very much of the strength and force of the Coherence, and the Light that depends on it." But a habit is a habit. If we can get people to read the New Testament, we can ignore the chapters and the verses if they occur only in the margin.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

PAULINE RE-ADJUSTMENTS.

I.

THIS paper is an attempt to discover the historical setting of 2 Timothy iv. 9 ff.

The difficulty of accounting for the details recorded in this section has led to two outstanding explanations of the movements of Paul.

On the one hand it is claimed that the Apostle visited Asia and Macedonia when released from imprisonment at Rome, and that Luke closed the Book of the Acts without recording the visit.

On the other hand this eastward journey with its implied second imprisonment is discountenanced on the ground of no reliable evidence. It is further maintained that the details given in the above section cannot in any possible way be accounted for during one single period of Paul's life as known to us from the Acts and the Epistles.

What is of special interest at present is that in developing this second point of view Dr. Harrison in his recent book [1] reconstructs the story of Paul's life at this time.

He pays particular attention to the material in this section of 2 Timothy, and advocates the view that while the details given are unquestionably Pauline they were originally personal Notes sent by Paul to Timothy, and that they were utilised later on by the *auctor ad Timotheum* who was responsible for the epistle in its present form.

New and interesting though Dr. Harrison's reconstruction is, it does not escape the objection that what is apparently a continued passage is broken up for reconstruction purposes. The

[1] *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 115–35.

reconstruction, moreover, perpetuates the view that it is impossible to regard the passage as a single whole and account for it during one period of Paul's career.

Is this verdict necessarily final?

It has occurred to the present writer that it might be still possible that Paul wrote most of this passage on a single occasion, and that, in consequence, it can be regarded as an unbroken record of the Apostle's activities during one period of his missionary journeys.

In advocacy of this point of view the writer suggests that 2 Timothy iv. 9–20 has been misplaced by a scribe, and that it originally belonged to the end of 1 Timothy.

The suggested original texts of both Epistles might be indicated as follows:—

(1)

1 Timothy vi. (R.V.).

v. 21.—"which some professing have erred concerning the faith"—

(insert verses 9–20 from 2 Timothy).

"Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me . . . (to) . . . Trophimus I left at Miletus sick"

(the benediction of 1 Timothy vi. 21)

"Grace be with you."

(2)

2 Timothy iv. (R.V.).

vv. 6–8. "For I am already being offered . . . to all that have loved his appearing"

(omit *vv.* 9–20).

vv. 21–2. "Do thy diligence to come before winter . . . Grace be with you."

It will be observed that in the present text of 2 Timothy the phrase "do thy diligence to come" occurs in verses 9 and 21.

It is the present writer's suggestion that the word σπούδασον especially led the scribe astray, and that he copied into 2 Timothy verses 9–20 from a manuscript of 1 Timothy.

In some way impossible now to ascertain, but generally acknowledged as within the range of possibility, the scribe's eye

passed from one *σπούδασον* to the other and the misplacement occurred.

Since it would appear to have been a misplacement of a whole column or page of an ancient MS, it is interesting, for example, to find that 2 Timothy iv. 9–20 would about cover exactly a single column of Codex Alexandrinus. The former contains about 168 words, and the latter, assuming that the Plates usually given of these ancient MSS. are of a whole column, contains about 172 words. A column of Codex Vaticanus, in which 2 Timothy is not found, has about 148 words.

Should this suggested misplacement be regarded as possible very interesting results would follow, chief among which would be the possibility of fixing the whole of 2 Timothy iv. 9–20 into that period of Paul's life that immediately followed the Ephesian ministry. This for other reasons than hitherto advanced would obviate the necessity of assuming an eastward journey from Rome to account for Paul's movements as recorded in the Pastorals, and it would also supply a case that might justify a reconsideration of the view that Paul wrote personal Notes to Timothy which ultimately got into the hands of the Paulinist responsible for the present form of the Epistle.

II.

For the purpose, then, of this paper, the remainder of which will be devoted to a consideration of the details in this passage, and which might involve two or three of the ten Paulines, it is submitted that 2 Timothy iv. 9–20 belongs to 1 Timothy, and that it fits the story of Paul's life after leaving Ephesus on the third missionary journey.

