

The Pastoral Epistles: authentic Pauline writings

Myriam Klinker-De Klerck

University of Reformed Churches (Liberated) in Kampen, the Netherlands

SUMMARY

The Pastoral Epistles are mostly assumed to be inauthentic letters. That is, few scholars believe these letters to be genuinely Pauline, however, not many of those commentators who reject the authenticity of the PE take the trouble to investigate the arguments. However, the arguments against authenticity are not solid. This article presents an

overview and a short evaluation of the important topics in the debate: their relation to the book of Acts, their language and style, their theology and church development. On a surface level it appears that the 'data' does not lead inexorably to the conclusion of lack of authenticity. The article also indicates why it matters for current Pauline debate, theology and Christianity whether or not the Pastoral Epistles are Pauline.

* * * *

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Oft wird angenommen, die Pastoralbriefe seien nicht authentisch. Nur wenige Theologen machen sich die Mühe, die Argumente zu prüfen. Diese Argumente sind jedoch nicht unerschütterlich. Dieser Aufsatz bietet einen Überblick und eine kurze Bewertung der wichtigsten Fragen dieser Debatte: Die Beziehung zur

Apostelgeschichte, Sprache und Stil, Theologie und die Entwicklung der Kirche. Schon oberflächlich betrachtet wird klar, dass die 'Fakten' nicht zwingend gegen die Authentizität sprechen. Der Aufsatz deutet auch an, warum es für die gegenwärtige Diskussion um Paulus, für die Theologie und für das Christentum nicht egal ist, ob die Pastoralbriefe paulinisch sind oder nicht.

* * * *

RÉSUMÉ

Les épîtres pastorales sont généralement considérées comme n'étant pas de Paul. Peu de théologiens se donnent cependant la peine de passer au crible les arguments conduisant au rejet de leur authenticité. Pourtant, ces arguments manquent de solidité. Cet article présente un tour d'horizon des points importants dans le débat et une courte évaluation : le problème de l'harmonisa-

tion avec les données du livre des Actes, les questions de langue et de style, ainsi que celles qui touchent à la théologie et au stade d'élaboration de l'organisation des Églises. Une première approche montre déjà clairement que les données ne conduisent pas inexorablement à la conclusion que ces épîtres seraient inauthentiques. L'auteur fait aussi apparaître les enjeux de la question de l'authenticité de ces lettres pour les études pauliniennes actuelles, la théologie et le christianisme.

* * * *

The authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles [PE] has been vigorously debated for two centuries. During the nineteenth century the debate was lively,¹ but, in the twentieth century the debate seemed settled in favour of the inauthenticity hypothesis. Nevertheless, proponents of authenticity continue to

argue their case.²

Although the debate is still going on, few exegetes are aware of this. Mainstream theology assumes the inauthenticity of the PE.³ Few scholars take the trouble to investigate the original arguments. The pseudonymous character of the letters

is simply taken for granted. Some scholars however join the debate in an attempt to move away from a simple either/or discussion. They are interested in the precise nature of the claim of Pauline authorship by asking *to what extent* these letters are Pauline. Unfortunately, their research has led to diverging results.⁴ These differing views on the one hand and the general unawareness on the other hand are both good reasons to take yet another look at the arguments for and against Pauline authorship of the PE.

This article presents an overview of the arguments for and against the authenticity of the PE. The first part of this article will concentrate on listing the arguments for inauthenticity. In the second part these arguments are investigated to see if they are solid and lead inexorably to a conclusion of inauthenticity. Before the general conclusion, the third part of the article will briefly indicate why it matters for current Pauline debate, theology and Christianity whether or not the PE are Pauline.

A. Arguments for the Inauthenticity Hypothesis

Four arguments support the hypothesis of inauthenticity: the historical argument; the argument of language and style; the argument of theology and the argument of church development.

