

PAULINE LANGUAGE AND THE PASTORAL EPISTLES
A STUDY OF LINGUISTIC VARIATION IN THE *CORPUS PAULINUM*

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PH.D.) IN THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES
FROM THE EVANGELISCHE THEOLOGISCHE FACULTEIT
LEUVEN, BELGIUM, AND THE
THEOLOGISCHE UNIVERSITEIT VAN DE GEREFORMEERDE KERKEN
KAMPEN, THE NETHERLANDS

TO BE DEFENDED PUBLICLY ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE RECTORES

PROF. DR. P. NULLENS AND PROF. DR. R. KUIPER

ON APRIL 21, 2017, AT 15:00

IN THE AULA OF THE THEOLOGISCHE UNIVERSITEIT,

BROEDERWEG 15, KAMPEN, THE NETHERLANDS

BY

HENDRIK JERMO VAN NES

Promotores: Prof. Dr. A. D. Baum (ETF Leuven)
Prof. Dr. P. H. R. van Houwelingen (TU Kampen)

Co-promotor: Prof. Dr. H. von Siebenthal (STH Basel)

Assessment Committee: Prof. Dr. R. A. Faber (University of Waterloo)
Prof. Dr. G. Kwakkel (TU Kampen)
Prof. Dr. S. E. Porter (McMaster Divinity College)
Prof. Dr. M. Reiser (formerly Universität Mainz)
Prof. Dr. M. I. Webber (ETF Leuven)

Sponsored by **S**TICHTING **A**FBOUW **K**AMPEN

ABSTRACT

The present study questions the common assumption in New Testament scholarship that language variation is necessarily due to author variation. By using the language of the Pastoral Epistles (PE), which is generally said to differ most from the other Pauline letters, as a test-case, it is argued that linguistic variation in the *Corpus Paulinum* need not necessarily be explained by author variation if one is willing to analyze the alleged lexical and syntactic peculiarities of the PE from a strictly linguistic perspective. By means of statistical linguistics it is demonstrated that only one out of five of the most apparent linguistic anomalies in 1 and 2 Timothy differs significantly from the other Pauline letters. Most of the PE's major lexical and syntactic peculiarities are shown to differ considerably in the *corpus Paulinum*, but modern studies in classics and linguistics suggest that factors other than author variation, including age, emotionality, and/or textuality (versus orality), account equally if not better for this variation. Since all of the explanatory models as offered by contemporary classicists and linguists are compatible with current authorship hypotheses of the PE, New Testament scholars perhaps no longer need to question their authenticity for linguistic reasons.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xvii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PART I – THE LINGUISTIC PROBLEM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE – ORIGINS OF THE PROBLEM: FOUNDING FIGURES.....	9
1.0 Introduction	9
1.1 E. Evanson.....	10
1.2 F. D. E. Schleiermacher	11
1.3 J. G. Eichhorn.....	16
1.4 H. J. Holtzmann.....	19
1.5 P. N. Harrison.....	26
1.6 Conclusion.....	35
CHAPTER TWO – CONSTITUENTS OF THE PROBLEM: LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES.....	39
2.0 Introduction	39
2.1 Peculiarities of Vocabulary	39
2.1.1 <i>Hapax Legomena</i>	40
2.1.2 Lexical Richness	45
2.1.3 Missing Indeclinables.....	47
2.1.4 Compound Words	50
2.1.5 Semantic Deviations.....	51
2.1.5.1 Grecisms.....	51
2.1.5.2 Un-Paulinisms	54
2.1.6 Summary	57
2.2 Peculiarities of Syntax.....	57
2.2.1 Interclausal Relations	58
2.2.2 Structural Irregularities	59
2.2.3 Miscellaneous Constructions.....	60
2.2.3.1 Ως	60
2.2.3.2 Articles	61
2.2.3.3 Prepositions	61

