

the assent of the common conscience. Most of all must the Christian Gospel be so ministered as the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation, that the world will be brought within the Church, not to be subjected to a foreign and galling yoke, but to be emancipated into a life in which holiness will be attained by the way of a joyous freedom in Christ. Thus and only thus will the moral and social problems which are so menacing to-day find their solution in a grace which takes law up into liberty.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

*THE HISTORIC SETTING OF THE PASTORAL
EPISTLES.*

(iii.) *The Historical Setting.*

THIS is the aspect of the Pastoral Epistles to which I have given more particular study, not only as being the one which really weighs most against a Pauline origin with cautious men of all schools, but also as that on which I most differ from the rest of those who hold to their authenticity. It has occupied my attention for a good many years, owing to the fact that, in writing in 1899 on the Apostolic Age, I felt it wise to approach so difficult a subject as the Pastorals first of all from the side which seemed least dependent on subjective estimates as to Paulinism and other large questions; and this meant starting from the concrete personal notices and the historic setting, which really afford more data than is generally realised. In the carrying out of this plan, however, I had, owing to a publisher's time-limit, to commit myself for the moment to hypotheses which I had not leisure to test from all points of view. Very soon I had the sad experience, which comes to those who print prematurely, of realising that the particular form of my theory was defective, while none the less it still seemed to be on the right lines.

Perhaps, then, I may be pardoned, if, in order to make clear just where I stand now as compared with my earlier position, and as an object-lesson in method, I indicate briefly the chief steps by which I moved away from a theory which never satisfied all the data even as I saw them, to one which at least satisfies all the essential requirements of the case to the best of my present knowledge.

The *crux* of the whole matter is 1 Timothy. Even Dr. Moffatt, who sums up against full Pauline authorship, writes in his recent *Introduction* (p. 398): "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."

Even when I framed my first theory on the basis of the conviction that Paul was never released from his imprisonment in Rome as recorded in Acts, but was beheaded as the result of his appeal to Cæsar, as a Roman citizen guilty of the mortal offence of disturbing the public order in the provinces, I was unhappy about the seeming necessity of separating the date of 1 Timothy from that of the kindred letter to Titus. But I felt forced to do it, on the assumption universal among those whose books I had consulted, and which it did not occur to me in my haste to test, namely, that Paul's hope (iii. 14, iv. 13) of joining Timothy (at Ephesus) before very long—though he might be delayed longer than he hoped—implied that he was at liberty when he wrote. Accordingly, he had not yet been arrested in Jerusalem; since from that time forth to his death after the two years' confinement at Rome, in which Acts lets him pass from our sight, he was not master of his own movements. Therefore, 1 Timothy, if genuine, must have been written *before* Paul's arrival in Jerusalem, but subsequent to his final departure from Ephesus, after the riot there (Acts xx. 1), the time apparently alluded to in 1 Timothy i. 3, "I exhorted thee to stay

on in Ephesus when (I was) going into Macedonia." In that case it seemed most natural to suppose that Paul, having sent Timothy back at the last moment with the elders summoned to Miletus (to receive a solemn charge in relation to their Church and the dangers which already threatened its faith and practice), had followed this up on the voyage to Jerusalem with a letter of instructions, adding to what he had been able to say to him on the spur of the moment. But besides the difficulty of explaining why Paul should in it allude to the earlier charge of a year before, rather than this more recent one, there was the yet greater difficulty of the affinities in style and contents between 1 Timothy and Titus, the latter of which, on my hypothesis, was not written till some three years later, *after* Paul's arrival in Rome, and after he had left Titus behind in Crete, where his ship had tarried for a time at Fair Havens (Acts xxvii. 8 f.).

As I thought over the matter at more leisure, I came to realise that all this sacrifice of verisimilitude for the sake of the common assumption referred to was needless. Nay, I had already set it aside when dealing with the letter to Titus, which, on the basis of the reference to Crete in Acts xxvii. 8, I had assigned to the Roman imprisonment. For this involved that Paul might, at a certain stage in his appeal case, have seemed to see release so clearly in sight as to make plans for wintering at Nicopolis (in Epirus) and there being joined by Titus (iii. 12). But further, and more important (because by general recognition), somewhat confident forecasts of release and consequent journeying were to be found in the so-called "Imprisonment Group," viz., Philemon (22) and Philippians (i. 25 f., ii. 23 f.). *Why, then, should not Paul have written 1 Timothy also from his Roman imprisonment, at a time when he was optimistic as to the speedy settlement of his appeal in his own favour?* Now when was this most likely to be? Why not at the very beginning of his stay

in Rome, when he was still full of the presumption created by the hearings in Cæsarea, and particularly the opinion of Agrippa that but for his having already appealed to Cæsar he might, on what this representative of Rome had himself heard of the case, have been at once set free? It is altogether probable that the more the provincial from Tarsus got to know of Roman policy in the capital itself, and of the ways in which justice was administered there under a Nero, especially with a Jew-loving Poppæa at his elbow, the less likely he was to speak of his release as a mere matter of time, possibly a very short time.

