

Perhaps, after all, it makes no difference whether we say that Luke fitted Q + L into Mark as a framework, or Mark into Q + L as a framework. What I should *not* say is that he fitted Q and Mark into L; but that would not in the least detract from my respect for the high value of L, as a source of the Gospel. And I should regard Mark as the backbone of Luke's Gospel, just as it is of Matthew's; but to establish this would not in the least invalidate the other arguments of Canon Streeter's illuminating essay.

T. STEPHENSON.

THE PROBLEM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

IF critical students must take Dr Parry's work on the Pastoral Epistles seriously, traditionists will certainly have to give heed to Mr Harrison's masterly codification of the linguistic evidence, his clear exposition of its bearing on the question of authorship, and his other contributions, valuable if less complete and convincing, towards the final solution of the whole problem raised by these letters.¹

It has, of course, long been matter of common knowledge that 'the language of the Pastorals shews on the face of it certain strongly marked peculiarities as compared with the other Paulines'. Mr Harrison has shewn us that close and methodical examination very greatly accentuates this contrast. His statistics and curves shew (1) that the ten Pauline Epistles 'maintain among themselves a close and unmistakeable family likeness'. Each letter and group has its characteristic expressions, but they form a series. The Pastoral Epistles stand apart from that series. In each curve a sharp rise separates them from the ten. Judged by their vocabulary the Pastoral Epistles find their place in the second century series and not in the Pauline series. Mr Harrison has also shewn that certain alleged analogies in the works of Shakespeare may be shewn by closer examination not to support the conclusions which have been based on them. Take the three groups, of the ten Pauline Epistles, the Pastorals, and the Apostolic Fathers, and we find that of the Pauline words not found in the Apostolic Fathers 94 per cent. are absent from the Pastorals. Put the whole New Testament on one side, and the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists on the other; the Pastorals have more words in common with the latter than the former group of writings. Thus Mr Harrison completes the work begun by Holtzmann. Dr Hort was right when he said that the real difficulty of

¹ *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, by P. N. Harrison, M.A., D.D., Oxford University Press, 1921.

accepting the Pauline authorship of these Epistles was to be found in their style and vocabulary. But Mr Harrison has a further contribution to make to the subject. The traditional view has always found its chief support in the difficulty of otherwise accounting for the Pastoral Epistles as we have them. The *personalia* which they contain bear the stamp of genuineness. They avoid the obvious resources of the pseudepigraphist. They ring true. But the difficulty of finding a place for them in the story of St Paul led Holtzmann and Baur to attribute them to 'the happy thought of invention'. It was felt to be impossible to find any one situation or period into which they could all be fitted. Mr Harrison denies the necessity for treating them as closely connected. By dividing them up into small enough sections he can find an appropriate 'situation' for each of them in the life of St Paul without creating a new period after release from imprisonment at Rome, which, with most critical students of the New Testament, he rejects.

He also divides the Pauline elements in these Epistles into *two* classes: genuine fragments of personal instructions, and stock phrases used by an imitator, in a way which betrays their derived character. In his reproduction of the text of the Epistles at the end of his essay the differences are clearly shewn by the use of uncial letters and of underlining. In such distinctions it is obvious that there is room for much difference of opinion as to details. But the working hypothesis is clearly stated and deserves full consideration.

By dividing up the *personalia* of 2 Timothy and Titus (in 1 Timothy he finds nothing genuine) he finds a place for (1) Titus iii 12-15 as written from Western Macedonia, after the 'four chapter letter' (2 Cor. x-xiii) and before the later letter (2 Cor. i-ix). Titus, then at Corinth, is bidden to hold himself ready to join St Paul in Epirus, where he intends to winter at Nicopolis. The situation is possible, though further study will probably reveal more clearly the extent of hypothesis needed to make it probable. (2) 2 Tim. iv 13-15, 20, 21a, written from Macedonia after the visit to Troas (2 Cor. ii 12) to bid Timothy, who has returned to Ephesus, to join him before winter. Again the conjectural element is certainly not absent. It is easy to find an occasion when Trophimus may have been left at Miletus sick. But the actual misdeeds of Alexander the coppersmith, though not unlikely, are not recorded elsewhere. All that we learn from Acts is that some one of that name was put forward by the Jews as their spokesman, and that the populace of Ephesus would not give him a hearing. (3) 2 Tim iv 16-18a, from Caesarea soon after his removal there from Jerusalem, the 'first defence' being Acts xxii 1 ff. Before the supposed time of writing there had been a *second* defence, but Mr Harrison gets over the absence of reference to it on the ground that

the brethren at Jerusalem had apparently no opportunity of standing by him on that occasion. Surely the hope expressed in the last verse that the Lord 'will save me unto His heavenly kingdom' is better suited to the final imprisonment, from which St Paul had no hope of escape. (4) 2 Tim. iv 9-12, 22*b*, the recall of Timothy to Rome before St Paul's trial, and (5) a longer letter on the eve of martyrdom, 2 Tim. i 16-18, iii 10*f*, iv 1, 2*a*-5*b*, 6-8, 18*b*, 19, 21*b*, 22*a*, 'his noble last letter and farewell to Timothy, in which he assures him of his complete confidence, bids him carry through to the end his task, as he, Paul, has now done; and so breaks to him the news that they two will not meet in this world again'.

