. It might well be, if so, that such a collection stood for some time separate from these three last letters which Luke himself had so freely composed and might not have troubled to retrieve from their recipients. This might help to account for the shorter *corpus* without the Pastorals, which is reflected both in p<sup>46</sup> and in Marcion.

That, in outline is my suggestion.<sup>3</sup> At very best it is a sorry attempt to make the best of a bad job, and I shall not be surprised if I carry no one—perhaps not even the whole of myself—along

<sup>1</sup> E.g. E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale Press, 1954), p. 8; J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (A. and C. Black, 1963), p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> *The Pastoral Epistles* (S.C.M., 1948), p. 10; cf. pp. 235 ff., and C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New Clarendon Bible, Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 9 f.

<sup>3</sup> The amanuensis theory is accepted in principle by J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (N.T.D., Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1953), p. 7 f.

with the argument. What I hope, however, is that there may at least be some value in this attempt to force a recognition of the difficulties attaching to orthodox solutions, and in the material I now present in relation to it.

## II

Let me first go into a little more detail about the matter of authorship. I have already indicated why I side with those who find it almost or quite impossible to attribute the whole of these epistles to Paul. It is not merely a matter of vocabulary. Although the evidence of vocabulary is not to be ignored, and, in a moment, I am going to use it myself, it is a limited evidence because the problems it is supposed to solve are much too complex. It is much more significant that ways of thinking about fundamentals are different in the Pastorals from anything that we find in the acknowledged Paulines. I have mentioned the definition of the uses of law. This is not the time or place for a full review of other alien features. I will recall only two significant facts.<sup>1</sup> The first is that the famous Pauline phrase "in Christ" (etc.), although used in the Pastorals, is not used in connection with a directly personal relationship, but only with non-personal words such as "the faith", or "the life that is in Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 1, etc.). The second is that the word "Spirit" (*πνεῦμα*) is only comparatively rarely used in the Pastorals, and only twice of the Spirit of God given to Christians (2 Tim. i. 14, Tit. iii. 5). Without going any further, we find ourselves thus confronted with something subtly but decidedly different in atmosphere from the Paulines.

If, then, the case is pretty heavily loaded against, at any rate, total Pauline authorship, the favourites among alternative names are Tychicus and Luke. Jeremias, who believes the Pastorals to be genuinely Pauline but written by an amanuensis, asserts roundly<sup>2</sup> that Luke is certainly excluded by 2 Timothy iv. 11 which says "Luke alone is with me", and he chooses Tychicus.

<sup>1</sup> See W. G. Kümmel (Feine-Behm-Kümmel), *Einleitung in das neue Testament*<sup>13</sup> (Quelle und Meyer, Heidelberg, 1964), p. 278.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Briefe an Timotheus u. Titus* (N.T.D., Göttingen, 1953), p. 8.



He means, I suppose, that the amanuensis, whether he remained anonymous or, like Tertius in Romans xvi. 22, declared himself, would at any rate not speak of himself in the third person—and in a rather complimentary way at that. But to speak of oneself in the third person seems to me not unnatural when one is not writing in one's own name; and to say that he is the only one still with the apostle is, if it is a fact, hardly over boastful. I cannot see that 2 Timothy iv. 11 excludes Luke's pen from that epistle—let alone from the others. And, although M. Albertz<sup>1</sup> also comes down, albeit tentatively, on the side of Tychicus, there are others who favour Luke. Besides H. A. Schott, quoted above, P. N. Harrison cites J. D. James, *Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles* (1906), p. 154: “ ‘ Only Luke is with me ’—stares us on the written page.” Robert Scott, to whom I shall return directly, made out a considered case for him a few years later (1909)<sup>2</sup>; and Sir Robert Falconer, whose commentary<sup>3</sup> contains a very elaborate partition theory of the Pastoral Epistles, attributes certain sections to Luke. It is the case for Luke's immediate authorship of all three epistles that I want now to try to reinforce, while, at the same time, suggesting that they were written in Paul's lifetime and at his behest, though not entirely at his dictation.

