

The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul

Donald Guthrie

The Tyndale New Testament Lecture, 1955

***This lecture was delivered in Cambridge on
July 8th, 1955, at a meeting arranged by the
Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research***

[p.3]

No-one can seriously entertain a study of this problem without being acutely aware that the many differing opinions which have been advanced during the last century and a half make it difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at any solution which would convince every school of thought. Although it is beyond our present scope to give more than a general classification of opinions, such classification is necessary to serve as a background for any investigation of the psychological issues with which we shall be more particularly concerned.

The traditional approach is to accept the Epistles as authentic works and, generally speaking, to relate them to the period immediately subsequent to the Acts record, necessitating the embracing of the second Roman imprisonment theory.¹ A modification of the traditional approach is the view that the substance of the Epistles is genuinely Pauline but their present form is the work of an editor who 'arranged' the notes shortly after Paul's death.² Another modification is the view that Timothy and Titus themselves edited the Pauline material, which they had collected, and published the three letters after Paul's death.³

The earliest serious reaction against the traditional view came from Schleiermacher (1807), who may be termed the precursor of the Fictional Approach which found its ablest advocates in F. C. Baur (1835) and H. J. Holtzmann (1880) and has been more recently embraced in the work of Martin Dibelius (1931). According to this view the Epistles are entirely pseudonymous,

[p.4]

and all the personal allusions are fictitious devices to create the impression of genuine Pauline authorship. The general dating of the Epistles by this school of thought is the first half of the second century. It is worthy of note that 'what we know of Paul' must be restricted to a portion of the traditional Pauline writings (e.g. in Baur's opinion only the four 'great' Epistles were Paul's work).

¹ J. V. Bartlet contended that the three letters could be fitted into the Acts history, so obviating the need to postulate a Roman release theory. See *The Expositor*, Series VIII, Vol. v. (1913), pp. 28-36, 161-167, 256-263, 325-347.

² See F. J. Badcock, *The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews in their Historical Setting* (1937), pp. 115-133.

³ See A. C. Deane, *St. Paul and His Letters* (1942), pp. 208-220.

The third approach, which has commended itself to many scholars since the time of Credner (1836) and of which the most able modern advocates have been P. N. Harrison (1921) and B. S. Easton (1948), adopts a mediating position by admitting the use of genuine Pauline fragments by an admirer of Paul in the early part of the second century. We shall call their theory, for convenience, the Fragment Approach.

Our main problem will be to discover which of these approaches presents the soundest psychological explanation of the phenomena observable in the Pastorals. All scholars recognize the serious problems confronting the traditional view (not least its own advocates), but the psychological problems involved in the alternative views have not generally been explored. It will be our primary purpose, therefore, to examine what psychological difficulties are found in accepting the Pauline authorship of these Epistles and then to make a comparison with other theories, particularly with the Fragment Approach.

One preliminary investigation needs to be made affecting our method of procedure. We must ask the question, what are our data for assessing the mind of Paul? Are we to appeal only to the great evangelical Epistles as the Tübingen school insisted? This idea has long since been discounted because it was based too narrowly on purely subjective considerations. Yet some of the after-effects of this radical criticism are found in much of the modern approach to the Pastoral Epistles. First exclude them from the Pauline Corpus as disputed books; then regard the remainder as the sole source of data for the 'mind of Paul as we know it'; next extract the dissimilarities between this and what we discover from the disputed books; and finally conclude that the disputed books cannot be Pauline. But it will be seen that the conclusion is assumed in the first premiss and the logical

[p.5]

validity of this method must, therefore, be questioned. It is also psychologically unsatisfactory because it involves an arbitrary selection of data for defining the mind of Paul.

In the case of writings like the Pastoral Epistles which at least claim to be written by Paul and which were clearly accepted as Pauline by the overwhelming testimony of external attestation, the only scientific procedure would seem to be to accept them as Pauline until such time as they are conclusively proved otherwise. But this will clearly affect our estimate of 'what we know of Paul', for the data of all thirteen letters must be collated and examined to discover whether it is possible to consider them as a psychological unity. Or, to state the matter differently, we must consider what kind of Paul is presented in all the Pauline Corpus (including these three Epistles) and then to determine whether this picture is a psychological probability. Quite obviously our conception of 'what we know of Paul' will be conditioned by our presuppositions; but there is no logical justification for assuming (as, for instance, Dr. Harrison tends to do) that the liberal approach of excluding the Pastorals from our presuppositions is any more scientific than the traditional method of including them.

Our plan of procedure, therefore, will be to demonstrate, not only the psychological 'possibility' or 'probability' of the Paul presented by the thirteen letters, but also to show the psychological problems involved in any pseudonymous explanation of the Pastoral Epistles.

The Paul of the Pastorals

We must, of necessity, restrict our investigations to those considerations which have a specifically psychological character and this will mean concentrating mainly on matters of language and doctrine. The historical problems (as in the personal allusions and the ecclesiastical situation) tend to fall into their proper perspective only when these other problems have first been decided, and will, therefore, find little place in our investigations. Most modern scholars admit the major objections to Pauline authorship are linguistic and dogmatic. The primary purpose we have thus set ourselves is to define as precisely as possible in

[p.6]

what ways an inclusion of the Pastorals in the Pauline Corpus contributes to our psychological understanding of the man himself.

(a) *An Enlarged Vocabulary*

The linguistic problem of these Epistles has played a major part in both the fictional and fragment approaches, while every traditionalist since the time of Schleiermacher has felt himself obliged, to a greater or lesser extent, to deal with these linguistic objections. So much has been written about the Pastoral Hapaxes that it must be the wish of every scholar of whatever shade of opinion to say as little as possible concerning them. Unfortunately the problem cannot be lightly dismissed since it still forms the real crux of the wider authenticity problem. Dr. P. N. Harrison's great contribution to the subject, *The Problem of the Pastorals*, has become established as a classic treatment of the problem from the point of view of those denying authenticity to the whole Epistles, and no serious advocate of Pauline authorship can ignore his detailed and seemingly exhaustive analysis.

If the Pastorals are included in the Pauline Corpus, it means, as Dr. Harrison has pointed out, that these Epistles are dissimilar linguistically from the earlier group. According to Dr. Harrison's calculations the accepted Paulines contain an average number of Hapaxes per page varying from 3.3 for 2 Thessalonians to 6.2 for Philippians, whereas the corresponding figures for the Pastorals vary from 12.9 to 16.1. If we judge such a matter as this on the grounds of arithmetic alone, it is clear that the Pastorals do not belong to the same mathematical group. But the question naturally arises whether such a matter ought to be decided on arithmetical grounds, and it is significant that many modern scholars who dispute the authenticity are not inclined to place as much weight as formerly on this method. Dr. Martin Dibelius, for example, agrees that the statistical method is insufficient for disputing the authenticity.⁴ This modern trend should certainly put us on our guard against allowing too much weight to Dr.

[p.7]

⁴ *Die Pastoralbriefe* (1931), p. 2—'Aber gerade die neuere Debatte hat gezeigt, dass diese statistische Methode zur Bestreitung der Echtheit nicht ausreicht.'

Harrison's contentions, but since his conclusions have gained wide acceptance it is necessary to examine them with some care.⁵

The real problem for our present purpose is whether it is psychologically possible for Paul to display such an unprecedented variety of new words in proportion to the length of the letters. Dr. Harrison, following Holtzmann and others, has maintained that 'what we know of Paul' renders it impossible to conceive that the same mind could have written the Pastorals. His contentions may be summed up in the following words: 'To discard suddenly at the end of a lifetime such a host of favourite expressions, and introduce in their stead such a mass of new and unfamiliar terms, might indicate a certain kind of versatility, but not the kind which we have any reason for attributing to the apostle.'⁶ Now Dr. Harrison has here pronounced a psychological judgment, but an examination of his line of argument will show that the only data brought forward in support are mathematical. Paul's working vocabulary (i.e. as seen in the other ten Epistles), he claims, can be described with precision. He therefore assumes that it should be possible to calculate with equal precision what vocabulary Paul would have used in any subsequent letters. The basic assumption here is clearly that any man's vocabulary can be mathematically predicted from his existing works, but such an assumption must be subjected to wider investigation.

That there appears to be a fallacy in this assumption may be demonstrated by an appeal to other literary analogies. Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock⁷ quotes, for instance, the results of Dr. Purser's examination of Cicero's works as illustrating the unreliability of this statistical method. The number of Hapaxes per page varied from four in the oratorical works to twenty-five in the philosophical. Two interesting observations may be made on

[p.8]

the basis of this evidence. The first is that the subject-matter and the purpose of writing appear to have a direct bearing on the vocabulary; and the second is that no amount of mathematical calculation could have predicted the working vocabulary of one group of writings by means of the other. But does anyone seriously doubt that one mind was capable of such remarkable variation? Rather we would suggest that the great variation in vocabulary in the case of Cicero is a measure of the greatness of his mind. But Dr. Harrison appears to think otherwise of Paul. Although assuring us that he has 'no wish to impose an arbitrary cast-iron standard on any human mind, least of all on Paul's mind,'⁸ he nevertheless seems to 'base his arguments on such a standard, involved as it is in his words-per-page calculations. If, of course, he could provide abundant supporting evidence that the kind of mathematical calculations which he uses are a safe guide in psychological questions, his standard would cease to have an arbitrary character.'⁹

⁵ Dr. Harrison, however, in an article published since this lecture was delivered, reconsidering his hypothesis still places great emphasis on mathematical calculations in establishing linguistic affinities. He claims as a confirmation of his own position 'the inability even of those who reject this hypothesis to deny the facts on which it rests' (*Expository Times*, Dec. 1955, pp. 77 ff.). But the main criticism against Dr. Harrison's theory is not the facts but the inferences which he draws from these.