Before, however, we come to the passage itself, it might be necessary to indicate that from the present point of view 1 Timothy i. 3, where we are told that Timothy was left at Ephesus, falls into line with the proposed reconstruction. Whether Timothy reached Ephesus straight from Macedonia or *viâ* Corinth might remain a doubtful point, but it would now seem that he must have reached Ephesus before Paul left for Troas and Macedonia.

Dr. Harrison seems to use this detail in his reconstruction of the history, though colour is lent to the view that it is an invention on the part of the Paulinist. That, however, cannot be the

case from the present re-setting of history, for if 2 Timothy iv. 9–20 refers to the third missionary journey, 1 Timothy i. 3 belongs to the same period.

We thus find Paul leaving for Macedonia with Timothy in charge of the Church at Ephesus. On this journey, whatever might be said against the Epistle as a whole coming from the hand of Paul, he writes the passage in question referring first of all to the secession of Demas.

This brings us to the details of the passage, and it is proposed to make only such observations as might be necessary from the new set of circumstances.

1. Demas had forsaken the Apostle and gone to Thessalonica, probably his home. Now in Philemon 24 and Colossians iv. 24 Demas is spoken of as Paul's "fellow-worker." He had therefore not forsaken the apostle when those epistles were written.

This points to the fact that Philemon and Colossians preceded 1 Timothy as at present regarded, and makes even the imprisonment at Cæsarea too late, not to mention that at Rome.

The question of an Ephesian imprisonment is now resurrected, and though certain historical considerations might be advanced from the new setting of history in favour of Ephesus being the place at which Philemon and Colossians were written (cf. obs. 4) it will suffice to indicate that the time of Demas' relapse is a new factor in the case. These two epistles must have preceded the passage in which Paul records that Demas had forsaken him, "having loved this present world," and since that passage was written after Paul had left Ephesus, Philemon and Colossians would appear to have been written during the Ephesian ministry.

Onesimus thus sought refuge at Ephesus, and it was from there Paul hoped to visit Philemon at Colosse. (Cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 229–30).

2. *Crescens.*—He is said to have gone to Galatia. Scholars are practically unanimous in identifying this place with Gaul, reading *Γαλλίαν* for the text. We would simply indicate that the new historical setting supports the reading *Γαλατίαν*, and suggests that Crescens was the bearer of the Epistle to the Galatians. Should this suggestion regarding the mission of Crescens be entertained it might be possible to harmonise the North and South Galatian theories if it be not insisted upon that Galatians iv. 13 of necessity means two *visits* rather than

two intervals such as the time of the illness and the period of activity that followed convalescence. That matter cannot be now discussed, but we venture to think that the suggested mission of Crescens to Galatia at this time might eventually prove to be a vital detail in the matter of Paul's relation to the Churches of Galatia.

3. *Titus.*—Not to burden the reader with intricate details, it is only necessary to point out that by this time Titus had met Paul on his journey after bearing the "Intermediate Letter" to Corinth. He was absent when Paul wrote the passage under consideration to Timothy, having gone to Dalmatia. But he was again the bearer of 2 Corinthians written on this journey. It would appear, therefore, that the visit to Dalmatia was undertaken in the interval between rejoining Paul and leaving for Corinth with the second Epistle to make arrangements for the collection that Paul had already written about (1 Cor. xvi. 1 f.).

4. *Luke.*—"Only Luke is with me," writes Paul, not now, as usually explained, in disappointment because the other companions mentioned in Philemon and Colossians had deserted him, but for the reason that Demas had forsaken him and because the other companions had been sent on their respective missions, Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia, Tychicus going to Ephesus. There is nothing to show that Aristarchus had accompanied Paul from Ephesus, and there is no reason why Epaphras and Justus should have done so. But Luke was with the apostle on this journey, and it would now be possible to identify him with one of the two unnamed brethren who accompanied Titus to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 18, 19).

That Paul speaks in Colossians iv. 10 of Aristarchus as his "fellow-prisoner" would now suggest that he himself and the companion seized during the riot (Acts xix. 29) had suffered imprisonment at that time. This would account for Paul speaking of himself as a prisoner in Colossians iv. 3, Philemon 1.

