

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1955

### The linguistic problem of the Pastoral Epistles

Norman C. Meyer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, nandemeyer@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Meyer, Norman C., "The linguistic problem of the Pastoral Epistles" (1955). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 908.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/908>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE LINGUISTIC PROBLEM OF  
THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

---

A Thesis Presented to  
the Faculty of Concordia Seminary  
Department of New Testament

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Bachelor of Divinity

---

By  
Norman C. Meyer

May, 1949

Approved by: Martin H. Franzmann  
Otto E. Bohm

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	111
I. Peculiar Variations from, and Additions to, Pauline Vocabulary. . . . .	1
II. Pauline Elements Lacking in the Pastoral Epistles. . . . .	34
III. Pauline Elements in the Pastoral Epistles. . .	46
IV. The Pastoral Epistles Compared with Writings of the Second Century . . . . .	62
Conclusion . . . . .	74
Bibliography . . . . .	81

THE LINGUISTIC PROBLEM  
OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

Introduction

The Pastoral Epistles comprise perhaps the most timely and practical letters in our New Testament canon. They are at one and the same time valuable for the twentieth century minister in his glorious task as shepherd of souls, and vital to the average Christian man -- beset from without with all sort of false doctrine, and beset from within with the ever present danger of slipping from "godliness" into a life of self-seeking and arrogant pride.

Yet, even these priceless letters have not escaped the suspicious eyes of critics. For some time they escaped the tag of "spurious," or "forgery," or even "compilation." Immediately after their appearance they were recognized by the Early Church as truly Pauline. Therefore, very early they were admitted with the other ten Pauline Epistles into the New Testament canon.

It was not until the appearance of the second century heretics that the critical machinery began to move against

the Pastoral Epistles. The first heretic to reject the Pastoral Epistles was Basilides (ca. 125 A.D.). A second heretic, Marcion (ca. 140) followed Basilides and omitted the Pastorals from his canon.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the critical machinery was oiled and ready to move on against the genuineness of the Pastorals. But again for a period they were universally accepted. From the time of Irenaeus (d. 202) until the beginning of the nineteenth century no one, Christian or non-Christian, doubted that the Pastoral Epistles were genuine letters of Paul. They were included in all the manuscripts and all lists of Pauline Epistles without exception. They were included in the Muratorian Canon (170-180), as well as in the Peshito (411-435). They were recognized by the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists among the universally accepted Scriptural Canon.<sup>2</sup>

The scholarly criticism of the Pastorals was reserved for the Bible students of the nineteenth century. The first

---

1. White, however feels this rejection by the heretics only serves as a "positive testimony in their favour by the contemporary Church." Newport J. D. White, "The First and Second Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus" (Introduction), in Vol. 4 of The Expositor's Greek Testament, W. Robertson Nicoll, ed., p. 76. Easton contends against the idea that Marcion "rejected" the Pastorals. "It is much more likely that the Pauline canon he knew in his younger days at Pontus (ca. 110?) simply did not contain them." Burton Scott Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 32.

2. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Jerome assert that the heretics' omission of the Pastorals was due to their dislike of the teaching of these letters, aimed directly against just such false doctrine as they were propounding. So also J. J. Van Oosterzee, "The Two Epistles

to take up the cudgels was J. E. C. Schmidt.<sup>3</sup> He denied the genuineness of 1 Timothy only. Schleiermacher followed Schmidt in rejecting 1 Timothy, feeling that it was a compilation based on the other two Epistles.<sup>4</sup> The first to deny the genuineness of all three letters was Eichhorn. In 1812 he advanced his theory that the basis of the Pastoral Epistles was derived from Paul, but that the actual writing was done by one of his pupils. This view was sustained by De Wette<sup>5</sup> and Schott.<sup>6</sup> Credner also rejected all three letters, but ascribed them to a fictitious source.

The most violent attack of this century against the authenticity of the Pastorals came from the Tübingen School. The harshest critic of the School was Baur. He saw the need of proving that our Epistles had their origin in a period later than the lifetime of Paul.<sup>7</sup>

This then was the beginning of criticism against the

---

or Paul to Timothy," in vol. 8 of John Peter Lange's A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Philip Schaff, trans. and ed., p. 2. It is perhaps noteworthy that Heracleon, a later heretic, seems to accept at least 2 Timothy by alluding to 2 Tim. 2:13. See White, loc. cit.

3. In his Introduction, 1804.

4. In his letter to Gass (1807).

5. In his Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1826.

6. Schott ascribed the actual writing of the Pastorals to Luke in his Isagoge, 1830.

7. "There is no sufficient resting-place for the critical judgment of rejection, so long as we only know that the epistles cannot be Pauline; everything depends on proving positively that they arose at a later date." Bauer cited in Huther, Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus (Introduction), in vol. 9 of H. A. W. Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament, David Hunter, trans., p. 59.

Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. At first directed only against one letter, it gradually expanded to include all three. This was the root from which a widespread growth of liberal<sup>8</sup> criticism has arisen, until the present age contains few New Testament scholars who are able to see their way clearly through the maze of internal problems which the Pastorals contain back to the universal position of the early Catholic Church.

Which then are the difficulties which hinder scholars from accepting the Pastorals as genuine letters from the pen of the great Apostle Paul? The problems of one letter are also the problems of the others. Modern critics are agreed that the three stand or fall as a unit.<sup>9</sup> We also approach our problem with that view in mind.

The problems which confront the critic as he approaches the Pastoral Epistles are varied. They have been concisely summarized by Zahn into five. The liberal scholars claim (1) that the church organization implied in the Pastorals points to a later period than the life of Paul; (2) that the false teachers condemned in the

---

8. To facilitate matters, and for want of a better term, we will use the terms "liberal" and "conservative" throughout this paper only in so far as they apply to views concerning the Pauline authorship of our Epistles.

9. "In der That sind die drei Briefe unzertrennlichere Drillinge, als Epheser- und Kolosser-brief Zwillinge sind." Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 7. So also Edmund K. Simpson, "The Authenticity and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," in The Evangelical Quarterly, XII (October, 1940), 290: "They cleave together inextricably."

Pastorals did not exist until after the death of Paul; (3) that the language of these Epistles is too different from that of the "authentic" Pauline letters, and that they therefore could not have been written by Paul; (4) that the logical sequence of thought, so evident in the other ten epistles, is lacking in the Pastorals; (5) that the conception of Christianity in the Pastorals differs from that in the other ten Pauline letters.<sup>10</sup>

We will restrict our study to the third of these problems: THE LINGUISTIC PROBLEM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. This is the problem around which critics of our day are chiefly building their critical studies. Liberal and conservative scholars alike are most deeply impressed with this one phase of study.

Our purpose, therefore, is to make a study of this linguistic problem confronted in our Epistles and to state the conclusions of various scholars derived from their research into this single problem.

---

10. G. Wohlenberg, Die Pastoralbriefe, in Theodor Zahn's Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, vol. 13, p. 21.



I. Peculiar Variations from,  
and Additions to, Pauline Vocabulary

Liberal criticism points to a peculiar newness in expression in the Pastorals as certain evidence that they could not have been written by Paul. These Epistles contain words and phrases which, while they have appeared previously in Paul, here in our Epistles arise conspicuously in a variation of form or meaning. Indeed, some words and phrases are entirely new to the vocabulary of Paul as known from previous Epistles.

White lists several of these phrases in the Pastorals which appear in a peculiar sense. Those which have caused the most stir in the minds of the critics are the following: A. Terminology of the Christian society-- *πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη* (1 Tim. 1:14; 2:15; 2 Tim. 1:13); *πίστις, ἀγάπη ὑπομογή* (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:10; Tit. 2:2); *ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία* (1 Tim. 1:10; 2 Tim. 4:3; Tit. 1:9; 2:1); *ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι* (1 Tim. 2:4; 6:3; 2 Tim. 1:13; 2:25; 3:7); *ὑγιαίνειν τῇ πίστει* (Tit. 1:13; 2:2); *λόγος ὑγιής* (Tit. 2:8); *ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας* and *ἐπιγινώσκειν τὴν ἀληθειάν* (1 Tim. 4:3); *κατ' εὐσέβειαν* (1 Tim. 6:3; Tit. 1:1); *εὐσεβῶς βίην* (2 Tim. 3:12; Tit. 2:12); *ὁ γὰρ αἰών* (1 Tim. 6:17; 2 Tim. 4:10; Tit. 2:12); *συνείδησις καθαρὰ* (1 Tim. 3:9; 2 Tim. 1:3); *καθαρὰ*

καρδία (1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:22); πίστις ἀνο-  
 πόκριτος (1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 1:5); πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη ἢ ἐν Χριστῶν  
 Ἰησοῦ (1 Tim. 1:14; 2 Tim. 1:13); πίστις ἢ ἐν Χριστῶν  
 Ἰησοῦ (1 Tim. 3:13; 2 Tim. 3:15); παρὶς τοῦ διαβόλου  
 (1 Tim. 3:7; 2 Tim. 2:26); φεῦγε· διώκε δὲ δικαιο-  
 σύνη . . . πίπν (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22); ἀγωνίσματα  
 τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα (1 Tim. 6:12; 2 Tim. 4:7); παραθύκην φυ-  
 γάσειν (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:12.14); παρακολουθεῖν δι-  
 δασκαλίᾳ (1 Tim. 4:6; 2 Tim. 3:10); ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ  
 (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:17); καλὸν ἔργον (1 Tim. 3:11;  
 5:10.25; 6:18; Tit. 2:7.14; 3:8.14); εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγα-  
 θὸν ἐξηρτισμένος (2 Tim. 3:17); πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν  
 ἠδοκίμοι (Tit. 1:16); πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐτοίμοις  
 (Tit. 3:1); ἀπόδεκτος ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Tim. 2:3;  
 5:4); μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ (1 Tim. 3:2.12; 5:9; Tit. 1:6);  
 ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς βίβλου (1 Tim. 6:12.19); τὸ μυστήριον τῆς  
 πίστεως or τῆς εὐσεβείας (1 Tim. 3:9.16); πίστις καὶ  
 ἀγάπη καὶ ἁγιασμός or ἀγνεία (1 Tim. 2:15; 4:12); ἐπα-  
 σχύνεσθαι τι or τινα (2 Tim. 1:8.16); ἐκεῖνη ἡ ἡμέρ-  
 α (2 Tim. 1:12.18; 4:8); καλῶν ἔργων προϊστάσθαι  
 (Tit. 3:8.14). **B. Polemical phraseology**— ἀπεστερημένων  
 τῆς ἀληθείας (1 Tim. 6:5); περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστοχῆ-  
 σαν (2 Tim. 2:18); μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας  
 (2 Tim. 2:25); μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας εἰθεῖν  
 ἰδυνάμενα (2 Tim. 3:7); ἀντίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (2 Tim.  
 3:8); ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἀκοήν ἀποστρέφουσιν (2 Tim.  
 4:4); ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀλήθειαν (Tit. 1:14); διεφθαρ-

μένων . . . τὸν νοῦν (1 Tim. 6:5); κατεφθαρμένοι  
 τὸν νοῦν (2 Tim. 3:8); μεμιάνται αὐτῶν . . . ὁ νοῦς  
 (Tit. 1:15); περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν (1 Tim. 1:19);  
 περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστοχῆσαν (1 Tim. 6:21); ἄδοκιμοί  
 περὶ τὴν πίστιν (2 Tim. 3:8); ἀποστήθουνται τινες  
 τῆς πίστεως (1 Tim. 4:1); ἀπεπληθύνθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως  
 (1 Tim. 6:10); κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν  
 (1 Tim. 4:2); μεμιάνται αὐτῶν . . . ἡ συνείδησις (Tit.  
 1:15); ἀνατρέπουσιν τὴν τινῶν πίστιν (2 Tim. 2:18);  
 ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν (Tit. 1:1); βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι  
 (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:16); μωραὶ ρητήρεις (2 Tim. 2:23;  
 Tit. 3:9); ἐπὶ πλείον προκόφουσιν ἀσεβείας (2 Tim.  
 2:16); οὐ προκόφουσιν ἐπὶ πλείον (2 Tim. 3:9); προ-  
 κόφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον (2 Tim. 3:13). C. Author's  
 favorite terms -- πιστὸς ὁ λόγος (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9;  
 2 Tim. 2:11; Tit. 3:8); πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς  
 ἄξιος (1 Tim. 1:15; 4:9); χάριν ἔχω (1 Tim. 1:12;  
 2 Tim. 1:3); διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ or τοῦ  
 κυρίου (1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:14; 4:1); εἶς ὁ ἐτέθη  
 ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος . . . διδάσκυλος (1 Tim. 2:7;  
 2 Tim. 1:11); χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη (1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim.  
 1:2); ὧν ἐστίν; ὁ ἐπιστάτης ἐγὼ (1 Tim. 1:11; Tit.  
 1:13); διαβεβαιῶσθαι περὶ τινος (1 Tim. 1:7; Tit.  
 3:8); προέχειν μύθοις (1 Tim. 1:4; Tit. 1:14); σπου-  
 δασον ἐλθεῖν (2 Tim. 4:9.21; Tit. 3:12); δι' ἣν αἰτίαν  
 (2 Tim. 1:6; Tit. 1:13).<sup>11</sup>

Lock adds to this list the following: ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ  
 (2 Tim. 2:9; Tit. 2:5) and ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας (2 Tim.

15); τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ (1 Tim. 1:11);  
 ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν (1 Tim. 1:1); τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν  
 (1 Tim. 1:19); ἡ καλὴ διδασκαλία (1 Tim. 4:6).<sup>12</sup>

Moreover, we find in the Pastoral Epistles several single words which have taken on a meaning different from that given to them in Paul's earlier Epistles. While they have appeared earlier in Paul, here they receive a new meaning. The author of our letters uses them almost as stereotyped common-places, apparently indicating thereby that they have become stock expressions in Christian thought and doctrine.

Belonging to this group is the word ἀληθεία. The appearances of this word in Paul's earlier Epistles are plentiful. But in the Pastorals this word suddenly appears in a peculiar technical sense. Here it presupposes a body of truth already quite well formulated.

Another word which has seemingly grown in meaning during the interim between Paul's first ten Epistles and the Pastorals is διδασκαλία. While this word occurs only four times in Paul's other letters, here it occurs no less than fifteen times. Wohlenberg reports that in the Pastorals διδασκαλία means not only "the act of teaching" (1 Tim. 4:13.16; 5:17; 2 Tim. 3:10.16; Tit. 2:7), but also "the body of doctrine" (Tit. 2:10; 1 Tim.

---

12. Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, in The International Critical Commentary, pp. xvi and xxviii.

15); τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοῦ (1 Tim. 1:11);  
 Ἰησοῦ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν (1 Tim. 1:1); τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν  
 (1 Tim. 1:19); ἡ καλὴ διδασκαλία (1 Tim. 4:6).<sup>12</sup>

Moreover, we find in the Pastoral Epistles several single words which have taken on a meaning different from that given to them in Paul's earlier Epistles. While they have appeared earlier in Paul, here they receive a new meaning. The author of our letters uses them almost as stereotyped common-places, apparently indicating thereby that they have become stock expressions in Christian thought and doctrine.

Belonging to this group is the word ἀλήθεια. The appearances of this word in Paul's earlier Epistles are plentiful. But in the Pastorals this word suddenly appears in a peculiar technical sense. Here it presupposes a body of truth already quite well formulated.