⁶ *Problem of the Pastorals*, p. 46.

⁷ J.T.S., xxx, (1929), p. 278.

⁸ *op cit.*, p. 46.

⁹ In his recent article in *The Expository Times* (Dec. 1955), pp. 77-81, Dr. Harrison pays no attention to the criticism which has been levelled against his theory from this point of view.

Now, if the Pastorals are considered to be a part of the Pauline Corpus, our approach will be different from that of Dr. Harrison, for we shall take it for granted that Paul's 'working vocabulary' was, at least, 2,483 words instead of the 2,177 words which he allows. This in itself does not appear to present any particular psychological difficulty, provided some reasonable explanation can be given for the use of the additional less usual words. Many conservative scholars have shown that new subject-matter is responsible for a great majority of the new words (as, for instance, Parry¹⁰), while others have argued that a different environment is responsible for the increase in Latinity observable in some of the new words (as Montgomery Hitchcock,¹¹ and E. K. Simpson¹²). Are these perfectly valid attempts to account for observed psycho-

[p.9]

logical data, or are they 'so much special pleading', to quote Dr. A. M. Hunter's¹³ summing up of the conservative reply to Dr. Harrison's arguments?

In any case Dr. P. N. Harrison agrees that the 2,177 words found in the ten Pauline Epistles do not represent the apostle's entire vocabulary. At the same time he adds, 'The number of Greek words known to Paul, though considerable... was not by any means unlimited.'¹⁴ All would agree with this statement, but it does not seem to support the refusal to allow Paul the use of a further 306 words in his 'working' vocabulary. Such a refusal could only be deemed psychologically justified if adequate reasons could be produced to show that Paul could not have known them. Admittedly Dr. Harrison has claimed that the language of the Pastorals belongs to the milieu of the second century and not the first, and if this were proved beyond question it would weigh heavily against the authenticity of the Pastorals. But has Dr. Harrison proved his point? Dr. A. M. Hunter refers to the 'almost bewildering wealth of statistics and graphs'¹⁵ with which Dr. Harrison supports his argument, and it cannot be denied that his mathematically presented case against the authenticity of the Pastorals produces the impression of the psychological impossibility of attributing these Epistles to the mind of Paul.

An examination of the evidence, however, confirms the view that Dr. Harrison has sought to prove too much. Both Dr. Hitchcock and Dr. Badcock have shown that the majority of the non-Pauline words in the Pastorals were known in the time of Paul. Dr. Hitchcock,¹⁶ for instance, argues that only 28 of the 306 words are unknown in other writings prior to A.D. 50. Even Dr. Harrison¹⁷ admits that there are only ten of these non-Pauline words for which we have no other record previous to the second century, but he lays great stress on the increasing frequency of

[p.10]

¹⁰ *The Pastoral Epistles* (1920), pp. cxi-cxxvi.

¹¹ 'Latinity in the Pastorals', *Expository Times*, xxxix (1927-1928), pp. 347-352.

¹² *The Pastoral Epistles* (1954), pp. 20, 21.

¹³ *Interpreting the New Testament* (1951), p. 64.

¹⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 46.

¹⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹⁶ J.T.S., xxx, (1929), p. 278.

¹⁷ See his review of C. Spicq's book *Les Épîtres Pastorales* in J.T.S., XLIX (1948), p. 208.

many of these 306 words in second-century writers as compared with first-century writers.¹⁸ Now it may be true that many of the Hapaxes, for instance, are found very frequently in second-century secular writers, but the same could be demonstrated for the vocabulary of the 'genuine' Paulines. What is more to the point is Dr. Harrison's use of second-century ecclesiastical writings to provide a basis for his argument that the writer of the Pastorals speaks the language of second-century Christian writers.

There are, in fact, 60 of the Pastoral Hapaxes which are found in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, but 28 of these are also Hapaxes in these latter writings. (See Appendix A.) When the Apologists are appealed to by Dr. Harrison 32 more of the Hapaxes are found, of which 16 occur once only. (See Appendix B.) Combining these two collections of second-century writings, we discover that out of the 92 Hapaxes found in one or both groups of second-century writings, no fewer than 32 occur in the whole range of these writings once only. It is difficult to see how these words, at least, can be construed as evidence for the working vocabulary of the second century, if it is denied that the Pastoral Hapaxes could be evidence for the working vocabulary of the first century. It is, moreover, significant that of the 175 Hapaxes in Dr. Harrison's lists no more than 17 are in fact used in more than one writer of the Apostolic Fathers, the period to which Dr. Harrison specifically designates the Epistles. In view of these facts, it is difficult to see how Dr. Harrison is justified in his statement that 'one word in every four throughout the Pastorals, 211 out of 848, while foreign so far as we know to the vocabulary of Paul, is now proved to form part of the working vocabulary of Christian writers between the years A.D. 95 and 170—including many words which recur with some frequency in these writers.'¹⁹ It will be seen that Dr. Harrison's contention is

[p.11]

based on two questionable assumptions, firstly that Paul's vocabulary must be indicated by the other ten letters attributed to him, and secondly that a large number of Hapaxes and words, infrequently used in the second century, can be claimed to 'prove' the working vocabulary of that period. There is also in this method of argument the problem of determining to what extent, if any, the second-century writers were indebted to the Pastorals for these parallel uses of words. We suggest,' therefore, that there is no scientific basis for the contention that the language of the Pastorals belongs to the second century.

In case this statement should appear to be no more than a subjective opinion, it may be further shown by way of corroboration that, on Dr. Harrison's basis of procedure, the accepted Paulines are as much and in some cases more aligned with second-century language than the Pastorals. It is true that Dr. Harrison²⁰ makes a comparison between the 70.9 per cent of Pauline words in the Apostolic Fathers and the 78.3 per cent of the Pastorals' words in a

¹⁸ In his recent article Dr. Harrison further elaborates this point by contrasting the fact that, while only five of these words occur in the earlier period (i.e. taking account of all Greek literature before Josephus) which do not occur in the later, 'nearly a score of these words appear in writers of our period, some of them in several different authors, and in these repeatedly, but not, so far as I can discover, in any writing prior to A.D. 90.' (*Expository Times*, December 1955, p. 79). N.B. In the same article Dr. Harrison corrects the number of non-Pauline words from 306 to 305.

¹⁹ *op. cit.*, p. 73.

²⁰ *op. cit.*, p. 74.

similar category, but he omits to give the percentages for the genuine Paulines. Colossians and Ephesians, e.g. have 85.6 per cent and 86.2 per cent respectively in common with the Apostolic Fathers, which will, at least, cause us to receive Dr. Harrison's inferences with some reserve. (See Appendix D for full details.) An even more startling result is obtained when the Apologists are also included, for the percentage number of words in the separate Paulines found also in the ecclesiastical writings of the second century range from 87.6 per cent to 96.2 per cent, whereas for the Pastorals the figure is 86.7 per cent. Only one conclusion is possible from these figures, i.e. that the major part of the Pauline and Pastorals' language is the current language of both first and second centuries. If this be so there can be no barrier as far as language is concerned to prevent our attributing them to Paul himself. There seems to be no psychological reason why Paul could not have known and used these particular words.

Another important line of evidence in the linguistic discussion is the LXX. It is a pity that Dr. Harrison minimizes this to such an extent that he dismisses it in fourteen lines concluding with the

[p.12]

statement: 'And the fact that a given word, or group of words, is known and its meaning understood, does not at once prove that it is likely to be used, by a given author, or at a certain time. Nor can it be conceded as self-evident that Paul must have been familiar with every Greek word in the LXX and Apocrypha.'²¹ Dismissal of such evidence seems hardly justified in view of Dr. Harrison's extensive use of extra-Biblical parallels. When, in fact, we examine this LXX evidence we find it to be somewhat adverse to Dr. Harrison's claims. Of the 92 Hapaxes previously mentioned as being found in second-century writings no fewer than 56 are found in the LXX (see Appendix A and B), and it is significant that these include all the words which Dr. Harrison claims as being most frequent in second-century ecclesiastical writers. Of the total number of Pastoral Hapaxes, 78 are found in the LXX, i.e. 18 more than in the Apostolic Fathers. Clearly this evidence cannot be ignored in view of the wide acquaintance of Paul and his contemporaries with the Greek Scriptures. We conclude, therefore, that it is psychologically probable that Paul was well acquainted with these words.

(b) A Different Style

We come next to a problem which is admitted by most scholars to form a greater obstacle to the authenticity of the Epistles than the vocabulary. As Dr. A. M. Hunter, for instance, has expressed it, 'We might find reasons for the appearance of some 300 new words (out of a total of nearly 900); but how are we to explain the fact that "the connective tissue" (particles, etc.—a very subtle test of style) is clearly not Paul's?'²² Consequently, any traditional re-statement of the case must face this charge squarely and explore whether any satisfactory answer can be given.