I infer, then, on further reflexion, (1) that all the so-called "Imprisonment Epistles" were written at a relatively early stage in the two years before Paul's appeal case was finally decided against him; (2) that Philemon and the closely related Colossians, and indeed the probably contemporary "Ephesians," date from the first year, preferably the first half-year of this period, while Philippians represents a rather later stage, marked by a state of the appellant's mind in which hope and despair of release were more evenly balanced (ii. 17), though on purely religious grounds ("in the Lord," ii. 24), like the welfare of his converts, he was inclined on the whole to count on the more favourable issue (i. 25 f., ii. 23 f.); and lastly, (3) that 1 Timothy, as well as Titus, belongs to the earliest stage of Paul's stay in Rome, when his mind was in much the same state of expectation as when he wrote Philemon, only not at identically the same season, but rather earlier. This last result follows from two considerations. Timothy is already with Paul when he writes Philemon and Colossians; further, Tychicus is named in the latter as its bearer (as well as of "Ephesians," probably the "epistle from Laodicea" of Col. iv. *fin.*), whereas in Titus iii. 12 Paul names Tychicus as one of two possible substitutes for Titus at his post in Crete. Presumably Paul

decided, after sending off the letter to Titus by "Zenas the lawyer and Apollos"—probably on their way to Asia (so at any rate Apollos) to get witnesses, or at least affidavits, for his appeal case, and carrying 1 Timothy to Ephesus—that he needed Tychicus for the mission to Asia on which he was bearer of Colossians and its companion letters. Accordingly, it seems as if 1 Timothy, like Titus, was written *quite early after Paul's arrival in Rome*, possibly in view of information reaching him through Tychicus or Aristarchus (cf. Acts xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10). At that date, or possibly a little later, his plans included wintering at Nicopolis (perhaps after visiting Ephesus), in order, it may be, to consolidate work already begun in Epirus (Rom. xv. 19; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 10), and be ready to start thence on his long-interrupted journey to Spain, when the spring opened the sea to navigation. These two letters may, then, have been despatched about early summer in 60 A.D., by the same messenger (say Apollos) travelling to Ephesus *via* Crete.

Whether 1 Timothy actually found Timothy at Ephesus is doubtful. He is already with Paul when Philemon was written, at what we have seen reason to believe was a comparatively early stage of his stay in Rome, when he was as yet confident of release; and it is unlikely that Timothy would have left his post soon after Paul's urgent charge by letter that he should remain there. We infer, then, that Timothy "crossed the letter on its way," and unexpectedly appeared in Rome, possibly with Epaphras, who brought news from Colossæ which led to the writing of Colossians and Philemon. It was probably their joint report on the state of the Pauline Churches in proconsular Asia generally which drew from Paul the closely related circular letter known to us as "Ephesians." These may well have been written and despatched in the care of Tychicus in the summer or early autumn of this same year, A.D. 60.

The date of Philippians, written while Timothy was still at Paul's side, is hard to define. But to judge from what it implies as to the considerable effect of Paul's presence upon the spread of the Gospel in Rome (i. 12-14), the more cautious tone in which he refers to his appeal case (ii. 23 f.), and the comparatively late arrival of the Philippian contribution to his needs (iv. 10), we should infer that it was not before Paul's first winter in Rome. Perhaps we may best view Epaphroditus' illness—of which the Philippian Church had already had time to hear and which was caused by his taking risks in conveying its belated gift to Rome—as due to his travelling at an unseasonable time, i.e., winter. Paul may, then, be writing in spring 61 A.D., when Epaphroditus would naturally return (ii. 25-30). He promises to send Timothy shortly, to bring him fresh news of them; but meantime he is keeping him back until he can see further ahead in the matter of his case, which he expects will be soon (ii. 19, 23). Whether this programme was carried out or not, Timothy would not return to Ephesus to take up his duties again there, until after it became apparent that Paul's case would be yet further delayed in reaching an actual hearing. This would become clear some time in summer. Hence we may imagine Timothy back in Ephesus before the winter of Paul's second year in Rome, as the trial could hardly come on save in spring or summer owing to the difficulty of witnesses reaching Rome from the East, particularly Judæa, during the winter months; and this would now mean the spring or summer of 62 A.D.

