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2 TIMOTHY CONTRASTED WITH 1 TIMOTHY AND TITUS

SUMMARY

An examination of over thirty points on which 1 Tim and Titus agree against 2 Tim and vice versa makes it most improbable that the three letters were written by the same person.

SOMMAIRE

L'examen de plus d'une trentaine de points d'accord entre 1 Tim et Tite — ou leurs silences — contre 2 Tim rend très improbable que les trois lettres aient été écrits par la même personne.

The three letters, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, have been known as the Pastoral Epistles since the beginning of the 18th century. The title has become so much part of customary usage that it influences the lay out of modern bibles (e.g. TOB) and the organisation of commentary series (e.g. ICC, EBib, Herm., RNT, NJBC). The justification for the grouping formulated by C. Spicq, “Toutes les trois sont du même style, contiennent la même doctrine, visent les mêmes tendances hérétiques, supposent à peu près les mêmes conditions de temps et de lieux,” is echoed by H. Koester, “These letters, ... form a unity in their language, theological concepts, and intention, and ... were written by the same author.”

2 Épitres pastorales, 31.
The presupposition of their unity has exercised a decisive influence on the way the authenticity of these letters is approached. It is taken for granted that the three are complementary. Elements lacking in the theological framework of one are interpolated from the others. Inevitably, the letters are considered to stand or fall together. All are authentic. Or all are inauthentic. Or all contain fragments of genuine Pauline epistles.

This consensus was challenged recently by M. Prior who, in a doctoral dissertation for London University, argued that if 2 Tim is examined in isolation from the other two letters the standard objections to its authenticity lose much if not all of their force. He highlights the individuality of 2 Tim by pointing out that, in opposition to 1 Tim and Titus, it contains a “thanksgiving” (2 Tim 1:3-5), which reveals the author’s fear for Timothy’s fidelity and his consequent desire for him to come to Paul. This extremely personal concern does not surface in either of the other two letters. Equally their interest in appointments to various ministries and a certain anti-Jewish polemic is not reflected in 2 Tim.

Prior, of course, was not the first to note the singularity of 2 Tim. W. G. Kümmel, for example, wrote, “In terms of content the three letters, of which 1 Tim and Titus are most closely related, form a group within (sic!) themselves,” but typically he felt no need to go further. Those who recognize the need for an explanation, all of whom deny the authenticity of the Pastoral, adopt an hypothesis analogous to that of M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, who maintained, “If church regulations are recognized as the core of 1 Tim and Tit, ...then 2 Tim may have been designed to provide for these regulations (which were supposed to appear under the name of Paul) a personal, historical background.” The speculative character of this hypothesis is clear from its formulation. In practice, however, the “if” and “may” are disregarded. What is seen to be true for one epistle is assumed to be true of both the other letters. Differences, if they are even noted, are dismissed as irrelevant. The Pastorals, we are told, “imply a unified, consistent conception.”

---

5 Paul the Letter-writer, 61-64.
6 Introduction, 387.
7 The Pastoral Epistles (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 71.
8 Dibelius-Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 71.
The accuracy of this observation has already been questioned by Prior. The purpose of this article is to move further along the same line of research by looking at a particular feature of the Pastorals, namely, points which 1 Tim and Titus have in common but which do not appear in 2 Tim and vice versa. Are such differences significant?

THE ADDRESS

The addresses of the three letters immediately confirm the distinctiveness of 2 Tim. According to this letter, the writer identifies himself as *apostolos Christou Iesou dia thelēmalos theou* "an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God" (1:1), and the letter is addressed to Timothy *agapētō leknō* "beloved child" (1:2). This language is typically Pauline. "Through the will of God" appears in the addresses of 1 and 2 Cor, and in 1 Cor 4:17 Timothy is characterized as *mou leknōn agapētōn* "my beloved child". There are no overtones beyond deep friendship.

Both 1 Tim and Titus, however, are addressed to *gnēsiō leknō* "legitimate child" with the further qualification *en pistei* "in the faith" (1 Tim 1:2) or *kata koinēn pistin* "according to a common faith" (Titus 1:4). While *gnēsios* can convey tender affection, its dominant connotation in the first century was that of authorized interpretation particularly in the sphere of religion. The meaning "legitimate, authentic" is demanded here by the reference to the faith (contrast Phil 4:3), and the author manifestly is thinking of those who teach a different doctrine (1 Tim 1:3; cf. Titus 1:1). The effect of the address is to identify Timothy and Titus as teachers in whom the communities may put their trust.