Dr. Harrison²³ gives an impressive list of 112 particles, prepositions and pronouns, etc., which appear in the Paulines but are excluded from the Pastorals. He invites the reader to 'Consider

²¹ *op. cit.*, p. 66. In his recent article Dr. Harrison again gives no serious attention to the evidence of the LXX as affecting the validity of his hypothesis.

²² *op. cit.*, p. 64.

²³ *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 37.

the balance of probability against such a contingency as the traditional theory requires us to accept—viz, that within a very

[p.13]

few years we should find the same writer producing three Epistles without once happening to use a single word in all that list—one or other of which has hitherto appeared on the average nine times to every page that Paul ever wrote.’ Apart from the fact that Dr. Harrison is here again depending for the force of his argument on the assumption that whatever Paul wrote must be equated to the ten other Paulines, his argument is further weakened by his omissions. His list of 112 particles etc., not in the Pastorals, needs to be balanced by those which are in the Pastorals if a true account of style is to be obtained. Dr. Harrison mentions these other particles, etc., but dismisses them as a counterbalance to his own data on the grounds that they all also occur in the Apostolic Fathers and that most of those that occur in all three Pastorals occur also in all the accepted Paulines.²⁴ But this would seem to do less than justice to the evidence as the following data will show.

A list of 93 particles, pronouns, prepositional forms, etc., of which all but one (ὄν) appear in the Pastoral Epistles, will be found in Appendix E. Since all but 7 of these words are Pauline it is important to add these to Dr. Harrison’s list in order to gain a complete picture of Pauline style. Considering the figures for the separate Pauline Epistles we find that of these 93 words, 73 are in Romans, 70 in 1 Corinthians, 60 in 2 Corinthians, 64 in Galatians, 54 in Ephesians, 57 in Philippians, 46 in Colossians, 46 in 1 Thessalonians, 45 in 2 Thessalonians, and 32 in Philemon. For the separate Pastorals the figures are 73 in 1 Timothy, 61 in 2 Timothy and 43 in Titus.

If we next add to these figures those of Dr. Harrison’s list we arrive at the following position. Of the total of 205, Romans has 131, 1 Corinthians 139, 2 Corinthians 113, Galatians 107, Ephesians 76, Philippians 86, Colossians 64, 1 Thessalonians 73, 2 Thessalonians 57, Philemon 44, and the Pastorals 92. It will be seen, therefore, that the Pastorals compare favourably with the other Paulines in the variety of Pauline particles, etc., which are used, and consequently Dr. Harrison’s deductions from the connective tissue would seem to be invalid.

It must, of course, be admitted that a greater number of these 93 additional forms are found in five or more Pauline Epistles

[p.14]

than is the case with Dr. Harrison’s 112, but there is no justification for assuming that these words are so common that no writer could write without using them, as the figures for the separate Paulines clearly indicate. It may further be claimed that these 93 forms occur with much greater frequency in the Paulines than those in Dr. Harrison’s list (e.g. 30 of them occur more than 50 times in the ten Paulines), but may it not be a valid inference from this that the mere quantity of those appearing in the latter list is not as significant as Dr. Harrison would have us believe? Clearly what is characteristic of Pauline usage must take account of both frequent and less frequent expressions, but Dr. Harrison’s exclusion of the frequent

²⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 38.

expressions does not appear to be based on their frequency but on their presence in the Pastorals.

It is not possible on the other hand to pass by these additional words on the grounds that they are found in the Apostolic Fathers for of Dr. Harrison's own list all but 21 are present in these later writings. These particles, etc., would seem, therefore, to be mostly the general usage of both first and second centuries. This is not, of course, to deny that Paul had a characteristic style, but to question whether 'connective tissue' can be mathematically assessed. It may, at least, be claimed that if particles, prepositions, pronouns, etc., are a true test of style, there is nothing in the style of the Pastorals which makes it impossible to attribute them to the Apostle Paul.

Undoubtedly linguistic style is very much a question of mood, for it is not to be expected that a writer of such a psychological nature as Paul would be stereotyped in this respect and considerable allowance must be made for the intense emotional influences on him as he writes. We shall not expect, for instance, to find the same particles, etc., used in the more reasoned letter to the Romans as in the more impassioned letter to the Galatians, although both deal with kindred themes. There are, in fact, only 25 of Dr. Harrison's list of 112 which are common to both. In the case of the closely connected Ephesians and Colossians the common particles, etc., in Dr. Harrison's list number only 6. Changes of 'style' within the ten Paulines are, in fact, not rare, but rather normal.

[p.15]

It has frequently been pointed out that many of the words in question are found only in rhetorical passages of the accepted Paulines, and since the subject matter of the Pastorals does not lend itself to rhetorical treatment, such particles, etc., are inevitably absent. Dr. Newport White²⁵ cites a list of 24 characteristic Pauline particles, the majority of which are in the four great Epistles, but very few of which are, for instance, in the Captivity Epistles. This focuses attention on the fact that subject-matter exerts a powerful influence not only on vocabulary but also on style.

Another psychological reason for stylistic changes is the advance of old age. C. Spicq²⁶ has produced cogent reasons for regarding the linguistic peculiarities of the Pastorals as due to linguistic evolution, which is traceable in other strongly cultivated personalities such as Plato, Schiller, Goethe, Shakespeare, Corneille and Victor Hugo. Mr. E. K. Simpson²⁷ illustrates the same point from Tennyson and Milton. In view of these parallels it would not appear to be psychologically impossible for the Apostle Paul to show similar variations.

(c) A Less Dynamic Approach

Most scholars denying the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals consider the general approach of the writer to be incompatible with the 'creative' Paul. Now Spicq²⁸ is surely right in maintaining that the psychology of the writer of the Pastorals is the psychology of an old man. To this fact he attributes the frequent return to events in his earlier life, e.g. the account of the

²⁵ *Expositor's Greek Testament* (1910), Vol. iv, p. 71.

²⁶ *Les Épîtres Pastorales* (1948), p. xci.

²⁷ *The Pastoral Epistles* (1954), pp. 15, 16.

²⁸ *op. cit.*, pp. lxxxix ff.

conversion of the 'blasphemer' (1 Tim. i. 12-17), the reference to the early persecutions in Antioch, Iconium and Lystra (2 Tim. iii. 11), etc. He is not now creative but reminiscent, a change which accords perfectly with the psychological approach of an ageing man.

[p.16]

Again, the writer is concerned about stability of doctrine and is somewhat anxious about the capability of his younger confederate Timothy, both of which are traits which accord with advancing years and which are certainly what we should expect if the traditional explanation of the Pastorals is true. Whatever view of the authorship problem is held, it cannot be denied that the relationship portrayed between the writer and Timothy and Titus is consistent with the Apostle Paul writing at the end of his life to his closest associates.

But the problem still remains to be answered whether a man so 'creative' as Paul could have changed as completely as appears from the Pastoral Epistles. It may be that there has been too much emphasis on the early creativeness of Paul, for he undoubtedly owed a great deal to the primitive *kerugma*, as Prof. C. H. Dodd has shown.²⁹ It is, at least, possible that Paul 'received' much more from the primitive tradition than he himself mentions, and some caution is necessary before concluding that the accepted Paulines show an invariably 'creative' Paul.

Advocates of Pauline authorship must, in any case, be prepared to accept the fact that the Paul which the Pastorals present has undergone a change, but there seems to be no psychological reason for maintaining that the character of this change is incompatible with the man we know from the earlier Epistles. Some Pauline scholars admit psychological changes within the ten Epistles, as for instance Prof. C. H. Dodd³⁰ who has contended that Paul underwent a spiritual crisis about the time of writing 2 Corinthians, causing him to revise his outlook. What is particularly interesting about such a theory of change in mental outlook is the fact that Prof. C. H. Dodd has attempted to show a definite connection between Paul's circumstances and his psychological processes and, if this is valid, there seems to be no reason why, along with other influences, later modification of circumstances might not have produced such changes as are observable in the Pastoral Epistles.

[p.17]

(d) A Formalized Theology

We come next to the problem of the doctrine found in the Pastorals, which is claimed to be of a different order from that of the other Paulines. Our main concern, as it affects our psychological investigations, will be the formal character of this doctrine, which constitutes the major doctrinal objection to authenticity.

(i) *The Problem of Stereotyped Doctrine*. The presence in the Pastorals of what may be called a formalized theology has been recognized by scholars of all shades of opinion. It will suffice to quote the view of an advocate of the traditional approach to illustrate this point. Dr.

²⁹ *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (1936), pp. 1-29.

³⁰ *New Testament Studies* (1953), pp. 67-128.

Newport White³¹ says: 'Great theological statements concerning man's salvation—not of the relation of Christ to the universe—are formulated, not daringly sketched... he has mastered them completely, and presents them with a finished expression which leaves the reader satisfied.'