Thus by skilful division the separated scraps can be put into possible, and sometimes probable situations. But no explanation is offered of the preservation and collection of such disjointed scraps alone of Pauline correspondence, or their redistribution in the letters where they now appear, and in which they create, as we are told, impossible situations. The stupidity of the final redactor has been too prominent perhaps in reconstructions of New Testament writings. Sounder criticism must study more carefully the probabilities of his case. But the theory here put forward is a distinct advance on Dr Vernon Bartlet's assignment of the Pastoral Epistles as they stand to various occasions in the life of St Paul covered by the record of the Acts. They shew a real unity, and must belong to one period, if each Epistle is treated as an integral whole.

Mr Harrison has given us a decisive presentation of the facts of vocabulary and style, in which the Pauline and non-Pauline elements, as he sees them, are clearly and convincingly set out: and he has suggested a possible theory to explain the presence of both in the Pastoral Epistles. To many readers his demonstration will probably appear final. The present writer has, however, to confess that he needs further light on several points. (1) There is no doubt that St Paul's style and vocabulary vary largely according to subject and circumstance. The Pastoral Epistles stand quite apart from the other ten in these respects. The difference is great. Is it certain that it is greater than residence in Rome, where the Greek spoken by the classes to which most Christians belonged probably differed from that spoken in Asia and Syria, and the new circumstances which had to be faced at the end of the two years' imprisonment or soon after it, could explain? The new circumstances which the writer, if he was St Paul, tries to meet are not always clearly understood. If he is responsible for these Epistles substantially as we have them, a very doubtful hypothesis, they must have been sent with a double object. He must instruct his delegates at Ephesus and in Crete how to deal with the situation till he can visit his churches

accepting the Pauline authorship of these Epistles was to be found in their style and vocabulary. But Mr Harrison has a further contribution to make to the subject. The traditional view has always found its chief support in the difficulty of otherwise accounting for the Pastoral Epistles as we have them. The *personalia* which they contain bear the stamp of genuineness. They avoid the obvious resources of the pseudepigraphist. They ring true. But the difficulty of finding a place for them in the story of St Paul led Holtzmann and Baur to attribute them to 'the happy thought of invention'. It was felt to be impossible to find any one situation or period into which they could all be fitted. Mr Harrison denies the necessity for treating them as closely connected. By dividing them up into small enough sections he can find an appropriate 'situation' for each of them in the life of St Paul without creating a new period after release from imprisonment at Rome, which, with most critical students of the New Testament, he rejects.

He also divides the Pauline elements in these Epistles into *two* classes: genuine fragments of personal instructions, and stock phrases used by an imitator, in a way which betrays their derived character. In his reproduction of the text of the Epistles at the end of his essay the differences are clearly shewn by the use of uncial letters and of underlining. In such distinctions it is obvious that there is room for much difference of opinion as to details. But the working hypothesis is clearly stated and deserves full consideration.

By dividing up the *personalia* of 2 Timothy and Titus (in 1 Timothy he finds nothing genuine) he finds a place for (1) Titus iii 12-15 as written from Western Macedonia, after the 'four chapter letter' (2 Cor. x-xiii) and before the later letter (2 Cor. i-ix). Titus, then at Corinth, is bidden to hold himself ready to join St Paul in Epirus, where he intends to winter at Nicopolis. The situation is possible, though further study will probably reveal more clearly the extent of hypothesis needed to make it probable. (2) 2 Tim. iv 13-15, 20, 21a, written from Macedonia after the visit to Troas (2 Cor. ii 12) to bid Timothy, who has returned to Ephesus, to join him before winter. Again the conjectural element is certainly not absent. It is easy to find an occasion when Trophimus may have been left at Miletus sick. But the actual misdeeds of Alexander the coppersmith, though not unlikely, are not recorded elsewhere. All that we learn from Acts is that some one of that name was put forward by the Jews as their spokesman, and that the populace of Ephesus would not give him a hearing. (3) 2 Tim iv 16-18a, from Caesarea soon after his removal there from Jerusalem, the 'first defence' being Acts xxii 1 ff. Before the supposed time of writing there had been a *second* defence, but Mr Harrison gets over the absence of reference to it on the ground that