I have said that I do not put much faith in the statistics of vocabulary. This is not because I am adverse to the use of figures carefully compiled by humans or by computers—being congenitally lazy, I am always eager for whatever help, human or mechanical, may be available.<sup>4</sup> It is merely because I doubt whether linguistic statistics can take us very far towards solving a problem in which a whole series of different factors must be taken into account—age, environment, situation, and so forth. One must ask how far the words in question are significant words; and—even more important—with what ideas they are associated. I am therefore far more inclined to take account of the character

<sup>1</sup> *Die Botschaft des neuen Testaments*, i. 2 (Zollikon-Zürich, 1952), 217-19.

<sup>2</sup> *The Pauline Epistles*, pp. 329 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937).

<sup>4</sup> K. Grayston and G. Herdan, “The Authorship of the Pastorals in the light of Statistical Linguistics”, *J.N.T.S.* 6 (1959-60), 1 ff., rightly complain against objections to applying statistical methods, as such, to literary problems.

of words, and of themes, images and ideas than of the mere numerical totals.

However, so far as indiscriminate word-counts do take us, it seems to me they take us, or at least allow us to go, in the direction of Luke.

Every student of this question is indebted to the late Dr. P. N. Harrison for his invaluable<sup>1</sup> tables, added to, at the end of his long life, in a posthumously published volume.<sup>2</sup> Sir Robert Falconer's commentary<sup>3</sup> and, more recently, R. Morgenthaler's splendid statistical tables<sup>4</sup> are also of great value.

The main result of statistical work on the vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles is to associate them rather with the Hellenistic and sub-apostolic writers than with Paul. But the same might well be true, I suspect, of Luke's writing, if we had enough of his own to test by. As it is, Luke-Acts is too full (in all probability) of sources for that particular test to be particularly easy. Luke is widely recognized as having used sources (especially in the Gospel) and as having assumed styles from the Septuagint when he deemed it appropriate to do so. But equally, he is recognized as capable, on occasion, of writing in the manner of a Hellenistic historian. If any test were to be applied to him, it should probably be on the last eight chapters of Acts, which look like his own independent, eye-witness narrative. I suspect that it would bring him out with much the same affinities as the Pastoral Epistles. It is true that P. N. Harrison maintains that it is the period A.D. 95-170 to which they belong, and that he shows that, of the words in them not found elsewhere in the New Testament, nor in the Apostolic Fathers, nor in the Apologists, very few can

<sup>1</sup> This, in spite of any criticisms to which he may be open. See criticisms in B. M. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles", *E.T.*, lxx (1958-9), 91 ff.; Grayston-Herdan, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> His earlier work, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford University Press, 1921), has just been crowned by *Paulines and Pastorals* (Villiers Publications, 1964), a supplementary volume. Dr. Harrison died, after a short illness, on 23 August 1964, and his son, J. G. Harrison, helped him through the publication of this book.

<sup>3</sup> *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937).

<sup>4</sup> *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Gotthelf-Verlag, Zürich, 1958).

be dated earlier.<sup>1</sup> But that is hardly convincing proof that they could not have been written by a Hellenistic writer in about A.D. 60.

So far as I know, the following two sets of figures have not been isolated by the scholars just mentioned : (i) the number of words in the Pauline epistles (excluding the Pastorals) found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Luke-Acts ; (ii) the number of words in the Pastorals found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Luke-Acts. With the help of the tables already available, I have attempted to obtain these figures, and the result (unless I have miscalculated) gives a distinctly, though admittedly not vastly, higher figure, proportionately, as an average per page, for the second group. As far as it goes—though this is, no doubt, not far—this reinforces the case for Lucan authorship. A further step, presumably, would be to compare with these figures the ratio between the Luke-Acts vocabulary and that of the non-Paulines. Not being a statistician, I only ask (it is not within my competence to answer) whether this type of investigation, carried out scientifically, might not yield some significant results.

The strongest evidence from mere vocabulary-counts that I have met against Lucan authorship is the dearth of Lucan particles, etc., from the Pastorals.<sup>2</sup> Most noteworthy of all is the lack of *σύν* and the dearth of *συν*-compounds.<sup>3</sup> That the Pastorals are more sparing in Septuagint words than are the other epistles<sup>4</sup> need not be so significant. Luke's Septuagintalisms are, one suspects, a "turn" that he could put on at will. There is no reason why he should do this when writing a letter.

Taking the statistics all round, then, I cannot see that—unless the argument based on the particles is decisive—there is anything but encouragement for the Lucan theory.

