

DATING THE EPISTLES

WE are all familiar with the problem of the interrelation of our four Gospels, even if no universally agreed solution to it has yet been discovered. Sometimes we fail to see that a similar problem exists in the case of a large number of the New Testament Epistles. There are some striking resemblances between Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Hebrews, James, 1 Peter and Revelation. Commentaries on any one of these books will often point out the resemblances to many of the others and usually postulate some sort of dependence. The result is that the dating of a letter is often founded upon whether it is thought to precede or follow another, while that other may have been dated by similar means. It is the purpose of this article to attempt to obtain a bird's-eye view of the field in question. Instead of dealing with the problems piecemeal, we shall attempt to date the various documents as objectively as possible and then see how they fit together to form a consistent whole. Those who have read either of the works will recognize that I am much indebted to Carrington's *Primitive Christian Catechism*, especially as modified and elaborated in Selwyn's commentary on 1 Peter. We shall consider briefly how far the resemblances between the Epistles may be explained by direct copying and how far they are due to the use of a common source or sources.

DATING OF INDIVIDUAL EPISTLES

The Thessalonian Epistles were almost certainly written in A.D. 51, whatever may be the exact relation between them. Romans is generally agreed to have been composed in A.D. 56 or 57, whether or not there was more than one edition of it. Colossians and Philemon must be taken together. The theory of an Ephesian origin of them is not convincing, though it is just possible. It is far more likely that they were written from Rome about A.D. 61. The writing of Ephesians is likewise to be attributed to the Roman captivity, though again some have suggested that it should be dated somewhere in the period A.D. 54-6 while Paul was in Ephesus, and a number of scholars believe that it is post-Pauline and that about A.D. 90 is a more probable date. This last conclusion is based largely on the supposed fact of its dependence upon various other letters. 1 Peter is most likely to have been composed between A.D. 62 and 64. The arguments used against its Petrine authorship are not convincing and depend largely on the supposition that the writer had certain other New Testament epistles before him.

James is notoriously difficult to date. It may belong to the end of the first century; but it is more likely to be the work of the Lord's brother and to have been written at some date between A.D. 45 and his death in A.D. 62, when the issues brought before the Council of Jerusalem were not thought to be of overriding importance. There is fairly wide agreement nowadays that Hebrews was written before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and the indications are that it was about the middle of the decade preceding that, probably about A.D. 66. It is not easy to assign a date to Revelation with certainty. There is more to be said for a date about A.D. 68 than is often realized, though it is more generally placed under Domitian in about A.D. 95. If the book is not a unity, it has been suggested that chapters i-xi should be assigned to the earlier date and chapters xii-xxii to the later.

SUGGESTED LITERARY DEPENDENCE

(a) *The Thessalonian Epistles*

There is no suggestion that these letters are dependent upon any others. Their date in A.D. 51 may be taken as a firm base in the case of any other epistles being dependent upon them.

(b) *Romans*

The only epistle upon which it is possible that Romans is dependent is James. However it would be a bold man who would state categorically that this was so, for many scholars hold that the dependence is in fact the other way. If James was written by the Lord's brother it is very unlikely that he would come across a copy of a private letter to the Roman church (though there may have been an Ephesus edition too) within a year or two of its being written. It may be that he was combating certain distortions of Pauline teaching and that might have been at almost any date. If a late date is proposed for James (for which there is little evidence), he may have been trying to refute Romans, but this cannot be proved. It would be easier to see how a tract from the leader of the church at Jerusalem could fall into Paul's hands and how he could try to correct any wrong emphases in it. But James is most likely to belong before the Council of Jerusalem or after Romans; it is therefore unlikely that Paul was answering it some twelve years later with the Council intervening. The circulation of James may have helped to lead up to the Council and misinterpretation of it may have continued afterwards, but it is most improbable that either Romans or James was directly answering the other.