Another word which has seemingly grown in meaning during the interim between Paul's first ten Epistles and the Pastorals is διδασκαλία. While this word occurs only four times in Paul's other letters, here it occurs no less than fifteen times. Wohlenberg reports that in the Pastorals διδασκαλία means not only "the act of teaching" (1 Tim. 4:13.16; 5:17; 2 Tim. 3:10.16; Tit. 2:7), But also "the body of doctrine" (Tit. 2:10; 1 Tim.

12. Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, in The International Critical Commentary, pp. xvi and xxviii.

1:10; 4:1.6; 6:1.3).<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the word διδασχῆ (four times in the Pastorals; four times in all others) signifies the objective "content of teaching" in Paul's earlier Epistles. But here it signifies also the "act of teaching" (2 Tim. 4:2), and once appears in the objective sense (Tit. 1:9).<sup>14</sup>

Another word which the Christian society of the early Church apparently adopted in time as a stereotype expression is πίετις. It appears frequently in the Pastorals in a manner which presupposes that the reader was very well aware of its deep significance -- a significance which was not so freely implied in Paul's early letters.

Perhaps the most notable example of words belonging to this group is σωφρων with its derivatives. Of the family derived from σωφρων, σωφρονεῖν is the only member which our Pastorals share with Paul's early Epistles (twice: 2 Cor. 5:13; Rom. 12:3). But in the Pastorals we have σωφρονίῳ, σωφρονισμός, σωφρόνως, σωφροσύνη, and σωφρων, in addition to σωφρονεῖν.

The word ἐπιφάνεια appears in 2 Thess. 2:8 in the of "brightness." In the Pastoral Epistles it occurs five times as "the appearing."<sup>15</sup> Paul's usual word is παρουσία.

13. Wohlenberg, *op. cit.* p. 52.

14. *Ibid.*

15. Ἐπιφαινω occurs in the active in Luke (1:79) and Acts (27:20), in the passive in the Pastorals (Tit. 2:11; 3:4), but not anywhere in Paul's early Epistles.

Διαβόλος as a noun occurs once in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, but five times in the Pastorals. The unique thing here is that the word appears also as an adjective in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 3:11), but never thus in Paul's earlier Epistles.

A very prominent and favorite word of the Pastorals must also be mentioned here. Twenty-four times in our letters we encounter the word καλός. Certainly this word is not foreign to Paul's vocabulary in his early Epistles, for it occurs there sixteen times. The remarkable thing is that in Paul's early Epistles καλός is used only as a predicate or a neuter substantive, while here it occurs twenty-one times as an attributive.<sup>16</sup>

The word of this group which has caused the most comment by critics is σωτήρ. It is used of Christ in Eph. 5:23 and Phil. 3:20 -- the only occurrences of this word in Paul's early Epistles. In the Pastorals σωτήρ occurs ten times, and is referred both to Christ and to God (five times).

Peculiar to the Pastorals is the author's use of δεσπότης as a designation for a slave-master in the secular sense. Alford finds this usage "certainly remarkable, St. Paul's word being κύριος, Eph. 6:5.9; Col. 3:22; 4:1."<sup>17</sup>

---

16. Wohlenberg, loc. cit.

17. Henry Alford, The Greek Testament, vol. 3, p. 82 (Prologue).

Nor can we pass over the well-known and widely used salutation of our Epistles without some comment as to its peculiarity. In 1 and 2 Timothy we find χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη in the opening salutation.<sup>18</sup> In his early Epistles Paul does not include ἔλεος in his opening salutation. Thus we have a peculiar variation from the usual Pauline greeting so consistent in his early Epistles.

In concluding the listing of peculiarities belonging to this type, we include instances in the Pastoral Epistles where Lock feels the author expresses the same thought as in Paul's early Epistles, but with a different word or phrase. Παράδοχῃ is used instead of παράδοσις ; ὑποτύπωσις instead of τύπος ; τυφούδα for φουσουδα ; ὁ νῦν κίων for ὁ κίων οὗτος ; χάριν ἔχειν for εὐχαριστεῖν ; δι' ἣν κίτιάν for ὥστε, διό, and ἄρα.<sup>19</sup>

Here then we have a group of words and phrases from the Pastorals which pose a problem when compared with Paul's early Epistles. We have listed phrases which at first glance appear out of harmony with the thought and idiom of earlier letters of Paul. We have noted words which have taken on a different connotation from that attached to them elsewhere in Paul. New Testament scholars have long seen the difficulty and deep significance of the problem. While they all claim a certain objectivity

18. The best manuscripts omit ἔλεος in Tit. 1:4.

19. Lock, op. cit., p. xxviii f.



in approaching it, their solutions find them not at all in agreement with one another. Liberal scholars have found this group of words and phrases as sure evidence against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Conservative scholars, on the other hand, fail to see that these peculiar words and phrases militate against a Pauline authorship. Wace, for example, believes that these peculiarities merely indicate the presence in Paul's mind of a new class of ideas. Thus he explains expressions like πιστός ὁ λόγος, πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίος, ὑγαίνουσα διδασκαλία and other phrases with ὑγιής and ὑγαίνω, and the σὺμφων group.<sup>20</sup> He believes that by the time Paul wrote the Pastorals Christian truth had assumed something of a fixed habitual form, and that many stereotype expressions arose as a result. Christian doctrine had assumed the character of a definite rule of "right judgment and wise action." The Gospel was contemplated not only in its central truths and primary elements, but in its practical working as a wholesome influence in all details of life. Having stressed the central truths of the Gospel in his other Epistles, Paul now, toward the end of his life, and as the churches are growing and influencing and being influenced by the world, stresses the practical elements of the Gospel and uses new expressions

---

20. Wace, "Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles," in The Holy Bible with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, F. C. Cook, vol. 3, p. 761.

to express new ideas.<sup>21</sup>

Conybeare indicates several factors which he feels could well account for the employment of old terms in a new sense in the Pastorals. He cites "the growth of new heresies, the development of Church organization, the rapid alteration of circumstances in a great moral revolution" as reasons why Paul could be expected to introduce the peculiar words and phrases of this group into his letters to Timothy and Titus.<sup>22</sup>

Conservative scholars have also tried to solve our problem by consigning many of our peculiarities to the subject-matter of the Pastorals. They say that the subjects handled by Paul in these letters differs to a greater or lesser degree from that of his earlier letters.

For instance, Weiss points to the heresies combated by Paul in the Pastoral letters. He believes that during the period previous to the writing of the Pastorals, when Paul was inactive as a writer, heresy had experienced a distinct growth and formulation, thus calling forth peculiarities of expression in our letters. Thus Weiss explains words like those of the *σωφρων* group, *ἐπιφάνεια*, *σωτήρ*, and phrases like *βεβηλος κενοφωνία*.

21. Alford agrees with Wace's explanation for the peculiar use of the *σωφρων* group: "... a term ... probably coming into more frequent use as the necessity for the quality itself became more and more apparent in the settlement of the Church." Alford, *op. cit.*, p. 81 (Prologue).

22. W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, vol. 2, p. 535 (Appendix I).

ἀγαθὴ (καθάρ) συνείδησις, and ἀγαθὰ (καλὰ) ἔργα.<sup>23</sup> Hug also points our attention to the heresies combated as explanation for the peculiar phrases and the changed significance of single words. In addition to βέβηλος κενοφωνία, he lists also γραΰσεις μύθους, λόγος ὑψηλός, and διδασκαλία ὑψηλοῦς as peculiarities explainable by the fact that Paul in the Pastorals refers to heretical teachings in a manner different from references in earlier Epistles.<sup>24</sup>

The subject-matter also serves as a key for Wace's explanation of the peculiar change of κύριος to δεσπότης in the Pastorals. His point is that Paul, in calling the master of slaves a κύριος in previous letters, was there enforcing the duties of a Christian master by reminding him of his relation to his own Lord, whose relation to His people is not one of a δεσπότης, but of their κύριος.<sup>25</sup>

Weiss finds another defense for the strange peculiarity of the words and phrases of this group. He says that in the Pastorals Paul again and again outlines the qualifications for workers in the Church—a topic lacking in his other Epistles. This, Weiss claims, explains phrases like διαβεβαιώσθαι περί τινος, ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ.

23. Bernhard Weiss, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 308, n. 3.

24. Johann Leonhard Hug, Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, pp. 396-398.

25. Wace, loc. cit.

παρὶς τοῦ διαβόλου, διὰ μαρτυρέσθαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ  
 (κυρίου), ὃν ἔστιν, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, and ἐν πᾶ-  
 σιν. <sup>26</sup>

Concerning the peculiar usage of as a designation of God, Alford informs us that it was "a purely Jewish devotional expression." However, the Apostles, when writing for the general public, were careful not to use it, or when they did employ this expression, they were careful to introduce it with limitations which would clearly indicate the mediatorship of Jesus (cf. Jude 25). "But in familiar writing one to another, when there was no danger of the mediatorship of Jesus being forgotten, this true and noble expression seems still to have been usual." Alford similarly believes ἐπιφανεία (for παρουσία) to have been a word familiar among the Apostles and his companions, though it was not used in the same sense when Paul wrote to Christians in general. <sup>27</sup>

The peculiar variation of the opening salutation in the Pastorals has been used both by liberal and conservative scholars as arguments for their hypotheses. On the one hand we have scholars who claim that it would be very unlike Paul to change the wording of his favorite salutation. On the other hand there are those who argue that this variation decisively proves the Pauline authorship,

26. Weiss, loc. cit., n. 4.

27. Alford, op. cit., p. 82.

for a forger would certainly not have changed something so distinctly Pauline in his efforts to pass off these letters as the workmanship of that Apostle.<sup>28</sup>

Another peculiarity in the Pastorals which intensifies the linguistic problem is the appearance of so many composite words. While Paul used compounds in his early Epistles, he did not use them with such frequency as they occur in the Pastorals. Holtzmann lists twenty-six such composite words: ἀγαθοεργεῖν, ἀσχροκέρδης, ἀναρω-  
πυρεῖν, ἀντιδιατιθεόμενος, αὐτοκράτης, διαπρα-  
τριβή, ἑτεροδιδάσκαλος, θεόπνευστος, ἑροπρε-  
πής, κακκπαθεῖν, καλοδιδάσκαλος, κενοφωνία,  
λογομαχεῖν, λογομαχία, ματαιολογία, ματαιο-  
λόγος, νομοδιδάσκαλος, οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, συγκακοπα-  
θεῖν, συγαποδνήσκειν, τεκνογονεῖν, τεκνογονία,  
τεκνοτροφεῖν, ὑδροποτεῖν, ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, φιλαν-  
θρωπία. Rejecting the Pauline authorship of the Pas-  
torals, Holtzmann believes that Paul would have expressed  
the same thoughts conveyed in these composites in two,  
or even three, words.<sup>29</sup>

Harrison stresses particularly those compounds bear-  
ing either the prefix φιλο- or α- privative. "There  
is of course nothing unusual in the mere occurrence of

28. So F. Torn, "Über die Sprache in den Pastoral-  
briefen," in Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissen-  
schaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, vol. 4 (1917-  
1918), 239.

29. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 92.

either of these formations, both of which are found occasionally in Paul himself and in many other writers. What strikes our notice here is their extraordinary frequency."<sup>30</sup>

Other compounds which could be mentioned are those with  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron-$ , and  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron-$ .

The liberal critics believe that the unusual number of these compounds speaks against a Pauline authorship. Conservative scholars, on the other hand, stress the fact that Paul's love for composite words is evident already in his earlier letters. Thus Wohlenberg has culled the following compounds from those letters:  $\sigma\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\kappa\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\omicron}\upsilon$ ,  $\sigma\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omega\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha$ ,  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\rho\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ,  $\mu\omega\rho\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\xi\grave{\xi}\alpha\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\delta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ,  $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\pi\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\phi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$ .<sup>31</sup> What is new, these defenders of the Pauline authorship call "Latinisms," which Paul acquired during his imprisonment in Rome.<sup>32</sup>

Thus far we have considered three small phases of our linguistic problem: (1) peculiar phrases; (2) words which appeared previously in Paul, but here take on a

30. P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, 44. Holtzmann lists twelve compounds of  $\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron-$  not in Paul's earlier Epistles (4 in other NT writings) and 44  $\alpha-$  privative compounds (22 not in Paul's earlier writings; seven not in Paul's earlier writings, but elsewhere in the NT; 15 only in the Pastorals). Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 92 f.

31. Wohlenberg, loc. cit.

32. So Weiss, loc. cit.

new meaning; (3) peculiar frequency of composite words. However, these phases alone hardly throw much weight against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. It is a combination of problems which has given rise to so much study and restudy of the authorship of our letters. We are now ready to take up another phase of our problem-- one which has particularly caught the eye of Bible critics: the "hapax legomena" in the Pastorals.

The Pastoral Epistles consist of about 902 words. Of these, 54 are proper names. Of the remaining 848, 306<sup>33</sup> or over 36 per cent, are not to be found in any one of the ten previous Pauline Epistles.<sup>34</sup>

Taking the three Pastorals separately, we find that 1 Timothy has 173 un-Pauline words (27.3 per page), 2 Timothy has 114 (24.4 per page), and Titus has 81 (30.4 per page). Paul's earlier Epistles also contain words which are not found in any other Epistle. Romans has 10 per page, 1 Cor.--11.1 per page, 2 Cor.--12, Gal.--10.3, Eph.--10.6, Phil--12.7, Col.--9.7, 1 Thess.--7.5, 2 Thess.--8.7, and Phim.--8. Hence the difference between the highest and the lowest of the early ten epistles is 5.2

---

33. Bacon gives as his number only 133. Benjamin Wisner Bacon, An Introduction to the New Testament, Shailer Mathews, ed., p. 139.

34. Harrison, op. cit., p. 20. Harrison has given us the most complete word study. Therefore we will use his figures as the basis for most of our considerations of the linguistic problem. Any detection of error in his figures by another scholar, or any discrepancies, will be acknowledged in the footnotes.

words per page. But the difference between the highest of the early epistles and the lowest of the Pastorals is 11.77 words per page.<sup>35</sup>

Of these words in the Pastorals which are not found in previous letters, 131 are however found in other New Testament books.<sup>36</sup> 1 Timothy has 77 such; 2 Tim.--54; Tit.--38. Of these 131 words, 61 occur in one New Testament author exclusively (3 in Mt; 2 in Mk; 29 in Lk. including Acts; 3 in John; 10 in Heb; 4 in 1 Pet; 7 in 2 Pet.; 2 in Jas; and 1 in Rev.)<sup>37</sup>

Holtzmann lists 35 un-Pauline words which the Pastorals share with Hebrews.<sup>38</sup> Thus almost one-half of the original 131 words of this type occur in books written by close companions of Paul.<sup>39</sup>

This brings us to a consideration of the "hapax legomena" in the Pastorals--those words which occur only

35. Ibid., p. 22. Discounting proper names, and regarding as only one, a word with all its derivatives, Torm supplies us with these figures: of about 2500 words used by Paul in his Epistles 1257 appear in only one letter (one or more times in that letter); 1 Thess. has 35 of these, 2 Thess.--22, Rom.--232, 1 Cor.--245, 2 Cor.--176, Gal.--83, Eph.--82, Phil.--69, Col.--58, Phim.--8, 1 Tim.--124, 2 Tim.--77, Tit.--86; the fewest per page--Thess. and Phim. (8 words per page); the most per page--the Pastorals (19-21); the most per page in Paul's early Epistles--Phil. (13). Torm, op. cit., p. 229 f.