But I said that it was significant words that must carry the weight, together with themes, images, and ideas. What happens, then, by such a test? Years ago I published a very slight sketch of what seemed to me to be traces and echoes of Gospel parables,

<sup>1</sup> See *The Problem*, pp. 82 ff. ; *Paulines and Pastorals*, pp. 19 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *The Problem*, p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles*, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles*, p. 23.

sayings, and scenes in the New Testament epistles.<sup>1</sup> My intention then was simply to see whether we could detect traces of the more descriptive and pictorial side of the Gospel traditions lurking in the words of the epistles. I did not immediately notice, as I have more recently, that, when I had done my best, a considerable proportion of the alleged Gospel echoes were in the Pastoral Epistles, and were echoes, moreover, from the material peculiar to Luke. Later, I went on to make a collection of all the parallels I could find between Luke and the Pastorals. These I mentioned in a short excursus to my book, *The Birth of the New Testament*<sup>2</sup>; and then I found that I had been anticipated by Robert Scott of Bombay. In a book, *The Pauline Epistles: a Critical Study* (T. and T. Clark, 1909), he made an attempt to detect, within the collection of writings canonically attributed to Paul, four groups, only the first of which was directly and immediately Pauline. This was, of course, nothing new in principle, even at that date. But Scott is important for the present purpose, partly because of his emphasis upon the fact that it does not require *lapse of time* to account for differences of phrase and theme, but only *a difference of culture and outlook* (pp. 351 f.), and partly because Scott was, perhaps, the earliest critic to exhibit in considerable detail a number of parallels between the Pastorals and Luke-Acts. I owe my own discovery of his book to D. Guthrie's *New Testament Introduction: the Pauline Epistles* (Tyndale Press, 1961), p. 235, n. 3. Putting my collection and Scott's together, rejecting some of Scott's as (to me) unconvincing, and adding some further items to my own collection, I now have what seems to me a not unimpressive list.

I will not weary you with a recitation of it all—I will select some specimens to show you the kind of thing I mean. Let me group my specimens in three broad categories, A, B, and C, although there will be a measure of overlapping between them.

First, A, the category of significant words, or uses of words:

(i) I have never been much impressed by the alleged medical

<sup>1</sup> "The Use of Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in early Christian Catechesis", *J.T.S.*, n.s. iii (1952), 75 ff. See also H. Riesenfeld, "Le Langage Parabolique dans les Épîtres de Saint Paul", *Recherches Bibliques*, v (Desclée de Brouwer, 1960), pp. 47 ff.

<sup>2</sup> A. and C. Black, 1962, p. 220 f.

language of Luke. H. J. Cadbury, I think, exposed the weaknesses in the reasoning of Hobart and Harnack when they tried to build upon it.<sup>1</sup> But it is, possibly, significant, nevertheless, that both νοσεῖν, "to be ill", and ὑγιαίνειν, "to be well", are *metaphorically* used (of doctrinal error or soundness) only in the Pastorals (νοσεῖν, 1 Tim. vi. 4, ὑγιαίνειν, 1 Tim. i. 10, vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 13, iv. 3, Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 1, 2). (As a matter of fact, this is the only New Testament occurrence of νοσεῖν; and ὑγιαίνειν, even in its literal sense, only comes in Luke v. 31, vii. 10, xv. 27, and in 3 John 2; but that, I think is not significant. νόσος (νοσώδης does not occur) and ὑγιής (ὑγίεια does not occur) have a rather wider currency.) It must be added that, as P. N. Harrison shows,<sup>2</sup> Philo uses the terms ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι (*de Abr.*, 223) and ὑγιής λόγος (*de somn.*, i. 79).

(ii) Luke and the Pastorals almost possess a monopoly within the New Testament, of the word-group εὐσεβ-, denoting piety or godliness: εὐσέβεια, outside Acts iii. 12 and the Pastorals, only occurs in 2 Peter (thrice); εὐσεβεῖν occurs only in Acts and 1 Timothy (once each); εὐσεβής occurs twice in Acts (x. 2, 7) and once in 2 Peter (ii. 9); εὐσεβῶς comes only at 2 Timothy iii. 12 and Titus ii. 12.

(iii) The interesting compounds ζωγρεῖν, (Luke v. 10, 2 Timothy ii. 26), "to catch alive", and ζωογονεῖν (Luke xvii. 33, Acts vii. 19, 1 Timothy vi. 13), "to preserve alive", are both confined to the Lucan writings and the Pastorals.