The same overtones of institutionalization are also perceptible in the self-identification of the author. He is *apostolos Christou Iesou kal epitalagēn theou solēros hēmōn kai Christou Iesou lēs elpidos hēmōn* "an apostle of Christ Jesus according to the command of God our Saviour and of Christ Jesus our hope" (1 Tim 1:1), and *doulous theou, apostolos de Iesou Christou* "servant of God and apostle of Christ Jesus" (Titus 1:1) which is explained by *en kērygmali ho episteuthēn ego kal epitalagēn lou solēroς hēmōn theou* "the preaching with which I have been entrusted according to the command of God our Saviour" (Titus 1:3). The key word in both is *epitalagē*. The author's mandate stems not from

---

a vague "will of God" but from a specific "command of God". One can detect a desire to avoid the possible subjectivity of a claim to authority based on the will of God,10 coupled with a concern to insinuate that authority be traceable to a definite commission.11

CHRISTOLOGY

The Christology of the Pastorals has been explored in detail by Hans Windisch.12 This classic study covers much which is unnecessary to repeat here, but it needs to be refined in one respect. Even though Windisch abstracted from the question of authenticity, he took it for granted that the Pastorals were a literary and theological unity, and so missed the nuances which differentiate the Christologies of the epistles. A number are worthy of attention.

The relationship of Christ to God need not concern us because Windisch has shown, in opposition to many of his colleagues and successors, that the Pastorals contain a low Christology, according to which a man died to save others and was raised from the dead and rewarded.13 Despite a possible reading of Titus 2:13, there is no question of the divinity of Christ in the Pastorals. This ambiguous verse has to be explained in terms of the other clearer references and not vice versa. "Saviour" is predicated of both God (Titus 1:3; 2:10; 3:4) and Christ (Titus 1:4; 3:6), but the two are clearly differentiated in Titus 1:1, 4 and 3:4-6. In consequence, it would be a false dichotomy to contrast the human Christ of 2 Tim with a divine Christ of Titus.

A characteristic feature of the Pastorals is their use of ἐπιφάνεια and ἐπιφανεῖν. There is no difference between the three letters in their use of the substantive in reference to the Parousia (1 Tim 6:14; Titus 2:13; 2 Tim 4:1, 8; cf. 2 Thess 2:8), but in 2 Tim 1:10 ἐπιφάνεια is

10 It is worth noting that Paul began to claim that his apostolate derived from the will of God only after he had lost his legitimating home base at Antioch; compare the address in 1 and 2 Thess with that in 1 and 2 Cor.
11 Even though this was the case of Paul himself (1 Cor 15:8-9; cf. 2 Tim 1:11), he preferred leaders to emerge from his communities (1 Thess 5:12-13; Phil 3:17; 1 Cor 16:15-16).
used of the earthly ministry of Jesus, which brings it into line with the use of the cognate verb in Titus 2:11 and 3:4. In the two latter instances what appears is hé charis tou theou “the grace of God” (2:11) and hé chrêstolês kai hé philanthropia lou sôlêros hêmôn theou “the goodness and lovingkindness of God our Saviour” (3:4). The reader is left to infer that the reference is to the ministry of Jesus, and remains in some doubt until 3:6. In this respect 2 Tim is significantly different because what appears is not a divine quality but a person dia lês epiphaneias lou sôlêros hêmôn Christou Iêsou “through the appearance of our Saviour Christ Jesus” (1:10). The two perspectives are not incompatible but the abstractness of one contrasts with the concreteness of the other.

As regards how Christ carried out his mission, 1 Tim and Titus have almost identical formulae; ho dous heaulon antilytron hyper pantôn “he gave himself as a ransom for all” (1 Tim 2:6); hos edœken heaulon hyper hêmôn hina lytrôsêTai hêmas “who gave himself for us to redeem us” (Titus 2:14). The idea of self-giving is entirely lacking in 2 Tim, as is the concept of redemption. 2 Tim in fact mentions the death of Christ only indirectly, ei gar synapethanomen “if we have died with him” (2:11), which is all the more curious in that it alone, in counterdistinction to 1 Tim and Titus, makes a reference to the resurrection, egêgermenon ek nekrôn “having been raised from the dead” (2:8).