The most relevant question for us to raise is whether the Pastoral formulations of doctrine have not been overstated. Much stress is laid, for instance, on the occurrence of such expressions as the faith, the truth, the teaching, the commandment, the charge, the deposit, all of which appear to refer to the whole body of doctrine. Now it is not difficult to supply evidence from the accepted Paulines that Paul did, at times, refer to an objectified body of doctrine (as e.g. Phil. i. 27) ; but it must also be admitted that the use of the above terms (with the exception of πίστις) cannot be paralleled in Paul. At the same time it might be strongly argued that Paul would need some such expressions to describe the whole body of doctrine in which both Timothy and Titus must often have been orally instructed and the words just mentioned could hardly be bettered for the purpose. Admittedly the writer of these Epistles makes no mention of 'faith' in the more usual Pauline sense of personal committal to Christ, but such mention is very slight in such letters as Philippians and Colossians, in both of which 'the faith' is used in a sense closely allied, at least, to the Pastoral usage.³² Moreover the Pastorals contain references to 'faith' which are akin to the more usual Pauline sense

[p.18]

(e.g. 1 Tim. i. 14, 'with faith and love which are in Christ Jesus'; cf. also 2 Tim. i. 13). Since our immediate purpose is to discover whether the Pastoral 'Paul' is psychologically compatible with the real Paul, we would suggest that in the nature of the case the use of such formalized expressions as 'the faith' was bound to increase as the more creative period of Paul's life receded. The phenomenon would thus become not merely compatible but confirmatory.

A matter of more importance is whether traces of liturgical formulae can be found in these Epistles, and, if so, whether we can imagine that Paul would have used such formulae. Dr. B. S. Easton³³ has made much of this point in disposing of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. The well-known 'faithful sayings' are the most obvious evidence for what appear to be liturgical forms, used in a way which is certainly unique in Pauline writings. The formula itself appears to be used of proverbial maxims that can be relied upon. In all but one case this formula seems to relate to some statement of doctrine, the exception being 1 Tim. iii. 1 (the saying about a bishop's office). It is noteworthy that in every one of these sayings the vocabulary and the thought (with the possible exception of Tit. iii. 5—the idea of the washing of regeneration) is surprisingly Pauline. Are we to deduce from this that Paul's language had become compressed into a liturgical form by a later generation for the convenience of worshippers, and if so, would not this create an insuperable objection to Pauline authorship? Such a question warrants careful consideration.

³¹ *op. cit.*, p. 60.

³² Phil. i. 25, 27; Col. i. 23, ii. 7.

³³ *The Pastoral Epistles* (1948), p. 16.

It is difficult, without examining each of these faithful sayings in detail, to give a satisfactory treatment of the case; but as our present compass allows only a passing reference to these sayings the following observations on them may, at least, indicate the direction in which a solution may be found. Such a saying as 1 Tim. i. 15 is particularly illuminating for the probable part played by such statements in the experience of the apostle. There can be no denying that the substance of this saying is Pauline, as Rom. v. 8 and 1 Cor. xv. 3 show. The latter parallel is significant as Paul there explicitly states he had 'received' this

[p.19]

truth, which evidently formed a part of the primitive *kerugma*. Now, if in the one case he acknowledges indebtedness to the tradition, there is no reason why this particular saying should not equally have been current in the *kerugma* from a very early date. Indeed since 'Paul' introduces the saying in his reminiscence of his own conversion when he received mercy, it may be that such a saying powerfully influenced his early Christian life. The addition to the formula in this case—'worthy of full acceptance'—suggests that Paul may have introduced it partly because it was an important formulation of a cardinal Christian truth which Timothy is recommended to use widely. There seems to be no sufficient reason for supposing this formulation to be later than Paul himself.

Dr. Easton³⁴ argues that the words 'I am the chief of sinners' are purely formalized, showing the tendency of post-Pauline writers 'to exalt their hero by exaggerating his humility—with the implication that so humble a man must have been very holy indeed.' But to deny that Paul could, or would, have used such a humbling confession seems unwarranted in view of the apostle's spiritual experience. If Dr. Easton will not admit Eph. iii. 8 as a parallel (he considers this is also formalized devotional phrasing), he cannot deny the strong sense of sin which pervades some parts of the Pauline writings (e.g. Rom. vii). In any case, other analogies can be found for such exaggerations on the part of deeply sensitive souls, John Bunyan's 'Grace Abounding' furnishing an able example.

In 1 Tim. iii. 1 the writer appears to be citing a proverbial saying about a bishop's office, and the main problem here is whether Paul would have cited such a saying particularly to enhance a bishop's office. While it is admittedly unusual for Paul, it is by no means psychologically impossible if we assume his reason for quoting it is to introduce the subject of the qualities required for such an office. The other saying in 1 Tim. (iv. 10) is not only entirely composed of Pauline phraseology but many parallels may be quoted from the accepted Paulines (e.g. Col. i. 29; 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Thes. i. 9; Rom. i. 16, iii. 22, etc.). The

[p.20]

difficulty once again is not the subject-matter but the form of the statement.

The saying in 2 Tim. ii. 11-13 breathes a decidedly Pauline atmosphere as a comparison with Rom. vi. 8, 1 Cor. iv. 8, and Rom. viii. 17 show. There is admittedly a rhythm about this statement not usually found in Paul, but the ideas are essentially his. Dr. Swete,³⁵ although

³⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 117.

³⁵ J.T.S., xviii (1916), p. 4.

admitting the first part of the saying to be thoroughly Pauline, considers the second part to breathe the atmosphere of Matthew and Luke (cf. Mt. x. 33 and Lk. xii. 9), and concludes that this saying is 'A fragment of a hymn into which some Pauline Church has worked the familiar teaching of the apostle, together with one of the words of the Lord Jesus which they had heard from him, and which also found its way into the Matthaean-Lucan tradition.' But if the apostle did on occasions remind his converts orally of the words of Christ (as appears, e.g. from Acts xx. 35), there seems no reason for postulating that these parallel thoughts were linked by some Pauline Church, for the apostle could just as well have done this himself.

The remaining saying is Tit. iii. 5-7. There is much to be said for the view that this was a hymn used at baptismal ceremonies (Bernard, Jeremias, Easton, etc.). It lacks the rhythmic qualities of the last saying considered but undoubtedly has some liturgical form. Once again the vocabulary is definitely Pauline (with the exception of *παλιγγενεσίας* found elsewhere only in Mt. xix. 28) and raises no difficulties in subject-matter except the first line which Easton renders 'by a washing that gave us birth'. This clearly refers to baptism, but even this cannot be considered un-Pauline if Eph. v. 26 be admitted as evidence of the Pauline view. But Easton rejects a Pauline origin for this statement—'Consequently,' he says, 'while the verse uses Pauline terminology, it must be explained as it stands without reference to Paul: justification is a fruit of baptism worked in the soul by the entrance of the Holy Spirit. This in Pauline phrasing would be called the beginning of sanctification.'³⁶ Easton's argument that 'justification' is here emptied of all relation to eternal life, and that it is

[p.21]

not here related to faith and therefore cannot be Pauline, carries no weight in view of 1 Cor. vi. 11, the only occasion on which Paul uses the verb in its technical sense outside Romans and Galatians. In these latter Epistles Paul is clearly aiming at establishing a contrast between justification by faith and justification by law, but in 1 Cor. vi. 11 this is absent and therefore no mention of faith is found, nor of the connection with eternal life. Moreover, it is not without significance that mention is made of washing in this 1 Corinthians passage.

From this brief survey of the faithful sayings there would seem to be no compelling reason for disputing their Pauline origin. But does this apply equally to the traces of Christian hymns and other sayings which the writer has cited? 1 Tim. iii. 16, for instance, seems a clear case of a Christian hymn, yet in this case again it comprises only Pauline words (*δικαιόω* and *ἀναλαμβάνω* are, however, used in a different sense). The major question here is whether this formal statement of Christian doctrine must be considered to be of later vintage than the apostolic age. There appears to be a trace of such a hymn in Eph. v. 14 which, if admitted as Pauline, would be evidence of an early use of such hymns. It may be that not sufficient attention has yet been given to the part played by poetic forms in early catechetical procedure, but it seems at least probable that such forms were used. It is another matter whether the apostle Paul would have cited any such fixed forms when writing to Timothy and this will come next under consideration.

Enough has been said to show the need for caution against too readily assuming that these more formalized sayings and hymns are late formulations unlikely in the apostolic age. Since

³⁶ *op. cit.*, p. 103.

we have reason to believe that certain forms were being used for the conservation not merely of doctrine generally, but of Pauline doctrine in particular, our next investigation must be to establish what relation exists between the apostle himself and these 'forms' of his doctrine.

(ii) *The Problem of the Conservation of Doctrine*. The study of form criticism has demonstrated that the conservation of the Christian tradition took place in certain recognized 'forms'; in other words,

[p.22]

it became to some extent stereotyped. Our immediate enquiry is to determine to what extent these influenced Paul in his own doctrinal formulations.

Adherents of the traditional view explain the more formalized expressions in the Pastorals by the fact that these latest writings of Paul were written at a time when doctrinal phraseology had become more fixed. Dr. J. H. Bernard³⁷ explains the faithful sayings in the following way: 'Such passages teach us that at the moment of the Church's life when the letters were written, there had grown up a doctrinal and religious phraseology which would come naturally to the lips of a Christian teacher addressing a well-instructed Christian disciple and friend. By this St. Paul would be influenced as much as another man and it is not extravagant to suppose that, as time went on, he would acquire phrases and words from the use of the society with which he associated which did not form part of his earlier style.' The main difficulty in this statement of the case is that what applied to the majority of teachers is not so readily conceivable of so virile and creative a mind as Paul.