36. Torm feels that these are more important than the previous group. Ibid., p. 226 f.

37. Harrison--op. cit., p. 21 f.

38. Holtzmann--op. cit., pp. 95-96.

39. That is, if we hold that Barnabas wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews.



in our letters and nowhere else in the New Testament. There are 175 such words in all. 1 Timothy has 96 (15.2 per page), 2 Timothy 60 (12.9 per page), Titus 43 (16.1 per page). "Hapax legomena" occur also in the other Epistles of Paul, but when compared with the Pastorals, they tell an interesting story and make our problem very real. Romans has 4 such words per page, 1 Cor. 4.1 per page, 2 Cor. 5.6, Gal. 3.9, Eph. 4.6, Phil. 6.2, Col. 5.5, 1 Thess. 3.6, 2 Thess. 3.3, Phim. 4. Thus the difference between the lowest and the highest of the early Epistles is 2.9 such words per page. But the gap between the lowest of the Pastorals and the highest of the Paulines is 6.7 per page!<sup>40</sup>

Many conservative scholars believe that the un-Pauline words and "hapax legomena" in the Pastorals add little weight to our problem. They argue that Paul's early Epistles also contain such peculiar words, and therefore their occurrence in our letters cannot be taken as evidence against their authenticity. Thus Torm considers them as being no basis at all for argumentation.

---

40. Harrison, op. cit., p. 20 f. Hayes gives the following figures for "hapax legomena" in Paul's letters: 1 Tim.--74; 2 Tim.--46, Tit.--48, Rom.--111, Cor.--186, Gal.--57, Phil.--54, Col. and Eph.--143. D. A. Hayes, Paul and His Epistles, pp. 451-456. Heinrich Planck finds 54 in Phil., 57 in Gal., 145 in Titus. Quoted in Hug, op. cit., p. 396 (Note).

"Heutzutage werden indessen die meisten einräumen, dass dieses Phänomen nicht stark bei der Frage der Echtheit ins Gewicht fällt. . . . Man ist in den letzteren Jahren meistens noch vorsichtiger geworden, auf Grund von ἀπαρ δευό-μεν να zu argumentieren."<sup>41</sup>

The problem which confronts the New Testament scholar as he studies these peculiar words is to explain as best he can just why they occur in our letters. Certainly their frequency in the Pastorals cries out for some explanation. A full and unified explanation is impossible. On the other hand, to reject the Pauline authorship of our Epistles on the basis of these peculiar words alone is open to censure.

"There seems no reason why any of the above peculiarities of diction should be considered as imperilling the authenticity of our Epistles. . . . Of many of them, some account at least may be given: and when we reflect how very little we know of the circumstances under which they were used, it appears far more the part of sound criticism to let such difficulties stand unsolved, under a sense that we have not the clue to them, than at once and rashly to pronounce on them as indicative of a spurious origin."<sup>42</sup>

However, both liberal and conservative scholars have tried to find some explanation for the occurrence of these peculiar words in the Pastoral Epistles. Liberal scholars find a similarity between these words and the general

41. Torm, op. cit., 228.

42. Alford, op. cit., p. 83 (Prologue). So also Zahn: "Es ist daher kein Grund gegen die Echtheit." Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 485.

vocabulary of a period after Paul's time. Conservative scholars have found circumstances surrounding Paul and the writing of the Pastorals which could possibly account for the use of these peculiar words as early as the time of the Apostle. Our purpose here is to note the various explanations which the problem of these peculiar words has given rise to in the minds of liberal and conservative scholars.

Goodspeed, who places the writing of the Pastorals in the second century, finds support for his hypothesis in the occurrence of *ἀντιδωκεῖς*. Its occurrence in 1 Tim. 6:20 is the only one in the entire New Testament. Goodspeed feels that the use of this word "looks like an express warning against Marcion's book of that name."<sup>43</sup>

Other liberal scholars have tried to find a link between these peculiar words of our Epistles and the literary Hellenism of a post-Pauline period. Harrison shows the relationship of the language of our Epistles to that of the Apostolic Fathers, and thereby tries to prove that the Pastorals were written during the second century.<sup>44</sup>

Conservative scholars realize the difficulty which these peculiar words cause. They, however, believe that there are circumstances and influences which could have

---

43. Edgar J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 333. Marcion lived around the year 140 A. D.

44. The relationship between the Pastorals and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers will be taken up in detail in chapter 4.

easily affected Paul's vocabulary in our letters.

Many scholars use the character, personality, and versatility of Paul as a key to the solution. Even the liberal Holtzmann looks upon the "hapax legomena" as "Exemplare einer reichen Gattung."<sup>45</sup> Paul was a man with amazing talents and a versatile mind. His command of the Greek language is remarkable. Thus Weiss also believes that these unique words merely indicate a "lebensvollen Reichtum der paulinischen Lehrsprache."<sup>46</sup> Perhaps the best expression on the part of the conservative scholars as to the relation between the personality of Paul and the peculiar language of the Pastorals is that of Wace:

The extraordinary versatility of his mind and his whole nature--to the Jews becoming a Jew, to the Greeks a Greek, to the Romans a Roman, able to be all things to all men--is one of his most conspicuous characteristics. It is in every way to be expected that the letters of such a man would vary, both in their phraseology, and in their mode of expression, with the subject he was treating, his time of life, and the persons whom he addresses.<sup>47</sup>

However, liberal scholars, while admitting that Paul was a versatile writer, nevertheless doubt that his mind was as versatile as would be necessary to assume on the basis of the changed vocabulary in the Pastorals.

Paul's mind did not first begin to be versatile, original, or impressionable at the end of his career. It had all these characteristics, and showed them

---

45. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 89.

46. Weiss, op. cit., p. 307, n. 2.

47. Wace, op. cit., p. 760. Cf. Van Oosterzee, op. cit., p. 3, nos. 3, 5, 6.

more clearly in many ways, in earlier epistles. But, like all true genius, it moved within certain limits, and was subject to certain laws, some consciously self-imposed, others quite unconscious, imposed by the very nature of things . . . . To discard suddenly at the end of a lifetime such a host of favorite expressions, and introduce in their stead such a mass of new and unfamiliar terms, might indicate a certain kind of versatility, but not the kind which we have any reason for attributing to the Apostle. . . . It may have been physically possible for Paul to have composed a trio of letters in which not only 21 per cent but 90 per cent. of the words were Hapax Legomena. But it remains equally incredible that he should have done so, whether by accident or by design. Each of the Paulines . . . has naturally a certain number of expressions peculiar to itself. But that this is so to a degree comparable for a moment with that obtaining in the case of the Pastorals can hardly be asserted in the face of the evidence now forthcoming. . . . A 'development' there is indeed from 1 Thess. to Phil. . . . But applied to a transition like that from Phil. to the Pastorals, this word, implying as it does a certain degree of orderly continuity, would seem to be a misnomer.<sup>48</sup>

Moreover, Harrison feels that in spite of the genius of Paul to absorb new expressions into his vocabulary, "it is not the usual result of old age to produce a new vocabulary."<sup>49</sup>

Conservative scholars, however, are not so easily swayed by such arguments. Though the Pastorals are distinct from Paul's early Epistles in the use of unique words, these men feel that this is to be explained by the wide travels, broadening experiences, and new acquaintances of the Apostle during the later years of his life,

---

48. Harrison, op. cit., p. 46 f. Similarly Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 108.

49. Harrison, op. cit., p. 49

and immediately preceding the writing of the Pastorals.

Thus Wohlenberg states that Paul's double imprisonment in Caesarea and Rome, and the broad missionary travels which followed his release, was bound to affect his language.<sup>50</sup> Weiss also believes that Paul's Roman imprisonment accounts for many of the peculiar words, particularly the Latinisms in our letters. He attempts to prove his point by showing the similarity of the Pastorals with Philippians, which is the letter closest in time to the Pastorals. The following words are found only in the Pastorals and Philippians: προκοπή (1 Tim. 4:15; Phil. 1:12.25), ἀνάληψις (2 Tim. 4:6; cf. Phil. 1:23), κέρδος (Tit. 1:11; Phil. 1:21; 3:7), σεμνός (1 Tim. 3:8.11; Tit. 2:2; Phil. 4:8), σπένδεσθαι (2 Tim. 4:6; Phil. 2:17).<sup>51</sup>

Simpson believes that many of Paul's new words in the Pastorals resulted from reading which Paul did while in prison. He lists: (1) words "from older literary strata"-- ἀνδραποδίετης; ἀεχροκερδής; ἀπαίδευτος (in Plato, "but belongs to all stages of literary Greek"); ἀναβωπύρειν; γυμνάζειν; μελετᾶν; ὀρέεσθαι; πειθαρχεῖν; στεφανοῦν; φροντίσειν; φλύαργος; ὑπόνοια; (2) words "of purely vernacular usages"-- ἀῦθεντεῖν; (3) "samples of

50. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 54.

51. Weiss, op. cit., p. 308 f.

ordinary literary Hellenistic"-- ἀστοχεῖν (Polybius, Plutarch, Lucian); ἀνανήφειν ; κακοπαθεῖν ; ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος (Polybius); ἀγωγῆ (Polybius and Aristotle); οἱ ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντες (Aristotle); κατά-στημα (Josephus and Plutarch); καταστολή (Josephus, Plutarch, and Epictetus); κοινωνικός ; περι-ἴστασθαι (Josephus, Philodemus of Gadara, and Marcus Aurelius); πορισμός and ῥητῶς (Philodemus, Plutarch, Vetius Valens; ῥητῶς also in Polybius), ναυ-αρεῖν and περιπεῖρειν ; στρατολογεῖν; σωφρονίσειν group (Plutarch); ὑποτύπωσις (Galen and Quintilian).<sup>52</sup>

Even this defense of the Pauline authorship is not accepted by the liberal scholars. Harrison voices his protest by stating that each of Paul's early Epistles was not written under the same circumstances either, and yet they "show no such far-reaching changes among themselves." Moreover, the appearance of the peculiar Latinisms could also be explained by assuming that the Pastorals were written at Rome, but by an author other than Paul.<sup>53</sup>

In addition, Harrison shows that, while there is a similarity of expression between the Pastorals and the

52. Simpson, op. cit., p. 305 f.

53. Harrison, loc. cit. So also Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 109.

Captivity Letters, there is even a greater similarity between the Pastorals and the four "Homologoumena" (Rom., Cor., and Gal.). The Pastorals have 28 words in common with the Epistles of the Roman imprisonment, and with these only: 160 with Rom., Cor., and Gal., and 13 with 1 and 2 Thess. (1.5 per page with Thess. Epistles, 2.1 with the four Homologoumena, and only 1.2 with the four prison-letters)--". . . hardly what the idea of development would have led us to expect."<sup>54</sup>

Conservative scholars, have found another possible reason for the "hapax legomena" and non-Pauline words in the Pastorals. They point to the subject-matter as a way out of this difficulty. They claim that new words are only the result of a new topic taken up by the Pastorals. In accord with this view, Torn writes, "Im groszen und ganzen steht die Anzahl der einem Brief eigentümlichen Wörter im Verhältnis zu der grözeren oder kleineren Anzahl neuer Themen, welche darin behandelt werden--wie ja zu erwarten war."<sup>55</sup>

Our letters concern themselves with heresy which was creeping into the Church. Though Paul had condemned heresy in previous letters, particularly in Colossians, conservative scholars feel that this heresy had since become more fixed and conspicuous, thereby demanding of

---

54. Harrison, op. cit., p. 48.

55. Torn, op. cit., 230.



Paul new terms in combating it in the Pastorals. Thus Alford explains the occurrence of the following words: παραίτησις<sup>1</sup> (1 Tim. 4:7; 5:11; 2 Tim. 2:23; Tit. 3:10; found elsewhere in the New Testament only twice in Luke, twice in Heb., and once in Acts); γενεαλογία (1 Tim. 1:4; Tit. 3:9); ματαιόλογος (Tit. 1:10) ματαιολογία (1 Tim. 1:6); λογομαχείν (2 Tim. 2:14); παραθήκη (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:12.14); ἀποτρέψεις<sup>2</sup> - θαι (2 Tim. 3:5); ἔκτρέψεις<sup>3</sup> θαι (1 Tim. 1:6; 5:15; 6:20; 2 Tim. 4:4; elsewhere in the New Testament only in Heb. 12:13); ἀστοχείν<sup>4</sup> (1 Tim. 1:6; 6:21; 2 Tim. 2:18); τυφούσθαι (1 Tim. 3:6; 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:4); ἀρνείσθαι (1 Tim. 5:8; 2 Tim. 2:12 f.; 3:5; Tit. 1:16; 2:12; 4 times in Matt.; twice in Mark; 4 times in Luke; 4 times in John; 4 times in Acts; once in Heb.; once in 2 Pet.; 3 times in 1 John; once in Jude; twice in Rev.; but nowhere else in Paul); βέβηλος<sup>56</sup> (1 Tim. 1:9; 4:7; 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:16; Heb. 12:16); ἀνόσιος (1 Tim. 1:9; 2 Tim. 3:2); φητῆσεις (1 Tim. 1:4; 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:23; Tit. 3:9; Acts 15:2; 25:20; John 3:25); μῆδοι<sup>57</sup> (1 Tim. 1:4; 4:7; 2 Tim. 4:4; Tit. 1:14; 2 Pet. 1:16)<sup>58</sup>

56. ". . . An epithet interesting, as bringing with it the fact of the progress of heresy from doctrine to practice." Alford, op. cit., p. 82 (Prologue).

57. ". . . To be accounted for by the fact of the heretical legends having now assumed such definite shape as to deserve this name." Ibid., p. 81 (Prologue).

58. Ibid., pp. 81-83 (Prologue). See also Weiss, op. cit. p. 308 n. 3; and Hug, op. cit., pp. 396-398.

In contrast to these false teachings, the conservative scholars feel, Paul employed new terms to show the true Christian doctrine and practice. Among such words are  $\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$  (1 Tim. 2:2; 3:16; 4:7.8; 6:3.5.6.11; 2 Tim. 3:5; Tit. 1:1; otherwise only in 2 Pet. 4 times, and once in Acts);<sup>59</sup>  $\upsilon\gamma\iota\gamma\iota\varsigma$  and  $\upsilon\gamma\iota\alpha\iota$  —  $\nu\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  (of right doctrine--1 Tim. 1:10; 6:3; 2 Tim. 1:13; 4:3; Tit. 1:9.13; 2:1 f. 8);<sup>60</sup>  $\upsilon\pi\omicron\mu\iota\mu\upsilon\eta\gamma\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  (2 Tim. 2:14; Tit. 3:1; 2 Pet. 1:12; 3 John 10; Jude 5; John 14:26; Luke 22:61).<sup>61</sup>

Van Oosterzee expresses the view that many of the peculiar words of the Pastorals can be explained by the fact that Paul here reverts to the "glowing, sharp language" of his opponents, and thus borrows many expressions from them.<sup>62</sup>

Liberal critics refuse to accept this explanation for some of the peculiar words in the Pastorals. They

---

59. ". . . Used as a customary expression for the character of Christian life." Wace, *op. cit.*, p. 761. "We should be disposed to ascribe its use to the fact of the word having at the time become prevalent in the Church as a compendious term for the religion of Christians." Alford, *op. cit.*, p. 81 (Prologue). ". . . One of the most characteristic words of pagan religions thought." W. M. Ramsay, "Historical Commentary on the Epistles to Timothy," in *The Expositor*, W. Robertson Nicoll, ed., Eight Series, vol. 1 (1911), p. 362.

