

The Deutero-Pauline Hypothesis:

An attempt at Clarification

by Arthur G. Patzia

The deutero-Pauline hypothesis is the hypothesis that certain documents in the Pauline corpus are not directly the work of Paul but of disciples of his or others writing under his influence. Dr. Patzia, now of Bethel Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota, presented an abbreviated version of this critical account of the hypothesis at a meeting of the Society for Biblical Literature. The hypothesis—which, as Dr. Patzia points out, remains a hypothesis (or perhaps a group of hypotheses) — raises important questions not only for New Testament introduction and early Christian history but also for the nature of apostolic authority. We hope shortly to publish something by Dr. Donald Guthrie which will take up one recent application of the hypothesis.

INTRODUCTION

The term, "deutero-Pauline," which occurs as early as 1911 in H. J. Holtzmann's *New Testament Theology*,¹ has become a household term among NT scholars. Monographs and commentaries that deal with Paul generally have some reference to this concept. And, within the past several years, several articles and books have appeared which deal specifically with the deutero-Pauline literature and the idea of a "deutero-Paulinist."²

In spite of the general acceptance and employment of the term, there is a serious lack of understanding among Pauline scholars as to its meaning. In its most elementary form, "deutero-Pauline" implies a "second Paul" or an author who has written in the name of Paul and to whom certain epistles of questionable Pauline authorship have been attributed. Beyond this, however, there has been no systematic attempt to explain the meaning of "deutero-Pauline." One can rightly sympathize in this respect with H. J. Cadbury who criticizes scholars who deny the Pauline authorship of certain epistles but who do not feel any compulsion to explain why, for example, Ephesians was written under Paul's name at a later time. "All that needs to be suggested," laments Cadbury, "is that for some unknown reason and on some unknown occasion an unknown person felt moved to write this exposition of the Pauline gospel."³

27

¹ H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (2nd ed. Vol. 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), 195.

² Notably G. Bornkamm, *The New Testament: A Guide to Its Writings* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), especially "Appendix: The Deutero-Pauline Letters," 116ff.; E. Lohse, "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians," *NTS* 15 (1968-69), 211-220; Lohse, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (Meyer, 14th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968), Eng. transl. *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); Wayne A. Meeks, ed. *The Writings of St. Paul* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1972), Part II. "Works of the Pauline School," 105-148; E. Schweizer, "Zur Frage der Echtheit des Kolosser und des Epheserbriefes," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), 429; D. Selby, *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971), Ch. 6 "In Imitation of Paul," 406-479; P. Stuhlmacher, "Christliche Verantwortung bei Paulus und seinen Schülern," *EvT* 28 (1969) 165-186; K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen*, WMANT 8 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962).

³ H. J. Cadbury, "The Dilemma of Ephesians," *NTS* 5 (1958-9), 97.

The purpose of this essay is to examine the usage of this term in contemporary scholarship and to categorize its various components. Such an investigation, it is hoped, will clarify the concept and demonstrate that there is both substance and legitimacy to the deutero-Pauline hypothesis.

I. THE BASIS OF THE DEUTERO-PAULINE HYPOTHESIS

There are several fundamental factors upon which the deutero-Pauline hypothesis is based.

1. First of all, and quite naturally so, there is the issue of authorship. Once the Pauline authorship of certain epistles had been questioned, it became necessary to provide alternate proposals. One common suggestion in cases where no specific attempt at identification was made was to attribute the authorship of these "questionable epistles" to a deutero-Paulinist who apparently was writing in the name of Paul some time after the death of the apostle and possibly even as late as the early second century.

Now it is obvious that we cannot go into a detailed study of the pros and cons of Pauline authorship. Let it suffice to say that the deutero-Pauline hypothesis is built upon the presupposition that Paul is not the author of certain epistles that have traditionally been attributed to him. And while there is no unanimity among scholars as to which specific epistles are in question, it is quite generally conceded that the epistles which are labeled "deutero-Pauline" include 2 Thessalonians, the Pastorals, Ephesians and Colossians.⁴

Scholars who argue for the non-Pauline authorship of these epistles do so on the basis of certain considerations. These arguments, although they may not be used by all scholars and may be more applicable to some of the deutero-Pauline writings than others,⁵ will, for the sake of convenience, be summarized under the following headings:

(a) the peculiarities of language and style, (b) doctrinal differences involving such fundamental issues as Christology, Ecclesiology and Eschatology, (c) changed historical situations and (d) the development of church organization.⁶ With respect to 2 Thessalonians, for example, Willi Marxsen finds it much easier to interpret the "terminology, theological viewpoint and the material employed" within the letter as a post-Pauline document by which the author "tries to withstand Gnostic aberrations . . . by an appeal to Paul."⁷ W. G. Kümmel makes a similar observation with the Pastorals when he states:

We probably cannot determine either the presupposed situation of the individual epistles

⁴ Cf. above, n.2 as well as H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTS* 12 (1965-6), 231-244; W. Marxsen, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).

⁵ For a concise summary cf. G. Bornkamm's *Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), especially Appendix I: "Authentic and Inauthentic Pauline Letters", 241-243.

⁶ Arguments for and/or against the Pauline authorship of certain epistles can be found in most good "Introductions" to the NT, critical commentaries or selected studies. Donald Guthrie's *New Testament Introduction* (Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971) is a thorough attempt to handle the pros and cons of authorship.