Fairly early, then, in Paul's third year in Rome, according to Luke's hints in Acts xxviii. 30 f., his case reached the important stage when the appellant stated his plea in reply to the charges against him; and to Paul's eye the omens went against him as to the final issue reserved for a later hearing. He feels that the hour has arrived to set his house

in order ; not only to collect his few private possessions left for the time with friends elsewhere, like his cloak, books, etc., in the keeping of Carpus at Troas (probably his host when he passed through on his last journey to Jerusalem, perhaps in expectation of passing that way again *en route* for Rome and Spain) ; but also to give his final instructions to those of his helpers on whom the chief burden lay of carrying forward his great unfinished work. Among these Timothy occupied the most trying post ; and he was, too, Paul's special son in the faith. To him, therefore, the Apostle addressed his last extant letter, our 2 Timothy, probably in the early summer of A.D. 62, reinforcing much of the charge more fully set forth in 1 Timothy, but with more personal touches, drawn from memory of their earlier relations. It contains his last will and testament to the younger man, as chief heir of his own spiritual treasure, while their Lord continued to delay His manifest appearing in power and glory. Its sum was : " Be thou sober in all things, do an evangelist's work, fulfil to the full thy ministry," whether at Ephesus or elsewhere. " For I am already being poured forth as a drink offering, and the season of my departure is just upon me." ¹ His last earthly desire is to see Timothy once more, and be cheered in his almost total solitude, as regards old friends, by his affectionate and loyal sympathy. And so he bids him leave his post in Asia ² for this final personal ministry of love, and hasten to his side " before winter."

¹ iv. 6. The metaphors here used are prominent among those special points of contact between 2 Timothy and Philippians (see ii. 17, i. 23) which confirm our view of their historical sequence. Another striking resemblance in thought is afforded by 2 Timothy ii. 10 and Philippians i. 12 f., 25.

² 2 Timothy iv. 12 : " But Tychicus I have sent to Ephesus," seems to imply that Timothy might not be there when the letter reached him, but be fulfilling his quasi-apostolic ministry as Paul's substitute elsewhere in Asia ; cf. iv. 5, and the general tone of a passage like ii. 1.

All the personal references which occur between the first statement of the request for his immediate presence in iv. 9, and the end of the letter, seem appropriate to the situation as just described, save those in one verse, viz.: v. 20. This comes in with odd abruptness between Paul's remembrances to Prisca and Aquila and the family of Onesiphorus (ver. 19), and the greetings sent to Timothy by certain Roman Christians. It runs as follows: "Erastus stayed in Corinth, and Trophimus I left at Miletus sick." The latter would be a strange piece of news to send across half the world to a friend of this same Trophimus apparently resident in Ephesus, only some miles from Miletus itself. It can hardly have stood here originally, and probably is a personal notice later detached from some insignificant letter written to Timothy on an earlier occasion, in order to be preserved by being attached after Timothy's death to the *personalia* at the close of a letter which promised to enjoy greater permanence. The fugitive note in question may well have been written by Paul after his farewell to the Ephesian Elders, to Timothy, who quite likely had been sent to summon them to Miletus and himself to remain at Ephesus for a season. It informed him that Erastus, whom we find in Acts xix. 22 associated with Timothy in a journey into Macedonia, probably on the collection business then in hand, had remained in Corinth (of which he was seemingly treasurer), instead of joining Paul at Miletus; while Trophimus, an Ephesian (Acts xxi. 29) and one of the collection delegates, had had to be left behind at the last moment owing to sickness (which proved only of such duration as to allow him to be with Paul just before the arrest in the temple at Jerusalem). Why Timothy should have withdrawn at this point from the party conveying the great Gentile offering to the poor saints at Jerusalem, though Acts xx. 3 f. mentions him among those destined for this duty, we need not attempt to

define,¹ any more than we need try to say just why Timothy was with Paul when he wrote 2 Corinthians from Macedonia, although he had apparently, according to 1 Timothy i. 3, been charged quite recently to stay on in Ephesus to check certain nascent abuses—an allusion which Paul's later address to the Ephesian elders helps to clear up (Acts xx. 29–31). But just as in the one case it may be that Paul, disappointed in his hope of being met early on his way to Macedonia by Titus with news from Corinth, while on his arrival in Macedonia he was “afflicted on every side—without fightings, within fears” (2 Cor. ii. 12 f., vii. 5)—summoned Timothy to leave Ephesus and join him; so it is quite probable that his sense of the growing dangers threatening the Ephesian Church (Acts xx. 29 f.) made him change his plans so far as to leave Timothy behind in charge. Nor is it needful to suppose that Timothy was ever permanently withdrawn from this special duty during the rest of Paul's life.

While, as we have just seen, it is probable that Timothy resumed charge of the Church of Ephesus once at least between the time when he first received such a commission, as Paul was leaving the city after the riot described in Acts xix., and its formal renewal in 1 Timothy; still, that original commission may well have been regarded as fundamental, especially to the mind of the local Christians. For when we remember that Acts xx. 1 records a solemn assembly of the Ephesian Church at which Paul “exhorted” it before saying farewell prior to “going into Macedonia,” it is natural to suppose that on that occasion he also “exhorted” Timothy to represent him among the Ephesian “disciples” in his absence. Thus, when the time came, later on, that it seemed needful both to brace Timothy to greater courage and persistence in his efforts to control

¹ His presence, as a substitute for the Apostle himself, would be most valuable in the great centre of Asian Christianity at such a critical time as that implied in Paul's speech at Miletus.

dangerous tendencies at work in this Church, and to strengthen his hands by rallying to him the Church's public opinion through reminding it of the Apostle's authority as always behind Timothy, Paul would, in writing, naturally go back to the analogy of his first solemn action in the matter. In this the local Church was, no doubt, a consenting party. That is, the exact reference in i. 3 ff. was made quite as much for the Church's sake as for Timothy's, since this was the only "exhortation" of the kind of which the Church could be expected to be cognisant, and to which it would attach full importance.