60. ". . . Arising probably from the now apparent tendency of the growing heresies to corrupt the springs of moral action." Alford, *loc. cit.*

61. ". . . A word naturally coming into use rather as time drew on, than in the beginning of the Gospel." *Ibid.*, p. 83 (Prologue).

62. Van Oosterzee, *loc. cit.*, n. 7.

refer to Galatians and Colossians, where Paul also wrote against heretical teaching, but failed to use the peculiar words found in our letters. Thus Harrison writes, "Paul was not now for the first time forced to breathe the heated atmosphere of doctrinal discussions, nor to deal with opposition on the part of false teachers coming in and leading weak minds astray. We do not find this particular type of linguistic phenomena in Galatians nor yet in Colossians."<sup>63</sup>

Taking the subject-matter of the Pastorals as a whole, Harrison fails to see in it the possibility of ascribing the writing of these letters to Paul. "The very wide range of subject covered by the ten Paulines themselves has not, in their case, resulted in similar discrepancies." Instead, he believes that the terms used to characterize heresy and Christian life and practice "coincides significantly with the terminology of second-century writers."<sup>64</sup>

When considering the language of the Pastorals, we also have to take into account the persons to whom they were addressed. Conservative scholars stress this point. They point out that the Pastorals are the only letters, outside Philemon, which were addressed to single individuals. The others were addressed to churches. Van Oosterzee emphasizes that these were written to men of

---

63. Harrison, op. cit., p. 50. See also Holtzmann, loc. cit.

64. Harrison, op. cit., p. 51. See also Theodor Nägeli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, p. 86 f.

superior education and close friends of Paul, while his earlier Epistles were official, apostolic writings to the whole Church.<sup>65</sup> Timothy and Titus were also fellow-workers with Paul. Wohlenberg feels that this fact would naturally change Paul's language and choice of words in the Pastoral Epistles. There would be a tendency for Paul to employ words common in Apostolic polemics and other terms commonly known by the Apostles and leaders of the Church.<sup>66</sup> What is the right of any specialist when writing to his co-workers, is also a right which we cannot deny the Apostle Paul.<sup>67</sup>

These references to the addressees of our letters to explain the non-Pauline words and "hapax legomena" fails to impress the liberal scholars.

. . . Philemon, which really is a private letter in a far fuller and truer sense than either of these, shows no trace of the special features now under consideration; on the contrary, it keeps remarkably close to the normal Pauline type, and well inside its natural allowance of unique words. . . . Neither the ancient Church nor the modern has ever yet derived from these epistles to churches [Paul's early Epistles] the impression that their author was writing down to the mental level of ignorant and illiterate readers. . . . We must avoid too much stress on the superior educational qualifications of Timothy and Titus. . . . Timothy is addressed as an immature youth who needs very elementary

---

65. Van Oosterzee, *loc. cit.*, no. 4.

66. Wohlenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 54 f. So also Conybeare: "The language of letters to individual friends might be expected to differ somewhat from that of public letters to churches." *Loc. cit.*

67. Koelling, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-51. "Das Recht war zugleich Pflicht." *Ibid.*, p. 46.

lessons in life and duty [Shaw, quoted in Harrison].<sup>68</sup>

Even Alford, a conservative scholar, sees the difficulty of explaining the peculiar expressions of the Pastorals by appealing to the individual nature of the addressees. Were this a good explanation, one would expect to find some similarity between the Pastorals and Philemon. But Alford finds the word  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\rho\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (2 Tim. 2:21; 4:11; Phim. 11) the only point of contact between the unusual expressions of the two Epistles.<sup>69</sup>

Nor is there agreement--even among conservative scholars--that the unique expressions of our letters can be attributed to an amanuensis. The only serious attempts to find an amanuensis have resulted in ascribing this secretarial activity to Luke. This is natural because of the statement "Only Luke is with me" in 2 Tim. 4:11. Leading proponents of this view are H. A. Schott and J. D. James. But Harrison points out that "the Hapax Legomena are of course as foreign to Luke as to Paul."<sup>70</sup> So also the conservative Torm advises his readers not to build too strong an argument upon the possibility of an amanuensis.<sup>71</sup>

68. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 54-56.

69. Alford, op. cit., p. 80 (Prologue). Weiss: "Der Einfall Köllings aber, dass der litterarisch gebildete Paulus mit seinen Schülern von gleicher Erudition in wissenschaftlicher Terminologie rede, ist wohl kaum ernst zu nehmen." Op. cit., p. 308, n. 4.

70. Harrison, op. cit., p. 53.

71. Torm, op. cit., p. 242.

Jacquier's explanation of the peculiar words in the Pastorals is that many of them are merely derivatives of previous Pauline words.<sup>72</sup> This would explain particularly the new compounds in our letters. But Harrison rightly points out that such a view only cuts down the unique words in Paul's early Epistles too, "and the net result will be to leave the comparison more unfavourable than ever for the Pastorals."<sup>73</sup>

Eager to show that a change in language is possible in the Pastoral Epistles, conservative scholars have been greatly encouraged by a glimpse into the writings of other great men in history. They have found that the works of these men also do not always coincide in language and style with one another. This discrepancy being possible in their writings, why should it not be considered possible in the writings of the great Apostle Paul? Thus the peculiarities of the Pastorals have been shown to be no greater than those in evidence in writings of Luther, Klopstock, Schiller, Goethe, and particularly Shakespeare. But Harrison believes there is a weakness in such comparisons.

The difficulty with so many of the ancients is that the true origin of their reputed works is wrapped in an obscurity as deep as, or deeper still than that which we are seeking to penetrate. So that it is a case of explaining ignotum per ignotius. On the other hand, any modern writer is divided from Paul

---

72. In Harrison, op. cit., p. 65.

73. Ibid.

by so vast an abyss of time, so many incalculable changes resulting from the invention of printing (to name only one all-important factor), that, even supposing that any real resemblance were apparent, it would be largely nullified by the obvious differences between the two cases.<sup>74</sup>

Too much stress cannot be laid on these analogies. Only in so far as they show the possibility of changes in expression do they have some value.

Torm attempts to show the difficulty in establishing a rigid Pauline vocabulary. He divides Paul's letters into four groups: (1) the Thessalonian Epistles; (2) Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians ("Big Four"); (3) the Captivity Letters; (4) the Pastoral Epistles. He indicates that most of the so-called "Pauline words" actually occur in only one of these four groups preponderantly. Of Paul's words 274 occur in only one of these four groups--1 such in the first group, 194 (ca. 3 words per page) in the second, 27 in the third, and 52 (ca. 4 words per page) in the Pastorals. All words having to do with "sin" are used heavily in the second group, while they are used far less in other groups. The  $\varphi\rho\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma$  family does not occur at all in the first and fourth groups, but appears 22 and 12 times in the other two groups. Torm shows, moreover, that there are 339 words in Paul which are shared by one group with only the next group in time. The first and second groups share

---

74. Ibid., p. 59.

64 such words; the second and third group--248; the third and the fourth group--27. Keeping this group-picture of Paul's letters in mind, these considerations lessen considerably the problem of the non-Pauline words and "hapax legomena" in the Pastorals.<sup>75</sup>

Another mitigating circumstance is the fact that many of the "hapax legomena" of our letters are to be found either in the Greek literature of a pre-Pauline or Pauline period, or in the Septuagint,<sup>76</sup> or that many are semi-quotations from faithful sayings, liturgical doxologies, and hymns.<sup>77</sup>

Whatever the problems are which confront us as we study the language of the Pastorals, we cannot disregard the fact that these letters clearly bear Paul's superscription. To disregard it means to stamp them as forgeries. This is just what the liberal scholars make them. Yet, conservative scholars argue with one accord that it is incredible that a forger would have risked detection by including in these letters so many non-Pauline words and "hapax legomena." Certainly a forger would have been doubly careful not to make his product so unlike that of a man with whom he was attempting to identify himself. At least he would have been careful not

---

75. Torm, op. cit., 230-233.

76. Torm, op. cit., 229, n. 1. See also John E. Steinmueller, Special Introduction to the New Testament, vol. III of A Companion to Scriptural Studies, p. 351.

77. Lock, op. cit., p. XXIX.



to add a host of new words and peculiar expressions. Had a forger inadvertently done so, is it not strange that his forgery was not soon detected by the early Christians?<sup>78</sup>

Harrison believes it to be quite questionable whether these peculiarities of expression were obvious to the early Christians. He believes that they were in no position to judge the authorship of the Pastorals on the basis of language. Thus it would be quite possible that all the non-Pauline words and "hapax legomena" completely escaped their notice. "Many centuries had to pass before this mark of the master's style could be recognized as such; and even now it would certainly escape the notice of the vast majority of readers, unless it were pointed out to them."<sup>79</sup>

We have tried in this chapter to state the difficulties presented by the peculiar words and phrases in the Pastoral Epistles, and to cite the deductions and possible explanations resulting from the study of these difficulties. It perhaps would be helpful here to briefly summarize the views of liberal and conservative scholars on these difficulties.

The view of the liberal scholars can best be summarized in the words of Moffatt:

The force of these linguistic considerations cannot

---

78. Cf. Hayes, op. cit., p. 458; and Van Oosterzee, loc. cit., n. 8.

79. Harrison, loc. cit.

be turned by the assertion that Paul's style would vary in private letters; the pastorals are not private letters, and in Philemon, the only extant example of such from Paul's pen, such traits do not appear. Nor can it be argued that in writing on questions of church-order and discipline he would necessarily adopt such a style, for in Corinthian correspondence he deals with similar phenomena, and here again the treatment differs materially from that of the pastorals. Still less can we ascribe the peculiar phraseology to the fact that Paul quotes from the vocabulary of his opponents, or that he is now, in contrast to his former letters, dealing with the duties of a holy life instead of with controversial topics. . . . An examination of the topics handled in these pastorals, and of their method of treatment, reveals fresh proof that they belong to a sub-Pauline period, and that the *ἄρα εὐρομένη*. . . cannot fairly be attributed to such factors as change of amanuensis, lapse of time, fresh topics, literary versatility, or senile weakness."<sup>80</sup>

Directly at odds with this view is that of the conservative scholars, as summarized by Wiesinger. "Considering all the circumstances, that the epistles are aimed at new phenomena, that they are addressed to fellow-teachers, that they are kindred in contents, and were composed at the same time, the peculiar vocabulary is conceivable, and, in comparison with Paul's other epistles, presents no special difficulty."<sup>81</sup>

---

80. James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 407 f.

81. Wiesinger, quoted in Huther, op. cit., p. 53.

## II. Pauline Elements Lacking in the Pastoral Epistles

Another factor which has fed the critical attack against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is the lack of Pauline words and phrases, and of the general idiom of the Apostle. If Paul did write the Pastorals, have we not the right to expect that he would make use of his favorite expressions -- expressions which occur again and again in his earlier Epistles? Liberal critics believe we do. Failing to find many of them in our Epistles, they see reason to reject a Pauline authorship.

Harrison has counted 1,053 Pauline words which are missing in the Pastorals, but are found in other New Testament books. Of these, 532 are to be found in more than one of Paul's earlier Epistles -- 41 in 5 earlier Epistles, 19 in 6, 10 in 7, 6 in 8, and 4 in 9.<sup>1</sup>

Considering only those words which occur in Paul's early Epistles, but not elsewhere in the New Testament, we find 582 such words lacking in the Pastorals. Of these, 469 occur in only one of Paul's early Epistles,

---

1. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 30-32.

113 in more than one--21 in 3, 8 in 4.<sup>2</sup>

White has listed the most important of these Pauline words lacking in the Pastorals. The numbers in parentheses indicate the times each word occurs in Paul's early Epistles. White lists the following: ἀδίκος (3), ἀκαθαρσία (9), ἀκροβυστία (19), ἀποκαλύπτειν (13), ἀποκάλυψις (13), ἀπολύτρωσις (7), γνωρίζειν (18), διαθήκη (9), δικιούν (27), δικκίωμα (5), δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ (9), δοκεῖν (18), ἕκαστος (42), ἑλευθερία (7), ἑλεύθερος (16), ἑλευθεροῦν (5), ἐνέργεια (8), ἐνεργεῖν (17), ἐνεργημα (2), ἐνεργῆς (2), ἕξειστιν (5), ἔργα νόμου (9), κᾶθῶ (27), καταργεῖν (25), καταργήσθαι (20), καυχᾶσθαι (35), καύχημα (10), καύχησις (10), κρείσσων (4), μείρων (4), μικρός (4), μωρία (5), ὁμοιούν (1), ὁμοίωμα (5), ὁμοίως (4), οὐρανός (10), οὐρανός (21), παράδοσις (5), παραλαμβάνειν (11), πατήρ ἡμῶν--outside salutations--(7), πείθειν (2), περιβασία (3), περισεύειν (26), περισσευμα (2), περισός (2), περιπεποιθήσις (6), πλεονάζειν (8), πλεονεκτεῖν (5), πλεονέκτης (4), πλεονεξία (6), οἱ πολλοί (8), πράττειν (18), συνεργός (12), ὧμα (91), ταπεινός (3), ταπεινούν (4), τελειος (8), τελειότης (1), τελειούν (1), υἱοθεσία (5), υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ (17), ὑπακοή (11), ὑπακούειν (11), φρονεῖν (24), φρόνημα (4), φρόνησις (1), φρόνιμος

2. Ibid., p.30.

(5), φύσις (11), χαριῖς εἰς θεοῦ (16), χρῆστός (3).<sup>3</sup>

Certainly those words which occur only a few times in Paul's early letters hardly merit consideration. Their absence in the Pastorals exerts little weight against the Pauline authorship. But there remains a host of words which do occur quite frequently in Paul's early Epistles. What shall we say of them?

White endeavors to show that the lack of many of these words in our letters is not so striking as it appears at first glance. Many of these so-called "Pauline words" occur preponderantly in only one or two of Paul's early Epistles or Epistle groups. He has divided Paul's early Epistles into four groups: (1) 1 and 2 Thess.; (2) Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Gal.; (3) Eph., Col., and Phim.; (4) Phil. Of the Pauline words listed above, 11 do not occur in groups 1, 3, or 4. Moreover, of these,  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  is not found in 2 Cor. or Gal.;  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$  is not in 2 Cor. (but twice in the Pastorals);  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$  occurs only in Rom.;  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  θεοῦ is not in 1 Cor. or Gal.;  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  is not in Rom. or Gal.;  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$  νόμου is not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.;  $\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\nu$  is not in 2 Cor. or Gal.;  $\mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\sigma}$  is not in Rom.;  $\mu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$  occurs only in 1 Cor.;  $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  is not in 2 Cor. or Gal.;  $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$  is not in Rom. or 1 Cor.;  $\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}$  πολλός is not in Gal. (but 5 times in Rom.). Obviously, these eleven words "are not

---

3. White, op. cit., p. 69.

characteristically Pauline words, as some say."<sup>4</sup>

Of the others, 4 do not occur in groups 1 and 3: δοκεῖν not in Rom.; κρείσσων not in Rom., 2 Cor., or Gal.; ὁμοιοῦν<sup>1</sup> not in 1 Cor., 2 Cor., or Gal.; ταπεινός not in 1 Cor. or Gal.<sup>5</sup>

Moreover, 7 do not occur in groups 1 and 4: ἀκροβυστία not in 2 Cor.; ἀπολύτρωσις not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; ἐλευθερός and -οῦν not in 2 Cor.; ἐλευθεροῦν also not in 1 Cor.; υἱοθεσία not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; φύσις not in 2 Cor.; χρηστός not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; διαθήκη once in group 3, and all others in group 2; ἐλευθερία twice in group 3, and all others in group 2.<sup>6</sup>

Six words do not occur in group 1. Of these, κατεργάζεσθαι occurs 17 out of its 20 instances in Rom. and 2 Cor.; ἐπλάγχθαι is not found in Rom., 1 Cor., or Gal. (3 times in Phim.); none of the τέλειος group occurs in 2 Cor. or Gal., while τελειοῦν and τελειότης are also missing in Rom. and 1 Cor.; προνεῖν occurs 25 of its 34 times in Rom. and Phil. (once in 1 Tim.); πρόνημα occurs only in Rom.; πρόνησις occurs only in Eph.; πρόνημος occurs only in Rom. and 1 and 2 Cor. Therefore γνωρίζειν and χαρίζεσθαι are the only words of this group of six which are fairly representative in Paul's early Epistles.<sup>7</sup>

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 69 f.