(c) *Colossians and Philemon*

It is not generally supposed that these letters are dependent upon any others, unless T. W. Manson is right in his guess that they followed Hebrews to the same destination. However, the case for an Italian destination for Hebrews is much stronger and similar situations could have occurred in more than one place. If Manson is correct, then the more likely date of Colossians is confirmed (A.D. 61), and Hebrews must have originated in A.D. 60 or 61. But we have seen reasons for preferring a slightly later date for Hebrews, and Manson's theory must be regarded as no more than an ingenious conjecture for which further evidence is needed.

(d) *Ephesians*

Clearly this is closely related to Colossians. There is no direct literary dependence except in the section about Tychicus. All those who have professed to see such dependence have been compelled to admit that in some places it seems that Colossians is borrowing from Ephesians, and therefore another recension of Colossians has had to be postulated. The dependence consists almost certainly in Ephesians being based on the memory of Colossians, and perhaps of other Pauline epistles, whether it is the work of an imitator or not. Similarities with Acts do not give us any warrant for believing that there is interdependence there, though this supposition is one of the reasons why some critics think Ephesians to be post-Pauline. The relationship with 1 Peter is more difficult. There are many common words and some parallel passages. It has been generally supposed that it is 1 Peter which is dependent on Ephesians, though Moffatt thought the dependence was the other way round (mainly because he believed that 1 Peter was genuine but that Ephesians was not). This is very unlikely; and it may be asserted that only Colossians may be used as a *terminus post quem* for the dating of Ephesians.

(e) *1 Peter*

This letter is often supposed to show signs of dependence upon several others. There are six parallels to it in Romans xii-xiii and two in Romans ix. Sanday and Headlam thought that the occurrence of the same thoughts and the same rare words in the same order gave conclusive proof of dependence. If there is such a relationship it must be that 1 Peter is the later both on other grounds of dating and because in Romans there is a much more logical working out of the thesis. But Wand has shown that two of the parallels are Old Testament prophecies, two give lists of common Christian duties, a fifth is semi-

liturgical, a sixth depends more on thoughts than on words and the remaining two are doubtful. But why should Peter or his imitator wish to borrow from Paul? Had he no teaching of his own on these things? It would be possible that he should have seen Romans when he was in Rome, but it may be that the resemblances are better explained by another theory. There are also distinct parallels with 1 and 2 Thessalonians. If 1 Peter is genuine it must have been drafted by Silvanus and this would probably be sufficient to account for these. There seems to be no good reason why Peter should have wished to copy these letters even if he had come across them. If there is any direct connection with Ephesians, we have seen that there is every cause to believe that Ephesians was the earlier. But if 1 Peter is authentic, Ephesians, written to Asia Minor a year or two previously, is unlikely to have come into Peter's hands, unless Paul had kept a copy of his 'circular' to the Gentiles and showed it to him in Rome. There are thirteen suggested parallels and Mitton considers that dependence is proved. But Hort said that the connection, though very close, did not lie on the surface; and Selwyn likewise thinks that they are similar because they both breathe the same spiritual atmosphere when the Gentile question was settled and there was a mood of solid achievement. If both were written for Rome within a year or two of each other and if Peter had seen Paul, this would seem very likely.

There are some unusual resemblances to James, which most scholars would account for by the suggestion that James was using 1 Peter. This may be partly due to uncertainty about the date of James. But Mayor makes out quite a strong case for the priority of James. James is more simple and less theological. Why does he not make his Old Testament quotations more exact if he had 1 Peter in front of him? Could not Peter have picked up this general tract from the leader of the Jerusalem church and developed it into something more specific and theological? Yet this view has its difficulties. There are a number of parallels with Hebrews especially with chapter xiii. Selwyn wishes to attribute many of the similarities to Silvanus who may have been one of 'them of Italy' who saluted the readers of Hebrews. While it is more likely that Peter should come across Hebrews, which was probably written to Rome, than that the author of Hebrews should come across 1 Peter in Asia Minor, we have seen that Hebrews is probably a little later than 1 Peter. Therefore it is very difficult to suppose that there was direct dependence in either direction.