Such a view of the case fits in excellently with what is, indeed, widely recognised,¹ viz., that 1 Timothy, as distinct from 2 Timothy, is in tone and manner largely an "open letter," such as Timothy might communicate at least to the Church's elders, if and as need arose, owing to the resistance of any section of the Church to his cautions or censure.

Once this wider potential audience is allowed for, we cease to find any difficulty in a good deal that has been thought strange in a letter to an intimate friend and disciple, even one of a temperament apt to be unduly daunted by confident contradiction or challenge, especially when coming from men older than himself and supported by a good many among the local Christians. There are not a few passages which gain fresh fitness and force when read in this light. "I speak the truth, I lie not" (ii. 7) is a case in point.² But the principle applies especially to those enforced by the

¹ Thus in the article on 1 Timothy in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is rightly called "a pastoral letter upon Church order addressed by the Apostle Paul to the Asiatic Christian communities in and round Ephesus (i. 3) . . . The writer really has the Church in his mind all through." But this in no way excludes its being addressed primarily to an individual, as it purports to be.

² Another is 1 Timothy vi. 6-10, with its general "we" followed by "But thou, O man of God" (v. 11); while in 17 ff., the danger of riches is reverted to.

formula "Faithful is the saying" (λόγος), presumably as being virtually called in question by some section of the local Church. This is the case with the central idea of "Salvation" itself, that of grace to sinners (1 Tim. i. 15): so with that of faithful endurance as inspired by Hope in a living God as guarantor of life eternal, in 9 (cf. 8b), 1 Tim. iv., and again in 2 Tim. ii. 11-13. In Titus iii. 8 the thought emphasised is Christian care for "fair deeds" of beneficence: and of like spirit is the remaining maxim, "If a man seek the office of oversight, he desireth an honourable work" (1 Tim. iii. 1), followed by the qualifications needful in the aspirant. Amidst these occurs a little argumentative aside (iii. 5) addressed, as it were, to would-be overseers: "If a man knoweth not how to rule his own household, how shall he take charge of the Church of God?"

But besides these more obvious examples, we may take a verse like 1 Timothy iv. 14, where the "gift," more diligent exercise of which Paul is pressing in a fatherly way upon Timothy by reminding him of the solemn conditions of its original manifestation, is referred to as given not only through prophetic designation (cf. i. 18) but also with "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (*διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*). Now, when we compare this with the parallel passage in 2 Timothy i. 6, where in keeping with its whole appeal as based mainly on the personal relations of the two, as of father and son in Christ, "the laying on of *my* hands" is referred to, we can hardly fail to trace in the former case the influence of the probability that this passage will be read in the presence of the presbytery of the Church in which Timothy is being urged to exercise his high gift more strenuously (cf. the parallel case of Paul himself in Acts xiii. 1-3). Incidentally, too, one may note how strongly against the theory of forgery are the allusions in i. 18, iv. 14 to "prophecy" as condition-

ing Timothy's call to his ministry : and similar water-marks of early and authentic origin are scattered throughout the Epistles. Even the absence of any explicit indication of place *whence* and *whither* they were (to be supposed as) written is distinctly alien to the habits of forgery, which tries to satisfy the natural curiosity of the public for which it is intended. Again, the marked differences of situation presupposed by them, as well as the large number of otherwise unknown or obscure names occurring in allusive fashion, are hard to explain, save on the basis of authenticity.

Nor is it really a tenable view that the present letters have been built up on the basis of Pauline *reliquiae*, as they have been called, fragments of slight notes such as the one which we have seen reason to suspect as lying behind the "erratic block" embedded amid the salutations at the end of 2 Timothy. No attempt to work out any theory on these lines has ever been made to the satisfaction of any one save the author in each case ;¹ indeed, they are hardly put forward seriously, rather than as make-shifts to meet the obvious fact that there are Pauline elements in our Epistles, in spite of any difficulties about them as a whole—a fact which only a few rigorous extremists now deny. As has been said, however, the really abiding difficulty to most unbiassed minds is simply the fact that, as Professor Peake puts it (p. 61), "the attempts to place them in the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles have not succeeded" hitherto ; and, as he rightly shows, the alternative attempts to place them outside Paul's otherwise known life, common as they have been especially in England, are really not allowable. All our earliest evidence is against any release from the imprisonment in which Acts leaves Paul, though it was altogether

¹ Thus Holtzmann thought that the theory of sheer invention was easier to conceive than that of partial genuineness, and Jülicher now takes the same view : see Wohlenberg, 58 f.