(iv) περιποιεῖσθαι, "to acquire, get hold of" or "save, preserve" occurs only at Luke xvii. 33, Acts xx. 28, 1 Timothy iii. 13 (though the noun, περιποίησις, is quite differently distributed).

(v) Finally, so far as "A" is concerned, the word τιμή which, in the New Testament, mostly means "honour", is used just twice in the sense honorarium or material gift or reward, namely, at Acts xxviii. 10 (of the gifts given to the shipwrecked Christians by the Maltese) and at 1 Timothy v. 17 (of the stipend, or honorarium, of elders).

<sup>1</sup> *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Harvard Theological Studies, VI, 1920), pp. 39 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Paulines and Pastorals*, p. 135 f.

In category "B" I place what may be called significant phrases, or collocations of words. My meaning will be obvious enough as we look at them.

(i) In 1 Timothy vi there is a good deal of moralizing against love of wealth. In verse 10 it is called *φιλαργυρία*, "love of money"; in verse 17, when the theme is taken up again, Timothy is told to charge his flock *μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*—"not to be haughty". Now, in Luke xvi. 14, the Pharisees (surprisingly, and I do not know how correctly<sup>1</sup>) are described as *φιλάργυροι*, "lovers of money"; and in the next verse, Jesus is represented as saying to them that what is lofty, *ὑψηλόν*, among men is abominated by God. Is this collocation fortuitous? *φιλαργυρία* and *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*, it may be added, come, in the New Testament, only at 1 Timothy vi. 10, 17; *φιλάργυρος* comes only at Luke xvi. 14 and 2 Timothy iii. 2; *ἀφιλάργυρος*—the opposite adjective—comes only at 1 Timothy iii. 3 and Hebrews xiii. 5. Here, then, is a group of words which might have been split up and quoted separately in group "A", but which receive added significance by this collocation.

(ii) Still on the subject of true and false riches, it is Luke's gospel which, more than the others, elaborates the theme of the folly of laying up treasure on earth, but not being (as the phrase has it) rich "towards God" (*μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν*, Luke xii. 21); and it is that same passage in 1 Timothy vi that takes up these phrases also: men are to be exhorted (verses 18 f.) "to be rich in good deeds" (*πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς*), "laying up for themselves a good foundation for the future" (*ἀποθησαυρίζοντες ἑαυτοῖς θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον*). The themes of the distinctively Lucan parables of the rich fool and the dishonest bailiff are clearly audible here.

(iii) In 2 Timothy ii. 12 comes the aphorism: "if we endure we shall share his Kingdom" (*εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συνβασιλεύσομεν*). In Luke alone comes the saying of Jesus (Luke xxii. 28 f.), "You are the ones who have persevered with me in my testing times, and I covenant to give you a kingdom" (*ὕμεῖς . . . ἔστε οἱ*

<sup>1</sup> But see J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*<sup>2</sup> (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1958), II.A, 28-30, where there is evidence for cases of greed, coupled with a lack of affluence.

διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν . . . βασιλείαν).

(iv) In the Gospel saying about the labourer being worthy of support, the Matthean form (Matt. x. 10) has “worthy of his keep” (τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ). Luke (x. 7) has “of his pay” (τοῦ μισθοῦ), and so does the version of the saying in 1 Timothy v. 18.

(v) Next, there is a linked complex of sayings about Christ as destined to be judge of all alike, of the whole world, of both living and dead. The cliché “living and dead” is peculiar, within the New Testament, to 2 Timothy iv. 1 and Acts x. 42. (The nearest approach is Romans xiv. 9, where it is in the reverse order, “dead and living”.) If we place these two passages, 2 Timothy iv. 1 and Acts x. 42, side by side, and add a third, from Paul’s Areopagus speech in Acts xvii, we can see some suggestive links :

Acts x. 42 : καὶ παρήγγειλεν ἡμῖν κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ καὶ διαμαρτύρασθαι ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.