1. The historical argument

One of the difficulties regarding the authenticity of the PE is historical.⁵ The historical data found in the PE do not seem to match the historical data in the book of Acts. As a consequence, the historical framework of Acts does not provide a fitting time and place during which the PE could originate. All other Pauline letters however do fit the historical framework of Acts.

2. The argument of language and style

The language and style of the PE differ from the language and style of the so-called authentic letters. This deviation from the 'normal' language and style register found in the *corpus Paulinum* is decisive in making scholars reject the authenticity of the PE. For example Oberlinner concludes: 'Diese Unterschiede in Sprache und Stil zwischen den Past und den anerkannten Paulinen sprechen deutlich gegen paulinische Verfasserschaft'.⁶

In 1921 Harrison published a pioneering work regarding the language of the PE.⁷ He noticed the huge amount of *hapax legomena* in the letters and

concluded that they belong rather to the vocabulary of the second century literature than to the vocabulary of the Pauline literature. Furthermore, 'typical Pauline' usage of particles, prepositions and pronouns was found to be absent from the PE. In 1959 Grayston and Herdan refined Harrison's method and their statistical analysis confirmed the results Harrison had published earlier.⁸

Concerning the style of the letters a few examples are sufficient to illustrate the problem. Structural analysis of the letters, for instance, shows that the typical opening of the Pauline letter is absent from 1 Timothy and Titus and, although an opening is present in 2 Timothy, it is unusually short. Furthermore, there appears to be a lack of personal notes in 1 Timothy and Titus. Next, regarding the method of argumentation the PE seem to invert the rather usual 'ethic-follows-doctrine' pattern into a 'doctrine-follows-ethic' pattern. Also typical of the PE is the remarkable expression πιστός ὁ λόγος ('here/this is a trustworthy saying,' 1 Tim. 1:15, 3:1, 4:9 etc.) This expression occurs frequently in the PE and is exclusive to these letters. Last but not least, the monotone and colourless style of the PE catches one's attention.

3. The argument of theology

Not only the language and style, but also the theology in the PE differs from the so-called authentic letters. More specific, the theology of the PE is said to reflect a later period of origin than the authentic Pauline literature.⁹ First, the PE seem to be strongly oriented toward orthodoxy. The word διδασκαλία ('teaching' or 'doctrine') is mentioned 19 times in the *corpus Paulinum*, 15 times in the PE. Occasionally the thought is even stressed by speaking of the ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία ('sound doctrine,' 1 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 1:9, 2:1). Besides, the usage of the word πίστις ('the faith') seems to point to a 'closed doctrine' rather than to a 'living reality' (see, e.g., 1 Tim 5:8, 6:12 etc.). Further, rather than articulating this doctrine in the PE, the author wants it to be handed down (e.g. 2 Tim. 1:13-14; 2:2). Second, the orthodoxy in the PE goes hand in hand with an emphasis on orthopraxy. Lexemes from the *eu-se-beia* word-group occurs 13 times in the *corpus Paulinum*, all instances of which are in the PE. Besides, the requirements for bishops and deacons mentioned in these letters are of a 'bourgeois' character (i.e. apparently more concerned with ideas of citizenship and participation in society than with holiness and abstract ethical standards). For example, these persons are to

live a sober and steady lifestyle, and they should be hospitable and moderate. Furthermore, the Christian life is described in terms of certain stoic virtues (Tit. 2:12). This so-called ‘bourgeois’ character of the PE contradicts the more usual ethics of Pauline literature and is viewed as an attestation of a late origin. Third, the PE strongly oppose false teachers and ‘heresy’. In the past this heresy was identified as *gnosis*, especially because of the occurrence of the word γνῶσις in 1 Tim. 6:20.¹⁰ This identification also indicates a late time of origin. Fourth, the theology of the PE differs from the Pauline theology in its colourlessness and in the absence of important Pauline themes such as the emphasis on the Spirit. Other concepts seem to be used in a different way or even in opposition to Pauline theology. For example the PE present the concept of δικαιοσύνη (‘righteousness’) as a virtue that has to be attained (1 Tim. 6:11 and 2 Tim. 2:22, δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην ‘pursue righteousness’), rather than as a gracious gift of God.