to its author's purpose to show the opposite, however briefly, even suppose he were contemplating returning to the last phase of his career in a third work—for which there is really no evidence, but much against it. This Dr. Peake (pp. 61–63) shows conclusively enough as regards Acts and 1 Clement,¹ the latter of which clearly suggests that both Peter and Paul were dead before the Neronian horror of summer A.D. 64, since its victims are said to be “gathered together unto” Peter and Paul, i.e., in the place of reward (ch. vi.). But there is yet another witness, for those at least who accept the authenticity of 1 Peter, a witness carrying back the date of Paul's death yet nearer to 62, to which we have assigned it (according to Ramsay's Chronology). For it is widely admitted (e.g., by Dr. H. B. Swete, *Comm. on St. Mark*, p. xvii.), that Peter would not have addressed Christians generally in Galatia and Asia, where so much of Paul's work lay, during the lifetime of that Apostle, and without a word of explanation. Yet Peter did not survive the summer of 64, and his Epistle is dated by Dr. Hort about A.D. 63.

If, then, the Pastorals are Paul's at all—and this view is held by English scholars for the most part, including men of fine theological and historical instinct, like Lightfoot, Hort, Sanday, Lock and Gwatkin, as well as by Weiss and not a few other foreign scholars—I may fairly claim that some such theory as I have been expounding has marked advantages over theirs as to date and setting, by placing them within the known limits of Paul's life. It cannot be shown that the mere lapse of four or five years would materially lighten the difficulties felt on the score of style and

¹ Whether its author meant by the famous phrase (c. 5) “the bound of the West,” when read *in the light of its context*, Rome or rather Spain, may be left an open question, since in any case he implies (c. 6), that Paul did not survive summer 64. Moreover, his idea of a mission to Spain (if he had it) might be no more than an inference from Romans xv. 23.

thought, such as they are ; while the difficulty of dating any Pauline Epistles after 64 or even 63 is enormous.

I am quite aware that to many such a construction will seem both new and problematical.¹ That is but natural, since apart from the sketch of it in the article " Paul " in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which is essentially on the same lines, though I would now amend it in one or two details,² I do not know that it has before been broached. It is true that attempts of a somewhat similar kind, besides my own earlier one, have been put forward in Great Britain and America, not to speak of the Continent. Most of those known to me, however, are marred by falling into the same error as formerly led me astray in relation to 1 Timothy, as though it must be prior to Paul's imprisonment on account of its confident reference to an early visit to Timothy. Accordingly, they either separate 1 Timothy by an incredible interval from the kindred letter to Titus,³ or place Titus also prior to Paul's arrest at Jerusalem,⁴ and so several years prior to the Imprisonment Group, with which both seem too closely related to be so separated in time and conditions. This latter view also sacrifices Paul's one known point of contact with Crete, which makes it natural to date Titus subsequent to the voyage to Rome—a point on which I have just noticed that the Rev. J. Macpherson, writing in

¹ The very fact, however, that it *is* a synthesis of so large a number of detailed phenomena of various kinds, personal and other, seems to give it a claim to be on the right lines. If it is not, it should be easy to refute it by some of the many data involved ; and its author only hopes that it will be thought worth testing, and not simply left on one side by workers in this field.

² E.g., the account of the origin of the misplaced matter forming 2 Timothy iv. 20, 21a, which I too hastily adopted from others without noticing that Paul was not likely to pass Miletus on his way to Macedonia.

³ As Rev. J. Macpherson, in the *American Journal of Theology* for 1900, pp. 23 ff.

⁴ So W. E. Bowen, *The Dates of the Pastoral Epistles*, 1900, p. 21 f., and T. C. Laughlin, *The Pastoral Epistles in the Light of one Roman Imprisonment*, an inaugural address at the Pacific Theol. Seminary, 1905, p. 27.

The American Journal of Theology for 1900 (pp. 47 f.), reached the same conclusion expressed in my *Apostolic Age*, published about the same date. I find that he also places all three Pastorals in the two years of Paul's Roman imprisonment, though he has no satisfactory solution of 2 Timothy iv. 20 to offer, and places 2 Timothy next to 1 Timothy, while he thinks Titus was written subsequently, when its recipient was in Dalmatia or had returned once more to Crete. His statement, however, of the conditions under which the Pastorals were written is very brief, and a little confused¹ as to 1 Timothy, the bulk of his paper being a full discussion (pp. 23-44) of the question, "Was there a second imprisonment of Paul in Rome?" which he answers very conclusively in the negative.