2 Timothy iv. 1 : διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,  
...

Acts xvii. 31 : καθότι ἔστησεν ἡμέραν ἐν ἣ μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὤρισεν, . . . <sup>1</sup>

(vi) Finally, there is a striking metaphor—the metaphor of the athlete finishing his race—shared in common between Paul’s farewell address to the elders of Ephesus, in Acts xx, and what reads like his farewell message in 2 Timothy :

Acts xx. 24 : “For myself, I set no store by life ; I only want to finish my race” (ὡς τελειώσω τὸν δρόμον μου) “and complete the task which the Lord Jesus assigned to me . . .”.

2 Timothy iv. 7 : “I have run the great race” (τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι), “I have finished the course” (τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα), “I have kept faith.”

It is to be observed that only once again does δρόμος, “race-course”, occur in the New Testament, and this, too, is in a Pauline speech, in Acts xiii. 25 : “And when John was nearing

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Acts xxiv. 15.

the end of his course" (*ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρο Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον*), . . . The simplest explanation of this phenomenon, obviously, is that all three passages are genuinely Pauline; but I think it proper to include it here, in case it is deemed that the Acts speeches are Lucan.

My last group, "C", may be headed significant ideas. Once again, there is a certain overlapping, for the athletic metaphor we have just been considering as a significant phrase could be classed also as an idea. But I distinguish, in this third section, something more far-reaching than mere phrases—what can only be called ethical or theological ideas; and of these I offer two.

(i) The first is the so-called "angelic trinity"—that is, a phrase which, instead of the late, credal Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—speaks of God or the Father, Christ or the Son of Man, and the angels. I do not, of course, mean that the triple phrase is intended metaphysically or is really comparable to trinitarian terms, as though it were an early and undeveloped form of these. It is merely a convenient designation for a triple phrase of majesty in which the angels figure side by side with God and Christ.

In Luke ix. 26 there is the saying, "Whoever is ashamed of me and mine, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him, when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and the holy angels".

In 1 Timothy v. 21, "Before God and Christ Jesus and the angels who are his chosen, I solemnly charge you . . .".

(ii) Peculiarly clear in Luke (if, for a moment, we leave the Pastorals out of reckoning) is a quantitative, retributive notion of justice and responsibility, coupled with a theory of the veniality of unwitting sin. At Luke xii. 47 f. comes the saying, peculiar to Luke, about the one who sins in ignorance deserving a less severe beating than the one who sins with his eyes open, and about the man of many gifts being correspondingly the more responsible. At Luke xxiii. 34 (if it is the true reading, though this is doubtful) is the prayer of our Lord as he was fastened to the cross: "Father, forgive them; they do not know what they are doing"; and at Acts iii. 17, Peter excuses the Jews for the death of Christ because they did it in ignorance (a very rare note in the New



Testament). Where else is this weighing of guiltiness expressed? Surely at 1 Timothy i. 13, "But because I acted ignorantly in unbelief I was dealt with mercifully" (ἠλεήθην, ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα). One may add, in passing, that without any such condition, the dying Stephen prays, at Acts vii. 60, "do not hold this sin against them"; and similarly at 2 Timothy iv. 16 we find "I pray that it may not be held against them".

Other ideas might be adduced, not least in the Christological realm, but I leave you with these two examples, only adding that there is an indication of more that might be said in C. K. Barrett's remark (*Luke the Historian in Recent Study*, 1961, p. 62 f.) that Luke "shares the attitude of the Pastorals, though he is prevented by his subject-matter from uttering the explicit: O Timothy, guard the deposit, and turn away from profane babblings, and the contradictions of falsely so-called *gnosis* (1 Tim. vi. 20)."

### III

Supposing, then, that, for the sake of argument, we accept the hypothesis that Luke may have been the "framer" (shall we say?) of these epistles. We must now examine more narrowly the question I have already formulated: In what circumstances can we conceive of this taking place? Writings under an assumed name—pseudepigraphs—are, for obvious reasons, normally composed after the death of the bearer of the name. Otherwise there would be no point in the fiction. There are plenty of pseudepigraphical books attached to great Old Testament names like Daniel, Enoch, Moses, Solomon and Esra which were written centuries after the period of the real or mythical figures who are their alleged authors; and a spate of fiction under apostolic names, too, sprang up some century and a half or two centuries after the apostles. A writing like 2 Peter, inside the New Testament canon, which is widely believed to be a pseudepigraph, is, if so, exceptionally close to its alleged author's actual date; and K. Aland has plausibly suggested<sup>1</sup> that the earliest

<sup>1</sup> "The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Christian Literature of the First Two Centuries", *J.T.S.*, n.s., xii (1961), 1 ff.

stage of Christian pseudonymity was an oral stage, when an actual disciple of an apostle spoke in the apostle's name under the influence of a prophetic afflatus. Nobody was at the time deceived: they recognized this as—say—a Petrine message through an inspired disciple of Peter's, and gladly accepted it for what it was. It was only later, when such a message came to be written down, and when the generation who knew the speaker had passed, that the speaker's words, still bearing not his name but his master's, might be mistaken for literally the apostle's work—or as purporting to be such.