⁷ Marxsen, *Introduction*, 43-4.

or the sequence of their composition. Rather, the author wants to support the churches near to him (in Asia Minor?) in the danger which is indicated by the false teaching. Writing as a pupil of Paul in the name of Paul, he shows the churches how to repulse the false teachers through correct order in the churches, through sound doctrine, and through a pious life according to the teaching of Paul, to the end that Christians may "become heirs in hope of eternal life" (Tit.3:7).⁸

Much the same can be said about the authorship of Ephesians and Colossians. These two epistles, because of their similarity, are often discussed together even though the Pauline authorship of Colossians has not been surrendered as readily as it has with Ephesians. In this instance E. Lohse represents a significant number of scholars on the deutero-Pauline status of Colossians. In his excellent commentary he concludes:

It is true that the thought of Colossians certainly exhibits Pauline features. The differences, however, that exist between Colossians and the theology of the major Pauline epistles must not be overlooked. They are not at all limited to the passages that argue against the "philosophy," but also occur in sections that are free of polemic. Consequently, the appearance of non-Pauline concepts and expressions cannot be explained simply by saying that they were coined by the specific circumstances of this controversy. Rather Pauline theology has undergone a profound change in Colossians, which is evident in every section of the letter and has produced new formulations in Christology, ecclesiology, the concept of the apostle, eschatology, and the understanding of baptism. Therefore, Paul cannot be considered to be the direct or indirect author of Colossians.⁹

While the above selection of authors is very limited, the examples, nevertheless, serve to illustrate the direction of thinking regarding the authorship of these deutero-Pauline epistles.

The Pauline authorship of all, or at least most of these "questionable epistles," is energetically defended by such scholars as D. Guthrie,¹⁰ E. E. Ellis,¹¹ E. Percy,¹² B. M. Metzger,¹³ and Everett F. Harrison.¹⁴ The reasoning of these—and other—writers is that the arguments against Pauline authorship are unconvincing and that they see no need to depart from the traditional approach. Stylistic, linguistic and doctrinal differences are accounted for by such factors as the versatility of Paul, the "ageing Apostle," the use of an amanuensis, or the actual historical situation which occasioned the initial writing of the letter. Donald Guthrie aptly relays the thinking of many when he writes: "In any case Paul's delicate handling of so many different situations and problems reveals a dexterity of mind and an astonishing power of adaptation which has seldom been surpassed. Here is a man who can deal with equal masterliness with all sorts and conditions of

⁸ W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (14th revised ed.: Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), 272.

⁹ Lohse, *Commentary*, 180-1, and "Pauline Theology," 212-220.

¹⁰ *Introduction*.

¹¹ "Authorship of the Pastorals: A Resumé and Assessment of Current Trends," *EQ* 32 (1960), 151-61.

¹² *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe* Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, (1946); Percy, "Zu den Problemen des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefes," *ZNW* 43 (1950-51) 178-194.

¹³ "Reconsiderations of Certain Arguments vs. the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," *ET* 70 (1958-59) 91-94.

¹⁴ *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).

men."¹⁵ Scholars holding to the Pauline authorship are not about to give it up and, in fact, find it more incredible to believe that "one greater than Paul" is at work.

2. Secondly, and closely related to the area of authorship, is the factor of early catholicism—or, to use E. Käsemann's terminology, *Frühkatholizismus*.¹⁶ Although most of the recent scholarship that has been done in the area of early catholicism has been carried out in connection with studies in Luke-Acts, the deutero-Pauline literature is also representative of early catholic thought. The identifying marks of such Christian documents include, according to a recent survey by John H. Elliott, "traces of, or tendencies in the direction of," the following:

the organization of the Church according to hierarchical in contrast to charismatic ministry; the development of the monarchical episcopate; an objectification of the proclamation and an emphasis upon a strictly formulated rule of faith; a stress upon "orthodoxy" or "sound doctrine" in opposition to false teaching; moralization of the faith and conception of the gospel as new law; an understanding of faith in objective rather than subjective, in static rather than dynamic, terms, as *fides quae creditur* in contrast to *fides qua creditur*; a development of the principle of apostolic succession and transmitted authority; a distinction between laity and clergy; a conception of an authoritative interpretation of the scriptures; a trend toward "sacramentalism"; the formulation of a "natural theology"; a concern for ecclesiastical unity and consolidation; and an interest in the collecting of the apostolic writings.¹⁷

30

Most of these themes are, for example, treated in W. Marxsen's discussion on the Pastoral epistles, in which, he maintains, we can see the beginnings of an independent theological treatment of the idea of tradition, the ideals of Christian citizenship, the ethical adjustment of the Christian to this world because of the delayed parousia and the importance of the apostolic office.¹⁸ Conzelmann¹⁹ and Lohse²⁰ see a new eschatological perspective in Colossians and Ephesians which essentially changes the Pauline "futures" into "past" tenses. And Käsemann discovers the voice of the "sub-apostolic age" in a document such as Colossians which presents "the apostolic office as guardian of the truth,"²¹ or in Ephesians where the connection between ecclesiology and christology is given a sacramental basis²²

¹⁵ *Introduction*, 289. Cf. also H. Chadwick, "All Things to All Men," *NTS* 1 (1954-5), 261-275. Chadwick argues that Paul had an astonishing elasticity of mind and flexibility in dealing with different situations. Hence, one should take Paul's "adaptability" seriously. This certainly is a factor that proponents of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis need to consider.

¹⁶ "Paulus und der Frühkatholizismus," *ZTK* 60 (1963), 77-89.

¹⁷ John H. Elliott, "A Catholic Gospel: Reflection on 'Early Catholicism' in the New Testament," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 214.