Another traditionalist, Dr. Newport White,³⁸ has argued that Paul's theology would undoubtedly come back to him in forms differing from those in which he originally couched it, and the Pastoral doctrinal expressions may, therefore, be the result of the fusion of the thoughts of the thought-maker with the minds of the receivers. He also pointed out that the Church conditioned and was not merely conditioned by Paul, John and Peter. But this impact of the community upon the apostle Paul is too often overlooked, with the result that he is raised on a pedestal beyond the reach of the influences moulding the communities which he served.

There seems to be no psychological reason why Paul should not himself have expressed his own doctrinal statements in rhythmic or liturgic form to facilitate the permeation of their truth into the Christian community. But the general absence of these forms in the other Epistles provides a difficult obstacle for such a view.

[p.23]

Some allowance must naturally be made for the difference in the persons addressed. But would Paul be more stereotyped when writing to his most intimate helpers than when writing to communities of believers? There is every reason to believe that he would. Dr. Harrison³⁹

³⁷ *Cambridge Greek Testament* (1906), p. xxxviii.

³⁸ *Expositor's Greek Testament* (1910), Vol. iv, pp. 61-62.

³⁹ *op. cit.*, p. 131.

has pointed out that 'Timothy must indeed have "followed" Paul's teaching, alike in its detail and in its large outlines, as no other ever did or ever will.' Since Timothy is referred to in all Paul's Epistles (except Galatians and Ephesians) as co-sender or as an intimate colleague, Dr. Harrison remarks: 'He knew therefore the actual circumstances under which each of these immortal letters was written.' In addition, 'He has had unique opportunities of following not only the written, but also the spoken words of the apostle—sermons on great occasions, discourses in school and synagogue, fierce debates, conversations in street or market or upper room—personal applications of one divine remedy to the infinite variety of human need.' We suggest that such a man would need to be reminded only of the most concise expression of those truths he had so often heard in order perfectly to recapture the apostle's meaning. But communities as yet unacquainted with those truths or, at best, with but an inadequate grasp of them would require much weightier expositions. The formula used in the Pastoral 'sayings', especially in its longer form—'this is a faithful saying and worthy of full acceptance'—lends support to the view that they were popular presentations of the apostolic doctrine endorsed by Paul himself for use in the worship of the communities.

This leads directly to the question whether the idea of conservation of doctrine was alien to the mind of Paul. It is generally assumed that the Pauline mind was too creative, too impetuous, to descend to the level of the common-place statements of these Epistles. Thus Dr. Harrison writes of the style of the Pastorals, 'It lacks too the Pauline grip and intellectual mastery, strong, clear, logical, sweeping and comprehensive.... It is much rather the speech of a man greatly concerned to preserve intact the correct pattern of sound words, which must be diligently memorized, and faithfully recited, and so passed on from lip to lip as the

[p.24]

one duly authorized expression of saving truth.'⁴⁰ But are we to suppose that the apostle never recognized the need for preserving the precious 'deposit of faith' in forms readily remembered? We do not suggest that he ever imagined that the last creative thought had been uttered and nothing now remained but to conserve what had already been worked out, but he must have been acutely conscious of the practical demands of the churches. Sabatier⁴¹ is undoubtedly right when he recognized that 'Paul was an, apostle before he was a theologian. To him the need of conservation was more urgent than that of innovation.... The greatest misfortune which can befall those who have received his message is to betray the trust.' To neglect or belittle this factor does less than justice to the apostle's great foresight.

If we regard the Pastorals as evidence for that side of Paul's character which, with statesmanlike acumen, saw the need for conservation, the probability of their authenticity is considerably increased. If, on the other hand, we reject the idea that Paul had any particular interest in methods of conservation we shall need to provide convincing justification for attributing such shortsightedness to the apostle. It surely enhances rather than detracts from his character if he made provision for the preservation of those truths which he himself had helped so much to formulate, and it is certainly most natural that evidence of such provision should come to us from his own writings to his right-hand men.

⁴⁰ *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁴¹ *Paul* (1903), p. 270.

(iii) *The Relation Between the Pastorals and Pauline Doctrine*. We have so far omitted from our examination another line 'of evidence used against the authenticity of the Pastorals, namely, the surprising absence of so many characteristic Pauline ideas. To quote Dr. Moffat⁴² on this point: 'No possible change of circumstances or rise of fresh problems could have made Paul thus indifferent to such cardinal truths of his gospel as the fatherhood of God, the believing man's union with Jesus Christ, the power and witness of the Spirit, the spiritual resurrection from the death of sin, the

[p.25]

freedom from the law and reconciliation.' We shall examine the approach of the writer of the Pastorals to the first three of these truths, since these have been particularly emphasized by Dr. Easton.

In connection with the Pastoral conception of God, Dr. Easton⁴³ remarks that 'God is usually described in the combined terminology of Judaism and Hellenism: "blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings, eternal, immortal, invisible", etc. The austerity of these titles is relieved by "Saviour", "Saviour of all men", "who wishes all men to be saved", and by such phrases as "God's kindness and love for men". But the most truly Christian title, "Father", appears only in the opening greeting formulas; there is always a sense of God's remoteness.' While admitting that the absence of the title 'Father' constitutes a difficulty for the advocates of Pauline authorship, we would point out that the title itself is not particularly frequent in the Pauline Epistles apart from the opening salutations. Moreover, we cannot concede that the absence of such a title in the Pastorals constitutes remoteness. It is significant, for example, that in 1 Corinthians Paul uses the title 'Father' twice only (apart from the salutation) and in both cases (viii. 6 and xv. 24) it is where he forsakes his practical concerns to make some profound doctrinal statement. In Romans the title is used once only (xv. 6), although viii. 15 is an indirect reference.

Dr. Easton may again be quoted in illustration of the second criticism. ' "In Christ", to be sure, is taken over from Paul but its force is altered beyond recognition. Paul uses it to describe believers as so closely united with their Lord that the "in" has an almost physical sense; in the Pastorals the phrase does not describe believers but gifts "found in" Christ.'⁴⁴ On the basis of this Dr. Easton asserts that 'Paul was a mystic and the Pastor was not.' But even a mystic is not always obliged to be mystical and Paul himself can write, for example, to Thessalonica with very little trace of such mysticism. Moreover, although the phrase 'in Christ' in the Pastorals describes gifts rather than persons, the mystical element is not entirely absent. The statement 'that they

[p.26]

also may obtain the salvation which in Christ Jesus goes with eternal glory' (2 Tim. ii. 10) cannot be divorced from Paul's mystical approach; nor can the phrase 'in the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus' (2 Tim. i. 13). Dr. Easton disposes of the mystical element by

⁴² *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1912), p. 412.

⁴³ *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁴⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 12.

suggesting that 'in' here means no more than 'given by', but is this weakening of the force of the Greek preposition really justified?

A much more serious obstacle to the Pauline authorship is the paucity of reference to the Holy Spirit. Yet Dr. Easton surely exaggerates when he declares that the reminiscence of Rom. viii. 15 found in 2 Tim. i. 7 'turns triumphant ecstasy into moralistic exhortation',⁴⁵ for the purpose is not the same in each case. In the one Paul is contrasting the spirit of slavery with the spirit of sonship, while in the other he contrasts the spirit of timidity with the spirit of power and love and self-control. The reference to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in 2 Tim. i. 14 is in complete accord with Paul's own usage, while the Spirit's work in revelation alluded to in 1 Tim. iv. 1 is not out of harmony with the Pauline assertion that the mystery has been made known to the apostles and prophets by the Spirit (Eph. iii. 5). The idea of renewal in the Holy Spirit (Tit. iii. 5) must also be considered as agreeable to the Pauline approach, although the precise expression does not occur elsewhere in Paul's letters. When Paul refers to the process of renewal he strangely enough makes no direct reference to the work of the Spirit (e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 16, Col. iii. 10, Rom. xii. 2), but there can be no reasonable doubt that he would have endorsed the Spirit's essential part in this operation.

It seems clear, therefore, that the references examined are in complete agreement with Pauline thought, but can the absence of any further references be satisfactorily explained? There might seem to be considerable weight in the contention that the Paulinist had no experience of the Spirit in view of the paucity of evidence, were it not that such an argument would produce a comparable difficulty in the case of Colossians where the Spirit is mentioned once only (Col. i. 8). We must be on our guard against the assumption that any writer must mention all his

[p.27]

beliefs in all his letters. Absence of reference cannot be regarded as evidence that the writer did not at the time of writing hold those beliefs.

This brief examination of the doctrinal approach of the Pastorals has failed to reveal any fundamental cleavage between the doctrine of Paul and the Pastorals. Yet a change of theological 'atmosphere' must certainly be admitted necessitating an examination of any possible psychological explanations. Undoubtedly, if Pauline authorship is admitted, the imminence of the end of Paul's life would be responsible for a considerable amount of this change, since as we have previously demonstrated it is in complete accord with what we should expect from an ageing man. But the change would seem even more attributable to the particular character of the readers and the subject-matter with which he deals. We should not expect Paul to write in the same vein to his intimate associates as to Christian communities. Indeed, had he done so there would have been greater ground for suspicion for it is an elementary principle of letter writing to adapt oneself to the person addressed. Even if the Pastorals be considered as quasi-public letters their primary purpose is clearly to give instructions to his personal lieutenants and such a purpose is without parallel in the other writings of the Pauline corpus. Similarly we should not expect letters dealing with ecclesiastical arrangements to partake of the same form as letters with a specifically doctrinal purpose. Spicq⁴⁶ goes so far as to maintain that the

⁴⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁴⁶ *op. cit.*, p. cv.