I am proposing, however, to treat the Pastorals as Luke's work, but written in the apostle's life-time and at his behest. The chief reasons that drive me to this odd conclusion are these (I have already alluded to the first of them): (i) I can understand a pseudepigrapher representing the apostle, as in 2 Peter i. 14, as standing near the end of his life. It is a perfectly intelligible device to add weight to the message by presenting it as the apostle's last words. But I find it harder to conceive of an apostle's disciple pretending, after his master's death, that he was still shortly coming to visit his addressee. Twice in 1 Timothy this note is struck: iii. 14 f.: "I am hoping to come to you before long, but I write this in case I am delayed . . ."; iv. 13 "until I arrive . . .".<sup>1</sup> Some may say that this is an obvious device to lend verisimilitude, and I know that judgments of this sort are difficult to assess objectively. I can only say that to me it seems a piece of gratuitous irony and in bad taste.

(ii) On the other hand, in 2 Timothy iv. 6 ff. where there is indeed a "last words" setting, perfectly suited to a pseudepigraph, the effect is gratuitously ruined by the introduction of those extraordinary snippets of trivial detail, about the cloak and the books. It is hard enough to understand what Paul would want with them if he really thought that he was soon going to be executed. But it is still harder, in my opinion, to see why a pseudepigrapher should invent details so little consistent with an idealized scene of martyrdom. Surely, of the two, it is easier to

<sup>1</sup> Whether this *ἕως ἔρχομαι* goes with what follows, as N. Turner, in Moulton-Howard's *Grammar*, iii (T. and T. Clark, 1963), p. 344, holds, or with what precedes, does not alter the case.

believe that Paul really did send a message to Timothy (by Luke's pen, as I am suggesting) to this effect, either because he had a secret hope he might be reprieved and outlast the winter, or because he did not know that there would not be a long delay before the execution, even if he were condemned.

(iii) The P. N. Harrison type of solution, of course, has its answer to this problem. These—and other bits of all three letters—really are genuine scraps of Pauline “personalia”, but they belong at a quite different stage of his career and have simply been posthumously incorporated—both to preserve apostolic material and to lend verisimilitude—by the imitator. I must confess that it amazes me that such a solution has gained wide currency, for it presupposes (what, to the best of my knowledge there is not a shred of evidence to support) that Paul wrote these little scraps on separate, detached papyri; and, even if that could be established, it requires us to believe that they were kept by the recipients—another improbable assumption; and finally, it asks us to picture an imitator going round and collecting them and copying them into the letter he has fabricated at points so captiously selected that they have puzzled commentators ever since. Incidentally, it has been pertinently asked why the compiler did not put any of these fragments in 1 Timothy.<sup>1</sup> What seems to me fatal to the scrap theory (this stromatic theory, if I may coin the term!) is that it requires so much credulity on all sides.

For such reasons, I suggest, it is worth while to hunt for a more plausible explanation. The phenomenon to be explained—supposing I am right in my analysis of it—is a series of writings written in the name of Paul, but bearing, at various points, non-Pauline characteristics such as I have listed, yet containing also phrases and statements about Paul, which, whether in Paul's own actual words or not, are difficult to account for, and seem to be aimless, unless Paul himself prescribed them at those points. It is at this stage that I join with many before me who have invoked

<sup>1</sup> See D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles* (Tyndale Press, 1961), p. 224 f.; J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (A. and C. Black, 1963), p. 29; cf. W. G. Kümmel (Feine-Behm-Kummel), *Einleitung in das neue Testament*<sup>13</sup> (Quelle und Meyer, Heidelberg, 1964), p. 279.