the brethren at Jerusalem had apparently no opportunity of standing by him on that occasion. Surely the hope expressed in the last verse that the Lord 'will save me unto His heavenly kingdom' is better suited to the final imprisonment, from which St Paul had no hope of escape. (4) 2 Tim. iv 9-12, 22*b*, the recall of Timothy to Rome before St Paul's trial, and (5) a longer letter on the eve of martyrdom, 2 Tim. i 16-18, iii 10*f*, iv 1, 2*a*-5*b*, 6-8, 18*b*, 19, 21*b*, 22*a*, 'his noble last letter and farewell to Timothy, in which he assures him of his complete confidence, bids him carry through to the end his task, as he, Paul, has now done; and so breaks to him the news that they two will not meet in this world again'.

Thus by skilful division the separated scraps can be put into possible, and sometimes probable situations. But no explanation is offered of the preservation and collection of such disjointed scraps alone of Pauline correspondence, or their redistribution in the letters where they now appear, and in which they create, as we are told, impossible situations. The stupidity of the final redactor has been too prominent perhaps in reconstructions of New Testament writings. Sounder criticism must study more carefully the probabilities of his case. But the theory here put forward is a distinct advance on Dr Vernon Bartlett's assignment of the Pastoral Epistles as they stand to various occasions in the life of St Paul covered by the record of the Acts. They shew a real unity, and must belong to one period, if each Epistle is treated as an integral whole.

Mr Harrison has given us a decisive presentation of the facts of vocabulary and style, in which the Pauline and non-Pauline elements, as he sees them, are clearly and convincingly set out: and he has suggested a possible theory to explain the presence of both in the Pastoral Epistles. To many readers his demonstration will probably appear final. The present writer has, however, to confess that he needs further light on several points. (1) There is no doubt that St Paul's style and vocabulary vary largely according to subject and circumstance. The Pastoral Epistles stand quite apart from the other ten in these respects. The difference is great. Is it certain that it is greater than residence in Rome, where the Greek spoken by the classes to which most Christians belonged probably differed from that spoken in Asia and Syria, and the new circumstances which had to be faced at the end of the two years' imprisonment or soon after it, could explain? The new circumstances which the writer, *if* he was St Paul, tries to meet are not always clearly understood. If he is responsible for these Epistles substantially as we have them, a very doubtful hypothesis, they must have been sent with a double object. He must instruct his delegates at Ephesus and in Crete how to deal with the situation till he can visit his churches

himself, and so resume leadership. He must also give instructions which will hold if, as he knows only too well may happen, he never has the chance of resuming his work of supervision again. He has to face questions of organization, to meet temporary circumstances which may become permanent. The creative period is over. Many churches will, all may, have to get on without their former leaders. It is a new situation as compared with the backgrounds of any of the other Pauline Epistles.

(2) There is a real connexion between the language of the Pastorals and that of the age of the Apostolic Fathers, to say nothing of the Apologists. But there is also a difference between their content and the essentially second-hand character of the subapostolic literature. Are the Pastorals merely part of the product of that age, or did they help to form its Christian language and thought? The answer to this question may or may not determine the question of authorship. Its bearing on the value of the Epistles is of decisive importance.

(3) The Church organization which forms the basis of 'Paul's' instructions to his delegates is not that of the monarchical episcopate. It seems to be even pre-Ignatian. Does it represent a state of Church management which appealed to Christians widely enough and long enough to have called out the desire for Pauline authority in its support which would lead to the composition of the Epistles?

(4) The combination of genuine Pauline *personalia*, with the use of stock Pauline phrases not always happily applied, and the addition of large quantities of non-Pauline language and matter is of course quite possible. But do the phenomena exclude the possibility of a larger Pauline element in the composition; real letters, perhaps expanded at a later date, in which the personal instructions were practically dictated, the language of Paul prominent in other parts, and the general instructions left to be formulated by the scribe? We do not know under what conditions of hurry and constraint St Paul may have been forced to send out his instructions towards the end of his life.

(5) If the preservation of scraps of *personalia* can be satisfactorily explained, again a doubtful hypothesis, we have seen that by adequate division possible places for them can be found in the life of St Paul without the assumption of a release from the Roman imprisonment. But no satisfactory explanation of their combination into their present form has been suggested. There is now something like consensus of agreement that these fragments are genuine, whatever view is taken of the rest of the content of the Epistles. Can a simpler explanation of them be found than Mr Harrison's rather elaborate subdivision and re-distribution over a long period? To the present writer it seems that a short period of travel after release followed by speedy re-arrest, imprisonment, and martyrdom offers the most natural explanation.