2 Tim thus expressed the effect of Christ’s ministry, kalargêsantos men ton thanaton phôlisanlos de zôiân kai aphtharsian dia tou euangeliou “abolishing death and bringing to light life and incorruption through the gospel” (1:10). The association with “incorruption” gives “life” here an eschatological connotation, as does the future tense in 2 Tim 2:11 (syzetomen) but it would be wrong to exclude completely the existential sense,14 which seems to be implied by zôê hé en Christô Iêsou “the life which is in Christ Jesus” (2 Tim 1:1; cf. 1:13; 2:1; 3:12) and not only because one is the seed of the other. The existential sense of “life” does not appear in either 1 Tim15 or Titus.

Even if “life” is given an exclusively eschatological connotation in 2 Tim 1:1, 10, there is still a difference. “Life” in 1 Tim and Titus is always qualified by an adjective, “eternal life” (1 Tim 1:16; 6:12; Titus 1:2; 3:7); “the coming life” is contrasted with “the present life”

---

14 So rightly Dibelius-Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 105 note 55.

15 Note however the existential sense of “death” in 1 Tim 5:6.
(epangelion echousa zôês lês nyn kai lês mellousês, 1 Tim 4:8), and identified as “the real life” (lês onlôs zôês, 1 Tim 6:19). This is never the case in 2 Tim.

It would be going too far to conclude that the Christology of 2 Tim diverges substantially from that of 1 Tim and Titus. Nonetheless the differences are not without significance. Precisely because they are minor and in a situation where Christology is not an issue, the formulations reflect an unconscious habitual phraseology and thus betray different mindsets.

THE MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL

One of the notable features of 1 Tim and Titus is the detailed list of qualities considered desirable in a minister of the gospel (1 Tim 3:1-13; Titus 1:5-9).\textsuperscript{16} It has been pointed out that nothing comparable appears in 2 Tim. What does not appear to have commanded attention is the fact that the latter instead gives the minister a number of titles, which do not appear in the other two letters.

I abstract from the titles which “Paul” gives himself, “herald, apostle and teacher” (1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11) to focus on those which reveal the author’s understanding of ministry. 1 Timothy and Titus contribute the synonymous titles of presbyteros “ elder” (1 Tim 5:1, 17; Titus 1:5) and episkopos “supervisor” (1 Tim 3:1; Titus 1:7).\textsuperscript{17} To these bureaucratic titles 1 Timothy adds another of the same type, diakonos “ servant” (1 Tim 3:8-13; 4:6). None of these appears in 2 Tim as a title; ministry (diakonia) is mentioned (4:5) but the meaning is the generic one of service (4:11).

The one genuinely spiritual title in 1 Tim is anthrôpos theou “man of God” (6:11), which appears in the more solemn form ho tou theou anthrôpos “the man of God” in 2 Tim 3:17. This is the one slender link between the two letters, for the titles in 2 Tim are anything but bureaucratic. The minister is kalos stratiôlês Christou lêsou “a good soldier of Christ Jesus” (2:3; cf. 1 Tim 3:18); ergetês anepaischynlos

\textsuperscript{16} A convenient synoptic table is to be found in Dibelius-Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 133.
\textsuperscript{17} Both exercise authority over the church (1 Tim 3:4-5; 5:17), and both are responsible for preaching and teaching (1 Tim 3:2; 5:17). Moreover, the transition from v. 6 to v. 7 in Titus 1 is such as to suggest that the singular “ supervisor” (cf. 1 Tim 3:1) is intended to typify each member of the previously mentioned group of “ elders”. See in particular Spicq, Étîtres Pastorales (2nd ed. 1969) 439-55; Dibelius-Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 54-57; J. P. Meier, “Presbyteros in the Pastoral Epistles,” CBQ 35 (1973) 323-345.
"an unashamed workman" (2:15); *skeuos eis timēn* "a vessel for noble use" (2:21); *doulos tou kyrion* "slave of the Lord" (2:24); and *euangelisios* "evangelist" (4:5).

The resonances of these titles are clear from the contexts, and accentuate the specificity of 2 Tim. "Soldier of Christ Jesus" highlights the relationship of the minister to Christ, a dimension which is entirely absent in 1 Tim and Titus. The soldier must be prepared to accept suffering (2:3). For 2 Tim, shared suffering is integral to ministry (*sygkakopathein*, 1:8; 2:3; cf. 4:5), because it is of the very nature of the Christian life; "all who desire to live a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted" (3:12; cf. Phil 3:10). In neither 1 Tim nor Titus is there the slightest hint that the Christian life will involve suffering. 1 Tim, on the contrary, does everything to ensure "a quiet and peaceable life" (2:2) and insists that the minister must be well thought of by outsiders (3:7). For Titus the behaviour of the community must be such that it does not draw attention to itself (3:1-2; cf. 2:5).