Otto Roller's celebrated work.<sup>1</sup> This is an investigation of the Pauline corpus in the light of methods of letter writing in antiquity—the use of amanuenses, and so forth ; and it reaches the conclusion that, unless one had a professional stenographer and high quality papyrus, one would be unlikely to dictate verbatim. Verbatim dictation would need to be so slow and laborious that it would, in fact, become dictation syllable by syllable, and the composer's style (especially if he were a torrential thinker like Paul) would be gravely hampered. Much more likely alternatives are either that the apostle would write with his own hand—as he evidently did at the end of Galatians, if not throughout that letter, and as I strongly suspect he did at a certain point in 2 Corinthians, where the style is more intensely Aramaic than anywhere else<sup>2</sup>—or else that he would tell a friend what he wanted said and let the friend frame it in his own words, using, no doubt, as much of the apostle's actual words as he remembered. The apostle would then read it through to alter or emend before he added his signature or, at any rate, his autograph.

Some of Roller's details have been challenged, and I am told that he overdraws the picture of the slowness and difficulty with which the non-professional amanuensis might write. But I am not aware that his main conclusions need to be altered.<sup>3</sup>

If so, I repeat the suggestion of many before me, that a solution to our problem might be found by postulating Luke as the amanuensis ; and I would assume a rather exceptional range of fluctuation between, on the one hand, the very free composition, embodying little more than the subjects and general lines of

<sup>1</sup> *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament*, ed. A. Alt and R. Kittel, 5 Folge, Heft 6, Stuttgart, 1933). Cf. J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (N.T.D., Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1953)*, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. in 2 Cor. viii. 23 f. there is not a single main verb.

<sup>3</sup> W. G. Kümmel (Feine-Behm-Kümmel), *Einleitung in das neue Testament*<sup>13</sup> (Quelle und Meyer, Heidelberg, 1964), 176, surely dismisses Roller too lightly when he objects that the frequent breaks and interruptions in the Pauline letters imply dictation, and appeals to the consistency of style. Has not the uniformity of style (as contrasted with thought) in the epistles been exaggerated? It does not seem to me to be true that (to quote Grayston and Herdan in *J.N.T.S.* 6 (1959-60), 15) "if ever a writer was in the grip of his own words, it was Paul". More realistically, Roller (p. 148) speaks of the "Timotheisch-Paulinisch Mischstil" of Paul's letters.

exhortation which the apostle had directed (1 Tim.), and, on the other, the much more nearly verbatim reproduction of his phrases (2 Tim.).

The non-Pauline characteristics are spread over all three epistles,<sup>1</sup> but it is widely agreed that 1 Timothy looks the least Pauline of all, and it contains the highest concentration of the sort of features I have illustrated, while 2 Timothy, by contrast, is, by some, accepted as at least containing much that is fully Pauline. It would, as I have said, be easy to propose that this only means that 1 Timothy is a posthumous pseudepigraph, even if 2 Timothy (and possibly Titus) are not: but I have already pointed out the difficulties in the way of treating 1 Timothy so. Instead, we have to find a setting in which 1 Timothy could have been freely composed by Luke shortly before Paul was, in fact, released. And why not? It has been pointed out by several writers that there is no radical objection to the old theory (as old at least at Eusebius)<sup>2</sup> that Paul was released from imprisonment in Rome and only later reimprisoned. Is it not conceivable that, just before this release, he needed to send messages to Timothy in a hurry—pastoral directions as well as personal messages—but had not the leisure from preoccupations (including, it might be, the actual judicial proceedings immediately preceding the release) to devote to working out his themes in detail? In such circumstances, might not Luke have worked up this pastoral letter for his friend and master, using his own phrases and his own examples and his own reasoning (or lack of it) as best he could?<sup>3</sup> And might it not have been that he found a suitable messenger just leaving for Ephesus, and decided that, since there was no time to lose, it had better go off, even though the apostle had not read and signed it? C. Spicq, in a recent article,<sup>4</sup> has collected from the non-literary papyri some reference to just such opportunist seizing upon messengers to carry letters. Objectors will,

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 22-24.      <sup>2</sup> See above, p. 434, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Roller, *op. cit.* pp. 147 ff., notes the official character of 1 Tim. (especially). Is not this just how a disciple, impressed by his master's authority would have written?