There may not be convincing evidence for the release: there is really no substantial evidence against it.

The passages which have to be considered as Pauline *personalia* have been, with one or two exceptions, enumerated. For the sake of clearness it may be well to remind ourselves of their content. They are as follows:—

- 1 Tim. i 3. Timothy urged, on a former occasion, to stay on at Ephesus, when Paul goes to Macedonia. (Not used by Mr Harrison.)
- Titus i 5. Reference to an occasion when St Paul left Titus in Crete. (Not used by Mr Harrison.)
- iii 12-14. St Paul intends to send thither Artemas or Tychicus. After their arrival Titus is to hasten to Nicopolis, where St Paul intends to winter.
- 2 Tim. i 15-18. All Asia turned against St Paul. Phygellus, and Herogenes. The contrast of Onesimus's conduct, his courage at Rome and Ephesus. Apparently he is now dead.
- iii 11. Reference to St Paul's sufferings at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra.
- iv 6-8. The end is near: *ἡδὴ σπένδομαι*.
- 10 ff. Timothy is to come to him. Demas, Crescens, Titus, already sent to Thessalonica, Galatia, Dalmatia: Tychicus to Ephesus. Luke alone with him. Timothy to bring Mark. The cloak, &c., from Troas. The evil deeds of Alexander. The 'first defence'. The assurance of true safety.
- 19-21. Greetings to Prisca and Aquila and the 'house' of Onesiphorus. Erastus at Corinth. Trophimus left 'sick' at Miletus. Greetings sent from Roman Christians, Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren. (No real contradiction of the former statement that only Luke, of his own *entourage*, is with him.)

Mr Harrison's attempt to find situations for all these passages (save two) by sub-division has been fully described, and reference has been made to Dr Vernon Bartlet's similar endeavour on the supposition of the genuineness and integrity of the whole Epistles. Is there a simpler and more satisfactory explanation?

Assuming the truth of the traditional view that the two years' Roman imprisonment was followed by release and re-arrest, several elaborate journey plans have been put forward to fill up the years between 62 (or 64) and 67. These plans are, on that supposition, possible; but they are

not necessary. Perhaps the simplest solution of the questions raised by these passages in the Pastorals is to suppose a far shorter period of activity after the end of the 'first' Roman imprisonment.

It would have been well if students had set themselves the task of thinking out what St Paul must have done in the way of travelling, if the references in these Epistles are to real events subsequent to the 'first' Roman imprisonment. There are many things that he may have done, one especially that tradition elaborated at a later date, taking its start from an intention announced in Romans, of visiting Spain. But even the most rigid orthodoxy has allowed the possibility of an inspired Apostle changing his mind. If, as these letters seem to imply, he visited Ephesus again, it was in direct opposition to what he expected, as we learn from Acts. We need not therefore assume that because he *expected* to winter at Nicopolis, and made arrangements with that end in view, that he actually *spent* the winter there. The Roman power may have interfered with his intentions.

It may be surprising to those who began their study of these Epistles with the help of the older English literature on the subject to find that all we are bound to find room for in possible reconstructions of St Paul's further activities after the two years 'in his own hired house' at Rome, are (1) a visit to Crete, if he *left* Titus there 'to set in order the things lacking, and establish presbyters in each city, as I commanded thee', on some occasion subsequent to the visit to the island he was forced to pay on his way to Rome. When the instruction is written Titus is still in Crete. St Paul *expects* to send him word by Artemas and Tychicus. When that happens Titus is to hurry to Nicopolis, where St Paul *expects* to pass the winter. Zenas and Apollos are clearly expecting to visit Crete, or are already there and expecting to leave it. Possibly they are the bearers of the letter. They are to be zealously forwarded on their way, so that they may lack nothing. Even this visit is not necessary, if we assume that Titus was left in Crete when Paul visited the island on his way to Rome from Jerusalem. The silence of Acts is no evidence on the subject of Titus, who is never mentioned in the book at all. All *might* have been written from a Roman prison which St Paul never left, in spite of his expectation, at the time of writing, that he would winter in Epirus. (2) A visit to Ephesus if St Paul, when *en route* for Macedonia, exhorted Timothy to stay on at Ephesus, in order to urge some Christians there not to give false teaching or pay heed to myths and interminable genealogies. (3) A visit to Macedonia, unless indeed he was interrupted *en route*. Such a journey many have included (a) touching at Troas, where the cloak and books were left, and *possibly* (b) a visit to Corinth, if (iv 18) 'Erastus abode at Corinth' is held to imply that the writer left him there, and (c) Miletus, where Trophimus had to be left.