Church is 'now more organized and more varied with the result that the apostle is obliged to adapt himself to human mediocrity'. If this is a right judgment it would enhance the mind of Paul by showing its great adaptability. But whatever the cause of the modification, there would appear to be insufficient evidence for denying the psychological possibility, or even probability, of such a change of approach on the part of the apostle.

There is one matter that must be mentioned before we pass on to the psychological examination of the fragment approach. Dr. Harrison claims that the Pastorals contain a remarkable

[p.28]

number of Pauline phrases and considers that the use of these 'point to the intermediate activities of another mind'.⁴⁷ He states even more categorically that, 'taken as a whole, the facts here arranged seem to leave no room for doubt that our author must in any case have been deeply versed in these Pauline writings which have come down to us, and actually incorporated a number of words and phrases from each of them into his own three Epistles'.⁴⁸ Evidently Dr. Harrison is convinced that a Paulinist author is much more likely to have done this than Paul himself. In fact he disputes whether Paul himself 'would have been able, or likely, to reproduce, purely from memory, such a variety of extracts from letters which he had dictated seven or eight years previously. Supposing that the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals were fully established, we should almost feel driven to conclude that the apostle must have obtained, or retained, copies of his own earlier Epistles, and refreshed his memory of their contents before setting to work on the Pastorals'.⁴⁹ An examination of the lists of these phrases which Dr. Harrison⁵⁰ supplies shows that the great majority of them are not citations, but at most literary allusions of the most general kind. Where the language does coincide, the phrases in almost all cases consist of no more than two or three words. The question naturally arises, therefore, whether Dr. Harrison's explanation is psychologically sound. The evidence does not prove that the writer quoted from the other Epistles. In fact, Dr. Harrison does not suppose his Paulinist did this, but rather that he had become so well acquainted with Paul's letters that his mind was saturated with Pauline phraseology. It is, however, not immediately apparent why a Paulinist's mind should be more saturated with such phraseology than Paul himself. But in any case, if Dr. Harrison is convinced that Paul would have needed to refresh his mind from his earlier Epistles (if he possessed copies) in order to produce the Pastorals, it would seem to follow that, without such aid, his phraseology would have differed from the earlier letters after such an interval, in which case the basis of his own linguistic argument would be vitiated.

[p.29]

The phenomenon of the Pauline phrases does not, at least, conflict with the view that the writer is Paul himself in reminiscent mood.

⁴⁷ *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁴⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁴⁹ *op. cit.*, p. 89.

⁵⁰ *op. cit.*, pp. 167-175.

We have sought to demonstrate that when the Pastorals are included in the Pauline Corpus, and when the total picture of Paul thus presented is examined, there is nothing psychologically incompatible. We admittedly discover a Paul in his declining years, less original and more stereotyped, less creative and more reminiscent; but there seems no psychological reason for denying that this is a true picture. In fact, it may not be claiming too much to state that our understanding of the mind of Paul is enlarged by the inclusion of the Pastorals.

The Problems of the Fragment Approach

It is now necessary to enquire whether the Fragment Approach is more psychologically feasible than the traditional view, for if this could be established (as Dr. Harrison and others maintain it can be) it would clearly weigh against the authenticity of the Epistles. There are two main problems to be considered, the process of compilation and the question of motive.

(a) *The Problem of Compilation*

If, as the fragmentists maintain, a devout Paulinist of the second century wrote these Epistles to present the Pauline approach to contemporary ecclesiastical problems, incorporating in two of them some genuine fragments which had somehow survived, several problems immediately arise. Why were there three Epistles, and why were two addressed to Timothy and one to Titus? If, as Dr. Easton maintains, the persons addressed represent the monarchical episcopacy, there would have existed no earlier record of these two associates of Paul holding such positions and it would be necessary to assume, therefore, that the Paulinist is drawing upon his imagination. There are, in fact, many personal allusions found in the Pastorals which are not included in the 'genuine fragments' (according to Dr. Harrison's delineation of these), e.g. the reference to Timothy's residence at Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3), Paul's intention soon to visit Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 14), Paul's concern for Timothy's health, especially

[p.30]

his stomach (1 Tim. v. 23), the mention of Lois and Eunice (2 Tim. i. 5), the defection of the Asiatics (2 Tim. i. 15) (including Phygelus and Hermogenes), the residence of Titus in Crete (Tit. i. 5). These personal details could have been included only to give a greater appearance of genuineness to these Paulinist productions. But if some features were invented while others were incorporated from 'genuine' fragments, it is difficult to see how the fragment theory is in any better position than Holtzmann's wholehearted fiction theory.

There would seem to be two possible explanations of the presence of these personal details in addition to the genuine fragments. Either the discovery of these fragments inspired the invention of other personal details, or else these other details had somehow been preserved in the tradition and incorporated for that reason. In the former case a psychological problem arises, for the genuine fragments should themselves have provided sufficient authentication for the Paulinist's purpose (i.e. had he distributed them more evenly). In the latter case, it is difficult to see how such details could have been preserved.

The Paulinist, with motives of the highest order (according to Dr. Harrison and Dr. Easton), must have set out with the purpose of producing three works which would bear all the marks of genuine Pauline Epistles and, according to external evidence, he certainly succeeded well

in his task. But why were there three Epistles? And why were four of the 'genuine' fragments (according to Dr. Harrison) incorporated in 2 Timothy, one only in Titus and none in 1 Timothy?⁵¹ Dr. Easton's explanation on this point is that the 'Pastor' first wrote 2 Timothy and found it was such a success that he ventured to produce Titus, and then, although possessing no more 'genuine' fragments to incorporate, he issued 1 Timothy. Of this latter Epistle, Dr. Easton⁵² writes: 'Finally in 1 Timothy the method was so well known that pseudonymity is a bare convention; it is only in i. 3 (copied from Tit. i. 5) that any attempt is made to put the situation back into the

[p.31]

past. And as Paul had no third noted disciple, the Pastor addressed it to Timothy once more.' Dr. Easton criticizes Martin Dibelius' suggestion that, after writing the less colourful Titus and 1 Timothy, the writer made a direct appeal to Paul, on the grounds that no writer would show such enthusiasm as to contradict his own earlier writings. But the same charge may be levelled against Dr. Easton's own reconstruction; for if any obvious contradiction exists, this in itself constitutes a problem for the theory, and the order of writing becomes immaterial. It is difficult not to feel that both of these explanations envisage an artificial situation. It seems improbable from a psychological point of view that any writer who had scored a success by means of the 'genuine' stamp of a few surviving fragments, although dislocated in the extreme (according to Dr. Harrison's reconstruction of Paul's 'Swan-Song'), would have risked spoiling this success by issuing a further work addressed to the same man yet lacking entirely in any 'genuine' notes. The reverse procedure seems equally improbable, for it lacks an adequate psychological explanation of the more direct appeal to Paul after 1 Timothy and Titus had paved the way. Were not the former two Epistles also attempts to appeal to Paul?

Another problem for the Fragment Approach arises from the psychology of the author. Since the Pastorals, as we have seen, suggest that the author is an old man, the Pastor himself must either have been an old man or else have possessed considerable insight to portray so precisely the character traits of advancing age. In either case the phenomenon is more extraordinary than the traditional explanation would seem to require.

The character studies of Timothy and Titus have always been considered by the advocates of the traditional view as completely conformable to what we know of them from other parts of the New Testament. But this position has been strongly challenged by Dr. Easton⁵³ who makes the following comment on the relationship existing between Paul and Timothy as seen in 2 Timothy—'Yet to these years of close and affectionate intercourse there is not the slightest allusion in 2 Timothy. Timothy is said, indeed,

[p.32]

to have witnessed Paul's sufferings—but the sufferings (iii. 11) are those at Antioch, Iconium and Lystra, all of which occurred before Timothy's call! The tone of 2 Timothy is affectionate but the affection has not been won by more than a decade of devoted and unselfish service; it

⁵¹ Dr. Harrison has now modified the number of fragments to three by a rearrangement of the genuine material in 2 Timothy (*Expository Times*, December 1955, p. 80).

⁵² *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁵³ *op. cit.*, p. 10.

is the affection an older man feels for an attractive youth, of goodly family (i. 5) and well brought up (iii. 15), with every promise for the future, but as yet untried; could the historic Paul at the end of his life have assured the historic Timothy that he had every confidence the young man would prove worthy of his excellent grandmother?' But has not Dr. Easton here overstated his case? Timothy is not, in fact, said to have witnessed Paul's sufferings at Antioch, etc., but to have followed them fully among other things (*παρακολουθέω* being understood of carefully following an example). Dr. Easton also considers that Timothy is as yet untried, but may it not be that as a result of earlier observations Paul is anxious over certain weaknesses in him? In any case the psychological relationship described by Dr. Easton is in perfect harmony with what we should expect in the approach of the aged Paul giving parting instructions to his younger lieutenant, even to the point of appealing to the example of his excellent grandmother, whom Paul evidently knew well.