This desire for the anonymity of benign neglect is the antithesis of the Pauline view that the local church should by its quality of life proclaim the gospel to the world (Phil 2:14-16). With one possible minor exception (Titus 2:9-10), 1 Tim and Titus exhibit no interest in the missionary dimension of the church; they are concerned exclusively with internal maintenance. Recognition of this aspect permits us to appreciate properly the implications of "evangelist" (2 Tim 4:5), whose role is to proclaim the word (*keryxon ton logon*, 4:2). Given the established meaning of *euangelion*, the one who bears good news is one who proclaims Christ to those who have not heard the word. The title is essentially outward looking and apostolic.

The positive use of "workman" in a ministerial context (2 Tim 2:15) is at first sight unusual. It needs little perspicacity to see how out of place it would be in reference to the lordly "elders" and "supervisors" of 1 Tim and Titus! Paul, however, does use the term but only in reference to his opponents who preached another gospel; they are *ergatai dolioi* "deceitful workmen" (2 Cor 11:13) and *kakoi ergatai* "evil workmen" (Phil 3:2). This usage best explains the presence of the adjective "unashamed" in 2 Tim 2:15. The context alludes to eschatological judgement which is based on achievement. 1 Tim and Titus, on the contrary, are concerned only with survival.

The qualification of the minister as "a vessel for noble use" (2 Tim 2:21) is significant insofar as it reveals what qualifications the author considered important for ministry. They are "righteousness, faith,
love, and peace” (2:22), which are complemented a little further on. “The slave of the Lord must not be quarrelsome but gentle towards all, an apt teacher, patient, correcting opponents with gentleness” (2:24-25). These virtues are not without parallel in 1 Tim and Titus. Timothy, for example, is exhorted, “Pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, steadfastness, gentleness” (1 Tim 6:11; cf. 1:14; 2:15; 4:12; 6:2; Titus 1:1; 2:2; 3:2). In these letters, however, they are ordinary Christian virtues without any specifically ministerial overtones, which means that for 2 Tim what makes someone a good Christian also makes that person a minister. The bureaucratic conditions of 1 Tim and Titus do not apply.

This is not to say that there is no overlap with the qualities required of supervisors, elders and deacons (1 Tim 3:1-13; Titus 1:6-9). What these lists do not mention, however, is the supreme virtue of love, which is central to 2 Tim (note especially 1:7). The difference this makes is perfectly illustrated by the varying attitudes towards opponents and members of the community.

As the above citation of 2 Tim 2:24 shows, the aim of 2 Tim is to win over adversaries by patient persistence so that they may repent and “escape the snare of the devil after being captured by him to do his will” (2:26). The charitable hint that the adversaries are not entirely responsible for the evil they do (cf. 4:16) contrasts vividly with the harsh judgement of opponents in 1 Tim 6:4. Timothy must “order” them not to teach false doctrine (hina paraangeilés lisisin mé heterodidaskalein, 1 Tim 1:3). At first sight Titus is a little milder in asserting that the apt teacher must be able tous antilegeontas elegchein (1:9), because elegchó has many meanings ranging from “to expose, set forth” to “to punish, discipline”. A meaning towards the latter end of the scale, e.g. “to confute” (RSV), is demanded by the following hou deis epistemizein “their mouths must be stopped” (1:11). Opponents, instead of being changed, must be crushed.

The same nuances surface as regards the exercise of authority within the community. The harsh overtones of elegchó in Titus 1:9 appear elsewhere in this same letter. “Rebuke them sharply (elegche autous apolomós) so that they may be sound in faith” (1:13); “rebuke in full command” (elegche meta pasēs epilagēs, 2:15). The adverbial phrases indicate an extremely authoritarian style of leadership, whose endemic fear is made explicit by “Let no one despise you” (2:15).

18 BAGD, 249.
Offenders are to be given two chances and then ignored (3:10). Precisely the same pattern is repeated in 1 Tim. Timothy is told “Let no one despise you” (4:12) and ordered “Publicly rebuke sinners, so that the rest may be afraid” (5:20). Nothing remotely similar appears in 2 Tim, where reproof is given no particular emphasis (4:2), and in directing the community the verb used is diamarłyromai which need mean no more than “bear solemn witness to” (2:14).