¹⁸ Marxsen, *Introduction*, 199-216; see also Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 289ff.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* (see n.18), 314ff.

²⁰ "Pauline Theology," 216, and *Commentary*. 104-6, 145-7, 180.

²¹ "A Primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy," *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 166-7.

²² "Paul and Nascent Catholicism," in *Distinctive Protestant and Catholic Themes Reconsidered* (Vol. 3, *JThC*, eds. R. W. Funk and G. Ebeling; New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 20.

Other facets of early catholicism will be discussed below under the "characteristics" of the deutero-Pauline literature. These tenets of early catholicism, according to proponents of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis, are fairly well distributed throughout the inauthentic epistles of Paul. It is inconceivable that Paul could be the author of ideas that plainly contradict the thought of his earlier epistles or that he could speak to issues which did not arise until after his death. The most plausible answer is that a deutero-Paulinist was trying to meet all the challenges of the new age by appealing to the authority of the apostle but yet not being limited to what the apostle had said or written. The deutero-Pauline literature is offered as proof that such a process did, in fact, occur.²³

3. For the third supporting factor, an appeal is made to the practice of pseudonymity in the pre-Christian and early Christian centuries. Such an appeal is made in answer to the charges that deutero-Paulinism constitutes forgery, fraud or fiction and that the writer of such material is nothing short of a charlatan, impostor or deceiver.²⁴ Unfortunately, such negative and pejorative comments have only succeeded in distorting the issue and have resulted in a further polarization between those who support the deutero-Pauline concept and those who are opposed to it.

On the basis of twentieth-century standards on such matters as intellectual propriety, plagiarism and copyright laws, the phenomenon of pseudonymity may be judged as something less than worthy. However, one must not judge ancient practices by modern standards. There is sufficient literary evidence and sound

²³ For a recent challenge to the concept of early catholicism cf. I. H. Marshall, "Early Catholicism in the New Testament," *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishers, 1974), 217-231, and L. Morris, "Luke and Early Catholicism," *WithJ* 35 (1973) 121-136.

²⁴ At this point the battle also wages around the legitimacy of pseudonymity with respect to the canonical epistles. Several studies which question the practice: D. Guthrie, "The Development of the Idea of Canonical Pseudepigraphs in New Testament Criticism," *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*, SPCK Theological Collections 4 (London: SPCK, 1965), 14-39; Guthrie, "Epistolary Pseudepigrapha," *Introduction*, 671-684; Guthrie, "Acts and Epistles in Apocryphal Writings," *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce* (eds. W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), 328-45. Guthrie's objections, however, are not taken too seriously by many recent scholars. Such recent studies include K. Aland, "The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Christian Literature of the First Two Centuries," in *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*, SPCK Theological Collection 4 (London: SPCK, 1965), 1-13; Horst R. Balz, "Anonymität und Pseudepigraphie im Urchristentum," *ZTK* 66 (1969), 403-36; J. C. Fenton, "Pseudonymity in the New Testament," *Theology*, 58 (1955), 51-56; B. M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigraphs," *JBL* 91(1972), 3-14; Martin Rist, "Pseudepigrapha and the Early Christians," *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren (ed. David E. Aune; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 75-91; J. A. Sint, *Pseudeonymität im Altertum, ihre Formen und ihre Gründe* (Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag, 1960). For a detailed bibliography cf. Metzger's article. Another helpful study is "Pseudonymity and Pseudepigrapha in Early Christian Literature," by E. J. Goodspeed, in his *New Chapters in New Testament Study* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), 169-188.

scholarship available to justify the claim that pseudonymity was an ancient literary device which is probably as old as literature itself. Nor does this phenomenon only appear in the non-canonical writing of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. In the New Testament, for example, while the authorship of 2 Peter is still defended in some circles,²⁵ it is quite widely conceded that this is a pseudonymous writing, possibly of the early second century.²⁶

In the case of the deutero-Pauline literature we need to conceive of an individual—possibly a pupil of Paul—who is assuming his master's name and who firmly believes that such a practice would in no way dishonour the apostle, God, or deceive his readers. Donald Guthrie is of the opinion that one needs to distinguish between canonical and non-canonical pseudepigrapha and finds difficulty in reconciling the concept with the inspiration, authority and canonicity of the new Testament documents.²⁷ Recourse, therefore, is often made to variations of the amanuensis theory which allows the writer greater freedom in composition but which still falls short of positing a deutero-Paulinist.

However, there appears to be no valid reason for believing that pseudonymity in early Christian epistolary literature is impossible and that it is contradictory to truthfulness. Bruce Metzger expresses this opinion in his helpful article when he states: "In short, since the use of the literary form of pseudepigrapha need not be regarded as necessarily involving fraudulent intent, it cannot be argued that the character of inspiration excludes the possibility of pseudepigrapha among the canonical writings."²⁸

32

4. Fourthly, there is the role of Paul's co-workers. It is possible that NT scholars have not recognized sufficiently the very active and creative role of Paul's co-workers, companions, or associates in the formation of the Pauline literature. As already indicated, there are recent studies which give Paul's secretary or amanuensis great freedom in composition—possibly composing with no more than the aid of the apostle's outline. This would certainly help to account for the variations in style, language and other characteristic "Paulinisms." E. E. Ellis, in his very provocative article, does a commendable job of categorizing the classes and function of Paul's co-workers, and goes so far as to suggest that some of these associates "may have had a literary role."²⁹

In the deutero-Pauline hypothesis this idea is carried to its logical conclusion. Now while it is not denied that Paul sanctioned some literary creativity of his co-workers, proponents of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis suggest that such a practice existed *both during his life and after the apostle's death*. In fact, the likelihood exists that Paul himself founded some kind of school of theology where his ideas were discussed but which continued to function even after his death. "We can understand the existence of the deutero-Pauline literature," claims Conzelmann,

²⁵ Cf. Guthrie, *Introduction*, 814-863.