5. *Mark.*—Timothy is told to bring Mark with him. That Timothy visited Paul in response to the request "do thy diligence to come shortly unto me" is substantiated by the fact that he is mentioned in the greetings of 2 Corinthians. He probably took Mark with him from Ephesus; for even if Mark visited Colosse as in Colossians iv. 10 he could have returned to Ephesus by this time, and the expression *ἀναλαβών* could mean

that Timothy was to take Mark in hand for further service. That this service was rendered seems very probable, for it would again be possible to identify Mark with the second of the unnamed brethren who assisted Titus in the matter of the collection at Corinth. Paul seems to have had this work in view for Mark when he bade Timothy bring him with him.

Nothing would be gained by discussing the view that Timothy "picked up" Mark at Colosse on the former's return from a supposed visit to his home at Lystra, for from the present historical situation there is no reason for believing that Timothy left Ephesus at all prior to visiting Paul at Nicopolis (since that is the place we know Paul intended to winter at) in response to "do thy diligence to come shortly unto me," and taking Mark with him "for he is useful to me for ministering."

6. *Tychicus.*—He was sent by the apostle to Ephesus, and it looks as if he was the bearer of the letter to Timothy, even as Crescens was the bearer of the Epistle to the Galatians a little previously. It might be possible also that Paul intended Tychicus to take charge of affairs at Ephesus during Timothy's absence on his visit to him.

7. *The cloak left at Troas.*—This detail can now but refer to the time Paul waited in vain at Troas for the return of Titus from Corinth whither he had gone with the letter of 2 Corinthians ii. 4. It points to the coming winter at Nicopolis, where, for all we know to the contrary, Titus rejoined the apostle. (Cf. Harrison, pp. 118, 121.)

8. *Alexander the Coppersmith.*—From the new setting there can be little doubt that this person is the Alexander mentioned during the riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33). Paul is referring to the harm recently done to him, and bids Timothy be on his guard. (Cf. Harrison, p. 118.)

It would now appear that the same person is also referred to in 1 Timothy i. 16, and that Hymenæus was of Ephesus. The latter thus would probably be the person referred to with Philetus in 2 Timothy ii. 18 as declaring that "the Resurrection is past already." This was a form of false teaching that troubled the Church at Corinth at the very time. (Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 12 f.)

Though this paper is primarily concerned with the historical details in this passage, it seems worth while making a passing

reference to this form of false teaching in view of the later heresies the Epistle is said to contain, and which cannot now be discussed, since for one reason the matter is disputed. (Cf. Harrison, p. 7.)

9. *The passage*—"*At my first defence. . . . Amen*" (16–18). —In the new set of circumstances this much discussed passage would appear to refer definitely to the recent Ephesian riot. Compared with Acts xix. 30–1, the words "no man took my part, but all forsook me" seem to have been literally true of Paul's experience. He was deserted by the "disciples" and the "chief officers of Asia."

If a second defence is implied in the passage we are not bound to conclude that it was not made on this occasion, seeing that the town clerk's interference was in Paul's favour, and that he spoke not of Paul alone but of "these men which are neither robbers of temples nor blasphemers of our goddess" (Acts xix. 37). If a second defence was made these words would seem to justify the inference that some of Paul's followers had summoned sufficient courage to associate themselves publicly with him. The Asiarchs might not have done so, but "these men" could mean the "disciples." (Cf. further obs. 10.)

If, again, 1 Corinthians xv. 32, "fought with beasts" is to be taken literally (cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 280), the phrase would but strengthen the conclusion that Ephesus was the place Paul had in mind in the passage. (Cf. McGiffert, *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, p. 280 f.) In its new setting the whole passage fits exactly what is recorded of the riot at Ephesus in the Acts.

10. *Prisca and Aquila.*—It will be enough to indicate that they were still at Ephesus at the time (1 Cor. xvi. 14), not having left for Rome as in Romans xvi. 3. This fact is not affected by the possible Ephesian destination to portions of Romans xvi., but it clears up the difficulty of accounting for their presence at Ephesus after returning to Rome. There is no evidence that they returned from the capital, and the new historical setting makes such a supposition altogether unnecessary.