(f) *James*

As we have seen, this letter may depend on Romans, but that is unlikely as it does not really set out to answer it. It may depend on 1 Peter, but not if it is the work of the Lord's brother. It should be dated on its own merits though they do leave some room for difference of opinion.

(g) *Hebrews*

There are certain affinities with Romans in this letter, but they are of a relatively minor nature. Hebrews cannot be before A.D. 57; it must therefore be the dependent letter if there has been copying. If the author of Hebrews was one of the Pauline circle who had spent some time at Rome, this would easily account for memories of Romans in his letter. Dependence on 1 Peter is unlikely and to suggest that Hebrews xi is based upon James seems gratuitous.

(h) *Revelation*

Apparent echoes of Colossians and Ephesians may be found in Revelation i. 5. iii. 12, iii. 14, and xxi. 14. It is more doubtful whether we are to see references to 1 Peter, James and Hebrews, though all these would be possible as Revelation can hardly have been written before A.D. 68.

THE COMMON CATECHETICAL TRADITION

(a) *Its likelihood*

Dodd has shown how the early Church had a common *kerygma* underlying everything as a ground-plan of its theology and also a common substructure of Old Testament testimonies which is found in all the main portions of the New Testament. It would be natural to deduce from this alone that there was a common tradition of *didache* too. A number of hymns and liturgical

fragments may be found in the New Testament, and we should not be surprised to find the crystallization of catechetical teaching. There is in Romans vi. 17 the phrase *typos didaches* suggesting some fairly fixed form of instruction. Frequently the words *paradidomi* and *paralambano* are used, indicating that there were similarities in the early Church to the system of instruction of the Jewish Rabbis and their schools. 'Words of the Lord' were clearly treasured and a number are referred to which are not recorded in our Gospels. These and other considerations make it almost certain that there was a large amount of fairly well-fixed material which was used to instruct converts in the early Church, and to which reference is frequently made in most of the epistles.

(b) *Its contents*

It is difficult to be completely convinced by Carrington's reconstruction of the baptismal catechism. Nor can we be sure that the elements we can observe to be common to the epistles all come from a single source. Paul, Peter, James, Silvanus and others may all have had some part in composing schemes of instruction which may have gained local or universal acceptance. But at least we may be certain that there was a catechism which included the four points — lay aside, submit, watch, stand (see Colossians, Ephesians, 1 Peter and James) — and Psalm xxxiv played a prominent part. There may also have been a Christian holiness code, a persecution fragment and various other pieces. It is likely that the decree of the Council of Jerusalem had something to do with some of these.

Enough has been said to show that the suggested copying of one New Testament letter by another is in almost every case most unlikely. The facts are far better accounted for by the supposition of common material underlying them, for which there is much independent evidence. If this is so, the dates which we have suggested for the various epistles will all stand on their merits, and there will be no need to place any at a late date because of supposed dependence. Most of them were almost certainly written within a few years of each other and they serve to show the broad measure of consent that there was throughout the Church in the teaching of Christians as well as in the facts of the gospel. Was it not through the careful preservation and handing on of the traditions, whether orally or in writing, that the Holy Spirit fulfilled the promise of Jesus that 'He shall teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you' (Jn. xiv. 26)? It is thus that we can speak of the unity of the New Testament and of New Testament theology. Each apostle had his own branch, but it was firmly attached to the trunk.

N.B. Those wishing to set themselves an exercise in modern literary criticism should take the booklets *Becoming a Christian* by J. R. W. Stott, and *How Can I Find God?* by M. A. P. Wood, and try to account for the very remarkable resemblances between them. (Mr. Wood writes that he is not conscious of having used Mr. Stott's booklet. He attributes the resemblances to their friendship and common background.)

R. E. NIXON, B.A.