7. Ibid., p. 70.

Of those words not found in group 4,  $\lambda\iota\kappa\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\sigma\iota\alpha$  does not occur in 1 Cor.;  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\eta\epsilon\iota\gamma$  occurs in 2 Tim.;  $\sigma\rho\alpha\upsilon$  occurs in 1 Tim., but not in 2 Cor. or Gal.;  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is not in Rom. or 2 Cor.; none of the  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\gamma\iota\alpha$  group occurs in Gal., while  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  and  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\gamma\iota\alpha$  are absent also from 1 Cor., and  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$  from 2 Cor. Of the seventeen places where our Lord is called  $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau. \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ , eleven are in Rom. and Gal.<sup>8</sup>

Thus we have 27 words, or more than half of the original number, "the absence of which from the Pastorals obviously need call for no remark." Those words which remain are also interesting in regard to their manner of occurrence in Paul's early Epistles.  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  occurs 22 of its 42 times in 1 Cor.; of the  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$  group,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\eta\mu\alpha$ , and  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\eta\varsigma$  are not found in Rom., 2 Cor., or Gal., and  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$  also not in 1 Cor.; of the 27 appearances of  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ , 19 are in 1 and 2 Cor.; of the  $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\upsilon\alpha\iota$  group, 29 of its 55 occurrences are in 2 Cor.;  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  is not found in Rom. or 2 Cor.; outside of salutations  $\pi\kappa\tau\eta\rho \eta\mu\omega\upsilon$  occurs 3 times in 1 Thess., twice in 2 Thess., and once in Gal. and Phil.; of the  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$  group, none occur in Gal.,  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$ ,  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ , and  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  also not in 1 Cor., and  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  and  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$  are not in Rom.;  $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$  and  $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\theta\eta\varsigma$  do not

8. Ibid.

occur in 1 Cor., and  $\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  also not in Rom. or Gal., while 7 times in 2 Cor., and 7 times in Phil.; 13 of the 25 occurrences of the  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha$  group are in Rom., which also has 10 of the 18 occurrences of  $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ ; neither of the  $\epsilon\upsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$  group occurs in Gal.;  $\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha$  occurs 46 of its 91 times in 1 Cor.; neither  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\gamma\eta$ , nor  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  occurs in 1 Cor. or Gal., and  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  also not in 2 Cor.<sup>9</sup>

This study shows that liberal scholars have perhaps laid too much stress upon the lack of these Pauline words in the Pastorals. Here is evidence of Paul's habit of returning again and again to the same word in the same letter, while at the same time it is lacking completely in a letter of the same group. Torm also has pointed this out in his study. "Es geht also nicht an, gewisse Begriffe zu 'Paulinischen Hauptbegriffen' zu erheben und dann das Fehlen dieser Begriffe als Argument gegen die Echtheit einiger Briefe zu benutzen."<sup>10</sup>

Other arguments have also been advanced by conservative scholars to explain this peculiar lack of Pauline words in the Pastorals. Weiss points out that in other letters Paul uses many of these words in discussing things for which he had no occasion to speak in the Pastorals. Instead, Paul here is concerned about

9. Ibid., p. 70 f.

10. Torm, op. cit., 232.



heretics, a topic which reoccurs again and again, as in no other Epistle. Thus he explains the lack of φρονεῖν, ἐνεργεῖν, περιβεύειν, πλεονάζειν, ὑπακούειν, ἀπακλύπτειν and καυχᾶσθαι.<sup>11</sup>

Thiessen uses the analogy of Shakespeare in an attempt to solve the difficulty:

We would not insist that Shakespeare's shorter writings must have a certain percentage of words of any one of his plays; how much less can we insist that the Pastoral Epistles, which cover only about seventeen pages out of a total of 128 for all of Paul's Epistles . . . must have a certain percentage of the words in the rest of his Epistles.<sup>12</sup>

Wohlenberg believes that this lack of Pauline words in the Pastorals only proves the Pauline authorship. Certainly a forger would have included words recognized to be Pauline in his forged letter if he wished people to believe they were written by Paul.<sup>13</sup>

Also lacking in the Pastorals is a number of particles commonly employed by Paul in his earlier Epistles. Harrison lists 112 Pauline particles which are lacking in our Epistles. Of these, Rom. has 58, 1 Cor.--69, 2 Cor.--53, Gal.--43, Eph.--22, Phil.--29, Col.--18,

11. Weiss, loc. cit.

12. Henry Clarence Thiessen, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 258. So also White: "We do not demand that Shakespeare's Sonnets or Cymbeline should exhibit a certain percentage of Hamlet words. Antecedently, we should not expect that an author's favorite expressions would be distributed over the pages of his book like the spots on a wall-paper pattern." Op. cit., p. 68.

13. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 53.

1 Thess.--27, 2 Thess.--12, and Phim.--12.<sup>14</sup>

Twelve of these occur only in Paul and nowhere else in the New Testament--7 in one of Paul's earlier Epistles; 2 in two Epistles; and 3 in four Epistles.<sup>15</sup>

Of those Pauline particles lacking in the Pastorals, but found in other New Testament books, 35 occur in only one of Paul's early Epistles; 21 in two Epistles; 12 in three; 15 in four; 7 in five; 6 in six; 6 in seven; 4 in eight; and 1 in nine.<sup>16</sup>

White has listed 24 of the most important Pauline particles which are lacking in the Pastorals, and the number of times they occur in Paul's early Epistles: ἄρα (15), ἔτεκεν (6), ἴδε (1), ἰδοὺ (9), πάν (10), παρά with the accusative (14), εἶπειτα (11), μήπως (10), οὕτως (34), ἄχρι (14), οὕτω (3), πάλιν (28), διότι (10), ἐμπροσθεν (7), ἐτι (15), ἀντί (5), ἄρα οὐ (12), δὲ (27), ὅπως (9), οὐκέτι (15), ἐν παντί (16), ποτέ (19; once in Tit.), ὡς περ (14), and οὐ (38).<sup>17</sup>

In addition, Harrison points to the peculiar use of ὡς in the Pastorals. While ὡς does occur fairly often in the Pastorals, it is generally followed by a substantive. But there is no trace in the Pastorals of

14. Harrison, op. cit., p. 35.

15. Ibid., p. 36 f.

16. Ibid.

17. White, op. cit., p. 71.

the Pauline use of  $\omega\varsigma$  -- (1) with the participle; (2) with the adverb; or (3) with  $\alpha\iota$ .<sup>18</sup>

Another peculiarity is Paul's preference for  $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$  instead of  $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ , which occurs abundantly in all of Paul's letters except Phim., 2 Thess., the Pastorals, and to a great degree not in Heb. and 1 Pet.

Harrison stresses the lack of the Pauline definite article in the Pastorals. He lists the following Pauline uses of the definite article which are conspicuous by their absence from the Pastorals: (1) the Pauline phrase  $\omicron \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \omicron \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ; (2)  $\omicron$  with the nominative instead of the vocative; (3)  $\omicron$  with numerals; (4)  $\omicron$  with an infinitive; (5)  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  with the infinitive; (6)  $\omicron$  with the adverb; (7)  $\omicron$  with an interjection; and (8)  $\omicron$  with a whole sentence. Harrison sees a peculiarity in the Pastorals' use of the article with  $\delta\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ , thus converting  $\delta\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$  into an adjective, whereas in his early Epistles Paul uses it adverbially.<sup>19</sup>

Form, however, shows that the article before whole sentences is only in 1 Thess., Rom., Gal., and Eph., and in Gal. only once (in an Old Testament citation). The article before numbers is also missing in 2 Cor., Gal., and Col. The article before an infinitive is also missing in 1 and 2 Thess., and occurs in 2 Cor. only twice.<sup>20</sup>

Harrison admits that the Pastorals make use of

18. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 39 f.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 38 f.

20. Form, *op. cit.*, 237.

Pauline particles, but "with a certain looseness and vagueness which only throws into relief the absence of any strong logical coherence." He gives as examples:

ὅτι in 1 Tim. 2:1, ὡσαύτως in 1 Tim. 2:9, γὰρ in 1 Tim. 2:5, the lack of an apodosis before καὶ ὅτι in 1 Tim. 1:3.<sup>21</sup>

Harrison goes on to point out the lack in the Pastorals of Paul's fond use of Oratio Variata, consisting of pairs of sentences running parallel and more or less synonymous with one another, and each complete in itself (Rom. 4:12; 3:7 f.; 12:16 f. 20 ff.; 1 Cor. 4:6; 7:13; 14:1; 2 Cor. 11:6.<sup>22</sup> Also lacking in the Pastorals is Paul's series of prepositions in a single sentence with reference to some one subject.<sup>23</sup>

Taken as a whole, these missing particles do present a difficulty, which cannot be overlooked. Liberal scholars are convinced that these words are to be added to the other peculiarities of the Pastorals as evidence against a Pauline authorship. Moffatt, for example, believes that "the difference in the use of the particles is one of the most decisive proofs of the difference between Paul and this Paulinist."<sup>24</sup>

White, however, reveals the fact that the great majority of Pauline particles lacking in the Pastorals

21. Harrison, op. cit., p. 44.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 40.

24. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 407.

are confined to Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Gal., because they are most argumentative and controversial, and the subject-matter demands the employment of inferential and similar particles.<sup>25</sup>

Torm also tries to show the relative unimportance of these missing particles. Most of the so-called Pauline particles appear in only one of Paul's early letters, or in only one group of those letters. Others, while appearing in more, follow generally the same pattern of Paul's habit of repetition in one letter.<sup>26</sup>

White also sees the possibility of accounting for this deficiency in particles by assuming some freedom on the part of an amanuensis employed by Paul at this time.<sup>27</sup> We feel, however, that this assumption cannot be defended with sufficient information concerning Paul's use of an amanuensis. Moreover, granted that the possibility of an amanuensis exists, the peculiarities of the Pastorals are so similar in all three letters, that we would have to assume that Paul employed the same amanuensis for each of the three. The known facts of Paul's travels hardly allow for such a view.

Wohlenberg believes that Paul's living in a Latin-speaking area (Rome) in his later years of travel accounts for this peculiarity. Paul's mother tongue was Hebrew

---

25. White, loc. cit.

26. Torm, op. cit., 234 f.

27. White, op. cit., p. 71 f.

and Aramaic, while he picked up Greek later in school. Since Greek was only a second language to Paul, the influence of Latin upon it would have been much more noticeable than if it had been his mother tongue. This would especially account for the omission of the article in the Pastorals.<sup>28</sup>

Summarizing the facts before us, we find an abundance of peculiar elements in the Pastoral Epistles. Certainly it is strange that Epistles, accepted early as Pauline, should contain such an amount of material so out of harmony with previous writings of Paul. We feel, however, that conservative scholars have successfully shown that such peculiarities, numerous as they are, can be accounted for, without rejecting the Pauline authorship. Moreover, to draw a line between Pauline and non-Pauline material necessitates far more evidence than liberal scholars offer.

---

28. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 54.

### III. Pauline Elements in the Pastoral Epistles

In spite of all the peculiarities in the Pastoral Epistles, there are in them many similarities to Paul's earlier Epistles. Not everything in the Pastorals is new and different. Now and then we come upon a word, phrase, or element of style which definitely reminds us of the Paul of old. Even modern liberal critics do not deny that there are points of contact between our Epistles and the early Epistles of the Apostle. In the words of Harrison--" . . . The Pastorals do unquestionably contain a notable quantity of definitely Pauline matter bearing the unmistakable stamp of the Apostle. The only question is--Who put it there?"<sup>1</sup> The answer is of course self-evident to conservative scholars. Liberal scholars, however, have had considerable difficulty in accounting for the Pauline elements in the Pastorals. Virtually united in their offensive thrusts against the Pastorals because of the peculiarities outlined in the previous chapters, they suddenly find themselves in quite general disagreement when put on the defensive by the "unquestionably" Pauline elements in the Pastoral Epistles.

---

1. Harrison, op. cit., p. 87.

What then are these Pauline elements?

The Pastorals contain 542 words in common with Paul's early Epistles. Of these, 50 are exclusively Pauline words, not occurring elsewhere in the New Testament. Breaking down these 50, we find only 7 occurring in more than one of the Pastorals, and 1 (ἐπιφάνεια) in all three Pastorals; 30 occur in only one of Paul's early Epistles, 10 more in two Epistles, 3 occur in five; 2 occur in Paul's early Epistles only in quotations from the Septuagint (ἀλοάω and ἠωρεύω); and only 3 occur more than twice in any of Paul's early letters (ἐφθαρσία, οἰκέω, χρηστότης).<sup>2</sup>

In addition to these exclusively Pauline words, the Pastorals also share with Paul's early Epistles 492 words which occur in other New Testament books. Of these, 47 occur in all ten of Paul's early Epistles; 30 are shared with nine Epistles; and 25 with eight.<sup>3</sup>

We have culled from Barnett's book<sup>4</sup> the following words and expressions which suggest a relationship between the language of the Pastorals and that of Paul's earlier Epistles. A. From all three Pastorals -- ἐπίγνωσις (1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Tim. 2:25; 3:7; Tit. 1:1): the New Testament only in Paul's early Epistles, the Pastorals, Heb., and 2 Pet.; ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας

2. Ibid., p. 24.

3. Ibid., p. 26.

4. Albert E. Barnett, Paul Becomes a Literary Influence, pp. 252-277.



(1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Tim. 2:25; 3:7; Tit. 1:1): elsewhere only in Heb. 10:26; ἐπιφάνεια : only in 2 Thess. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 1:10; 4:1.8; and Tit. 2:13; κλετόν δ' λόγος (1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11; Tit. 3:8): a possible allusion to Rom. 5:8. B. From 1 and 2 Timothy-- στρατεύομαι (1 Tim. 1:18; 2 Tim. 2:4): also in Paul (1 Cor. 9:7; 2 Cor. 10:3) and in the New Testament elsewhere (Lk. 3:14; Jas. 4:1; 1 Pet. 2:11)--the figure of a soldier is popular in Pauline letters; ἐνδυναμῶ (1 Tim. 1:12; 2 Tim. 2:1; 4:17): also occurs in earlier letters (Rom. 4:20; Eph. 6:10; Phil. 4:13); ἀνυπόκριτος (1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 1:5): also in Rom. 12:9 and 2 Cor. 6:6 (cf. Jas. 3:17; 1 Pet. 1:22); χάρισμα (1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6): only in Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., 1 and 2 Tim., and 1 Pet.; παγίς (1 Tim. 3:7; 6:9; 2 Tim. 2:26): also in Rom. 11:9 (Lk. 21:35 is its only other occurrence in the New Testament). C. From 1 Timothy and Titus -- σωτήρ (of God--1 Tim. 1:1; 2:3; 4:10; Tit. 1:3; 2:10. 13; 3:4): in Paul's early letters applied only to Christ, but cf. 1 Cor. 1:21, where the conception of God as σωτήρ also exists; ἐπιταγή (1 Tim. 1:1; Tit. 1:3; 2:15): only here and in earlier letters (Rom. 16:26; 1 Cor. 7:6. 25; 2 Cor. 8:8); γνησίος (1 Tim. 1:2; Tit. 1:4; cf. 2 Cor. 8:8; Phil. 4:3): "The sense in which it is used here corresponds with its use in Phil. 4:3 and was probably suggested by the use of the adverbial form in Phil. 2:20;" <sup>5</sup>