11. *The house of Onesiphorus.*—All that is involved in this phrase and in the similar expression in 2 Timothy i. 16 cannot now be discussed. But it would appear in the present circumstances that the expression does not at all imply the death of

Onesiphorus. Paul was only recently in his company, and he is referring to the help Onesiphorus had rendered him during the riot at Ephesus.

We would only add that since it might now be possible that the words "all that are in Asia" in 2 Timothy i. 15 refer to the same people as in the expression "all forsook me" in the passage under consideration (1 Tim. restored), the above phrase in 2 Timothy i. 16 even would not appear to imply the death of Onesiphorus.

It would indeed seem that since Paul writes definitely to Timothy "this thou knowest," that in 2 Timothy i. 15, 16 he is also referring to the riot at Ephesus, and accordingly to the fact that he had been bound by a chain in that city. For how else could Timothy have definitely known that "all that are in Asia" had turned away from the apostle? It cannot now be supposed that Timothy, while on a visit to Rome, had gleaned this information regarding certain people from Asia who had visited Paul in the capital, for from the present setting of history Timothy could not have visited Rome by this time. His one and only visit to Rome took place later on, and in response to the request of 2 Timothy iv. 21, "do thy diligence to come before winter."

But if, as suggested, Paul had in mind the Ephesian riot in 1 Timothy i. 15–16, Timothy would have known on the spot at Ephesus all about Onesiphorus' kindness, and everything about "all that are in Asia" deserting the apostle, for they would be the people of Acts xix. 30–1, and those meant by "all forsook me" in the restored passage of 1 Timothy.

It might also be asked, would not the opportunities to "oft refresh" be more likely at Ephesus than at Rome?

It would thus seem that in both references to the "house of Onesiphorus" Paul had in mind the Ephesian riot, though we are told in the following verse (2 Tim. i. 17) that Onesiphorus had also visited the apostle at Rome. That he met his death there is but an assumption based on nothing more tangible than the supposed meaning of the above expression.

12. *Erastus.*—It need only be indicated that he was the person who accompanied Timothy to Macedonia. (Cf. Harrison, p. 119.) The fact that Paul acquaints Timothy of the whereabouts of his recent companion suggests that Timothy himself had returned

to Ephesus without going to Corinth as originally intended. (Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10.)

13. *Trophimus.*—It cannot now be possible that Trophimus was left sick at Miletus after the trouble at Jerusalem during Paul's last visit to the city. Though no mention is made of his sickness in the Acts, he must have been left at Miletus some time during the Ephesian ministry. (Cf. Harrison, p. 121.) Timothy would be interested in Trophimus, as the latter was a native of Ephesus (Acts xxi. 29).

It has not been possible to discuss at length all that is involved in the details we have considered, but from the foregoing it will be seen that the passage as a whole can be fitted into the story of Paul's life immediately after the Ephesian ministry. It would appear to be a precious record of the latter part of the third missionary journey, and as such it would justify a reconsideration not only of the verdict that these historical details cannot in any possible way be fitted into one single period of Paul's life, but also of the question of the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles. It is true that such questions as the language of the Epistles and the sub-apostolic matter they are said to contain have not entered into the foregoing considerations, but it is respectfully submitted that on historical grounds it would now be possible to maintain that 1 Timothy as restored was written on the journey through Macedonia to Achaia following the abrupt close of the Ephesian ministry, and that 2 Timothy without iv. 9–20 was written at Rome.

On historical grounds, again, it would now be possible to argue that the Epistle to Titus preceded 1 Timothy, and that it was written at Ephesus. The main consideration that points to this conclusion is the fact that the journey Paul refers to in Titus iii. 12 would appear from the present suggested reconstruction to be no other than the journey through Macedonia after leaving Ephesus.

Before making for Achaia and Corinth on this journey Paul wintered at Nicopolis, where presumably he wrote 1 Timothy.