4. The argument of church development

The PE (especially 1 Timothy and Titus) seem to be very concerned with church order. The letters contain a surprising number of rules for community life and for leaders of the community: elders/bishops and deacons. This tendency to organisation with a strong focus on leadership reflects, according to most scholars, a post-pauline stage of church development.¹¹ They state that it contradicts the ‘charisma’ of the original Pauline community. The PE reveal the beginnings of the institutionalisation of the early church.

5. Main Question

After listing the arguments in favour of the inauthenticity hypothesis, the possibility of an alternative view will be considered. Hence the main question for the following part of the article: *do these four arguments demand the assumption of inauthenticity?*

B. An Alternative View

Each of the arguments for inauthenticity will be investigated with respect to their probability. Are they built on clear observations? Do these observations admit other lines of argumentation?

1. The historical problem

The historical problem concerning the incompatibility of Acts and the PE has generated several

proposed solutions. First, as noted above, the common assumption nowadays is the inauthenticity of the letters. If the PE are inauthentic letters, then, because of their late origin it is not surprising that they do not fit the historical framework of Acts. Second, some proponents of the authenticity hypothesis state that the letters may have been written in the period after the closing chapter of Acts.¹² They argue Paul was released from prison and restarted missionary activities in the east of the Roman Empire. In that period the apostle wrote 1 Timothy and Titus. The second letter to Timothy was written during a second Roman imprisonment.¹³ If this hypothesis is accurate then the incompatibility of the PE with the historical framework of Acts is also not surprising. Third, other proponents of the authenticity hypothesis tend to place the origin of the PE during Paul’s third missionary journey and during the Caesarean or Roman imprisonment as described in the book of Acts.¹⁴ This last proposal argues explicitly that there is no historical incompatibility of the PE and Acts.

With respect to the proposals in favour of authenticity, although the second option is not impossible, the third option deserves more consideration for at least two reasons. First, this proposal shows that the book of Acts and the PE are not incompatible as is often stated. Second, this proposal demands less speculation than the second option since it can be checked against the data in Acts. A full discussion of the details of the different proposals is not possible within the limits of this article. It is important to notice, however, that a comparison of data between Acts and the PE need not lead to a hasty conclusion of inauthenticity.

2. The problem of language and style

A remark about the data is in order here. As mentioned above, scholars arguing for inauthenticity generally refer to the work of Harrison (1921) and the statistical analysis of Grayston and Herdan (1951). Although the statistical analysis is clearly an important method for quantifying the language of the PE, it nonetheless has its limitations.¹⁵ First, the PE do not deliver enough material for a reliable statistical analysis especially given the fact that the three letters are not one document, something many scholars tend to forget.¹⁶ Second, the method assumes a rigid consistency in use of vocabulary and style. Third, the extant statistical models end up with different results. In 1986 Kenny presented a revised and more advanced statistical analysis of

the PE. He came to the following conclusion: 'It is only Titus which is shown as deserving the suspicion cast on the Pastorals (...) on the basis of the evidence in this chapter for my part I see no reason to reject the hypothesis that twelve of the Pauline Epistles are the work of a single, unusually versatile author'.¹⁷ Fourth, the mathematical character of the method creates an illusion of exactness and objectivity – wrongly so, because the method ignores the complexity of the phenomenon 'authorship' completely.

This last remark needs some explanation. Statistical analysis can easily cause one to lose sight of some factors that may have influenced the language and style of the PE. These factors are connected to issues of authorship on the one hand (a), and the audience on the other hand (b).