5. Ibid., p. 252.

εεμνός (1 Tim. 3:9.11; Tit. 2:2): also in Phil. 4:8  
 and 10 times in the Septuagint. D. From 2 Timothy and  
 Titus -- σωτήρ (of Christ--2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 3:6;  
 1:4): Christ is called σωτήρ only in Pauline letters  
 (Phil. 3:20; Eph. 5:23). E. From 1 Timothy only --  
 ἑλπίς : predominantly a Pauline word in the New Test-  
 ament; applied figuratively to Christ only in Col. and  
 1 Tim. 1:1 (also in Ignatius); οἰκονομία (1 Tim. 1:4):  
 used in Col. 1:25 in connection with τὸν λόγον, which  
 is a "probable source of influence for 1 Tim., where false  
 teaching is described as creating controversy instead of  
 οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ;"<sup>6</sup> νομοδιδάσκαλος (1 Tim. 1:7):  
 elsewhere only in Lk. 5:17 and Acts 5:34; but has same  
 connotation as the thought expressed by Paul in Gal. 4:  
 21-27; καλός (applied to the Law): used thus in New  
 Testament only in Rom. 7:6 and 1 Tim. 1:8; ὑπερπλεονάζω  
 (1 Tim. 1:14 only occurrence in New Testament): similar  
 to πλεονάζω (only in Paul and 2 Pet.)--"The type of  
 thought and expression is thoroughly Pauline;"<sup>7</sup> στρατεία  
 (1 Tim. 1:18): only elsewhere in 2 Cor. 10:4 (see στρα-  
 τεύομαι under B. above); ἡσυχία (1 Tim. 2:11.12): cf.  
 2 Thess. 3:12; Acts 22:2 (ἡσυχάζω in 1 Thess. 4:11);  
 μεσίτης (1 Tim. 2:5): only in Gal. (3:19.20), Heb., and  
 1 Tim; ἀντίλυτρον: only in 1 Tim. 2:6, but it is the

6. Ibid., p. 253.

7. Ibid., p. 272.

equivalent of ἀπολύτρωσις of Eph. 1:7 (cf. Rom. 3:24);  
 οὐ ψεύδομαι (1 Tim. 2:7): also in Rom. 9:1, 2 Cor.  
 11:31, and Gal. 1:20; πρέπω : only in 1 Cor. 11:13  
 and 1 Tim. 2:10 does it indicate conduct that is appropriate for women; ἐξαιπάτω (1 Tim. 2:14): only in  
 early letters and Pastorals, and only in 2 Cor. 11:3 and  
 1 Tim. is it used of the origin of sin and of Eve's temptation;  
 ἔργα ἀγαθὰ (1 Tim. 2:20): used thus in the plural to designate evidences of genuine Christianity  
 only here and in Eph. 2:10;<sup>8</sup> ἀνεκδικεῖν (1 Tim. 3:7): only occurrences are in Rom. (15:3) and Heb.; προκοπή  
 only in Phil. 1:12.25 and 1 Tim. 4:15; οὐκείος : only occurrences in Gal. 6:10, Eph. 2:19, and 1 Tim. 5:8;  
 περιέργος (1 Tim. 5:13): elsewhere only in Acts 19:19, but similar in thought and usage as περιεργάζομαι in 2 Thess. 3:11; αὐτάρκεια : only in 2 Cor. 9:8 and 1 Tim. 6:6 (cf. αὐτάρκης in Phil. 4:11); ὀλέθρος (only in early Epistles and Pastorals--1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Thess. 5:3; 2 Thess. 1:9; 1 Tim. 6:9): its eschatological connotation in 1 Tim. is similar to its usage in 2 Thess. F. From 2 Timothy only -- κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν: only in 2 Tim. 1:2 and Gal. 3:21.29; ἀγαπητός τέκνον (2 Tim. 1:2): Timothy is thus designated also in 1 Cor. 4:17; ἐνοικέω (2 Tim. 1:5.14): occurs only in Paul (Rom. 7:17; 8:11;

---

8. In every other case Paul uses the plural to designate something in conflict to the Gospel.

2 Cor. 6:16; Col. 3:16), and only in Rom. 8:11 and 2 Tim. 1:14 does it apply to τὸ πνεῦμα; πείθω: the form used in 2 Tim. 1:5 occurs elsewhere only in Rom. (8:38; 14:14; 15:14); τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ: only in Rom. 6:23 and 2 Tim. 1:6; πνεῦμα δουλίας (2 Tim. 1:7): cf. πνεῦμα δουλείας of Rom. 8:15; ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (2 Tim. 1:8): "In Acts Paul is known as ὁ δέσμιος, but it is in Eph. [3:1] and Philem. [1:9] that he pre-eminently appears as ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ;"<sup>9</sup> ἐπασιχύνεσθαι (2 Tim. 1:8.12.16): predominantly a Pauline word in the New Testament; προδεδεγίς (2 Tim. 1:9; 3:10): elsewhere only in Acts and in earlier Pauline Epistles (Rom. 8:28; 9:11; Eph. 1:11; 3:11) -- the sense of this word in 2 Tim. 1:9 corresponds closely to that in Rom. and Eph.; καταργέω: once in Lk., 24 times in Paul's early Epistles, once in 2 Tim. (1:10), and once in Heb. -- its use with δάνατος in 2 Tim. corresponds to 1 Cor. 15:24-27.54-57; εὐχρηστος: only in Phim. 11 and 2 Tim. 2:21; 4:11; ἰδοκίμος (2 Tim. 3:8; Tit. 1:16): a Pauline word -- its usage in 2 Tim. is parallel with Rom. 1:28; σπένδομαι: only in Phil. 2:17 and 2 Tim. 4:6; ἀνάδυσις: occurs only in 2 Tim. 4:6, but similar to ἀραλύω in Phil. 1:23 and Lk. 12:36 (its only occurrences in the New Testament). G. From Titus only --

---

9. Ibid., p. 264.

κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν : only in Tit. 1:1 and Rom. 8:33;  
 ἀνακαίνωσις : only in Rom. 12:2 and Tit. 3:5 (cf. ἀνα-  
 καινῶσις in 2 Cor. 4:16 and Col. 3:10).

Alford adds the following expressions similar to  
 the usage of Paul's early Epistles: ὁ δὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντί-  
 λυτρον ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. (1 Tim. 2:6) and ὅς ἑδωκεν  
 ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Tit. 2:14) -- cf. τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν  
 περὶ κ.τ.λ. (Gal. 1:4);<sup>10</sup> 1 Tim. 1:17 and 2 Tim. 4:  
 18 -- cf. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (Gal. 1:5; cf.  
 Phil. 4:20); προέκοπτον (2 Tim. 2:16; 3:9.13) -- cf.  
 Rom. 13:12; Gal. 1:14; used only by Paul in the New Testa-  
 ment; ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου) -- 1 Tim. 5:  
 21; 6:13; 2 Tim. 2:14; 4:1; Gal. 1:20; σταθός (1 Tim.  
 3:15) -- cf. Gal. 2:9; ἀνόητοι (1 Tim. 6:9; Tit. 3:  
 3) -- cf. Gal. 3:1; Rom. 1:14; πνεύματι ἄεθε (2 Tim.  
 3:6) -- cf. Gal. 5:18; Rom. 8:14; καιρῶ ἐδίω (1 Tim.  
 2:6; 6:15; Tit. 1:3) -- cf. Gal. 6:9; εὐαγγελιόν μου  
 (2 Tim. 2:8) -- cf. Rom. 2:16; 16:25; κήρυγμα (2 Tim.  
 4:17; Tit. 1:3) -- cf. Rom. 16:25; 1 Cor. 1:21; 2:4;  
 15:14); χρόνοις αἰωνίοις (2 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 1:2) --  
 cf. Rom. 16:25; φαγερωδέντος (1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:  
 10; Tit. 1:3) -- cf. Rom. 16:26 and others; μόνω σοφῶ  
 δεῶ (1 Tim. 1:17) -- cf. Rom. 16:26.<sup>11</sup>

10. The only places where this expression is used of  
 our Lord.

11. Alford, *op. cit.*, p. 80 f. (Prologue), nn. 5 and  
 6. Alford feels that there is a particular similarity  
 between the Pastorals and Galatians in content, spirit,

(1 Tim. 1:17)--cf. Rom. 16:26."

In the interest of liberal criticism Barnett offers the following graph to show that the writer of the Pastorals must have been well acquainted with Paul's early Epistles.<sup>12</sup> The graph indicates the number of instances where the Pastorals simulate in expression each of Paul's early letters. Barnett has classed them according to the degree of probability of their "literary indebtedness," (A) indicating practical certainty, (B) high probability, (C) reasonable probability, and (Unc.) still less probability, or unclassified instances. We give the graph here with the mental reservation that Barnett's classifications indicate only degrees of similarity between expressions in the Pastorals and Paul's early Epistles.

	A	B	C	Unc.
Rom.- - -	6-	3-	4-	--26
1 Cor.- - -	2-	4-	6-	- -9
2 Cor.- - -	- -	3-	3-	- -9
Gal.- - -	- -	- -	3-	- -9
Eph.- - -	- -	4-	3-	- 10
Phil.- - -	-2-	1-	3-	- 10
Col.- - -	- -	4-	3-	- -7
1 Thess.- - -	- -	- -	1-	- -6
2 Thess.- - -	- -	1-	3-	- -2
Philem.- - -	- -	1-	1-	- -1

Here we have a vast amount of Pauline material evident in the Pastorals. The similarities with Paul's early Epistles are so striking that even the liberal critics cannot by-pass them, and it is right here that they fall into disagreement with one another. Some explanation of

---

and expression.

12. Barnett, op. cit., p. 277.

this Pauline matter is necessary for them if they wish to prove that a Pauline authorship of our letters is impossible.

Holtzmann believes that the Pastorals are a fictitious product of a second-century writer writing in Paul's name. Acquainted with Paul's letters, this writer in the Pastorals attempted as best he could to make his product appear genuine. The result is this vast amount of Pauline matter in the Pastorals.<sup>13</sup>

Barnett expresses a similar view:

The indications of this study are that the author of the Pastorals was acquainted with Paul's letters as a collection and that he knew each of the ten letters that seem to have constituted the corpus. Of the three letters, 2 Tim. is the fullest of reminiscences, but acquaintance with the older letter collection is evident in 1 Tim. and Tit. There are no direct and formal quotations from Paul's letters, but the language and ideas of Paul's authentic writings are unmistakably used in many instances.<sup>14</sup>

Harrison wishes to show that the similarities between the Pastorals and Paul's early Epistles are not as great as figures and listings indicate. The similarities include: (1) words without which it would be impossible to write at all, or universal Christian terms indispensable to any Christian writer, and distinctive of none -- every one of the 102 words which the Pastorals share with 8, 9, or 10 of Paul's early Epistles; (2)

---

13. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 125.

14. Barnett, loc. cit.

words occurring in only one of the Pastorals, and only once there; (3) words which carry a different meaning in the Pastorals from that given them earlier; (4) derivatives from Pauline words and compounds of two or three Pauline expressions. Thus he feels that this common vocabulary of Paul and the Pastorals "is subject to a heavy discount."<sup>15</sup>

Moreover, Harrison feels that many Pauline expressions are clumsily injected into the Pastorals for no good reason. He cites ἀληθεύειν ἢ ἔγω, οὐ ψεύδομαι in 1 Tim. 2:7 -- "What was the point, and where the necessity of assuring Timothy, of all people in the world, that he really was speaking the truth, and not telling lies, when he asserted that he, Paul, had been appointed an Apostle and teacher of the Gentiles? By what conceivable possibility could it have occurred to Timothy to have denied or doubted that?"<sup>16</sup> Harrison terms οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν in 2 Tim. 1:9 as a "slip" for the Pauline οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων (Rom. 9:11; 11:6; Gal. 2:16; 3:2.5.10; Eph. 2:9), for Paul says in other places that God will reward man κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (Rom. 2:6; 2 Cor. 11:15; 2 Tim. 4:14).<sup>17</sup> He finds εἰ γὰρ συνάπτεθ' ἀνομεν καὶ συνήσομεν of 2 Tim. 2:11 f. to be almost verbatim with Rom. 6:8, and

15. Harrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-29.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 90 f. So also Bacon, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

17. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 91.



yet different from it in its unnatural use of the aorist verb form.<sup>18</sup> Finally, the <sup>c</sup>ωs construction in 2 Tim. 1:3 Harrison calls "certainly awkward and difficult to account for grammatically."<sup>19</sup>

In addition to Pauline words and expressions in the Pastorals, there are 77 particles which the Pastorals share with Paul's early Epistles. Harrison, however, emphasizes the fact that these are not too significant, for: (1) every one occurs in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, the Apologists, and a great majority in practically every book of the New Testament; (2) only 36 occur in all three of the Pastorals -- all but one of these 36 occur in 1 and 2 Cor., Eph., Phil., Gal.; 33 in Col.; 30 in 1 Thess.; 31 in 2 Thess.; and 30 in Phim.; (3) of the remaining 41, 7 are in only one of Paul's earlier Epistles, 17 in only one of the Pastorals, and 10 only once in the Pastorals.<sup>20</sup>

Some difficulty arises from the fact that most of the Pauline expressions in the Pastorals occur in the earliest Epistles of Paul. "While we have echoes from every period of Paul's epistolary career, and from every specimen of his literary craftsmanship, the most numerous and striking of these are taken, not from the latest group -- as would have been natural, if he had written

---

18. Ibid., pp. 91 f.

19. Ibid., p. 91.

20. Ibid., p. 38.

the Pastorals during and shortly before a second Roman imprisonment -- but from Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians.<sup>21</sup> Part of this difficulty can, however, be explained by pointing to the size and general character of those letters.

For the sake of completeness we include another argument advanced by Harrison on the basis of the Pauline elements in the Pastorals. "So numerous and striking are these verbal agreements that it becomes a very serious question whether Paul himself would have been able, or likely, to reproduce, purely from memory such a variety of extracts from letters which he had dictated seven or eight years previously."<sup>22</sup> We feel this view is too subjective for serious consideration.