It is all the more curious, therefore, that both 1 Tim and Titus expect church leaders to offer existential witness to their communities and 2 Tim does not. “Set the believers an example (typos) in speech and conduct... Practice these duties, devote yourself to them so that all may see your progress” (1 Tim 4:12-15). “Show yourself an example of beautiful works” (typon kalοn ergοn, Titus 2:7). In 2 Tim, on the contrary, “Paul” presents himself as a model for Timothy in both word (1:13; 2:2; 3:14) and deed (3:10), but never hints that Timothy should offer the same example to his community.

How are church leaders appointed? Titus provides no answer, but 1 and 2 Tim give radically different responses. According to 1 Tim a group of elders are the commissioning agents and the candidate is selected by prophecy. “Do not neglect the gift (charisma) that is in you, which was given to you through prophecy with the laying on of hands by the council of elders” (4:14; cf. 1:18). For 2 Tim, on the contrary, “Paul” alone is responsible and there is no mention of prophecy. “I remind you to rekindle the gift (charisma) of God which is within you through the laying on of my hands” (1:6). The variety of harmonizing expedients reflect the intellectual contortions intrinsic to any attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable. If the texts are accepted at face value what they prove is that the authors of 1 and 2 Tim are not the same person, and that the two letters reflect different ecclesial situations.

Who could become a minister of the gospel? The formulation of 1 Tim 3:1-13 and Titus 1:6-9 makes it clear that only males can be considered and this is reinforced by other material. 1 Tim is categorical, “I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men” (2:12). Titus harmonizes perfectly because the only teaching

---

19 There are three basic types on which variations are embroidered. (1) Paul was the most important of the ordaining elders (e.g. SPIÇO, Eplantas Pastorales, 2nd ed., 1969, 728-29). (2) The author of the three letters wanted to get different points across (e.g. DİBELİUS-KONZELMANN, Pastoral Epistles, 71). (3) The word presbyterion does not mean a ‘council’ of elders (e.g. KELLY, Pastoral Epistles, 108). For a sober evaluation see MEIER, “Presbyters,” 339-42.

20 This is not contradicted by oikodespotein (1 Tim 5:14), which is not intended to imply that since men are part of a household they are ruled by women.
activity it permits to females is the training offered by older women to young women in conformity with the structures of a patriarchal society (2:3-4). At first sight 2 Tim appears to be no different, but this is not in fact the case. Its one reference to women is, “There are those who insinuate themselves into houses and capture silly women (gynaikaria), overwhelmed by their sins and swayed by all kinds of desires, always learning but incapable of reaching a knowledge of truth” (3:6). The scornful diminutive underlines that the author is not thinking of all women or women as such, as is the case in 1 Tim and Titus which reflects a deep-rooted misogyny (cf. 1 Tim 5:11-13). The reference here is to a specific and well-known psychological type, which should no more be extended to include all women than the scathing description of some men (4:2-5) should be applied to all males. Thus, while 2 Tim probably assumes that ministers will be men (cf. 3:17), it does not exclude women, as its presumed companion letters do.

The Gospel

Both 1 Tim and Titus use the expression ho episteuthēn egō “with which I was entrusted”; in one case the object is ho evangelion “the gospel” (1 Tim 1:11) and in the other to kerygma “the preaching” (Titus 1:3). The same idea is expressed in completely different terms in 2 Tim. Tēn kalēn parathēkēn phylaxon “guard the beautiful deposit” (1:14; cf. 1:12), which has a parallel in tēn parathēkēn phylaxon “guard the deposit” (1 Tim 6:20). Yet there is a difference. Whereas 1 Tim leaves Timothy to his own devices, 2 Tim continues, dia pneumatos hagιou tou enotēkontos en hēmin “through the Holy Spirit who dwells within us” (1:14).

The only other reference to the Holy Spirit in the Pastoral letters are in Titus 3:6 where, in an allusion to Baptism, it is said to be “poured out” (execheen). 1 Timothy evokes only the Spirit of prophecy (4:1). By contrast these highlight the distinctively Pauline idea of the indwelling of the Spirit (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19) in 2 Tim.

One of the most distinctive features of the Pastoral letters is their use of hygaiainein “to be sound” and hygiēs “sound”. Titus stands alone in qualifying faith as “sound” (1:13; 2:1), but all three letters agree in

21 This is not an allusion to an unsavory past, as Diehlus-Conzelmann assume (Pastoral Epistles, 116); so rightly N. Brook, Die Pastoralbriefe (RNT 7/2; Regensburg: Pustet, 1969) 255.
making the same predication of didaskalia “teaching” and logos “words”. The differences, however, are instructive.