2.2.4 Stylometric Data.....	61
2.2.4.1 Univariate Statistics.....	62
2.2.4.2 Multivariate Statistics.....	64
2.2.5 Summary	67
2.3 Conclusion.....	68
CHAPTER THREE – SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM: AUTHORSHIP HYPOTHESES	71
3.0 Introduction	71
3.1 Orthonymity Hypotheses.....	72
3.1.1 Paul.....	73
3.1.1.1 Statistical Fallacies	73
3.1.1.2 Derivative Words	75
3.1.1.3 Preformed Traditions.....	75
3.1.1.4 Age	77
3.1.1.5 Addressees.....	78
3.1.1.6 Subject Matter	80
3.1.1.7 Textuality (versus Orality)	82
3.1.1.8 Stylistic Adaptation	82
3.1.1.9 Register.....	83
3.1.2 Secretary.....	85
3.1.2.1 Luke.....	86
3.1.2.2 Tychicus	87
3.1.3 Summary	87
3.2 Pseudonymity Hypotheses	88
3.2.1 One Author.....	88
3.2.1.1 Luke.....	90
3.2.1.2 Timothy	91
3.2.1.3 Polycarp.....	91
3.2.2 Two Authors.....	91
3.2.3 Three Authors.....	92
3.2.4 Summary	93
3.3 Partial Orthonymity Hypotheses	94
3.3.1 Genuine Fragments	94
3.3.2 Second Timothy: A Genuine Letter	95
3.3.3 Second Timothy and Titus: Genuine Letters.....	97
3.3.4 Summary	98
3.4 Conclusion.....	98

PART II – THE LINGUISTIC PROBLEM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES RECONSIDERED	101
CHAPTER FOUR – APPROACHING THE PROBLEM: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	105
4.0 Introduction	105
4.1 Linguistic Criticism.....	106
4.2 Towards a Linguistic Analysis of the <i>Corpus Paulinum</i>	108
4.2.1 Authorship Model	108
4.2.1.1 Consistency Model	108
4.2.1.2 Resemblance Model	109
4.2.1.3 Population Model	110
4.2.2 Analytical Method.....	110
4.2.2.1 Quantitative Analysis	111
4.2.2.2 Qualitative Analysis	117
4.2.3 Possible Objections	118
4.2.3.1 Post-Pauline Interpolations?.....	119
4.2.3.2 Co-authors and/or Secretaries?.....	122
4.2.4 Summary	125
4.3 Conclusion.....	126
CHAPTER FIVE – PAULINE VOCABULARY: NEW PERSPECTIVES	129
5.0 Introduction	129
5.1 <i>Hapax Legomena</i>	129
5.1.1 Quantitative Analysis	131
5.1.2 Qualitative Analysis	133
5.1.2.1 Quotations	133
5.1.2.2 Proper Nouns.....	136
5.1.2.3 Similes	138
5.1.2.4 Productivity	140
5.1.2.5 Age	147
5.1.3 Summary	148
5.2 Lexical Richness	148
5.2.1 Quantitative Analysis	149
5.2.2 Qualitative Analysis	151
5.2.2.1 Emotionality	151
5.2.2.2 Age	154
5.2.2.3 Topicality	155
5.2.2.4 Textuality (versus Orality)	157
5.2.3 Summary	159

5.3 Missing Indeclinables.....	160
5.3.1 Quantitative Analysis	162
5.3.2 Qualitative Analysis	165
5.3.2.1 Subjectivity.....	166
5.3.2.2 Emotionality	168
5.3.2.3 Textuality (versus Orality)	171
5.3.3 Summary	174
5.4 Conclusion.....	175
CHAPTER SIX – PAULINE SYNTAX: NEW PERSPECTIVES	179
6.0 Introduction	179
6.1. Interclausal Relations	179
6.1.1 Quantitative Analysis	179
6.1.1.1 Parataxis	181
6.1.1.2 Hypotaxis	182
6.1.2 Qualitative Analysis	184
6.1.2.1 Age	184
6.1.2.2 Textuality (versus Orality)	186
6.1.3 Summary	190
6.2 Structural Irregularities	190
6.2.1 Quantitative Analysis	190
6.2.1.1 Parentheses	191
6.2.1.2 Anacolutha	193
6.2.1.3 Ellipses	194
6.2.2 Qualitative Analysis	196
6.2.2.1 Emotionality	197
6.2.2.2 Textuality (versus Orality)	200
6.2.3 Summary	203
6.3 Conclusion.....	203
CONCLUSION	207
APPENDIX ONE – <i>HAPAX LEGOMENA</i> IN THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	i
APPENDIX TWO – LEXICAL RICHNESS IN THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	xxxix
APPENDIX THREE – MISSING INDECLINABLES IN THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	xxxv
APPENDIX FOUR – INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS IN THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	xli
APPENDIX FIVE – STRUCTURAL IRREGULARITIES IN THE <i>CORPUS PAULINUM</i>	clxv
BIBLIOGRAPHY	clxxi
INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS	ccxvii
SUMMARY	ccxxi