Conservative scholars look upon these Pauline elements as definite proof for Pauline authorship. Torn stresses the point that these Pauline passages are not "slavish repetitions" from earlier Epistles, but similar expressions -- just what can be expected in different writings of the same author.<sup>23</sup>

Torn also believes that the Pauline elements speak for a Pauline authorship because the similarities between letters of Paul are more abundant between letters in one time-group, as well as between letters of one

---

21. Ibid., p. 89.

22. Ibid., p. 89.

23. Torn, op. cit., 239.

group with those of the following group. The Pastorals also follow this trend. "Es müsste ein sehr raffinierter Fälscher sein, der dafür sorgte, alle diese Berührungspunkte gerade mit den zuletzt von Paulus abgesetzten Briefen anzubringen."<sup>24</sup>

There remains a Pauline element in the Pastorals which causes some liberal critics to qualify somewhat their view that these letters are fictitious. This element is the vast amount of personal references in the Pastoral Epistles. Even the liberal Harrison, who rejects the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals as a whole, feels that these Personalia must be products of Paul's own hand. He takes exception to the views of his colleagues, and says that they "have . . . made out an unanswerable case for their thesis, that there is no single moment in Paul's life, as known to us from Acts and the ten epistles, into which these personal references as a whole can by any ingenuity be inserted."<sup>25</sup>

Harrison believes that a second century writer had before him a certain amount of genuine Pauline material. This he incorporated bodily into his letters. Though this material "cannot be identified with any of the surviving epistles," it is so closely Pauline, that we cannot regard these Personalia as pure fiction invented

---

24. Ibid.

25. Harrison, op. cit., p. 95.

by the "auctor ad Timotheum et Titum" in order to make his product look genuine.<sup>26</sup> On the contrary, Harrison believes these Personalia to be fragments of several brief personal notes which Paul addressed at various times to one or another of his friends. These then were "eventually copied out from scattered scraps of papyrus on to a single sheet, either by our author himself or by some other scribe," and then incorporated into the Pastorals.<sup>27</sup>

According to this view, Harrison places the stamp of genuineness upon the following Personalia sections in the Pastorals: (1) Tit. 3:12-15; (2) 2 Tim. 4:13-15.20. 21a; (3) 2 Tim. 4:16-18a (? 18b); (4) 2 Tim. 4:9-12. 22b; (5) 2 Tim. 1:16-18; 3.10 f; 4:1.2a.5b.6-8.18b.19.21b.22a. The first Harrison believes was written in Western Macedonia, several months after 2 Cor. 10-13 and before 2 Cor. 1-9; the second in Macedonia, after Paul's visit to Troas mentioned in 2 Cor. 2:12 f.; the third in Caesarea, soon after his arrival under escort from Jerusalem; the fourth in Rome, about 62 A.D. In short, Harrison believes that 2 Timothy consists of Paul's last personal letter to Timothy "edited and brought up to date by the auctor ad Timotheum, for the benefit of the less heroic Timothys of his own day, with the three earlier notes tacked on at the end."<sup>28</sup>

26. Ibid., pp. 93 and 102.

27. Ibid., p. 109.

28. Ibid., pp. 125 and 127.

In an effort to explain the peculiarities of diction which occur in these sections, Harrison uses the same arguments which conservative scholars use to prove the genuineness of the Pastorals as a whole.<sup>29</sup>

This view, however, stands out in sharp contrast to that of other liberal critics. Baur feels that the Personalia are only examples of "the happy thought of invention."<sup>30</sup> Likewise Holtzmann:

Jedenfalls ist uns die Vorstellung schwieriger vollziehbar, dass um wenige echte Verse ein ganzer unechter Brief sich angesetzt habe, als die andere, dass, wer einmal einen Brief im Namen eines Andern schrieb, dazu sich das nothwendige Persönliche selbst bildete oder aus Literatur und Tradition zusammensuchte . . . . zugegeben, dass an Paulus die Nothwendigkeit öfters herangetreten sein mag, Billets zu schreiben, so sieht man doch nicht ein, weder warum dann unter so vielen nur so wenige sich sollten erhalten haben, noch warum gerade diese, welche nichts darboten, was sie vor anderen als werthvoll erscheinen lassen konnte."<sup>31</sup>

Conservative scholars think it incredible to ascribe these Personalia to a forger. Citing 1 Tim. 5:23 ("Drink no longer water etc."); Paley doubts that a forger would have given such a direction, "so remote from everything of doctrine or discipline, everything of public concern to religion or to the Church, or to any sect, order, or party in it, and from every purpose with which such an Epistle could be written."<sup>32</sup>

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 92 f. 96-98. 118. 121 f. 124.

30. Baur, cited in *Ibid.*, p. 93.

31. Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 125 f.

32. William Paley, *Horae Paulinae*, p. 303 f. So also Bacon, *loc. cit.*

Simpson takes the position that only Paul could have called himself "chief of sinners" (1 Tim. 1:13). Moreover, setting at 23 the number of Personalia in 2 Timothy alone, Simpson says, "He who does not catch Paul's accents in this letter must be remarkably hard of hearing . . . . false witnesses are careful not to compromise by too many specific particulars."<sup>33</sup>

This conservative scholar also has no use for Harrison's patch-work. To him, Harrison's hypothesis makes the second century "the golden age of fancy work, barring the incomparable twentieth!"<sup>34</sup>

Side by side with these linguistic elements we also find the true Pauline style present in the Pastorals. A few examples will suffice: (1) images (the martial aspirant to fame, the seat, the steward, the outpoured libation, the vessels unto honor); (2) meiosis, or understatement; (3) appositions; (4) compendious compounds-- "These conglomerates fully accord with Paul's manner" (Simpson); (5) enumerations; (6) the play on words (1 Tim. 6:17; 2 Tim. 3:4; 3:17; 4:2); (7) Latinistic influences-- . . . more legible than heretofore in the apostle's Greek . . . nor could anything be more natural than this phenomenon" (Simpson).<sup>35</sup>

---

33. Simpson, *op. cit.*, p. 296 f.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 310.

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 306-310.

#### IV. The Pastoral Epistles Compared with Writings of the Second Century

Both liberal and conservative scholars have looked to writings of the second century to prove their hypotheses. Liberal critics believe that the similarities between these writings and the Pastorals indicate that both were products of the same century--the second. On the other hand, the conservative group feels that these similarities merely show that the writers of the second century were familiar with the Pastorals, their familiarity with them manifesting itself in many allusions to, and quotations from, those Epistles.

Harrison attempts to show by means of a thorough study that the Pastorals are more similar to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and of the Apologists than to Paul's early Epistles. He states that our Epistles have 542 words in common with Paul; 623 with other New Testament books; 664 with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers; 641 with the writings of the Apologists; 673 with writings of the New Testament, including Paul's early Epistles; and 735 with the combined writings of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists. Thus the Pastorals have 61 words more in common with Christian writings from

95-170 AD than with Christian writings of the last half of the first century, including those of Paul.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the Pastorals share with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers 664 of their total of 848 words, or 78.3%, while Paul's early Epistles share with those writings 1,543 of a total of 2,177 words, or 70.9%.<sup>2</sup>

Carrying the study further, Harrison has found that 503 of the 542 words common to Paul's early Epistles and the Pastorals occur also in the Apostolic Fathers, or 92.8%; 485, or 89.5% in the Apologists; and 524, or 96.7% in one or the other.<sup>3</sup>

Of the 106 words occurring in all three of the Pastorals, 97 are in Paul's early Epistles, 102 in the Apostolic Fathers combined, and 105 in one or the other.<sup>4</sup>

Of the total of 492 words common to Paul's early Epistles, the Pastorals, and other New Testament books, 470 are in the Apostolic Fathers; 459 in the Apologists; 444 in both; and 485 in one or the other.<sup>5</sup>

Of the 50 exclusively Pauline words in the Pastorals, 33 occur in the Apostolic Fathers, 26 in the Apologists, 20 in both, and 39 in one or the other.<sup>6</sup>

The Pastoral letters contain 18 words which occur

- 
1. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 77 f.
  2. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
  3. *Ibid.*
  4. *Ibid.*
  5. *Ibid.*
  6. *Ibid.*



in Paul's early Epistles, but not in the Apostolic Fathers or the Apologists. Of these, 7 are found elsewhere in the New Testament. Thus there remain only 11 words which the Pastorals share exclusively with Paul's early Epistles.<sup>7</sup> This figure is significant when compared with the number of words which the Pastorals share exclusively with the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. Of the 175 "hapax legomena" in the Pastorals, 61 occur in the Apostolic Fathers, and 61 in the Apologists, including 32 which are not in the Apostolic Fathers. This makes a total of 93 "hapax legomena" which the Pastorals share with the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists combined. The Pastorals share with the Apostolic Fathers from 4.4 "hapax legomena" per page (1 Timothy) to 7.1 per page (Titus), while Paul's early Epistles share with the Apostolic Fathers from 1 "hapax legomena" per page (Romans) to 2.4 per page (Philemon). With the Apostolic Fathers or the Apologists, or both, the Pastorals share from 7.5 "hapax legomena" per page (2 Timothy) to 8.6 per page (Titus), while Paul's early Epistles share from 1.6 (Ephesians) to 3.2 (Philemon). The Pastorals share 21 "hapax legomena" with Clement of Rome; 7 with 2 Clement; 13 with Ignatius; 6 with Polycarp; 4 with The Martyrdom of Polycarp; 3 with The Didache; 4 with Barnabas; 21 with Hermas; 7 with Ep. ad Diognetum; 1 with Papias;

---

7. Ibid., p. 73 f.

1 with Aristeides; 19 with Tatian; 40 with Justin; 22 with Athenagoras; 2 with Melito; and 2 with Dionysius of Corinth.<sup>8</sup>

Similarly the Pastorals share with the Apostolic Fathers 161 non-Pauline words; with the Apologists, 156; with both groups combined, 106; with one or the other, 211. These figures are far greater than those non-Pauline words in each of the ten earlier Epistles of Paul which occur in the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. The Pastorals share 63 non-Pauline words with Clement of Rome, 28 with 2 Clement, 39 with Ignatius, 20 with Polycarp, 22 with The Martyrdom of Polycarp, 21 with The Didache, 28 with Barnabas, 75 with Hermas, 27 with The Ep. ad Diognetum, 4 with Papias, 7 with Aristeides, 61 with Tatian, 116 with Justin, 59 with Athenagoras, and 5 with Melito. This correspondence is also much closer than that between the Pastorals and other New Testament books, outside Paul. "The outstanding fact here is that one word in every four throughout the Pastorals . . . while foreign so far as we know to the vocabulary of Paul, is now proved to form part of the working vocabulary of Christian writers between the years A.D. 95 and 170."<sup>9</sup>

Of the 131 words found in the Pastorals and other

---

8. Ibid., p. 68 f.

9. Ibid., pp. 70-73.

New Testament books, but not in Paul's early Epistles, 100 occur in the Apostolic Fathers; 95 in the Apologists; 118 in one or the other; and 77 in these two combined. Taking the Fathers separately, we find 42 such words in 1. Clement; 21 in 2. Clement; 26 in Ignatius; 14 in Polycarp; 18 in The Martyrdom of Polycarp; 18 in The Didache; 24 in Barnabas; 54 in Hermas; 20 in the Ep. ad Diognetum; 3 in the fragments from Papias; 6 in Aristides; 42 in Tatian; 76 in Justin; 37 in Athenagoras; and 3 in Melito.<sup>10</sup>

Harrison points out that this similarity between the Pastorals and the Apostolic Fathers is strengthened by a study of the Pauline words missing in the Pastorals, and those missing in the Apostolic Fathers. The Apostolic Fathers lack 634 Pauline words, while the Pastorals lack 595 of the same words.<sup>11</sup>

A consideration of particles also bears out this similarity. The following Pauline particles missing in the Pastorals are also missing in the Apostolic Fathers: διόπερ, ἦτοι, ἴδε, μήτις, νή, πλητικός, υπεναντίας, υπεράνω, υπερίαν, ὡςπερεί, ἐφάπαξ, καθό, μενούνη, οὐ, ὁμως, τάχα, τούναντίον, υπερεκπερισσοῦ, ἐνι, ὄφελον, πλήν, and μήπως. Among those found only once in the Apostolic Fathers, we find δεῦρο, ἐξαυτῆς, ἡνίκα, μήπω, δίς, ἡλικός, κατενώπιον, εἰκῆ, εἶπερ, and ἄλλοι.

10. Ibid., p. 70.

11. Ibid., p. 74.

Of other Pauline particles missing in the Pastorals,  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  occurs 42 times in 9 early Epistles of Paul, but only 6 times in the Apostolic Fathers;  $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$  as a preposition occurs 38 times in 8 early Epistles, only 3 times in the Fathers;  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$  --63 times in 8 early Epistles, 3 times in Fathers;  $\epsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  --23 times in 8 Epistles and only in 1 Clement;  $\delta\iota\acute{\omicron}$  --27 times in 8 Epistles, 2 times in Fathers;  $\omega\acute{\sigma}\tau\epsilon$  --39 in 7 Epistles, 1 time in Fathers;  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$  --27 in 7 Epistles, 5 in Fathers;  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$  --16 in 7 Epistles, and missing entirely in 3 Fathers;  $\gamma\epsilon$  --13 in 7 Epistles, missing in 5 Fathers;  $\alpha\acute{\rho}\alpha$  --27 in 7 Epistles, missing in 4 Fathers;  $\nu\upsilon\upsilon$  --18 in 6 Epistles, missing in 7 Fathers;  $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$  --9 in 6 Epistles missing in 5 Fathers;  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  --14 in 6 Epistles, missing in 5 Fathers;  $\omega\acute{\sigma}\tau\epsilon\rho$  --14 in 5 Epistles, missing in 3 Fathers;  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$  --15 in 5 Epistles, missing in 5 Fathers;  $\alpha\acute{\chi}\rho\iota$  --14 in 5 Epistles; missing in 8 Fathers;  $\omicron\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}$  --18 in 4, missing in 4 Fathers;  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\epsilon\rho$  --16 in 4, missing in 8 Fathers.<sup>12</sup>

The particles shared with the Apostolic Fathers, but not occurring in Paul's early letters, are  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\acute{\pi}\omicron\tau\epsilon$  (also not in the New Testament),  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega\varsigma$  (also not in the New Testament),  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\iota$ ,  $\mu\acute{\eta}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ ,  $\delta\iota\prime\ \eta\gamma\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\upsilon$ .<sup>13</sup>

Of the 77 particles which the Pastorals share with Paul's early Epistles, the great majority occur in every book of the

12. Ibid., p. 75 f.

13. Ibid., p. 76.

New Testament also, and almost without exception are found both in the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologist.<sup>14</sup>

In spite of these verbal similarities, conservative scholars deny that the Pastorals fit into the period of the Apostolic Fathers. Simpson believes that our Epistles are "different from the secondary tone and lifeless tenor of the products of the age of the apostolic fathers."<sup>15</sup> We, however, feel this defense inadequate, since the spirit of a literary product is more dependent on the personality, mood, and purpose of the author, than on the age in which it is produced.

Other scholars believe that these similarities indicate that Christian writers of the second century show in their writings a certain literary dependence on the Pastorals, or that the language of the second century was to a great degree the same as that of the period to which they ascribe the Pastorals, namely, the latter half of the first century.

White lists the passages in the Pastorals which are writings of the post-Apostolic Christian writers. He believes that some of these similarities suggest literary dependence on the part of these writers upon the Pastorals, while others are merely "illustrations of that current religious phraseology which the Pastorals themselves reflect."