It should further be noted that Dr. Easton's criticism implies a greater difficulty for the fragment approach than for the traditional, for if the anachronism, which he supposes, is a real one, it would be necessary to assume the author's partial ignorance of Acts. It is also rather unlikely that a man so well versed in Paul's Epistles as to make extensive use of them would have been unaware that Timothy had been so closely associated with Paul and had given him devoted and affectionate service.

Turning next to the linguistic problems, we find that, according to Dr. Harrison's theory, the Paulinist is responsible for some strange variations. One of the presuppositions of this theory is that this devout man was not only an admirer of the apostle Paul, but was thoroughly well acquainted with his writings. In this he was outstanding among his contemporaries of the second century, who do not make particularly extensive use of the Pauline Corpus although it was generally known to them.

[p.33]

Since, however, there are large sections of the Pastorals where the writer has made no use of Pauline phrases and has widely deviated from Pauline vocabulary, some explanation will be necessary for these lapses in view of the necessary assumption that he was attempting to give as distinctive a Pauline flavour to his work as possible. Dr. Harrison⁵⁴ explains the position in the following way: 'In doing his best to convey what he honestly believed the apostle would have said, using as far as possible the apostle's own words and phrases, it was inevitable that he should fall unconsciously into the current speech of his own day.' But there are certain psychological difficulties in this view for it would seem that the Paulinist so far forgot his purpose that the unconscious influences exceeded the conscious. Can we imagine a Paulinist writing long sections (e.g. 1 Tim. iii. 1-13 or v. 14-25) without apparently bothering to give a Pauline atmosphere by an echo of Pauline phrases? It is difficult to believe that the theory of unconscious lapses supplies a satisfactory explanation.

Arising from the use of Pauline phrases, there is the further problem whether these were incorporated by direct citation or from memory. It is necessary, at least, to enquire into the process of incorporation because of the light it sheds on the psychological processes of the postulated Paulinist. If Dr. Harrison argues that it would almost be necessary to suppose

⁵⁴ J.T.S., XLIX (1948), in reviewing C. Spicq's book *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, p. 209.

(under the traditional view) that Paul consulted his own works, it would presumably be even more necessary for the Paulinist to consult them before citing them. But Dr. Harrison favours the view that the writer had pored over the Epistles so long that his mind had become steeped in them. This latter alternative would certainly account better for the phenomena than any direct citation theory, but the problem still remains to be settled how we may differentiate between a Paulinist steeped in the ten Paulines and Paul echoing his own earlier language, i.e. between a Pauline imitator and the apostle himself. It is interesting to note that a similar problem has recently been tackled in respect of Ephesians by Dr. L. Mitton,⁵⁵ who has devised two tests which he claims will enable us to

[p.34]

differentiate an imitator from the real Paul. An imitator would reflect acquaintance with certain passages more than others, and an imitator would choose many 'striking and memorable words', whereas Paul would use ordinary modes of expression. These two tests are used by Dr. Mitton to demonstrate that Ephesians was the work of an imitator, but he gives no supporting evidence for the general or universal validity of his tests. He rather treats them as axiomatic; but they are not so clearly axiomatic as to require no further proof. If, however, we accept the tests and apply them to the Pastorals we find no support for 'sustained parallels', nor are there much in evidence the 'striking and memorable words' of Dr. Mitton's second test. On the contrary what literary allusions to the ten Paulines are found in the Pastorals are spread evenly over the earlier Epistles.⁵⁶ The one safe conclusion appears to be that there are no satisfactory tests of this kind which can enable us to differentiate between Paul and his imitators. The major psychological objection to all such attempts to introduce conclusive tests is that they impose too stringent a limit on the mind of Paul. A test might conceivably indicate what Paul might be expected to do on the basis of the other letters, but it cannot prove that he must have done so. There is always the possibility he may have done the completely unexpected as most human minds are capable at times of doing.

In delineating his 'genuine' fragments Dr. Harrison⁵⁷ shows, on the one hand, that these are Pauline in vocabulary and, on the other hand, that they are completely lacking in Pauline phrases, and those two factors are claimed as evidence that the fragments are Paul's own works. But he appears to be using two opposing canons of literary criticism. The genuineness of the words is determined in the first case by Pauline usage and in the second by the absence of such usage. Dr. G. Salmon's criticism of the methods of F. C. Baur is very much to the point here. 'He holds that a letter, to be genuine, must be Pauline, but not too Pauline. If it contain phrases or thoughts for which we cannot find a parallel in Paul's acknowledged letters Paul did not write it; but if the flavour of Paulinism be too strong for Baur's delicate

[p.35]

susceptibilities, he detects a forger who betrays himself by a clumsy imitation of his master. By such methods of criticism it would be easy to prove any document spurious.'⁵⁸ It would

⁵⁵ *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (1951), pp. 111-117.

⁵⁶ See P. N. Harrison's lists, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-175.

⁵⁷ *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁵⁸ *Introduction to the New Testament* (1892), p. 365.

seem that in the end the 'genuineness' is determined more by subjective than objective criteria.

Again, the theology of the Pastorals needs considering from the point of view of the fragment approach. Although, as we have seen, there is no reason to suppose that the Pastorals contain any theological contradiction to the accepted Pauline theology, yet the apparent differences of emphasis have led many scholars to claim that the theological atmosphere is more akin to second generation Christianity than to the more primitive. But if the positive theological contribution of the Pastorals is emphasized there is much justification for the opinion of Spicq⁵⁹ that, 'not only are the major conceptions of St. Paul found, but the density of thought, the breadth of vision, the religious profundity are such that one cannot reasonably attribute them to an anonymous forger.' In other words, if Spicq is right, it would be necessary for the advocates of the Fragment Approach to postulate an anonymous Paulinist, who was not only well acquainted with the Pauline Epistles, but possessed a similar spiritual grasp. The psychological difficulties of such a view are obvious; but the difficulties admittedly diminish if it is contended (as it is by Dr. Easton) that the Pastor's spiritual grasp is much inferior to Paul's. Once again, however, this seems a matter of subjective opinion, and cannot be conclusive either way. It may be pointed out, nevertheless, in support of the traditional view, that the Pastor is so far superior to the apostolic Fathers in spiritual grasp that it constitutes a problem for any theory which allocates him anonymously to the contemporary second-century scene.

(b) *The Problem of Motive*

If these Epistles were not written by Paul, it is one of the major problems to provide an adequate motive for their production. It is generally supposed that the Paulinist desired to give to the

[p.36]

Church of his own day the fruit of his own long and profound reflections on Pauline thought, and especially to give what he conceived Paul would have written on the subject of ecclesiastical organization. His motives are naturally assumed to be of the highest order and his aim to have received the approbation of his immediate circle of friends. His use of pseudonymity in this instance is a case of modesty,⁶⁰ for he wished to take no credit for what were, in fact, his master's opinions. Let us suppose, then, the good faith of this Paulinist and examine the psychological probability of the situation envisaged.

The Paulinist, it must be remembered, is deliberately attempting to portray the Pauline attitude to the contemporary situation. Such a task must have been exceedingly difficult, for it would necessitate the avoidance of all obvious anachronisms which would naturally render the attempt far less convincing. He would have to use much tact in giving Pauline sanction to the elder-system which, according to Dr. Easton,⁶¹ could not have existed, in the form in which we find it in the Pastorals, in the apostolic age. Since he writes for believers of the second and third generations he must adapt Paul to the needs and the mode of thought of his own age, and

⁵⁹ *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, p. clvii.

⁶⁰ See Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁶¹ See *op. cit.*, p. 222.

he must suggest, by implication, that Timothy and Titus are really pseudonyms for monarchical bishops of the Ignatian type, who were beginning to exercise considerable influence in the Church. The readers would, of course, know that Paul had not actually said these things, but would receive the Epistles as brilliant attempts to bring Paul up-to-date and to show the natural development of Pauline thought.

If we are able to accept the historical probability of such a set of circumstances, it is still necessary to suggest the connection between this high-minded motive and the use of the 'genuine' fragments. Two alternative suggestions appear to be possible. Either the Paulinist had for some time had it in his mind to set out the Pauline approach to the contemporary situation and the immediate occasion was provided by the surprising discovery of

[p.37]

the 'genuine' fragments, in which case the discovery would provide a most extraordinary coincidence. Or else the possession of the fragments provided the real stimulus for the writings, and the writer only then decided to address Paul to the existing ecclesiastical situation primarily to provide a framework in which to set the precious fragments, a situation which does not commend itself for its psychological probability. On the whole Holtzmann's fiction-writer seems again more psychologically probable than this for the man who ingeniously provides a Pauline angle on the contemporary scene can surely provide also the authentic-looking personal allusions.

But it still remains to investigate whether the Epistles would have achieved what the advocates of a second-century origin claim for them. Let us attempt a reconstruction of the situation. There were presumably some bishops of the Ignatian type and some who, as yet, had not achieved monarchical rule. In the case of the 'former, the value of the Epistles would presumably be to give them much needed authority, or to instruct them in methods of procedure. In the latter case they would provide an impetus for the achieving of monarchical rule. Each would, in his own way, recognize 'Timothy' and 'Titus' as but a thin disguise for himself and in this matter would have the full support of his congregation. No one would be deceived by their pseudonymity, but would attach great authority to them because of the brilliant way in which they gave the Pauline approach to the present situation. And because of such universal approbation they would in an incredibly short time be attached to the Pauline Corpus and their true origin forgotten.