²⁶ Marxsen, *Introduction*; Kümmel, *Introduction*.

²⁷ "Acts and Epistles in Apocryphal Writings," and "Pseudepigrapha."

²⁸ "Literary Forgeries," 31.

²⁹ "Paul and His Co-Workers," *NTS* 17 (1970-71), 452.

“only if we assume that Paul founded an actual school.”³⁰ Günther Bornkamm likewise thinks it inconceivable that Paul would not have been in constant communication with his co-workers on matters of theology “in which he was the pupil as well as the teacher”. “While the sources do not go into this,” he admits, “it is a necessary inference supported by analogy from the practice of contemporary pagan itinerant teachers in their teaching and schools, and certainly also from that of the Hellenistic synagogue.”³¹

The concept of “eine Schule des Paulus” has received considerable attention in the writings of Hans Conzelmann. In his “Paulus und die Weisheit,” where, among other things, he discusses a number of passages from Rom. and 1 Cor., Conzelmann argues that Paul organized a “Lehrbetrieb” where theology was practised as a schooling in Wisdom.³² This thesis has quite generally been accepted by contemporary Continental theologians. E. Lohse, for example, concludes that Col. “presupposes a Pauline school of tradition out of which the author comes and whose traditional, transmitted material he now formulates.”³³

The existence of such a school in which Pauline theology was discussed and in which the Pauline epistles were collected (?) and studied, and from which other epistles emerged which sought to relate Paul’s words to later historical and ecclesiastical situations is, indeed, an attractive theory. It must be kept in mind, however, that the pupils of the school were thoroughly acquainted with the principal themes of Paul’s theology and that they wanted to carry on the tradition that they had received from their master. In commenting upon the author of the Pastorals, for example, P. N. Harrison concludes: “He was, in my view, a devout, sincere and earnest Paulinist who set out to express in this familiar form what his readers really believed the Apostle would have said had he been still alive.”³⁴

The most likely place for such activity to be carried out is Ephesus, for it is here that Paul spent a significant amount of his time (2 years according to Acts 19: 10). The coming of the learned and eloquent Apollos to Ephesus (Acts 18: 24-8), the presence of John the Baptist’s *mathetai* (19: 1), as well as Paul’s daily lectures in the hall of Tyrannus (19: 9-10), also indicate that this city could be an important centre for theological education. All of this activity in Ephesus, notes Bornkamm, “. . . confirms that the city and its church became a centre for the mission in Asia Minor: here, too, Paul did not spare himself in caring for the churches he had previously founded.”³⁵

Goodspeed considered Ephesus to be the foremost centre of early Christian literary activity. “We have seen,” he summarizes,

. . . that Phoebe’s letter of introduction and the limited encyclical known to us as I Peter were addressed primarily to Ephesus; that at Ephesus, or in its circle, were written three

³⁰ “Luke’s Place in the Development of Early Christianity,” *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds. L. E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 307.

³¹ *Paul*, 86.

³² Art. cit. (p. 28, n.4), 233

³³ Commentary, 181; “Pauline Theology,” 218.

³⁴ “Important Hypotheses Reconsidered: III. Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles,” *ET* 67 (1955-56), 77.

³⁵ *Paul*, 82.

out of four of Paul's letters to Corinth, Luke's two-volume work known to us as Luke and Acts, the Revelation of John, the Seven Letters of Ignatius and the Letter of Polycarp, and finally the Gospel and Epistles of John.³⁶

Scholars (viz. Bornkamm, Conzelmann, Käsemann, and Lohse), who support the deutero-Pauline hypothesis, are quite unanimous in selecting Ephesus as the centre for such a Pauline school of theology.

In the above discussion we have attempted to show how the question of authorship, the perspectives of early catholicism, the practice of pseudonymity and the emergence of a Pauline school of theology, all contribute to the deutero-Pauline hypothesis. We now move on to consider the motives of the deutero-Paulinist and to extract, if possible, the essential characteristics of the deutero-Pauline literature.

II. THE MOTIVES OF THE DEUTERO-PAULINIST

In the preceding section reference was made to the negative and pejorative way some scholars view the motives of the deutero-Paulinist. Hence, it cannot be stated too categorically, that proponents of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis *do not* consider the writer of the deutero-Pauline literature a charlatan or an imposter. Rather, he is a sincere disciple of Paul who earnestly desires to communicate the message and the authority of his master to succeeding generations.

34

There is, however, a certain amount of disagreement as to how the deutero-Paulinist understood himself and his task. On the one hand, there are some who seem to imply that the author, because of his extensive borrowing from the Pauline epistles, had no intention of going beyond the thought of Paul. E. P. Sanders, for example, in reference to the literary dependency in Colossians, states: "These phrases show a later disciple of the apostle who wished to meet a new challenge as Paul would have done. . . He wished to say nothing other than what Paul himself would have said, and to that end he used Paul's own words."³⁷ And A. T. Hanson, although he acknowledges that the great bulk of the Pastorals is un-Pauline and comes from various sources, believes "that the author of the Pastorals had no theology of his own. He is a purveyor of other men's theology. . . and . . . the last thing the author. . . would have wanted to be was 'an original theologian'."³⁸

A majority of scholars, on the other hand, view the deutero-Paulinist as a theologian in his own right, yet wishing to remain true to the teaching of the Apostle. Indeed, such an understanding is necessitated by the changed conditions of the age to which the writer speaks and the strong theological differences between the Pauline and deutero-Pauline literature. W. L. Knox, in reference to the author of Ephesians, claims that the author, although he adheres closely to the thought and language of Paul, "is by no means a mere imitator; he understands his subject,

³⁶ E. J. Goodspeed, "The Place of Ephesus in Early Christianity," *New Chapters in New Testament Study* (New York: Macmillan, 1937) 38-9.