(a) With regard to authorship: Did Paul use a secretary? Rom. 16:22 indicates that he sometimes did. In what way did his co-workers influence his writings? Both letters to the Thessalonians, for instance, mention three senders and are written in the first person plural. The possibility of co-authorship must not be ignored.¹⁸ M. Prior offers a very different, but intriguing explanation: 'Since Timothy is named as co-author with Paul in 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and with Paul and Silvanus in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, it must be the case that Timothy's role in the composition of the Paulines was quite significant. And since two of the Pastorals are written by Paul alone to Timothy, it could well be the case that some of the differences between the Pastorals and the Paulines can be attributed to the fact that the Pastorals are written by Paul alone, while most of the Paulines were written with some degree of co-authorship, particularly that of Timothy'.¹⁹ Other proposed explanations include the possibility that Paul's imprisonment influenced his language.²⁰ Or that his language register changed with age.²¹ Or that the *hapax legomena* belong to traditional material.²²

(b) With regard to the audience. It is not only the author who is responsible for the language and style of a letter; the intended reader(s) can also – even if only indirectly – influence its vocabulary and style. The question arises if these letters were meant for Timothy and Titus only, or implicitly for the communities they worked for as well. Some scholars believe the latter to be the case.²³ R. Fuchs, a proponent of the authenticity hypothesis, has shown some interesting differences in content and language between 1 Timothy and Titus. In his

opinion these particularities perfectly fit the two different communities the letters were sent to.²⁴ Certainly Fuchs's observations are of great value, contributing as they do to the recognition of the separate identities of the three letters that is usually overlooked.²⁵ However, the assumption that communities constitute the intended audience does not seem very helpful in explaining the specific characteristics of the PE compared to other letters of the Pauline *corpus*. On the contrary, interpreting the openings of the letters as they stand (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (... Τιμοθέῳ and Παῦλος δούλος θεοῦ (... Τίτῳ) seems more helpful in explaining the distinctiveness of these three letters. These letters, unlike all other Paulines, were written to individuals, more specifically co-workers of Paul.²⁶ It is to be expected that these letters would be more concerned with regulations of a specific kind than the usual community letters and that, as a result, Paul's language and style would differ from the other letters of the *corpus Paulinum*.

The above mentioned factors with regard to authorship and audience are not all of equal significance to the question of the authenticity of the PE. A thorough discussion of all possibilities is not needed, however, to notice that the results of a 'simple' statistical analysis are not sufficient to conclude in favour of inauthenticity.

3. The problem of theology

Some remarks need to be made with respect to the so-called orthodoxy of the PE. First, nowhere in the PE is the *didaskali,a* presented as a 'totally closed doctrine'. To be sure the word is not without content. The reference, however, could equally be 'the Pauline gospel' as originally preached in Ephesus/Crete. With respect to this possibility Mounce points to an interesting parallel in the letter to the Galatians: 'It (i.e. the gospel) is sufficiently coherent and consistent that teachings can be measured against it and shown to be true or false, as Paul also says in Gal. 6:6-11'.²⁷ Second, the word *διδασκαλία* is not totally absent from the so-called authentic Pauline letters (Rom. 12:7).²⁸ Third, the more frequent use of the word *didaskali,a*, when compared to the other Pauline letters, is not surprising when one remembers that, as pointed out above, the PE differ from the other Pauline letters in that they were explicitly written to co-workers of Paul. It is only natural that these letters would speak about *διδασκαλία* in a formal sense rather than explaining its theological content. Timothy and Titus must have been well aware of the content of Paul's

gospel. Thus the absence of the so-called ‘vivid Pauline theology’ in these letters requires no explanation.