---

14. Ibid., p. 77.

15. Simpson, op. cit., 295.

In The Epistle to the Corinthians of Clement of Rome (ca. 95 A.D.) we find similarities with the following passages: A. Those suggesting literary dependence -- 1 Tim. 1:18; 2 Tim. 1:3; Tit. 2:10; 3:1; B. Those which are illustrations of current phraseology -- 1 Tim. 1:17; 2:3.8.9.11; 3:10; 5:4.17; 6:1.8.12; 2 Tim. 2:1; 4:7; Tit. 2:4. "They prove that Clement's mind was at home in the religious world to which the Pastorals belong."<sup>16</sup>

The so-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (ca. 120-140 A.D.) alludes to the following passages: 1 Tim. 1:17; 6:12.14; 2 Tim. 2:4.5; Tit. 2:12.<sup>17</sup>

Van Oosterzee adds 1 Tim. 3:3 to his list of passages alluded to in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians.<sup>18</sup>

The liberal Moffatt says that these similarities between the Pastorals and Clement of Rome indicate some literary relationship, but that we cannot prove whether Clement was dependent on the Pastorals, or vice versa. That, according to Moffatt, must be determined by examination of the Pastorals in other aspects.<sup>19</sup>

Ignatius (ca. 110 A.D.) alludes to the following passages: A. Those suggesting dependence -- 1 Tim. 6:1.2; 2 Tim. 1:5.10.12; 2:4.5.12.25; 4:5; Tit. 1:14; 3:9; B. Those which are illustrations of current phraseology -- 1 Tim. 1:1.3.17; 6:3; 2 Tim. 2:21; Tit. 1:14; 3:1.9.<sup>20</sup>

16. White, op. cit., p. 76 f.

17. Ibid., p. 79.

18. Van Oosterzee, op. cit., p. 2.

19. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 418 f.

20. White, op. cit., p. 77 f.

Van Oosterzee has found allusions to 2 Tim. 1:6.18 and Tit. 2:3 in Ignatius.<sup>21</sup>

Moffatt believes that some similarities between the Pastoral Epistles and Ignatius show that he was definitely familiar with the Pastorals, while others have no great significance.<sup>22</sup>

Polycarp (d. 155) alludes to the following passages:

A. Those suggesting literary dependence -- 1 Tim. 2:2; 4:15; 6:7.10; 2 Tim. 4:10; B. Those which are illustrations of current phraseology -- 1 Tim. 1:1; 2 Tim. 2:12. In The Martyrdom of Polycarp we find allusions to 1 Tim. 2:2 and Tit. 3:1. "It is, to say the least, difficult to believe that a man like Polycarp, who had been a disciple of the Apostle John, . . . would have made such honourable use of letters which had been compiled by an unknown Paulinist a few years before."<sup>23</sup>

Van Oosterzee adds 2 Tim. 2:11 to this list of passages alluded to by Polycarp.<sup>24</sup>

Barnabas (70-132 A.D.) has similarities with 1 Tim. 3:14.16; and 2 Tim. 4:1, which are illustrations of current phraseology.<sup>25</sup>

Moffatt believes that "the coincidences of thought and expression between Barnabas and the pastorals are too general to prove dependence either way," and that the similar expressions-

21. Van Oosterzee, loc. cit.

22. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 418.

23. White, op. cit., p. 78 f. See also Easton, op. cit., p. 31.

24. Van Oosterzee, loc. cit.

25. White, op. cit., p. 79.

sions "probably belonged to the common atmosphere of the church, liturgical or catechetical."<sup>26</sup>

The Epistle to Diognetus (ca. 150 A.D.) offers examples of literary dependence on 1 Tim. 3:16 and Tit. 3:4, and alludes to 1 Tim. 3:16 in a manner which suggests that they are illustrations of current phraseology.<sup>27</sup>

A passage in Justin Martyr (ca. 140 A.D.) seems dependent on Tit. 3:4, while that Christian writer also alludes to 1 Tim. 4:1 and 2 Tim. 4:1.<sup>28</sup> Easton believes that the absence of more allusions in Justin is natural, since "even the acknowledged letters of Paul are rarely cited by him."<sup>29</sup>

We have shown by a word-study and a listing of passages alluded to that there are definite similarities between the Pastorals and the writings of post-Apostolic Christian writers. Combining these two studies, we see that these similarities are most prominent in the writings of Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, and Hermas. Goudge believes this fact to be very natural, since Clement, Hermas, and Justin were Christians of Rome, though they write in Greek; "and they are affected by the same influences as St. Paul in his latest years."<sup>30</sup>

26. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 417 f.

27. White, op. cit., p. 80.

28. Ibid.

29. Easton, op. cit., p. 32.

30. A. E. Burn and H. L. Goudge, "The Pastoral Epistles," in A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, Alfred Guillaume, eds., p. 581.



In addition to these similarities between the Pastorals and Christian writers, we also find a relationship between our letters and the pagan literature of the period from Paul to the end of the second century.

Harrison points out that of the 82 "hapax legomena" of the Pastorals, which do not occur in Christian writers, 57 are found in pagan writers between 95 and 170 A. D. All of the remaining 25 have derivatives or closely related terms in their place in the Christian and non-Christian writers of this period.<sup>31</sup>

The close similarity between the Pastorals and Christian - - as well as non-Christian - - writers of a post-Apostolic age is obvious from this study. We feel, however, that liberal criticism is not justified in making this fact the basis for placing the Pastorals into that period of literary activity. It is true, many words and passage of the Pastorals occur again only in literature of a post-Pauline period. Nevertheless, they could have been part of the common vocabulary as early as the time of Paul. For support of this view, we need only mention Nägeli.<sup>32</sup> He lists 60 words of Paul which do not occur again in Greek literature until over a century after Paul. While apparently these words were not in use before in common speech, yet Nägeli believes that in reality they were part of the common vocabulary even in Paul's day. Only 12 of these words listed occur in the Pastorals.

---

31. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 82-84.

32. Nägeli, op. cit., pp. 42-50.

Yet, who can deny that the number may be larger? In fact, how can we, living nineteen centuries after Paul, know just what was, and what was not, the common vocabulary of the Apostle's day?

### Conclusion

We have attempted to outline the linguistic difficulties arising in any study of the Pastoral Epistles. That these difficulties exist, no one can deny. Attempts to solve these difficulties have resulted in a wide variety of conclusions on the part of Biblical scholars. Basically, however, the conclusions resolve into a rejection, or acceptance, of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals.

The liberal critics of modern times with one voice have attempted to place the Pastorals into a post-Apostolic period. To them the linguistic difficulties are too great to allow for the traditional view of Pauline authorship. They feel, however, that these difficulties vanish if we place the Pastorals into a later period.

Thus Bacon looks upon the Pastorals as a compilation of Pauline material by a post-Apostolic Paulinist. "We must simply recognize the Pastoral Epistles as a special group . . . later formed than the primary Pauline Canon . . . bearing the marks of much alteration, interpolation, editorial adaptation . . . . They have passed through an experience similar to all known compilations of their class, a process of more or less unconscious accretion arrested only by the stereotyping hand of the Canon-

maker."<sup>1</sup>

Similarly Moffatt: "Were it not for 1 Timothy, it might be plausible to seek room for the other two within the lifetime of Paul, but all three hang together, and they hang outside the historical career of the Apostle." Moffatt believes that the Pastorals are pseudonymous compositions of a Paulinist, who wrote during the period of transition in the neo-catholic church of the second century. His aim was to safeguard the common Christianity of the age in terms of the great Pauline tradition. He knew Paul's Epistles and his gospel, and also had access to some Pauline "reliquiae" and traditions not represented in Luke's history.<sup>2</sup>

Harrison's conclusion to a study of the language of the Pastorals is an attack upon the traditional view and a defense of the liberal hypothesis --

It is universally admitted that the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastorals are such as to call loudly for some explanation. But while numerous explanations have been forthcoming from the side of those who still adhere to the traditional view of their origin, neither singly nor collectively are these sufficient, in the judgment of "critics," to neutralize the overwhelming cumulative effect of the great body of evidence pointing in an entirely different direction. The true explanation . . . is that the Pastorals were not written by Paul, but by a devout and earnest Paulinist with our ten Paulines and . . . other genuine notes before him, during the half century

---

1. Bacon, op. cit., p. 140.

2. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 398 f.

A. D. 95-145.<sup>3</sup>

Harrison believes that this Paulinist was not a forger, in the sense that he tried to deceive the people of his day. On the contrary, the Christians of his day "must have been perfectly well aware of what he had done."<sup>4</sup>

Goodspeed considers the Pastorals as a "corpus" written by a Paulinist around 150 A. D. Marcion Gnosticism had identified itself with Paul and his teachings. The Paulinist then wrote the Pastorals to rescue and recover Paul from this identification. This Paulinist meant the Pastorals to be a supplement to Paul's other writings, which had been collected and published perhaps fifty years before his time. Goodspeed looks upon the inclusion of the Pastorals in the Canon as indicating the success of the Paulinist's purpose.<sup>5</sup>

Easton gives the following dates for the writing of the Pastorals: 2 Timothy -- ca. 95; Titus -- ca. 100; 1 Timothy -- ca. 105.<sup>6</sup>

The position of Lock lies somewhere between that of the liberal and conservative scholars. "The argument from style is in favor of the Pauline authorship, that from vocabulary strongly, though not quite conclusively, against it."<sup>7</sup>

3. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 12. See also Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

5. Goodspeed, *op. cit.*, pp. 334-344.

6. Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 20 f.

7. Lock, *op. cit.*, p. XXIX.

In spite of all the linguistic difficulties and the efforts of men to place the Pastorals in a post-Pauline period, through the centuries there have been men who refuse to concede the impossibility of accepting the Pauline authorship. By attacking the conclusions of liberal critics, as well as by upholding the possibility of peculiarities in a product of Paul, these conservative scholars have defended a view traditional from the first century down to the present era.

Alford is among those who attack the critical view of liberal scholars. "The objections brought against the genuineness by its opponents, on internal grounds, are not adequate to set it aside, or even to raise a doubt on the subject in a fair-judging mind."<sup>8</sup>

The inconsistency of liberal criticism is pointed out by Wace -- "Criticism which at one moment uses differences to prove that an Epistle is not St. Paul's, and at another uses resemblances to show that it was the work of an imitator, is too hard to please to be worth much consideration."<sup>9</sup>

Gonybeare sees the difficulty of ascribing the Pastorals to a forger. "The opponents of the genuineness of these Epistles have never been able to suggest any sufficient motive for their forgery. Had they been

---

8. Alford, op. cit., p. 86 (Prologue).

9. Wace, op. cit., p. 758.

forged with a view to refute the later form of the Gnostic heresy, this design would have been more clearly apparent."<sup>10</sup>

Against the view that a Paulinist forged the Pastorals, but was unconscious of deceiving anyone, Simpson writes: "We cherish a loftier estimate of the ethical standard of primitive Christianity than that . . . . a sorry specimen of a Paulinist, this curvilinear Paul Pry, conjured up from a nameless grave by the magic band of criticism to send smuggled wares under sacred auspices with such cool effrontery."<sup>11</sup> Moreover, it would be strange indeed if a Pauline fabrication, produced with no intention of deception, would have any effect on the Gnostics. Something recognized as a forgery would have done little to rescue Paul from identification with the Gnostics.

In general, conservative critics believe that the hypotheses advanced by critics against Pauline authorship raise more problems than the view that they were written by Paul in the last period of his life, of which we know little from outside sources.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, Alford believes the external testimony overwhelmingly in favor of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. "External testimony in favor of the genuineness

---

10. Conybeare, *op. cit.*, p. 25 (Appendix I).

11. Simpson, *loc. cit.*

12. So Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 322 f.

of our Epistles is so satisfactory, as to suggest no doubt on the point of their universal reception in the earliest times.<sup>13</sup>

It is just this external testimony which we consider the answer to our problem. If the Pastorals are forgeries, we simply cannot understand how the early Christians -- ardent disciples of Paul and intimately acquainted with his letters -- could have been duped into accepting them as genuine products of an Apostle so near and dear to them.

The non-Pauline words and "hapax legomena", as well as the Pauline words missing in the Pastorals, do present a difficulty. We believe, however, that conservative scholars have successfully shown that such peculiarities are possible. Since the letters bear the superscription of Paul, all that remains to defend the Pauline authorship on the basis of language is to prove that the linguistic peculiarities could be possible for Paul.

As for the Pauline elements found in the Pastorals, their very presence obviously supports our view. All efforts on the part of liberal criticism to explain them away are in vain.

Moreover, the comparison of our Pastorals with Christian and non-Christian writers of a post-Pauline era offers little in support of the liberal view, but

---

13. Alford, loc. cit.



does much to defend the traditional view.

Attempts to find evidence against the Pauline authorship on the basis of linguistic factors alone must end either in hopeless confusion and inconsistencies, or in a purely subjective and precarious conclusion. All the efforts of the early heretics down to the liberal critics of the present century prove this statement quite clearly.

Until someone advances more conclusive proof against the authorship of these letters, and offers something more convincing in its place, we feel constrained to agree with Thiessen -- "Thus, we believe, the linguistic factors, while presenting somewhat of a problem, do not prove the spuriousness of the Pastoral Epistles."<sup>14</sup>

---

14. Thiessen, op. cit., p. 259.

## Bibliography

- Alford, Henry, The Greek Testament, fourth edition, Cambridge, Deighton, Bell, & Co., 1865, IV, pp. 70-111.
- Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, An Introduction to The New Testament, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1902.
- Barnett, Albert E., Paul Becomes a Literary Influence, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Burn, A. E., and H. L. Goudge, "The Pastoral Epistles," in A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume, eds., New York, The Macmillan Co., 1945, pp. 573-595.
- Conybeare, W. J., and J. S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, seventh edition, New York, Charles Scribner and Co., 1868, II.
- Easton, Burton Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J., An Introduction to The New Testament, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- Harrison, P. N., The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, Oxford, The Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Hayes, D. A., Paul and His Epistles, New York, The Methodist Book Concern, 1916.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius, Die Pastoralbriefe, Leipzig, Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann, 1880.
- Hug, Joh. Leonhard, Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, second edition, Stuttgart and Tübingen, J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1821.
- Huther, Joh. Ed., Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, trans. from the fourth edition by David Hunter, in Commentary on the New Testament, H. A. W. Meyer, ed., New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1885, IX.
- Koelling, Heinrich, Der Erste Brief Pauli an Timotheus, Berlin, Hugo Rother, 1882.
- Lock, Walter, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles, in International Critical Commentary, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924, pp. xiii-xliv.

- Moffatt, James, An Introduction to the Literature of The New Testament, third edition, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Nageli, Theodor, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905.
- Oosterzee, J. J. Van, The Two Epistles of Paul to Timothy and The Epistles of Paul to Titus, in John Peter Lange's A Commentary on The Holy Scriptures, Philip Schaff, trans. and ed., New York, Charles Scribner & Co., 1868, VIII.
- Paley, William, Horae Paulinae, J. S. Howson, ed., London, The Christian Evidence Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1877.
- Simpson, Edmund K., "The Authenticity and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," The Evangelical Quarterly, XII, October 16, 1940, pp. 289-311.
- Steinmueller, John E., A Companion to Scripture Studies, New York, Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., c. 1943, III.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence, Introduction to The New Testament, second edition, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1944.
- Torm, F., "Ueber die Sprache in den Pastoralbriefen," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, IV (1917/18), pp. 225-243.
- Wace, H., "Introduction to The Pastoral Epistles," The Holy Bible with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, London, John Murray, 1881, in vol. III of The New Testament.
- Weiss, Bernhard, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament, second edition, Berlin, Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz, 1889.
- White, Newport J. D., "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and The Epistle to Titus," in The Expositor's Greek Testament, New York, Hodder & Stoughton Limited, n.d., IV, pp. 57-88.
- Wohlenberg, G., Die Pastoralbriefe, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Theodor Zahn, ed., Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1906, XIII.
- Zahn, Theodor, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, third edition, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1906.