³⁷ "Literary Dependence in Colossians," *JBL* 85 (1966), 28-45.

³⁸ A. T. Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1968) 110-12. Cf. also J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), 414: "Tradition has not preserved any clue to his personality, as was not unnatural, since his pious aim was to sink himself in the greater personality of the apostle whose Spirit he sought to reproduce."

and where he has no model to guide him he shows himself capable of vigorous and original insight and clear expression."³⁹

Edward Lohse comes to a similar conclusion regarding the author of Colossians. "He was," affirms Lohse, "not a secretary, but an independently acting and judging theologian of Pauline stamp."⁴⁰ Even though the peculiarity of his language and style betray him as one schooled in Pauline theology, Colossians is not "a patchwork of individual passages from other Epistles."⁴¹ Under such a mind many Pauline concepts are either preserved, omitted, or undergo significant transformation. One must, perhaps, conceive of the deutero-Paulinist as existing between the tension of trying to be faithful to Paul and yet modifying Paul's theology to address new situations. Willi Marxsen sums this tension up well with respect to the author of Ephesians when he writes: "However, as he does not think of his account as a new revelation, but as an unfolding—of the earlier one made to Paul, he is acting entirely in good faith when he makes 'Paul' write this 'letter.' At that time this was by no means an unusual procedure, and we should therefore not judge it by our criteria."⁴²

The motives of the deutero-Paulinist may, for the sake of convenience, be divided into two categories, although it should be noted that there is some overlapping and that these motives may not be the same for each epistle.

1. First of all, it appears that the deutero-Pauline literature is a commendation of Paul to a later generation. Here we need to imagine a group of Paul's disciples who are not only interested in preserving Paul's teaching but who realize its permanent value and seek to commend it to the churches of a later generation. This principle of "commendation" can best be illustrated by using the epistle to the Ephesians as an example. Here, according to some, is a feasible solution to the long sought after *Sitz-im-Leben* or *raison d'être* of the epistle. In many ways it bears a striking resemblance to Goodspeed's reconstruction of the events that led up to the composition of the epistle, yet it makes some significant advances beyond it.

Ephesians, according to proponents of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis, is an attempt by the author to present a timely reaffirmation of the essentials of Paul's teaching to a later generation. The epistle, claims Mitton, "with its reiterated affirmations, pleas and exhortations, is entirely appropriate to the special needs of the second generation, and may even be said to become 'illuminated' if it is interpreted and addressed to them."⁴³

In assuming the name of his revered teacher, his purpose was, adds P. N. Harrison, "first, to glorify God (1,6.12.14), then to do honor not to himself but to Paul, by setting forth Paul's Gospel in such a way as would best help others to understand and believe it."⁴⁴ No one, however, has stated this aspect more

³⁹ W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: University Press, 1961), 263.

⁴⁰ "Pauline Theology," 218.

⁴¹ *Commentary*, 182.

⁴² *Introduction*, 197.

⁴³ C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), 242.

⁴⁴ "The Author of Ephesians," *Studia Evangelica*, 2 (1964), 601.

succinctly regarding Ephesians than F. W. Beare:

Ephesians is, and is meant by the author to be, a commendation of Paul's theology to the church of another generation. . . . The writer is confident that his readers can, as they read, perceive Paul's insight into the mystery of Christ. His interpretation will help them to understand Paul's writings, and to gain through them a deeper and wider comprehension of the gospel in its profoundest implications. We have the impression. . . . that he is seeking to bring out the permanent significance of something that is known, but not wholly understood and consequently not appreciated at its true worth.⁴⁵

2. Secondly, the deutero-Paulinist is motivated to appeal directly to the authority of Paul because of the church's confrontation with heresy and its attempt to establish "sound doctrine and practice." This is especially true of the Pastorals which were composed, according to Moffatt, "to enforce the continuity of apostolic doctrine and discipline against speculations which were threatening the deposit of the faith and the organization of the churches."⁴⁶ In this way post-Pauline problems are dealt with by an appeal to the apostolic authority represented by Paul. In these deutero-Pauline tracts, Paul's voice can still be heard and his authority is still valid even though the Christians are adjusting to changes that emerged because of the eschatological situation. Marxsen gives a helpful summary to this idea when he writes: "We can see the beginnings of an independent treatment of current questions in the Pastorals in the emphasis on the idea of tradition, and especially on the apostolic factor, which is still associated primarily with Paul. We can see this even from the literary aspect, in that Paul is claimed as the author of the letters."⁴⁷

36

Much the same can be said about the epistle to the Colossians where the heresy which was threatening the church is dealt with by an appeal to apostolic authority. Here the apostle's words are brought to bear on a new situation that has arisen in the church. "Just as Paul maintained his ties with his communities through letters, so also for his students the letter was the opportune form to be used in order to make binding positions and statements known to the communities."⁴⁸

III. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DEUTERO-PAULINE LITERATURE

The main characteristics or identifying features of the deutero-Pauline literature are tied closely to the motives which prompted their being written in the first place.