How is the so-called orthopraxy of the letters to be evaluated? Do the PE attest a ‘bourgeois’ character? With respect to the word εὐσέβεια (‘godliness’) Wainwright states that it need not support the idea of a bourgeois ethic in the PE: ‘Regardless of the authenticity of the PE, the occurrence of *eusebeia* in the PE does not support a *christliche*, *bürgerliche* ethic in the PE, nor does it merely indicate reverence for the established orders; but instead, *eusebeia* exhorts the Christian community to devote itself to God in every sphere of life, so that both beliefs and behavior are centered in Him’.²⁹ Furthermore, regarding the requirements for bishops and deacons, Fee points out that these requirements do not express distinctively Christian virtues for these functions. Rather they aim to establish a good reputation of the church over against outsiders.³⁰

Another purported indication of late origin of the PE is the so-called Gnostic heresy of the false teachers mentioned in them. Gnosticism, however, does not seem to be easily defined.³¹ Some scholars assume that the heresy was proto-gnostic, others identify it as pre-gnostic.³² In any case, the use of the word γνῶσις (‘knowledge’) in 1 Tim. 6:20 does not necessarily indicate a Gnostic heresy. Paul’s use of the same word in the context of 1 Cor. 8, for instance, shows that γνῶσις had a broad range of possible meanings.

Do the PE contain a theology that contradicts the more usual Pauline theology? The above cited example whereby δικαιοσύνη is seen as a virtue that has to be attained rather than a gracious gift of God is not convincing. A clear characteristic of Pauline theology, namely, is the eschatological tension in which indicative and imperative (gift and demand) go together (e.g. Gal. 5:1). This applies *a fortiori* to the theme of justification. Naturally, different aspects will be stressed in different contexts. This does not, however, indicate contradictory theology.

4. The problem of church development

Some remarks about the alleged post-Pauline church development in the PE are also necessary. It is undeniable that the PE show a tendency toward more complex organisation. This is unremarkable, however, when one considers that the PE were explicitly written to co-workers of Paul with specific tasks in the Pauline communities. Fur-

thermore, the strong focus on leadership does not necessarily reflect a late, post-charismatic, stage of church-development. On the contrary, a polarisation of charisma and organisation leads to a rather simplistic construction of early church history: the charisma of the original Pauline communities would have diminished in favour of a solid, hierarchical organisation during the second and the third generation. Van Bruggen has quite rightly pointed out the superficiality of this construction.³³ Furthermore, most of the functions mentioned in the PE also occur in the so-called authentic Pauline literature.

5. No solid ground

The question as to whether the four arguments mentioned in the first part of the article demand the assumption of inauthenticity must be answered negatively. First, the historical incompatibility of the PE and Acts does not seem to be the incontrovertible fact that some regard it to be. Second, the problem of language and style, is so complex that statistical analysis alone cannot adequately account for it. Factors connected to authorship or to readership may have influenced the distinctive language and style of these letters. For instance, the fact that the PE were written to co-workers of Paul and differ in this regard from the more usual community letter must not be ignored. Third, the problem of the orthodoxy and ‘bourgeois’ ethics in the PE is clearly relativized by the argumentation above. The argument with regard to Gnosticism in the PE is also not convincing, nor is the alleged un-Pauline theology. Fourth, the PE’s tendency toward organisation with a strong focus on leadership is perfectly explicable in term of the nature of these letters. It does not reflect a post-Pauline stage of church development at all. In short, the four arguments do not provide a solid ground for the inauthenticity hypothesis.

C. Authenticity: Benefits for Current Debate

If the PE are considered to be authentic documents current Pauline debate could benefit from that fact. The ‘old’ perspective of authenticity could provide for ‘new’ insights regarding at least four topics. First, the current view on Pauline language and theology could be nuanced. Second, in the socio-historical domain new insight could be gained concerning the outlook of Pauline communities in the late fifties of the first century. Third, it

would clearly be an enrichment for the study of the Pauline literature to have three letters written to direct co-workers in addition to the more common letters written to communities.

For theology in general, the authenticity of the PE could be of great importance with respect to the ongoing discussion concerning pseudepigraphy within the canon. Furthermore, it could alter the current reconstruction of the history of early Christianity and of the development of its theological, ethical and ecclesiological thinking.³⁴ As David A. deSilva admits: 'Debates about authorship have, in many circles, effectively relegated the deutero-Pauline epistles and other texts deemed pseudepigraphic to the margins of theological and ethical inquiry.'³⁵ The PE coming out of these fringes could also benefit Christianity, for example, by contributing more fully to the concept of discipleship and ministry in the modern context.