Before closing, let me add some further words on the final challenge any theory accepting the Pastorals as genuine must face, viz., What have you to say touching the alleged un-Pauline religion of these Epistles? What is their bearing on one's views of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, the champion of Salvation by Faith, as opposed to Legalism? I admit that this is the final issue, and that if one were forced to accept the religious estimate of the Pastorals assumed by those who reject them, one would be bound to draw the like conclusion. But is this estimate the right one? Does it not rest on too narrow and rigid a reading of Paul and Paulinism in the other Epistles, and of religious experience itself? The question is a large one, and is not strictly within the scope of the present paper. It is one, however, which I have carefully considered in studying the Pauline writings as a whole, when writing on Paul for the *Encyclo-*

¹ Particularly as regards the promised visit in 1 Timothy iii. 14, which on his theory, also, involves the writer's being already in Rome. Nor does he relate the Pastorals to the other Imprisonment Epistles at all.

pædia Britannica, to which I must be content to refer for the full argument on which my conviction rests. It is based largely upon the way in which the thought and expression of the whole series of letters bearing Paul's name overlaps and blends along many lines, particularly when justice is done to Colossians and Philippians—and I have no personal hesitation in adding Ephesians¹—as uniting the Pastorals to the earlier Epistles more obviously than would otherwise be recognisable. While there is wonderful development and variety in the forms and applications assumed by Paulinism, especially when we compare the letters farthest from each other in time and conditions, there is no contradiction in idea or even in spirit from first to last, if only one allows for the fact that Paul is in all adapting his message, as a true missionary ever must, to the actual needs of his readers under conditions, both intellectual and moral, which vary immensely in certain cases. I believe, too, with Sir W. M. Ramsay,² that “there was some development in his power of expressing his Gospel in a way that should be intelligible and convincing to his converts, morally undeveloped as they were,” compared with himself, even after years of Christian faith: that he was singularly able, through his sympathetic eye for the realities of life, to learn from experience in this matter; and that he came to recognise more and more that the forms in which he would most naturally and helpfully express his Gospel, if considering himself alone, were not those actually most helpful to all types of readers. In fact, some of his freer and more spontaneous utterances in the earlier Epistles had created mis-

¹ I observe with satisfaction that Prof. P. Gardner in his recent study on St. Paul (*op. cit.*), while noting its slightly “more advanced phase of Pauline thought” as compared with Colossians, inclines to accept Ephesians as really from Paul's pen.

² *EXPOSITOR*, VIII. i. 374.

understanding¹ and been abused by those of less deep moral experience and insight. What was love to do under these conditions? That was ever his supreme concern. What did the expediency of charity counsel in the way of further adaptation and even condescension of his Gospel to human capacity and need? It is only when we so conceive the problem, as it faced Paul the Missionary, that we are able to do justice to the more rudimentary and categorical forms of instruction which abound in the later Epistles,—in large proportion in Philippians and Colossians, still more in Ephesians, most of all in the Pastorals. Witness the practical directions of all sorts in the second part of Colossians and Ephesians, and the injunction in Philippians (iv. 8 f.) to reckon with whatsoever things are worthy of reverence, just, pure, lovely, of good name,—in a word, anything held excellent and praiseworthy. To this he adds “the things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these practise, and the God of peace shall be with you.” Here he sets forth the Christian ethical tradition (*παράδοσις*) as received through him; and if one is minded to press such language into contrast with that used in other connexions, where the inner dynamic of all is laid bare in the personal attitude of grateful trust and love towards the Christ

¹ Similarly it is probable that a plausible footing for a teaching of the Law as expedient even for Gentile Christians, such as is implied in 1 Timothy and Titus, was afforded by Paul's conservative attitude to the Law as having a certain claim upon the allegiance of “Israel after the flesh,” even when justified by faith in Christ. Harnack has recently, in *The Date of the Acts*, called attention to this practical limitation of Paul's fundamental principles, which might well seem to give the Law, especially as having some partial footing in the Patriarchal period to which Paul makes no polemical references in his Epistles, an abiding significance for the religious life of all Christians. But just as Harnack argues that when the Paul of the Epistles is rightly interpreted, viz., as one who could so consider the actual situation as regards Israel's special prerogatives, he ceases to be inconsistent with (but rather includes) the Paul of the Acts; so the same Paul, the missionary who treated both Jew and Gentile according to their actual state and needs, could well be the author of the Pastorals.

of God—as the language of the Pastorals is often pressed—why, one can easily style this “moralistic” and “sub-Pauline” and anything else that may be supposed to condemn these Epistles as unworthy of the evangelic Paul. This whole line of criticism is liable to the greatest unreality and exaggeration. The fact is that *fides qua creditur* and *fides quæ creditur* cannot be thus easily severed (cf. 1 Tim. i. 19 for both), at any rate as they appear in any of the New Testament Epistles. Christian faith—which is often the best equivalent for ἡ πίστις—whether in the more subjective sense or in the more objective sense found in the Pastorals (as elsewhere in St. Paul, for it is not really peculiar to them), always has implicit in it a distinctive content as conditioned by Christ, its immediate object.¹ But this implicit element