For 2 Tim the “words” in question are those of Paul (1:13), whereas for 1 Tim they are those of Christ (6:3). The single reference to “sound teaching” in 2 Tim 4:3 does not derive from any established usage. It is used simply as a spontaneous antithesis to the unhealthy teaching identified as “myths” (4:4), which is the contrary of “the word” (4:2) and “the truth” (4:4; cf. 3:8). The time frame is the indefinite future, estai gar kairos “the moment will come” (4:3). As the usage in 4:6 shows, there is no necessary reference to the last days, for which, moreover, the plural kairoi is used (2 Tim 3:1).

In 1 Tim “sound teaching” has the specific connotation of moral teaching based on the gospel (1:10). The impression is given that the list of vices in 1:9-10 were forbidden by the “sound teaching”; the implication is that this expression has an established technical meaning. Precisely the same is true of Titus. The moral content of “sound teaching” is clear from the list of directives which follows the injunction “As for you, teach what befits sound teaching” (2:1). The qualification demanded of the presbyter underlines its stereotyped character. In order to impart and defend “sound teaching” he must have a firm grasp of “the sure word as taught” (RSV; antechomenon tou kata tén didachén pistou logos, 1:9).

The impression that 1 Tim and Titus give a fixed value to what is but a casual expression in 2 Tim is reinforced by a parallel situation involving epignōsis alētheias “knowledge of truth”. This phrase appears twice in 2 Tim. The presbyter must correct his opponents with gentleness “in case God should grant that they will repent and come to knowledge of truth” (2:25). The other side of the coin is that certain people listen to everybody and “are never able to come to knowledge of truth” (3:7). In both cases the expression is naturally explained as the inevitable antithesis of imagined knowledge which is

---

22 There is no parallel in 1 Tim or Titus to this absolute use of ho logos, or to the concept of a power-laden ho logos tou theou (2 Tim 2:9; cf. 1:7; Titus 2:5), or to ho logos tēs alētheias (2 Tim 2:15).
23 To claim, as Dibelius-Conzelmann do, that the predicted future is in fact a present reality (Pastoral Epistles, 120) is based on the unjustified assumption that 2 Tim addresses the same situation as the other two letters.
24 The complexity of the ideas in this phrase is highlighted by the variety of translations: “the word that is trustworthy in accordance with the teaching” (NRSV); “the authentic message” (NAB); “the unchanging message of the tradition” (JB); “l'enseignement sûr, conforme à la doctrine” (BdeJ); “la Parole digne de foi, qui est conforme à l'enseignement” (TOB); “the orthodox faith” (Philipps).
only falsehood. An allusion to the gospel as “truth” (2 Tim 4:4) is certainly implied, but if one had only these two references no one would dream of qualifying the expression as “a formula for Christianity,” which is the way in which it is treated by all who depend on the classic studies of M. Dibelius and C. Spicq.

A formulaic quality, on the contrary, is certainly perceptible in the usage of the two other letters. God “desires all men to be saved and to come to knowledge of truth” (1 Tim 2:4). Those who believe are those who know the truth (lois pistois kai epegnōskosi lēn alēthian, 1 Tim 4:3). This combination of faith and knowledge of truth also appears in Titus. The purpose of the author’s ministry is “concerned with the faith of God’s elect and with their knowledge of truth which accords with godliness” (epignōsin alētheias tēs kalē eusebeian, Titus 1:1). In both instances “knowledge of truth” is a synonym for faith and salvation, and its meaning is very specific, “l’exacte connaissance de la vraie religion.” The technical character of the formula is paralleled by tē kalē eusebeian didaskalia “the teaching which accords with godliness” (1 Tim 6:3). Not only does this bind the two letters even more tightly together, but it sets them further apart from 2 Tim, whose only use of eusebeia is in the pejorative phrase “having the form of godliness but denying its power” (3:5).

On the social level the principal effect of the gospel, whose dynamis “power” is mentioned only by 2 Tim (1:7-8; 2:9; 3:5), is a pattern of behaviour which incarnates its values. For all three letters this is expressed in the phrase “good works”, but whereas 2 Tim always speaks of pan ergon agathon (2:21; 3:17), the other two switch between ergon agathon (1 Tim 2:10; 5:10; Titus 1:16) and kalon ergon (1 Tim 3:1; 5:10, 25; 6:18; Titus 2:7, 14; 3:8, 14). 1 Tim 5:10 makes it impossible to postulate any substantive difference between the two expressions, but the stylistic factor should not be ignored.