General Conclusion: The Authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles

After two centuries of debate mainstream theology generally assumes the inauthenticity of the PE. However, the relationship between pseudonymity and canon is very unclear as the ongoing discussion and the diverging results in the debate reveal. Furthermore the basic arguments against authenticity are not altogether solid: the distinctive features of the PE can easily be explained by other factors than pseudonymity. Finally, the 'old' perspective of authenticity could provide for 'new' insights regarding Pauline studies and theology in general.

The literal acceptance of the author's claim seems to be the more attractive position, not at least because it seems to create the fewest problems. There are, therefore, plenty of reasons for reconsidering the authenticity of these unique letters.

Notes

- 1 Schleiermacher vs. Planck. See also Eichhorn vs. Berthold, Hug, Böhl. See also Baur vs. Baumgarten, Wieseler.
- 2 For example, J. van Bruggen, *Die geschichtliche Einordnung der Pastoralbriefe* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1981); D.P. Moessner and I. Reicke, eds., *Re-examining Paul's Letters, the History of the Pauline Correspondence* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001); R. Fuchs, *Unerwartete Unterschiede* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2003) and the commen-

taries by Fee (1988), Knight III (1992), Mounce (2000), Johnson (2001), Towner (2006), Witherington III (2006).

- 3 For example, J. W. Aageson, *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Early Church*, (Peabody Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2008) and the commentaries written by Brox (1969), Roloff (1988), Quinn (1990), Oberlinner (1994), Quinn & Wacker (1999), Fiore (2007).
- 4 This is mainly due to the much debated relationship between pseudepigraphy and canon. An important study in the field is David G. Meade's *Pseudonymity and Canon*. According to Meade the PE are pseudonymous writings. These letters were rightly called 'Pauline' however because attribution was primarily an assertion of authoritative tradition in the process of *Vergegenwärtigung* of Pauline tradition, either than an assertion of literary origins. David G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and canon* (WUNT 39; Tübingen: Mohr – Siebeck, 1986), 122-139. In his commentary I. Howard Marshall also regards the PE as posthumous writings: 'fresh formulations of Pauline teaching to take account of the changing situation' (p. 92). Against Meade though Marshall prefers the term 'allonymity' above 'pseudonymity' because the latter still contains an element of intentional deceit in it. (I. H. Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 79-92. The German study of Armin D. Baum presents yet another picture. Baum argues that in antiquity authentic documents at least needed to be authorised by the person they were attributed to, otherwise they were looked at as literary forgeries. 'Analog galt in der frühen Kirche ein nicht von einem Apostel verfasster Apostelbrief als echt, sofern er von diesem als sein eigenen Schreiben autorisiert war. Daraus folgt andererseits, dass etwa die Pastoralbriefe nach antikem Urteil literarische Fälschungen waren, wenn sie nicht von Paulus autorisiert, sondern erst nach seinem Tod unter seinem Namen verfasst wurden.' (p. 93). Baum argues also that forgeries were 'kanonunfähig' (pp. 95-148). Already these few examples illustrate the complexity of the relationship between pseudepigraphy and canon. A full discussion of the problem is not possible within the limits of this article. See for example David A. deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Context, methods and ministry formation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 685-689.
- 5 See for example J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKKNT xv; Zürich / Neukirch-Vluyn: Benzinger Verlag/Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 26-27. L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (Herders theologischer Kommentar xi/2; Freiburg: Herder, 1994), xxxiv-xxxv.
- 6 L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, xxxvii. See also J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*, 28-31.