<sup>4</sup> "Pèlerine et Vêtements (à propos de *II Tim.* iv, 13 et *Act.* xx, 33)", in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, i (*Studi e Testi*, 231) (1964), 389 ff. (see p. 398 and n. 25).

no doubt, taunt me by asking whether Paul was so busy packing his valise that he could not sign his letters.<sup>1</sup> But I do not think that the situation I have sketched is really so implausible.

I do not think that 1 Timothy i. 3 compels us to postulate that Timothy had only *recently* been left at Ephesus when this letter was written. It is not incompatible with a much longer interval than either Paul or Timothy had expected when they parted (perhaps at the point indicated by Acts xx. 15 f.). The letter to Titus will have to have been written, again by Luke at Paul's behest but unsigned by Paul, from somewhere along Paul's route between Crete and Nicopolis, during the interval between the release and the reimprisonment; while 2 Timothy must have been written, also by Luke, during the second imprisonment and near the apostle's death, in different circumstances, and with much closer attention to the details of the apostle's messages, though still with a certain admixture of Luke's own style and ideas, and still without an autograph—this time, perhaps, because the apostle did not survive to add it. This means a thoroughgoing reinstatement of the old-fashioned theory of a journey to Crete and perhaps to Spain and all the rest of it. But why not? Objections are fashionable, but not, I think, cogent.

I have one final suggestion to fling out for your consideration. The collecting of the Pauline epistles is a notorious enigma. How did it take place—gradually, snowball-wise, or at the initiative of one man? <sup>2</sup> E. J. Goodspeed's most ingenious theory <sup>3</sup> that Onesimus was the initiator of it has been trenchantly criticized.<sup>4</sup> But I am not convinced that the only alternative is to postulate not the work of a single person but a gradual, snowball growth.

<sup>1</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New Clarendon Bible, Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 7, says that if the secretary was responsible for such un-Pauline writing he was not a secretary but an author. So be it! I do not wish to press the secretarial term; all I require is a trusted writer, writing for the apostle in the apostle's lifetime. In a review of J. N. D. Kelly, *J.T.S.*, n.s. xv. 2 (Oct. 1964), Barrett writes (p. 377): "The impression given by the Pastorals is precisely that of an essay in Paulinism written by one who was not Paul".

<sup>2</sup> See C. L. Mitton, *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus* (Epworth Press, 1955).

<sup>3</sup> *New Solutions to New Testament Problems* (Chicago, 1927), *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago, 1933), *The Key to Ephesians* (Chicago, 1956).

<sup>4</sup> See, especially, G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: a Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (British Academy, *Schweich Lectures*, 1946, 1953), esp. p. 276 f.

Suppose we offer St. Luke as a candidate. Goodspeed thought that Onesimus was led to his work of going round and collecting the epistles by reading Acts, which brought it to his attention that there must be epistles at the Pauline centres there described. But the one thing Acts does not refer to is that Paul wrote any letters to his churches. Surely it is far more plausible—if we are looking for a single person's initiative at all—to choose not the reader but the writer of Acts. Though Acts mentions no Pauline epistles, Luke as Paul's companion knew of them; and as the biographer of Paul (if I may be allowed a phrase which, I know, is not a strictly correct description of the Acts), he is the sort of person who might have thought of making such a collection. There is some degree of doubt whether the Pastorals formed part of the earliest Pauline corpus.<sup>1</sup> Suppose they did not, what more likely than that Luke, if he had written them himself, should deem them less important than the others, knowing, in any case, that whenever he did need them he could probably retrieve them from Timothy and Titus? It would be the earlier letters he would go for first.

I said at the beginning that theories about the Pastoral Epistles are too often put forward with too little attention to the difficulties attending them. I have tried to be fair to the difficulties attending the theory I have advanced, but I dare say that I am still unaware of their size. My main question is only whether the difficulties attending others are not even greater.

<sup>1</sup> That they were not in Marcion's canon is interpreted by Tert., *adv. M.*, v. 21, to mean that he had *rejected* them, not that they were not known by then, but this is not necessarily true. Tatian, however, knew and (according to Jerome (pref. to Tit.)) denied the authenticity of 1 Tim. on ascetical grounds, but accepted Titus. From the end of the second century (Murat. Canon, Iren., Tert.) they are recognized as Pauline. That p<sup>46</sup> does not contain them may not prove that they were never there (the question of space is not certain).