⁴⁵ F. W. Beare, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," *IB*, Vol. 10 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953) 388. See also J. Moffatt, *Introduction*: "To sum up. The cumulative force of the arguments already noted is in favor of a Paulinist, imbued with his master's spirit, who composed this homily in his name as Luke composed the Pauline speeches in Acts (either from a sense of what Paul would have said under the circumstances or from some basis in tradition.). From the writing of such speeches to the composition of an epistolary homily on the basis of an epistle like Colossians it was an easy step The writer designed his work to be read (3: 4) by the church as a manifesto of Paul's mind upon the situation; it was a pamphlet or tract for the times, insisting on the irenic needs of the church (like Acts) and on the duty of transcending the older schisms which had embittered the two sections of Christendom" (388).

⁴⁶ *Introduction*, 408.

⁴⁷ Marxsen, *Introduction*, 213.

⁴⁸ Lohse, *Commentary*, 181.

It is quite natural, therefore, that these letters reflect a heavy literary dependency upon the genuine epistles of Paul, that they make constant appeal to the apostle himself for their legitimacy and that any new teachings for the church conform to or are in harmony with the tradition of the apostle. Several other characteristics, however, have been noted and merit brief consideration.

First of all, there is the theme of tradition. Christians in the post-Pauline era are admonished to hold fast to what has been entrusted unto them (1 Tim. 6: 20) and not to depart from the faith (1 Tim. 4: 1); they have been given instructions, and appropriate ecclesiastical leaders have been appointed so they may know how to behave in the household of God, which is "the pillar and bulwark of truth" (1 Tim. 3: 15). Sound doctrine and legitimate office-bearers are the best defence against apostasy because these go back to the authority of the apostle himself. In other words, "the ordering of the Church as well as its doctrine and offices are in harmony with apostolic authority, for it is this that provides the Church with its decisive argument in the battle against the heretics."⁴⁹

Hans Conzelmann describes this post-Pauline development in the following manner:

. . . a new stage of *reflection* has been reached. There is tradition from the beginning. But now the nature of tradition is considered, in that men define their own position in it. . . . In this way the historicity of the church, its relationship to its origin, is maintained. In this way, too, criteria are gained: for the distinction of true and false doctrine; for the overcoming of the problem of eschatology; for the form of the church. . . the creed becomes *regula fidei*. The apostolic character is not only asserted, but laid down as a standard. . . .⁵⁰

37

Secondly, scholars often refer to the liturgical style and paraenetic structure of the deutero-Pauline literature, especially in Ephesians and Colossians. Recent studies by such men as Conzelmann,⁵¹ Käsemann,⁵² Schille,⁵³ Kirby,⁵⁴ Martin,⁵⁵ and Lohse,⁵⁶ have drawn attention to these characteristics and demonstrated their differences from the Pauline epistles.

Finally, there is the matter of theological development. These epistles, it is

⁴⁹ Marxsen, *Introduction*, 215.

⁵⁰ *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 292.

⁵¹ "Der Brief an die Epheser," *Die Kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus* (NTD, Vol. 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962).

⁵² Baptismal Liturgy, "Formeln: II. Liturgische Formeln im NT," *RGG*³, Vol. 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962) 993-96.

⁵³ G. Schille, *Liturgisches Gut im Epheserbrief*, Dissertation, Göttingen, 1953; Schille, *Frühchristliche Hymnen* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962).

⁵⁴ J. C. Kirby, *Ephesians: Baptism and Pentecost* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1968).

⁵⁵ R. P. Martin, "An Early Christian Hymn (Col. 1:15-20)," *EQ* 36 (1964), 195-205; Martin, "An Epistle in Search of a Life Setting," *ET* 79 (1967-68) 296-302; Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii, 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (SNTM 4; Cambridge: University Press, 1967).

⁵⁶ Especially his *Commentary*. See also J. T. Sanders, "Hymnic Elements in Ephesians 1-3." *ZNW* 56 (1965). 214-32.

claimed, represent a significant advancement over Paul in such areas as Christology, ecclesiology, anthropology, eschatology, sacramentalism (especially baptism) and the apostolate. These changes, we have noted, are a significant factor in the question of Pauline authorship as well.

Up to this point our discussion has touched briefly upon the motives of the deuterio-Paulinist and some of the main characteristics of the deuterio-Pauline literature. Another big question relates to the identity of this so-called "deuterio-Paulinist." Are we to think of *one* individual who is responsible for all the deuterio-Pauline literature? Or, is one to imagine the literature emerging from the "school of Paul" and thus the product of a number of minds? Or, more specifically, could different individuals be responsible for different epistles of the deuterio-Pauline corpus and are these individuals all associated with Paul and the school in the same way?

IV. THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE DEUTERIO-PAULINE LITERATURE

38 The problem of the authorship of the questionable epistles of Paul has always been an intriguing one. Since someone other than Paul has to be responsible for their composition, it is quite natural that a myriad of alternatives has appeared. Even scholars who do not identify these questionable epistles as the work of a deuterio-Paulinist or the product of the deuterio-Pauline school, are tempted to make certain proposals. Thus we have, for example, such a tantalizing suggestion by Goodspeed that Onesimus wrote Ephesians⁵⁷, or by H. von Campenhausen that Polycarp of Smyrna is the author of the Pastorals.⁵⁸

There is no unanimity of opinion regarding authorship among proponents of the deuterio-Pauline hypothesis. What these scholars agree upon, however, is the fact that this literature reflects the existence of a school in which Paul's letters—or fragments of Paul's correspondence—and theology were systematically studied but which extended the authority of their master to succeeding generations through their own body of literature which they wrote in the apostle's name. It is natural to expect that these would be the close friends, associates, and co-workers which are identified throughout the Pauline and deuterio-Pauline epistles. But it still remains a mystery of NT scholarship as to how many of these associates, apart from Paul's secretaries (cf. Rom. 16: 22), were involved in any literary activity during or after the apostle's life.