- 7 P.N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: University Press, 1921). In German literature Holtzmann is regarded as the founder of the statistical analysis. H.J. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe, Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1880).
- 8 K. Grayston and G. Herdan, 'The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles in the Light of Statistical Linguistics,' *NTS* 6 (1959): 1-15. Grayston and Herdan denote the amount of non-Pauline vocabulary by the letter 'C'. For the PE they registered a C-value of 46%, whereas the normal C-value of a Pauline letter varies between 32% and 34%.
- 9 See for example N. Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 50. See also L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, xxxvi-xxxvii.
- 10 See M. Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (FRLANT 146. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988) 265f.
- 11 See for example: L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, xxxviii-xxxix.: 'Im Vergleich zu den Gemeinden, an die die authentischen Paulusbriefe gerichtet sind, hat die Gemeindeordnung der Past ein neues Stadium erreicht, welches v.a. gekennzeichnet ist durch das Hervortreten verschiedener Amtsträger' See also: N. Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 42. 'Zweifelloos zeigt diese Kirche Züge eines gegenüber dem sonstigen Bild der Paulusbriefe fortgeschrittenen Stadiums der Institutionalisierung und Konsolidierung'.
- 12 See for example Ridderbos (1967), Fee (1988) and Mounce (2000).
- 13 This is the way the *subscriptio* found in some manuscripts (Majority-text) accompanying the second letter to Timothy is usually interpreted: Προς Τιμόθεον β της Εφεσίων εκκλησίας επισκοπου πρωτον χειροτονηθεντα εγραφη απο Ρωμης οτε εκ δευτερου παρεστη Παυλος τω καισαρι Ρωμης Νερωνι.
- 14 See for example S. de Lestapis, *L'énigme des Pastorales* (Paris : Gabalda, 1976) ; Van Bruggen, *Geschichtliche Einordnung* (1981); Johnson (2001) ; Moessner and Reicke, *Re-examining Paul's Letters* (2001).
- 15 For a clear overview of methodological problems: see W.D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary 46; Nashville: Nelson, 2000), cxiii-cxvii.
- 16 See therefore Robinson's criticism of Grayston and Herdan. He showed that this bias highly influenced their results. T.A Robinson, 'Grayston and Herdan's "C" Quantity Formula and the Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles', *NTS* 30 (1984): 282-288.
- 17 A. Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 100.
- 18 See P.H.R. van Houwelingen, *Tessalonicenzen, voortgezet basisonderwijs* (Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament; Kampen: Kok, 2002) 18-23. See also D.P. Moessner and I. Reicke, eds., *Re-examining Paul's Letters, the History of the Pauline Correspondence* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 30-32.
- 19 M. Prior, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, 45.
- 20 See the remarkable thesis of Hitchcock about the occurrence of Latinisms in the PE: F.M. Hitchcock, 'The Latinity of the Pastorals', *Expository Times* 39 (1927-8) 347-352.
- 21 Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, cii: 'Bernard emphasizes that in Paul's letters in general the number of unique words increases as Paul increases in age (...). Spicq observes the same development in the aging Plato (...), and the similar observation by Wohlenberg (55) concerning Schille and Goethe and by W.P. Workman concerning Shakespeare.'
- 22 See E. E. Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents* (BIS 39; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 327-329; 418-422 for the implications of preformed traditions for the nature of authorship.
- 23 They regard the letters as based on the *mandata principis* known in late imperial times. R. Fuchs, *Unerwartete Unterschiede*, 15-16, and L.T. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 96-97. Both scholars refer to the study of M. Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 165, 'Gerichtet waren die Mandata principis in der Form der direkten Anrede an die jeweils für einen bestimmten Bereich verantwortlichen einzelnen Amtsträger, vor allem an die Statthalter der keiselichen Provinzen. Die Empfänger der Mandata hatten deren Vorschriften durch eigene Edikte bekanntzumachen oder (...) in Übersetzung zu publizieren.'
- 24 R. Fuchs, *Unerwartete Unterschiede* (Bibelwissenschaftliche Monographie 12; Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2003).
- 25 See J. Herzer, 'Abschied vom Konsens? Die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe als Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft' in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 129 (2004): 1280. See also P. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (NICNT; Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 88-89.
- 26 The letter to Philemon was also sent to an individual person. Philemon, however, was not a co-worker of the apostle.
- 27 W.D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, xcv.
- 28 In this verse also the word *didaskōn* occurs. Besides, Rom. 16:17 may be interesting for comparison. Also the expression *παρά τῆν διδασκῆν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμαθετε* seems to point to a coherent normative Christian 'doctrine'.
- 29 J.J. Wainwright, 'Eusebeia: Syncretism or Conservative Contextualization?' *EQ* lxxv (1993): 223.
- 30 G.D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 18.
- 31 See R. Roukema, *Gnosis en geloof in het vroege christendom. Een inleiding tot de gnostiek* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 1998).
- 32 I.H. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 49-50.
- 33 J. van Bruggen, *Die geschichtliche Einordnung der*