¹ Compare Sir W. M. Ramsay in the *EXPOSITOR*, VII. ix. 172 ff., also for July, 1912, 88 ff. As regards the term *πίστις* itself in the Pastorals, there is, as A. Klöpffer puts it, “a peculiar changing shade of meaning in the idea, as between subjective faith and objective content of faith, or rather between personal faith and corporate faith” (*Gemeindeglaube*). But how inevitable that “faith” as personal should take common or collective form as “the faith”! This phenomenon appears already in Galatians i. 23, “preaches the faith which he once used to ravage,” and Philippians i. 27, “with one soul striving along with the faith of the Gospel” (*συναθλούντες τῇ πίστει τ. εὐαγγ.*), with which we may compare 2 Timothy i. 8 *συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, and 1 Corinthians xiii. 6 *συχχαίρει τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*. So in Ephesians iv. 4, he speaks of “One Lord, one faith, one baptism,” and in iv. 13 of “all attaining to the unity of (the) faith and of (the) insight into the Son of God.” In fact, I venture to say that he who will patiently think out (with the aid, say, of Lightfoot’s commentary) even the following extract from Paul’s very personal letter to Philemon, will be less ready to find the religious ideal of the Pastorals “sub-Pauline”; and such passages may be multiplied from the whole Imprisonment Group. “I thank my God always . . . hearing of thy love and the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus and toward all the saints, (praying) that the communicativeness (*κοινωνία*) of thy faith may become effective in (virtue of) insight (*ἐπίγνωσις*) into every good thing (ideal of action, cf. Col. iii. 10 and context) that is in us, directed towards Christ” (4–6). Here we have a hint as to the true meaning of the “insight into the truth” (*ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας*), as it is in Christ, which meets us in the Pastorals (1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 25, iii. 7, Tit. i. 1), and which is strictly akin to the use of “insight into His will” (*ἐπίγνωσις*) in Colossians i. 9 f., ii. 2 (where its object is “the mystery of God, even Christ,” quite as in 1 Timothy iii. 16), and iii. 10 (cf. Philemon 6), and to “the doctrine (*λόγος*)

naturally becomes more and more explicit in "principles (λόγοι) of the faith and of the fair instruction" (διδασκαλίας 1 Tim. iv. 6), especially as erroneous interpretations of this content, both theoretic and practical, develop amid the Gospel's working in actual human nature, biassed in certain definite directions by Jewish or Hellenic training. This would be specially true in such an active-minded and morally unsettled environment as the cities of proconsular Asia, where also the assumption must have been common that one man was as good as another in the function of "teacher." Particularly would this be the case with the moral ideal of Christian conduct, which is what Paul chiefly means by "healthful" or "sound," as distinct from "ailing" or "morbid" teaching, in the Pastorals. What is most emphasised in these letters as needful, as also in the Imprisonment Group, is a growing *insight* (ἐπίγνωσις) into the moral implications of personal faith in Christ, as distinct from barren intellectual notions¹ about Him and His Salvation, to which the Greek mind was specially prone. But is not this exactly what one would expect to be the situation already by 60 A.D., in the province of Asia? And there, too, surely some recognised norm of ethical and doctrinal principles must by this time have taken some sort of shape. Indeed, it has never been shown by sound analogy, either from the New Testament or from religious experience at large—least of all from the foreign Mission field—that "the pressing need of the Church," either in Asia or Crete, was *not* already in 60 A.D., "to maintain the true Pauline tradition against certain moral and speculative ideas," whether by "adherence to" of the truth of the Gospel" in Colossians i. 5, which "bears fruit" in devoted living (ib. 6, 10). All this, moreover, is rooted in Paul's earliest teaching in certain connexions, as when the Thessalonian converts are described as chosen "unto salvation in sanctification of spirit and belief of the truth . . . through our Gospel."

¹ Compare James ii. 14 ff. for a similar tendency in Jewish Christians to a "barren" or "dead" faith, without "the fruits of righteousness."

344 HISTORIC SETTING OF PASTORAL EPISTLES

more or less "formulated statements of the sound teaching" (particularly the Pauline ethical tradition or deposit), or by emphasis on the security of that tradition as handed on by certain of the regularly contributed ministers of the community (2 Tim. ii. 1; cf. 1 Tim. v. 17, Tit. i. 5, 9), in contrast to certain volunteer teachers of a self-opinionated type, often with an eye to material gain (Tit. i. 10 f.; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 3 f.). How else were "the interests of discipline and doctrine to be conserved?" Such a method has about it nothing necessarily "hierarchical" (such associations are simply imported from later times, when the idea of "apostolic succession" conditioned by *sacramental orders* had arisen); it is only a common-sense provision that the teachers shall be truly *representative* of the faith by which the Church (general and local) had been actually begotten and built up. In the establishing and consolidating of such methods of orderly teaching throughout the Churches which looked on Paul as their ultimate human founder or, at least, as the chief Gentile Apostle, what more natural than that "Paul's lieutenants" should be viewed as "possessing the central deposit of the Apostolic faith, and having the duty as well as the right of exercising the authority with which that position invested them"?¹

What I urge, then, is that in matters fundamental to Paulinism, and to the true Pauline spirit and attitude, there is no radical contrast between the Pastorals and generally admitted letters of his, particularly those nearest them in time and conditions; the difference, so far as it exists—and this is apt to be exaggerated in our mind owing to the proportion of specific directions in the "pastorals" from their very scope—is one of degree and perspective. The contrast is still further made artificial by overlooking the

¹ I quote for convenience the terms in which Dr. Moffatt states the phenomena in the *Encyc. Brit.*, xxvi. 993.