SUMMARY

In the introduction to this study, the question asked is whether language variation in the *Corpus Paulinum* is necessarily to be explained by author variation. It appears many New Testament scholars answer this question in the affirmative by attributing linguistic variation in the Pauline letter corpus to the work of a secretary, redactor, and/or pseudepigrapher. New Testament scholars typically focus attention on linguistic variation in biblical texts but seldom interact with studies in modern classics and linguistics where work has produced useful findings in the interpretation of Indo-European text corpora. This suggests that the explanatory models for language variation developed by contemporary classicists and linguists have yet to be fully developed in New Testament studies. Author variation need not be the only or even the best possible explanation for linguistic variation in the *Corpus Paulinum*. In order to test this hypothesis, the epistles addressed to Timothy and Titus, collectively known as the Pastoral Epistles (PE or Pastorals), are used as a test case. Their language is generally said to differ from that of the so-called undisputed Paulines (Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon) more than any other of the so-called disputed Paulines (Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians). This has made the PE particularly vulnerable to suspicion of being authored by someone other than Paul.

The first part of this study (“The Linguistic Problem of the Pastoral Epistles”) serves as a history of research on the so-called linguistic problem of the PE. Tracing its roots, chapter one (“Origins of the Problem: Founding Figures”) discusses some of the key figures in the emerging debate over the peculiar language of the PE in relation to the question of their authorship. Evanson in 1792 was probably the first to challenge the authenticity of Titus on the partial basis of its distinctive language. Schleiermacher in 1804 did the same with 1 Timothy, mainly for linguistic reasons, noticing especially a large number of unique words and twisted phrases, which he attributed to a later Paulinist’s compilation of 1 Timothy from 2 Timothy and Titus. Eichhorn extended Schleiermacher’s critical agenda in 1812, being the first to question the authenticity of all three Pastorals for their unusual language. One of the most comprehensive critiques on the authenticity of the PE came from Holtzmann in 1880. In a detailed study, he developed a case for the literary homogeneity of the Pastorals as distinct from the other Paulines, and the impossibility of dating the letters in the lifetime of Paul. The final major contribution was made by Harrison in 1921, who marshalled the argument that the language of the Pastorals is predominantly un-Pauline, claiming that in their final form the letters must have been written by someone other than Paul. Yet all of these founding figures in the history of authenticity criticism on the PE encountered serious opposition. Some challenged the idea that the language of the Pastorals is atypical for Paul in comparison to the other Paulines. Those who accepted variation in the language of the PE attributed it to other factors such as old age, individual addressees, different subject matter, and/or derivative words. These questions of whether the language of the Pastorals is peculiar in comparison to the other Paulines and whether author variation is the best explanation for it, is known as the linguistic problem of the PE.

The second chapter (“Constituents of the Problem: Linguistic Peculiarities”) discusses all of the major lexical and syntactic peculiarities that since the works of Schleiermacher, Holtzmann, and Harrison have constituted the quantitative part of the PE’s linguistic problem. In terms of vocabulary, scholars usually point to five major idiosyncracies: (1) *hapax legomena*, (2) lexical richness, (3) missing indeclinables, (4) compound words, and (5) semantic deviations, including Grecisms and un-Paulinisms. *Hapax legomena*, lexical richness, and missing indeclinables seem to be the most important lexical anomalies for exegetes. In terms

of syntax, scholars usually point to four major peculiarities: (1) interclausal relations, (2) structural irregularities in terms of anacolutha, parentheses, and ellipses, (3) miscellaneous uses of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, articles, and prepositions, and (4) stylometric data based on univariate and multivariate statistics. Interclausal relations and structural irregularities seem to be the most noteworthy syntactic peculiarities for New Testament scholars. To what extent these lexical and syntactic idiosyncracies in the Pastorals differ from the other Paulines continues to be debated. According to the majority of scholars, the Pastorals comparatively use more *hapaxes*, vocabulary types, missing indeclinables, and hypotactic clausal relations, but comparatively fewer anacolutha, parentheses, and ellipses. A vocal minority of exegetes, however, insist that there is as much variation in language use among the other Paulines. Some scholars even claim that there is disproportional variation among the Pastorals themselves.

Chapter three (“Solutions to the Problem: Authorship Hypotheses”) concerns the qualitative part of the PE’s linguistic problem, giving an overview of all authorship hypotheses that have been developed in order to solve the problem. A good number of scholars advocate that the PE were written during the life of Paul (orthonymity hypothesis), whether by himself or by a secretary, possibly Luke or Tychicus. Some scholars argue that the language of the Pastorals is broadly similar to the other Paulines and consider the statistical analysis underlying the linguistic argument to be false. Those who do believe that the language of the Pastorals differs from the other Paulines attribute it to other factors, including the use of derivative words, preformed traditions, Paul’s older age, individual addressees, different subject matter, time for composition, shift in writing style(s), and/or change of register. Probably the majority of scholars are convinced, however, that the Pastorals were written pseudonymously after Paul had died (pseudonymity hypothesis). Ever since the work of Holtzmann, many insist that the PE form a literary unity and were composed by the same author, possibly Luke, Timothy, or Polycarp. Some others find the hands of two or even three different authors in the Pastorals. Yet other scholars have the opinion that only parts of them are genuine (partial orthonymity hypothesis).