Pastoralbriefe (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1981), 13-14.
34 B. Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians. Vol.1: A socio-rhetorical commentary*

on Titus, 1-2 Timothy and 1-3 John (Downers Grove Illinois: InterVarsity Press/Nottingham: Apollos, 2006) 23-24.
35 DeSilva, *Introduction*, 689 (n. 16).

HISTORY FROM PATERNOSTER

Luther as a Spiritual Adviser

The Interface of Theology and Piety in Luther's Devotional Writings

Dennis Ngien

The aim of this book is to unfold the pastoral side of Luther, drawing on the spiritual insights he offers to people of high and low estate. His pastoral writings are devotional and catechetical in shape and intent, yet not devoid of rich theological substance. They are the exercises of Luther's basic calling as a theologian-pastor, and are the concrete illustrations of the interface of theology and piety, the former being the abiding presupposition of the latter. Ngien's work reveals Luther as a theologian of the cross at work in the pastoral context.

'This timely book will help to recover the pastoral theological importance of Luther for a new generation.'

Carl R. Trueman

Dennis Ngien is Research Professor of Theology at Tyndale University College and Seminary, and founder of the Centre for Mentorship and Theological Reflection, Toronto, Canada.

978-1-84227-461-3 / 229 x 152mm / 208pp / £19.99

The Westminster Confession of Faith and the Cessation of Special Revelation

The Majority Puritan Viewpoint on Whether Extra-biblical Prophecy is Still Possible

Garnet H. Milne

The Westminster Confession of Faith, drawn up in London in the 1640s, has been one of the most influential confessions in the history of Reformed theology. In the opening chapter of the Confession, the divines of Westminster implied that the means by which God had once communicated the divine will concerning salvation, such as dreams, visions, and the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, were said to be no longer applicable. However, many of the authors of the WCF accepted that 'prophecy' continued in their time, and a number of them apparently believed that disclosure of God's will through dreams, visions, and angelic communication remained possible. Milne explores how the 'cessationist' clause of WCF 1:1 is to be read in the light of these facts.

Garnet H. Milne lives with his wife Carol in Wanganui, New Zealand. Before his retirement he served as pastor of two churches in Wainuiomata and Wanganui. For many years he was the editor of the denominational magazine *Faith in Focus*.

978-1-84227-521-4 / 229 x 152mm / 354pp / £24.99

Puritan Millennialism

Literature and Theology, 1550 - 1682 (Revised Edition)

Crawford Gribben

Puritan Millennialism surveys the growth, impact and eventual decline of puritan millennialism throughout England, Scotland and Ireland, arguing that it was much more diverse than has frequently been suggested. This Paternoster edition is revised and extended from the original 2000 text.

Crawford Gribben is Lecturer in Renaissance Literature and Culture, English and American Studies, University of Manchester, UK

978-1-84227-372-2 / 229 x 152mm / 350pp (est.) / £24.99 (est.)

Paternoster, 9 Holdom Avenue, Bletchley, Milton Keynes MK1 1QR, UK