**False Teaching**

Nowhere has the assumption of the unity of the Pastorals been more pernicious than in treatments of the errors they oppose.

---

Dibelius-Conzelmann is far from untypical in writing, "If all these sections [from 1-2 Tim and Titus] are interpreted as referring to the same heresy ... a comparatively clear picture can be obtained." Inevitably the attempt to identify the heresy fails because the syncretistic picture is unhistorical, and refuge is sought in the extraordinary hypothesis that the author intended "to create an apologetic vademecum for all sorts of anti-Gnostic conflicts". If the data are looked at objectively, it becomes clear that 2 Tim has nothing in common with the other two which share all important elements.

The teaching combated by 1 Tim and Titus has an undeniable Jewish dimension. The false teachers aspire to be nomodidakaloi "teachers of the Law" (1 Tim 1:7); the meaning of the term is clear from its application to Rabban Gamaliel (Acts 5:34; cf. Lk 5:17). The problems in Titus derive especially from hoi ek lès peritomenes "those of the circumcision" (1:10), which in context means believers of Jewish origin (cf. Gal 2:12; Col 4:11). The congruence of the two designations needs no emphasis, particularly when details of their doctrine emerge. They taught abstinence from food explicitly (1 Tim 4:3) and implicitly (Titus 1:14-15) — and the obvious reference point is the one recommended by the context, Jewish dietary laws.

They also speculated on genealogiai "genealogies" (1 Tim 1:4; Titus 3:9). These texts offer two clues to the meaning of this highly controverted term. 1 Tim associates it with "myths" (cf. 4:7), whereas Titus links it with "quarrels about the Law". The former has directed attention to the world of Gnostic speculation, because myths and genealogies are coupled in Plato (Tim 22a). The effect has been to think in terms of "genealogies" in terms of the groups of descending aeons. There is no evidence, however, that these emanations were called "genealogies", and "myth" is too vague and general to be a satisfactory pointer to the cultural background. Except, of course,

30 Pastoral Epistles, 65.
31 Pastoral Epistles, 66.
32 This observation has been anticipated by B. T. Viviano who argues that the false teaching envisaged by 1 Tim and Titus is conserved in Matt 1-2 ("The Genres of Matthew 1-2: Light from 1 Timothy 1:4." RB 97 [1990] 31-53).
34 The juxtaposition of "commandments of men" and "to the pure all things are pure" (Titus 1:14) strongly suggests that the former is a reference to Jewish ascetic practices; cf. Mk 7:7; Rom 14:20; Col 2:22.
35 See Dibelius-Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 16-17.
36 So rightly Kelly, Pastoral Epistles, 44.
when qualified as "Jewish myths" (Titus 1:14), which harmonizes with the hint that the "genealogies" somehow involved the Law. From this perspective the most natural hypothesis is that they concerned allegorical speculations on the pedigrees of the patriarchs. 37

Finally, according to both 1 Tim and Titus the motivating force behind such false teaching was greed (1 Tim 6:5, 10; Titus 1:11).

Not a single one of these elements appears in any form in 2 Tim. This letter offers the only unambiguous example of erroneous teaching. Hymenaeus and Philetus maintained that the resurrection had already taken place (2 Tim 2:18). Dibelius-Conzelmann attempt to bring this into the orbit of 1 Tim and Titus by moving from spiritualization of the resurrection to the spiritualization of life in general by abstention from marriage. 38 Comment is hardly necessary.

The principal preoccupation of 2 Tim is futile debate, "fighting with words" (logomachein, 2:14); "profane and empty talk" (bebélous kenophônias, 2:16), "foolish and inexpert research" (mórás kai apaideuôs zêlèseis, 2:23). The one slight clue to what the author has in mind is furnished by the consequences. In opposition to the false teaching concerning the resurrection which is said to be "undermining the faith of some" (2:18), the meaningless discussions will lead only "to the demoralization (kalastrophé) of the hearers" (2:14), "to greater ungodliness" (2:16), and "to quarrels" (2:23). One has the impression that the author is more concerned with the waste of time and the effect on the character of believers than with their eternal salvation. His problem is a social "gangrene" (2:16), which must be cut out before its impact on the organism becomes too serious.