Part two of this study (“The Linguistic Problem of the Pastoral Epistles Reconsidered”) reassesses the linguistic problem of the PE. Chapter four (“Approaching the Problem: Methodological Considerations”) questions the corporal and historical approaches of many previous studies on the linguistic problem of the PE. The suggested alternative is to undertake analysis from a strictly linguistic perspective. This proposed analysis uses a population model of authorship assuming the orthonymity of all undisputed Paulines to which each member of the disputed Paulines can be measured. It involves a quantitative and qualitative analysis, given the bipolar nature of the PE’s linguistic problem. The quantitative analysis is informed by simple linear regression analysis, which is a widely used technique in *inter alia* statistical linguistics for modelling the relationship between variables. The qualitative analysis concerns a comparison of explanatory models for linguistic variation by contemporary classicists and linguists using Indo-European text corpora, and by New Testament scholars for the *Corpus Paulinum*. Possible objections, namely that many Paulines include post-Pauline interpolations and were written by co-authors and/or secretaries, are shown to have insufficient explanatory power to *a priori* dismiss such a comparative study of linguistic variation in the *Corpus Paulinum*.

Based on the methodology outlined in chapter four, chapter five (“Pauline Vocabulary: New Perspectives”) offers a strictly linguistic interpretation of the most prominent lexical peculiarities of the PE: (1) *hapax legomena*, (2) lexical richness, and (3) missing indeclinables. Quantitative analyses reveal that only 1 and 2 Timothy have significantly more *hapax legomena* than the other Paulines. Unlike the *communis opinio*, the Pastorals are not shown to exhibit a richer vocabulary, nor to use significantly fewer types of indeclinables than the other Paulines. For each of these lexical criteria, however, considerable (to be distinguished from

significant) variation is found in the *Corpus Paulinum*, both among the undisputed and disputed Paulines. The qualitative analyses (partially) based on studies in modern classics and linguistics reveal that quotations, proper nouns, *similes*, productivity, and age might all have affected the use of *hapax legomena* in the *Corpus Paulinum*. Similarly, lexical richness is shown to be affected potentially by emotionality, age, topicality, and/or textuality (versus orality), while the use of particular indeclinables are due to subjectivity, emotionality, and/or textuality (versus orality). All of these factors prove that lexical variation in the *Corpus Paulinum* is not necessarily to be explained by author variation.

The sixth and final chapter (“Pauline Syntax: New Perspectives”) offers a strictly linguistic interpretation of the most prominent syntactic peculiarities of the PE: (1) interclausal relations, and (2) structural irregularities in terms of parentheses, anacolutha, and ellipses. Quantitative analyses reveal that the Pastorals have no significant or even considerable more hypotactic clausal relations in their texts than the other Paulines. Similarly, the Pastorals are shown not to have significantly fewer structural irregularities in comparison to other Paulines. Only considerably fewer anacolutha are found in 1 and 2 Timothy. Qualitative analyses based on methods from modern classics and linguistics reveal that the overall (minor) variation found in the *Corpus Paulinum* for the use of interclausal relations and structural irregularities might have been affected by emotionality, age, and textuality (versus orality). All such factors prove syntactic variation in the *Corpus Paulinum* not necessarily explained by author variation.

Overall, only one of the five most important linguistic anomalies used by scholars to question the PE’s authenticity over the past two centuries proves to be significantly different in 1 and 2 Timothy. The variation found among the *Corpus Paulinum* for the other four idiosyncracies is shown to be considerable, but not significant. This enables the conclusion that the language of the Pastorals, despite differing from other Paulines in some respects, is quite similar in many more respects. The overall linguistic variation found in the *Corpus Paulinum* is shown to be affected in particular by age, emotionality, and textuality (versus orality). However limited the number of linguistic particularities and their interrelationship tested, the overall results of this study challenge the common scholarly assumptions that the language of the Pastorals is homogeneous; that it significantly differs from the other Paulines; and that it must necessarily be explained by author variation. Accordingly, the results of this study also call into question the common scholarly practice of disputing the PE’s authenticity for linguistic reasons.