It must be kept in mind that there is a significant difference between the amanuensis and deuterio-Pauline theories even though the personalities may be the same in some cases. In the amanuensis theory the writer is considered as being in the employ of Paul and as writing either from the apostle's notes, a rough outline, or as taking down dictation. Linguistic and stylistic variations within the Pauline corpus are attributed to the differences between Paul and his secretary, but *Paul is still considered to be the author of the epistles which bear his name*. In the deuterio-Pauline hypothesis, however, we have the literary activity of individuals who are not writing at the personal request of Paul but who, after the apostle's death,

⁵⁷ *The Key to Ephesians* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956), v-xvi.

⁵⁸ "Polycarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe," in *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1963) 197-252.

reconstruct their letters from Paul's epistles—and from their memory—in order to interpret, re-interpret and apply his theology to new situations in the post-apostolic period.

Bornkamm, after a brief discussion on the theology of the Pastorals, concludes that Paul could not have been the author of these letters. "He could not have dictated them, nor could he have communicated what he wanted to say to a 'secretary' by word of mouth, leaving the secretary free to write it up later and give it its final form. The difference in outlook and theology is too obvious and the condition of the church, its constitution and tendencies, all point to a later date."⁵⁹

It would appear that the author, or should one say the authors, who are responsible for the deutero-Pauline literature—and possibly also for certain redactions and interpolations of the Pauline *Hauptbriefe*—would have been close personal associates of Paul as well as having access to Paul's correspondence. Out of the many possibilities, the most likely individuals are usually narrowed down to Timothy, Tychicus and Luke.

Timothy is certainly a likely candidate because of his long and close association with Paul. Many have suggested that he is Paul's amanuensis and is responsible for the final drafts of Ephesians, Colossians and the Pastorals⁶⁰. But the same circumstances would also qualify him for membership in Paul's school and thus make him a fitting contributor to the deutero-Pauline correspondence. This is even more possible if B. H. Streeter's suggestion that Timothy settled permanently in Ephesus after Paul's death has any validity.⁶¹

Tychicus is also known as Paul's "beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow servant in the Lord" (Col. 1: 7) who is closely associated with the missionary work of Paul and, according to 2 Tim. 4: 12, was sent to Ephesus to carry out some kind of Christian activity. J. Jeremias has identified him as the amanuensis of the Pastorals⁶² and F. F. Bruce and W. L. Knox indicate a likely involvement in the composition of Ephesians⁶³. W. L. Knox, although he refrains from making a specific identification, suggests that in Eph. 6: 21 the allusion to Tychicus "may be a thinly veiled statement of the author's identity"⁶⁴ Knox, in contrast to Bruce, moves beyond the idea of amanuensis by referring to the author as "The Ephesian Continuator." One of the most forthright statements in this respect, however, comes from the pen of C. L. Mitton:

May it not be that at the time when the epistle was written Tychicus was still living as an old man in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, and was known both to the author and

⁵⁹ *The NT*, 115.

⁶⁰ F. F. Bruce, *The Letters of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965); John Gunther, *Paul: Messenger and Exile* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1972); R. Scott, *The Pauline Epistles* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).

⁶¹ B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London: Macmillan, 1929), 104-5. Streeter goes on to suggest that "Timothy would have virtually stepped into the place of Paul, and found himself in a position of acknowledged supremacy over other officers of the local church" (105).

⁶² J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (NTD, Vol. 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1953), 8.

⁶³ Bruce, *Letters*, 10; Knox, *St. Paul*, 203.

⁶⁴ *St. Paul*, 203.

to the Christians of that area; that the proposal to write the epistle in Paul's name was submitted to his judgement and gained his consent, and that his approval of the finished work as a worthy presentation of Paul's message was indicated by the inclusion of Paul's earlier reference to him as "a faithful minister", well able to represent Paul? If so, then this epistle comes to us as a kind of authorized reaffirmation of the Pauline message.⁶⁵

While this does not make Tychicus the author it does at least, indicate that he is directly involved in the publication of the epistle to the Ephesians.

There remains one more candidate for our consideration—namely Luke, and it is he who is most closely linked to the deutero-Pauline tradition. Luke's association with Paul is well known and needs no elaboration at this point. Recent studies on Luke/Acts have drawn attention to the significance of this individual for the development of Christian thought and generally concede that Luke's theology, in spite of certain differences from Paul, is to be considered as a further development of Pauline thought.

Ph. Vielhauer's article "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," for example, "poses the question whether and to what extent the author of Acts took over and passed on theological ideas of Paul, whether and to what extent he modified them."⁶⁶ Vielhauer concludes that Luke distinguishes himself from Paul and early Christian tradition with respect to the return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the imminent end of the world and the concept of history. In other words, Luke is a representative of the early catholic church. If such a picture of Luke is correct, argues O. Betz, "This means that Luke is no longer understood as the spiritual follower of Paul, but as the forerunner of Church Fathers like Ignatius and Irenaeus, or Tertullian and Cyprian."⁶⁷

Such a picture of Luke coincides beautifully with some of the characteristics that we have noted regarding the deutero-Pauline epistles. It is not unnatural, therefore, that Luke has been nominated as the author of this literature.