Much of this language appears in 1 Tim and Titus. For the latter "empty talkers" (mataioi logos, 1:10) are those who indulge themselves in "foolish researches (zêlèseis)" 39 and genealogies and strife and quarrels about the Law" (3:9). 1 Tim rails against "myths and endless genealogies that promote speculations (ekzêlèseis)" (1:4), "empty talk" (mataiologia, 1:6), "profane and old womanish myths" (4:7), "researches and word-battles" (zêlèseis kai logomachias, 6:4), and

37 SPICQ, Épitres Pastorales, 322.
38 Pastoral Épistles, 65-66. According to these authors, the prohibition of marriage in 1 Tim 4:3 is attested for Titus by the positive stress on marriage in Titus 2:4, which seems as far-fetched as their insistence on the meaning "sorcerers" for goûtes (2 Tim 3:13).
39 R. A. Culpepper has suggested that zêlèo is here the equivalent of the Hebrew darash with its overtones of Scripture studies (The Johannine School [SBLDS 26; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975] 291-99).
"profane empty talk and objections" (bebēlous kenophôniai kai
antithéseis, 6:20).

To be very specific, 2 Tim and the other two letters share the
following words in their references to false teaching:
logomachein/logomachia, kenophônia/mataiologos/mataiologia, zêtësis/
estêsis, mythos, bebēlos, and móros. Does this mean that all three are
talking about the same thing? Not necessarily! 40

In the religious sphere verbal disputes normally arise when
different meanings are perceived in an accepted authoritative text.
Given the Jewish dimension of the situation faced in 1 Tim and Titus,
the text in question can only be the Old Testament. This
interpretation is supported by the exhortation, proseche tê anagnôsei
"attend to the reading" (1 Tim 4:13). In itself anagnôsis is ambiguous,
but it is very probable that the reference here is to the public reading
of the Old Testament, not only because of the use of the term in Acts
13:15 and 2 Cor 3:14, but because of its association with exhortation
and teaching. 41

The reasonable assumption of all commentators is that the public
reading of the scriptures was part of the normal liturgical ritual of the
Christian assembly inherited from the synagogue. 42 None, however,
raises the obvious question? Why then should it be necessary for the
author to insist that Timothy does it? Unless we gratuitously make
the historicizing assumption that Timothy lacked the required
education and had to be bullied into reading in public, 43 the most
natural explanation is that some felt that the public reading should
be dispensed with because the Scriptures were a cause of dissent. The
author of 1 Tim, however, felt that he could not give his assent to
such a radical modification of the tradition even though the OT was
being misused.

The situation implied by 2 Tim is very different. Not only is there
no hint that the Old Testament is the cause of problems, but it is
singled out for exceptional praise. It contains "the sacred writings

40 The stereotypical character of the polemic when sketched in broad terms (cf.
R. J. KARRIS, "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral
Epistles," JBL 92 [1973] 549-564) makes it all the more imperative to look closely at
the nuances.
41 For more details, see SPIÇO, Épitres Pastorales, 2nd ed. 1969, 514-15.
42 E.g. KELLY, Pastoral Épistles, 104.
230f., 365f. Manuscripts without word spacing or punctuation could be read at sight
only with much practice. Hence the need for the specialized liturgical office of Reader.
(hiera grammata) which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. Every scripture (pasa graphê) is inspired by God and profitable (ophelimos) for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness" (2 Tim 3:15-16). Two points are significant here. First, the Scriptures are not being neglected (mene, 3:14). Second, the warmth and amplitude of the recommendation; the Sacred Scriptures are what make the man of God “complete and equipped for every good work” (3:17). Such enthusiasm for the Old Testament — there is no hint of caution or warning — must mean that the quarrels about words must have had a completely different basis than that in 1 Tim and Titus.

**

I have discussed over thirty points where something in 2 Tim is missing in both 1 Tim and Titus or where something shared by the two latter epistles is lacking in 2 Tim. While some may be of less significance than others, the cumulative effect is disastrous for the hypothesis of the literary unity of the Pastorals. Many of the differences go deep into the personality of the writers and their socio-theological perspectives. It does not seem possible that 2 Tim should have been composed by the author of 1 Tim and Titus. There have been hints that 2 Tim is more Pauline than either 1 Tim or Titus, but this does not imply that Paul was in fact its author. What it does mean, however, is that the authenticity of 2 Tim must be debated in isolation from that of 1 Tim and Titus.
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