Even if we were to grant the probability of such pseudonymous works being universally received without question, the degree of authority vested in them constitutes a psychological problem without parallel in the history of pseudepigrapha attributed to Paul. But apart from this the necessity in any theory to postulate a pseudonymous origin must be regarded as a problem for that theory. Indeed this is admitted by no less an advocate of New Testament pseudepigrapha than Professor E. J. Goodspeed who states: 'For if they are treated separately, the problem of pseudonymity is extremely difficult and baffling, but taken together they

[p.38]

may throw much needed light on what has long been their most difficult feature.⁶² Without discussing fully the problem of pseudepigraphy, therefore, we may at least venture to suggest that theories which do not require it are less open to objection on this score than those which do. Admittedly this question cannot be divorced from the many other problems arising from the Pastoral Epistles but it must be considered as one of the factors which weighs against the psychological probability of the Fragment or Fictional Approaches.

Conclusion

In this psychological study of the comparative probabilities of the various theories we have endeavoured to show that the Pauline authorship, although not without its difficulties, seems to be at least as credible as the Paulinist theory. Indeed, it would not be too much to claim that the latter theory is faced with many problems which have not yet been resolved and, in the light of these, it seems more reasonable to regard the Pastorals as true products of the mind of Paul.

⁶² *New Chapters in New Testament Study* (1937), p. 172.

[p.39]

Appendices

APPENDIX A

List of Pastoral Hapaxes in the Apostolic Fathers

*Those marked * occur once only in the Apostolic Fathers.*

Those marked † occur in more than one writer.

Those underlined occur in the LXX.

1 Timothy

ἀγνεία†, βλαβερός, δίλογος*, διωκτης, έτεροδιδασκαλέω*, ματαιολογία*, ὁμολομουμένως*, πραῦπαθία, πρόσκλησις, τεκνογονέω*, ὑπερπλεονάζω*. Also in the Apologists—ἄλλως, ἀνεπίλημπτος*, ἄπεραντος*, ἀπόδεκτος*, ἐλάττων* (Adv.), ἔντευξις†, θεοσέβεια†, φιλαργυρία†.

2 Timothy

ἀγωγή, ἀναζωπυρέω†, ἀνάλυσις*, ἀνανήφω*, ἀναψύχω, ἀπαίδευτος*, δειλία†, ἐπισωρεύω*, καταστροφή, νεωτετικός*, χαλκεύς†. Also in the Apologists—ἄθλέω, βέλτιον†, γόης*, ἐνδύνω*, καταφθέρομαι, μηδέποτε†, πιστόομαι, πραγματία, χρήσιμος†.

Titus

βδευκτός, ἐγκρατής†, κατάστημα*, περιούσιος*, στυγητός, φιλότεκνος*. Also in the Apologists—ἄψευδής†, ἐκστρέφομαι*, ὀργίλος*, πρεσβύτις*, σωτήριος†, φροντίζω*.

1 & 2 Timothy

ἀστοχέω†. Also in the Apologists—ἀνόσιος.

1 Timothy & Titus

Also in the Apologists—διαβεβαιόομαι*, διάγω*, σεμνότης†, σώφρων.

2 Timothy & Titus

εὐσεβῶς.

All Pastorals

διάβολος (Adj.)*. Also in the Apologists—ὠφελιμος†.

[p.40]

APPENDIX B

List of Pastoral Hapaxes in the Apologists (but not in the Apostolic Fathers)

*Those marked * occur once only in the Apologists.*

Those marked † occur more than twice.

Those underlined occur in the LXX.

1 Timothy

αἰδώς*, ἀμοιβή†, ἀνδπροφόνος†, ἀποδοχή*, ἀπρόσιτος, διατροφή*, ἔκγονος*, ἐντρέφομαι*, ἐπίορκος*, ἐπιπλήσσω*, ἤρεμος*, καταλέγομαι, κόσμιος, μετάλημψις*, μονόομαι*, νοσέω†, ῥητῶς†, ὑπόνοια*, φευδολόγος†.

2 Timothy

ἀκρατής†, ἀνεξίκακος†, ἀνήμερος*, ἀποτρέπομαι*, φίλαυτος, φιλήδονος, φιλόθεος

Titus

ἰουδαϊκός, σωφρονίζω, σωφρόνως*.

1 & 2 Timothy

πρόγονος†, τυφόομαι†.

1 Timothy & Titus

πλήκτης*.

APPENDIX C

List of Pastoral Hapaxes in Neither Apostolic Fathers nor Apologists But in LXX

ἀποθησαυρίζω, βάθμος, γυμνασία, ἐπαρκέω, καταστολή, νεόφυτος, ποσισμός, ὑδροποτέω, φλυάρος, ἀκαίρως, ἔκδηλος, ἔλεγμος, ἐπανόρθωσις, μάμμη, ὀρθοτομέω, περιφρονέω, φιλάγαθος, νομίμως, ἀκατάγνωστος, ἀφθορία, ἱεροπρεπής, νομικός.

[p.41]

APPENDIX D

Pauline Vocabulary and Second Century Writers

Compiled from P. N. Harrison's lists, pp. 140-148, 153-155

	Total Voca- -bu- lary	Absent from Apostolic Fathers	Percentages		Absent from AF & Apologists	Percentages	
			Not in AF	In AF		Not in AF or Apol.	In AF or Apol. or both
Romans	993	182	18.3	81.7	104	10.5	89.5
1 Corinthians	934	149	16.0	84.0	89	9.5	90.5
2 Corinthians	762	150	19.7	80.3	95	12.4	87.6
Galatians	503	71	14.1	85.9	47	9.3	90.7
Ephesians	523	72	13.8	86.2	47	9.0	91.0
Philippians	429	58	13.5	86.5	40	9.3	90.7
Colossians	409	59	14.4	85.6	40	9.8	90.2
1 Thessalonians	353	42	11.9	88.1	25	7.0	93.0
2 Thessalonians	243	22	9.0	91.0	14	5.8	94.2
Philemon	129	10	7.7	92.3	5	3.8	96.2
Pastorals	848	184	21.7	78.3	113	13.3	86.7

APPENDIX E

Particles, Pronouns, Prepositions, Etc., in the Pastoral Epistles

	Rom.	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Eph	Phil	Col	1 Th	2 Th	Phm.	1 Tim	2 Tim	Tit.
ἀνα	*						*		*		*		
μηδεῖς	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*
ἐνώπιον	*	*	*	*							*	*	
ὅσος	*	*	*	*		*	*				*	*	
νῦν	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*
ἑαυτοῦ	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*
ἐν τάχει	*										*		
ἐκτός		*	*								*		
χωρίς	*	*	*		*	*				*	*		
ταχέως		*		*		*		*			*	*	

εἶτα καλῶς	*	*	*	*		*					*		
C.fwd.	49	46	37	39	32	36	25	29	27	20	48	35	24

[p.43]

	Rom	1 Cor	2 Cor	Gal	Eph	Phil	Col.	1 Th	2 Th	Phm	1 Tim	2 Tim	Tit.
B. Fwd.	49	46	37	39	32	36	25	29	27	20	48	35	24
πῶς	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*		*		
ὅς	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ὅς μὲν	*	*	*									*	
ὅστις	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*	*	*
μάλιστα				*		*					*	*	*
ἀνά			*										
ἀπό	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
εἰς	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ἐκ	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ἐν	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ἐπί													
(with Acc.)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*
„ Gen.	*	*	*	*	*		*	*		*	*		
„ Dat.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*
διά													
(with Acc.)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
„ Gen.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
κατά													
(with Acc.)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
„ Gen.		*		*									*
μετά													
(with Acc.)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
„ Gen.		*		*							*		
ὀπίσω						*							
παρά								*	*			*	
(with Gen.)	*			*	*	*		*	*			*	
„ Dat.	*	*	*	*	*		*		*			*	
περί													
(with Acc.)						*					*	*	*
„ Gen.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
πρό	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*
πρός	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ὑπέρ													
(with Gen.)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*
ὑπό													
(with Acc.)	*	*		*	*		*				*		
„ Gen.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			*	
ἄλλως												*	
ἔλαττον												*	
ρητῶς												*	
C.fwd.	73	70	60	64	54	57	46	46	45	32	73	56	43

[p.44]

Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul*. The Tyndale New Testament Lecture, 1955. London: The Tyndale Press, 1956. Pbk. pp.44.

B.fwd. βελτίον μηδέποτε λίαν μήποτε μέντοι	Rom 73	1 Cor 70	2 Cor 60	Gal 64	Eph 54	Phil 57	Col. 46	1 Th 46	2 Th 45	Phm 32	1 Tim 73	2 Tim 56 * * * *	Tit. 43
Particles, etc. in P. N. Harrison's list	73 58	70 69	60 53	64 43	54 22	57 29	46 18	46 27	45 12	32 12	73	61	43
Totals	131	139	113	107	76	86	64	73	57	44	73	61	43

N.B. *The prepositions 'have been stated separately with their various Cases to balance P. N. Harrison's inclusion of παρά and ὑπέρ with Accusative.*

© 1956 Donald Guthrie. Reproduced by kind permission of Mrs Mary D. Guthrie.

Prepared for the Web in October 2006 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>