The many significant parallels between the writings of Luke and Ephesians have led such scholars as E. Käsemann and R. P. Martin to affirm the Lucan authorship of the epistle to the Ephesians.⁶⁸ Others have long affirmed that Luke was the amanuensis of Paul who is responsible for writing the Pastorals.⁶⁹ But is it not also possible that Luke is *more* than an amanuensis? Could he not be, as Martin

⁶⁵ *Ephesians*, 268.

⁶⁶ Ph. Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," *SLA*, 33.

⁶⁷ Otto Betz, "The Kerygma of Luke," *Int.* 22 (1968), 131.

⁶⁸ E. Käsemann, "Ephesians and Acts," *SLA*, 288-297; R. P. Martin, "An Epistle in Search of a Life-Setting."

⁶⁹ See P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: University Press, 1921), where he refers to a number of older sources which claim Lucan authorship although he himself does not consider this as possibility (52-3); C. F. D. Moule, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles," 438ff.; Moule, Excursus II "Luke and the Pastoral Epistles," in his *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1962), 220-21; Moffatt, *Introduction*, 414; F. A. Strobel, "Schreiben des Lukas? Zum Sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe," *NTS* 15 (1968-69), 191-210. For a critique of Strobel cf. N. Brox, "Lukas als Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe?" *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 13 (1970) 62-77. In *The Faithful Sayings in the Pastoral Letters*

suggests, "an extraordinary literary artist. . . the New Testament theologian of *ecclesia una sancta catholica et apostolica*?"⁷⁰

Naturally there are difficulties with such a proposal. The supposition that Luke is a representative of early catholicism needs to be, and rightly has been, criticized in several circles.⁷¹ However, even if we deny Luke such an extensive place in early catholicism, it still remains true that much of his theology is a developed Paulinism and corresponds to the general teaching of the deutero-Paulines. It is not unlikely, therefore, that he fits into this period of post-Pauline Christianity from which emerged a new corpus of apostolic literature and for which he *may* be responsible.

CONCLUSION

With this observation we terminate our discussion of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis. Our investigation has led us to consider the essential factors upon which the hypothesis is founded; we have discussed attempts at identifying the author(s) and his motives for writing; and finally, we have examined briefly the main characteristics of the deutero-Pauline literature.

It is obvious that the deutero-Pauline hypothesis is built upon many presuppositions and that these presuppositions, in turn, need to be examined more closely. Some of these areas for further exploration include:

1. The question of authorship. And even though this issue may never be settled to the satisfaction of everyone, proponents of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis need to examine their alternative to Pauline authorship very carefully.

2. The principle of early catholicism. Much of the deutero-Pauline hypothesis rests upon the assumption that the deutero-Pauline literature reflects the characteristics of early catholicism. This principle needs to be re-examined in the light of recent criticisms that have been made against it.

3. A comprehensive study in redaction criticism is needed for Paul. It should be investigated whether the redactions and/or interpolations in Paul's genuine letters could also be the result of this "school of theology" and whether these pupils of Paul are also responsible for the final editing of such epistles as 2 Corinthians and Philippians.

4. The deutero-Pauline epistles themselves need to be examined more closely for their similarities and differences. 2 Thessalonians, for example, does not have the same concerns as Ephesians, Colossians or the Pastorals. In what way, then, is it

41

(Kampen: J. H. Kok N. V., 1968), G. W. Knight indicates that Luke is the type of person that one could expect to preserve these "faithful sayings." Luke, claims Knight, "perhaps more than any other candidate for the amanuensis of the Pastoral Letters, would have had an eye and an ear for faithful sayings. Luke as an amanuensis may thus also help explain the presence of faithful sayings in the Pastorals" (151). For additional information on the relationship between Paul and Luke see Markos A. Siotis, "Luke the Evangelist as St. Paul's Collaborator", *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, Oscar Cullmann zum 70 Geburtstag (eds. H. Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972) 105-111.

⁷⁰ "An Epistle in Search of a Life-Setting," 302.

⁷¹ For such criticisms cf. A. T. Hanson, *Studies*, 116ff.; Conzelmann, *SLA*, 308; Betz, "The Kerygma of Luke," 131-146; L. Morris, "Luke and Early Catholicism," 121-36; I. H. Marshall "Early Catholicism in the New Testament."

to be identified as the product of the school? Further, is the same author responsible for all these epistles or are we to conceive of various authors writing independently and/or in consultation with one another?

5. Many of the objections to the deuterio-Pauline hypothesis need to be taken seriously. While most of these relate to the question of authorship and early catholicism, we do have to ask whether the type of reconstruction suggested by proponents of the deuterio-Pauline hypothesis is any less problematic than existing theories which try to make sense out of the difficulties surrounding the life of the apostle and his literary activity. One is still puzzled about the many personal allusions to Paul and the circumstances surrounding his life as well as the commendation of certain individuals in these letters, viz. the reference to the cloak, books and parchments in 2 Tim. 4: 13 or the importance of Epaphras in Colossians.⁷²

All of this research may have done no more than to confirm the fact that the deuterio-Pauline hypothesis is only an hypothesis, or, at best, a convenient concept into which the questionable epistles of Paul are placed. In spite of certain difficulties, however, we need to view it as a serious attempt to reconstruct that "grey area" in the period of church history in which the church, after the apostle Paul's death, was struggling to clarify its mission and message to the world.

⁷² Donald Guthrie provides some thoughtful challenges to the deuterio-Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, cf. his *Introduction*, 584-634.