Since Titus appeared at Ephesus in time to be the bearer of the letter of 2 Corinthians ii. 4, and is subsequently found in Paul's company on the Macedonian journey and sent on a mission to Dalmatia, it would seem that he must have arrived at Ephesus in response to the request "give diligence to come unto me to

Nicopolis, for there I have determined to winter" (Tit. iii. 12).

It is true that this would imply that Titus had come from Crete, but many scholars are of the opinion that Paul's visit to Crete was made during the stay at Corinth on the second missionary journey or during the Ephesian ministry, and Titus would have known from the bearers of the Epistle that Paul was at Ephesus, and he might well have made for that city to join Paul for the coming winter at Nicopolis.

It is appreciated that the matter is beset with difficulties, but it is submitted that from the present situation the one journey Paul had contemplated for some time was this journey through Macedonia to Achaia, wintering at Nicopolis on the way, and that this is the journey referred to in Titus iii. 12.

It would thus follow that the Epistle to Titus preceded 1 Timothy, and that it was probably written at Ephesus. On historical grounds accordingly the order of the Pastoral Epistles would be as follows:—(*a*) Titus; (*b*) 1 Timothy as restored; (*c*) 2 Timothy without iv. 9–20.

III.

A word might be added as to the sequence of the Pauline Epistles arising out of the present suggested reconstruction.

(*a*) If we are right in assuming that Crescens was the bearer of the Epistle to the Galatians, that Epistle preceded 1 Timothy, since it is in the restored passage Paul acquaints Timothy of Crescens' mission to Galatia.

(*b*) Since Demas forsook the apostle on the journey through Macedonia from Ephesus, Philemon and Colossians, in which he is spoken of as a "fellow-worker" were written before that journey was undertaken. Compare also what is suggested regarding Aristarchus under obs. 4.

(*c*) If Ephesians is to be identified with the Epistle at Laodicea mentioned in Colossians iv. 16, it was written before Colossians and Philemon, and since Timothy is mentioned in the greetings of these two Epistles it might be that Ephesians was written before Timothy arrived at Ephesus from Macedonia. This would support the view that *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* was not in the original text.

(*d*) The foregoing considerations suggest the following order for the Pauline Epistles:—

A. 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

B. 1 Corinthians, Titus, (Eph.) Philemon, Colossians, Galatians, 1 Timothy (as restored), 2 Corinthians, Romans.

C. 2 Timothy (without iv. 9–20), Philippians.

They might be grouped as follows :—

1. Corinthian Group—1 and 2 Thessalonians, (later) Romans.

2. Ephesian Group—1 Corinthians, Titus, (Eph.) Philemon, Colossians.

3. Macedonian or Nicopolis Group—Galatians, 1 Timothy, 2 Corinthians.

4. Roman Group—2 Timothy, Philippians.

It would follow from this that the outstanding period of Paul's literary activity was from the Ephesian ministry to the close of the third missionary journey, and that he wrote two epistles only—the one to his "beloved and faithful child in the Lord," the other to the Church that was his "joy and crown"—during his one and only imprisonment at Rome.

With regard to the very careful and minute comparisons made by Dr. Harrison between the language of the Pastorals and the ten Paulines it might be indicated that they are based upon the usual order given to these Epistles, and that if the present attempt at reconstruction is worth anything a case would appear to have been stated that would justify a reconsideration of the whole matter so scholarly dealt with by him in his book.

T. W. Llynfi Davies.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

2 TIMOTHY iii. 10.

Σὺ δὲ παρηκολούθησάς μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ, τῇ προθέσει, τῇ πίστει, τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ, κ.τ.λ. Commentators do not seem to have noticed a similar use of *παρακολουθέω* in Justin Martyr's *Apol.* i. 16. He is describing how some pagans have been brought over to Christianity by the good example of Christian neighbours; many, he declares, *ἐκ βιαίων καὶ τυράννων μετέβαλον, ἡττηθέντες ἢ γειτόνων καρτερίαν βίου παρακολουθήσαντες ἢ συνοδοιπόρων πλεονεκτουμένων ὑπομονὴν ξένην κατανοήσαντες. ἢ συμπραγματευομένων πειραθέντες.* Here, as in 2