Thus these notices do not necessitate any more elaborate journey than a visit to Crete, not on the usual route *from* Italy to the East, but not impossible: a visit to Miletus, whence he may have gone to Ephesus, or may have sent for Timothy, as on an earlier occasion he sent for the Ephesian elders to meet him at Miletus: a coast voyage to Troas and thence on to Macedonia, if he completed the journey on which he was setting out when he made his request to Timothy. The references would not exclude the possibility of re-arrest at Troas, and hurried departure from there. But we need not be too ingenious. Crete, Miletus, Troas, with the probable addition of Ephesus and Macedonia, and possibly a winter at Nicopolis, and even a visit to Corinth. The minimum requirements are not large. They are far simpler than the usual accepted reproductions by conjecture of the later years of St Paul's life. Some such journey, followed by a second imprisonment in Rome from which he wrote 2 Timothy, or at least the *personalia* which it contains, is perhaps the simplest and most satisfactory explanation of the facts that call for explanation. It avoids the questionable subdivision of small paragraphs by which alone Mr Harrison can find place in the pre-Roman period of St Paul's life for the references in the genuine *personalia*, which cannot be placed in Roman imprisonment. And it offers an explanation of *all* of them. Mr Harrison has to make at least two exceptions.

But the shortest plan which has been sketched suffers from one improbability. It would assume that Timothy, who had seen St Paul at Ephesus or at Miletus, had to be told of what happened to Trophimus at Miletus, in a letter written from Rome. It would be more natural to suppose that the Trophimus incident happened after Timothy had left Ephesus, where the first Epistle, or the reference to events with which it begins, which may be genuine if the whole Epistle is not, assumes him to be at the time of writing. News of the fact would have been more likely to reach Timothy from Miletus than from Rome, *after* St Paul had reached that city. If then we include 1 Tim. i 3 among the genuine *personalia*, it would be more natural to assume that St Paul paid a second visit to Ephesus or the neighbourhood.

If we are to leave room for this we must suppose that after the two years St Paul found himself at liberty, either because he had secured a verdict in favour of his appeal, or because the case went by default, the accusers having failed to appear. 'This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar' was the judgement of a competent Jewish authority called in to advise a Roman official who had to deal with the case in the province. St Paul must have visited Crete, where he left Titus to organize the work which he and others had begun; possibly St Paul himself had made a start more than two

years earlier. Thence he may have gone to Miletus and Ephesus, where he left Timothy to deal with some special difficulties, while he himself went on to Macedonia, perhaps visiting Troas. During this period he may have written to Titus, giving him instructions and telling him his plans for the winter; and also to Timothy with further instructions how to deal with the difficulties at Ephesus. The letters no doubt contained more than the personal references, if they lacked much of their present content. Timothy probably left Ephesus during the period, his work completed or found to be beyond his strength. Probably St Paul himself returned to the Asiatic coast and at least touched at Miletus, possibly going on to Ephesus. At the former place he was obliged to leave Trophimus. After this, or even before it, he may have carried out his intention of going to Nicopolis. We may assume that the Nicopolis in Epirus is meant, built by Augustus to commemorate his victory over Mark Antony and Cleopatra, on the site where his land forces encamped before the battle. Under the patronage of the Emperors it became the most important city on that part of the sea-coast. From Miletus he may have crossed the Aegean to Corinth, where perhaps he and Erastus parted company, crossed the Isthmus and again taken ship for Nicopolis, where he meant to winter. Here, if he reached it, he may have been re-arrested and taken to Rome. From his prison in Rome—after his first hearing, at which he was not condemned, but which augured ill for his final escape—he wrote to Timothy the second Epistle, or the genuine part of it, to urge him to come if possible, and to explain the arrangements which he had made for his ‘staff’ to carry on the work of the Churches, which he now knew that he must leave to others. Only Luke is with him of his own ‘set’, and perhaps also the scribe, to whom he dictates, or partly dictates and partly instructs him how to write at greater length.

Hypothetical reconstructions give scope for ingenuity, but of course cannot compel conviction. Many others would do equally or nearly as well. But it is sometimes worth while to test the possibility of a situation by these means. Some such scheme of events as that suggested seems to offer the most natural explanation of those parts of the Pastoral Epistles which are now generally considered to be genuine Pauline matter. If they are genuine they raise the question of the probability of at least a short period of release after the two years’ residence in the hired house. Their claim to be considered good evidence for that certainly deserves consideration.

A. E. BROOKE.