fact that "faith," in the more personal and dynamic sense, is in them presupposed as long present and rooted in the very habit of the Christian soul; whereas in certain of the earlier Epistles Paul is earnestly contending for its recognition as the root of the whole matter of salvation, over against Judaizing emphasis on the Mosaic Law, and that often on its ritual side, as the very condition of saving faith and acceptance with God. The perspectives are quite distinct; and only when this is fully realised can any good Paulinist—and I claim to be one—be easy about the tone and emphasis of the Pastorals, which after all is what tells on the mind in the long run. Thus, Dr. Denney complains that "the general impression one gets from the Pastoral Epistles is that, as a doctrine, Christianity was now complete and could be taken for granted. . . . There is nothing creative in the statement of it; and it is the combination of fulness and of something not unlike formalism that raises doubts as to the authorship." Here, allowing for a little over-emphasis, one can agree in principle, and only ask, Why should Christianity not be taken for granted by Paul at this late stage of instruction, as regards its essential features of faith and practice? And in fact, Dr. Denney himself largely admits our whole case when he adds, in speaking of Titus iii. 4 f., "St Paul could, no doubt, have said all this, but probably he would have said it otherwise, and not all at a time."¹ Thus, it becomes a mere matter of opinion as to the expediencies of the case, if what Paul might well have said—had he seen reason for so doing—one denies that he did say. In a word, a large part of the feeling against the Pastorals as unworthy of Paul's inspiration is highly subjective, and sacrifices Paul the Missionary Apostle to Paul the theologian or the self-contained fanatic for one way of putting things—even if the

¹ *The Death of Christ*, 1902, 202 f., quoted in Moffatt's *Introd. to the Lit. of the New Testament*, p. 412.

deepest and most morally effective way to himself, though others could not so grasp it. Full sympathy with all the facts of the case, alike for Paul himself and his correspondents, is the thing most needful in order to set the Pastorals in their true and vital light.

If these principles be sound, and if the historical setting be in the main such as we have pictured (and that is all one would venture to claim), then the value of the Pastorals for a full-orbed appreciation whether of Paul or of Paulinism, in their sanity, sympathy and true spirituality—as concerned above all for the great end, Christlike character, not only as inner and personal but also as realised socially in a community of holy and loving life—becomes also manifest. They cast back light upon an element in Paul, as the practical pastor of souls and organiser of the Christian life on a social basis,¹ which otherwise we are apt to overlook amid the splendour of his familiar pleas for the innerness of religion and for the freedom of the Gospel as spirit and power, rather than letter and impersonal law or sacred ritual. They show him clearly to have been all along, as we work out the lines running back from them through all his letters, not the doctrinaire, self-pleasing prophet or theologian, pitiless towards human limitations of insight and unable to adapt his high message to lower natures than his own, but rather the true Missionary or Apostle of Jesus Christ, full of prophetic insight indeed, but also (like his Master, in whom he saw God incarnate) caring even for those weak in faith, and willing to condescend in methods of teaching to the slow of heart and mind.

Accordingly, I accept the challenge that the final issue in this, as in every question of authenticity, turns on a true

¹ "Without these Epistles we might take a maimed view of Paul's character and philosophy. They show in what way he regarded the family," and "the family as the basis of the organised Church" (Sir W. M. Ramsay, *EXPOSITOR*, VII. ix. 178).

interpretation of Paul and Paulinism. In other words, one's attitude to the Pastorals forms—where one has studied them at all carefully—a test of the adequacy of one's insight into Paul and his spirit. And, as at present advised, I judge that the rejection of them as in general tone and attitude un-Pauline, argues either defective exegesis or a one-sided and partial view both of Paul and Paulinism.

Such is the view of the Pastoral Epistles to which I wished to invite attention. I hope at least to have shown that the issue is not the closed one which it is often represented, especially by the tone in which the negative conclusion is assumed as a kind of dogma or test of critical competence and open-mindedness. The fact is that either conclusion has its difficulties; ¹ and had time allowed, I think I could have shown that those of the negative theory are really greater ² than those of the view which accepts the good faith of their own claim to Pauline origin, once it is freed from the incubus of having to assume Paul's release and subsequent activity, against which all really early external evidence seems to witness irrevocably.

VERNON BARTLET.

SUGGESTIONS ON THE HISTORY AND LETTERS OF ST. PAUL.

III. BELIEF AND BAPTISM.

WHAT is the force of the term "believe" (*πιστεύω*) in the Acts? Does it necessarily imply that all who "believed" were converted and permanently became Christians

¹ Prof. Peake sums up those on both sides with his wonted fairness (*op. cit.*, pp. 69 f.). I hope I have succeeded in modifying, if not removing, most of those attaching to the positive side, and shown reason for getting beyond his intermediate position, viz., that while "the Epistles cannot have come from Paul's hand in their present form, yet they contain not a little Pauline material" (p. 71).

² Compare Wohlenberg, *op. cit.*, 63-66.