



SCHLEIERMACHER'S DORMANT DISCOVERY

Robert M. Price



Perhaps the major reason for making more widely available the seminal critical works of the past is so they may function as the biblical “stones of witness,” mute yet eloquent testimony to a past that may otherwise be too easily forgotten. For too often in the history of biblical scholarship we have imagined ourselves to have learned the lessons taught by our forbears when we have but inherited a garbled oral tradition passed down from teacher to student, each generation less familiar than its predecessor with the actual writings of the giants of the past. The result is that we often think we understand their theories and either accept or reject them for the wrong reasons. The cases made by biblical scholars whose work is no longer readily available to check for ourselves were sometimes much more compelling than their latter day summarizers make them seem. Sometimes we find, after some delving, that a scholar’s views, handily dismissed today, were never refuted, only given the cold shoulder by that scholar’s peers. Sometimes, too, the scholar’s views are just misrepresented, as if he championed some notion which in fact he merely mentioned in passing on his way to a better conclusion.

When one reads Schleiermacher’s “Concerning the So-Called First Letter of Paul to Timothy,” one is not merely reviewing one of the hoary monuments of biblical scholarship, like a tourist seeing for himself some landmark he had hitherto only heard about. There is that sense of historical awe, revisiting a pivotal moment when new ground was being broken. But more than that, one begins to realize that there is more in the essay than Schleiermacher’s heirs have realized. It is like Thomas’ parable of the treasure in the field (saying 109), in which a man inherits a field with a hidden treasure, hidden even to him, and he unsuspectingly sells it off to another, who does discover the treasure, intended for the previous owner, and he is glad enough to profit

from it. It will be our brief task here to uncover that treasure buried in the historical memory of Schleiermacher's momentous essay and lend it out to the wider market of scholars. Schleiermacher, being dead, yet speaks, and we may still have more to learn from this father of the modern church (and academy) than we had thought. Away with the smugness we may feel simply out of what C.S. Lewis called "chronological snobbery," as if we have advanced beyond this great teacher of the past just because so many have written on the same topic since.

Paul de Man speaks of the dialectic of blindness and insight, the fact of a strategic limitation of what we can now see, a myopia without which we would not see as much as we will later come to see. This insight may enable us to see yet more, but had we seen too much to begin with, ironically, we should not have been able to advance to the new and wider perspective. Schleiermacher's essay on 1 Timothy is an excellent example. In short, as we shall see, the fact that he took only 1 Timothy to be spurious, still regarding 2 Timothy and Titus as genuinely Pauline, enabled him to see something about the character of 1 Timothy that we no longer see because we have hastened on to a "better" view, namely that all three Pastoral Epistles are post-Pauline. Indeed they are, and knowing this, we have gone beyond Schleiermacher. But we have in the process forgotten something Schleiermacher knew about these documents, something he could see precisely because he still supposed Paul wrote 2 Timothy and Titus. What was this, his forgotten and dormant discovery? Simply that whoever wrote 2 Timothy and Titus did not write 1 Timothy. Instead, 1 Timothy is based on 2 Timothy and Titus in roughly the same manner as 2 Peter depends on both 1 Peter and Jude. We are right in denying the three Pastorals to Paul. We are wrong in ascribing all three to a single pseudepigraphist. Schleiermacher was wrong in not declaring all three Pastorals spurious; he was right in seeing that 1 Timothy was parasitic upon the other two and thus written subsequently.

Schleiermacher, you see, employed much the same sort of argument as persuades today's scholars that the three Pastorals collectively stem from a post-Pauline period. In short, he shows several instances where 1 Timothy repeats, but misuses, certain words and phrases found verbatim in Titus and 2 Timothy. Just as all agree the Pastorals speak of *faith* and the *law* in senses very different from those common in Romans and Galatians,

Schleiermacher shows how 1 Timothy has copied what he did not quite understand from the other two Pastorals. To cite just one example, rather than repeat Schleiermacher's whole case, 1 Timothy has picked out of Titus (Titus 1:14; 3:9) the references to controversial "myths" and "genealogies" (1 Timothy 1:4), failing to grasp that for Titus the terms denoted false doctrines spread by errant teachers of "the circumcision party" who must have appealed to priestly genealogies in the same way Africanus tells us certain of the latter-day kinsmen of Jesus did to authenticate their priestly credentials (see also Acts 19:14's team of exorcists who proudly claimed to be sons of a Jewish high priest named Sceva). 1 Timothy no longer understands the connection and makes it sound like the myths and genealogies are riddles forming the stock-in-trade of the false teachers, possibly denoting the chains of Valentinian Aions stemming from the Unknown Father.

If Schleiermacher's arguments be accepted, what new light may be shed on the three Pastorals and their relationship? For one thing, it begins to make sense that there are *three* of them. Both apologists seeking to reclaim the Pastorals as Pauline and critics who deny all three to Paul have confessed themselves baffled as to why a pseudepigraphist would have written all three when two would have sufficed. One hardly needs Titus' qualifications for the bishopric if one has the fuller list of 1 Timothy. Or why two letters of avuncular advice to Timothy especially if they are both peppered with false personal detail? The answer, one may suggest, is that the compiler of 1 Timothy sought to combine and replace the earlier 2 Timothy and Titus, much as we imagine both Luke and Matthew sought to combine and supplant the earlier Q and Mark (or, if you prefer, as Matthew sought to combine and replace Mark and Luke, or as Luke combined Matthew and Mark, or as Mark combined and abridged Matthew and Luke, take your pick). I have already indicated the parallel with 2 Peter's use of 1 Peter and Jude, though in that case it is not quite so evident that 2 Peter sought to replace its predecessors (the author assumes familiarity with 1 Peter, mentioning it in 2 Peter 3:1, and he makes little direct use of the earlier work). Schleiermacher shows that 1 Timothy appears to combine the personal reminiscences of 2 Timothy with the didactic content of Titus, though it does neither very well. We picture Matthew doing the same thing when he combined the parable collection and

apocalyptic chapters of Mark with the Q sermon section. And just as Matthew took Mark and Q, sources already patchwork in character (each being made up largely of earlier pericopae, albeit redacted by each source's original compiler) and added more ("M") pericopae, so has the author of 1 Timothy supplemented two compilations of liturgical fragments, sayings, hymn quotes, maxims, "faithful sayings," creedal bits, etc., by adding more of the same, drawn from the same sapiential and ecclesiastical stock.¹

Why would the author of 1 Timothy have done this? And, having undertaken to combine elements of the earlier works, why did he leave so much of the originals out? Here we may carry Schleiermacher's case farther by engaging in a bit of redaction criticism.

Some additions and alterations seem to reflect ecclesiastical developments subsequent to 2 Timothy and Titus. First, it is obvious that the hierarchy has become more elaborate. Titus 1:5-9 deals only with bishops, but by the time of 1 Timothy, we are reckoning with a separate order of deacons (and apparently deaconesses as well: "deacons... the women," 1 Timothy 3:8, 11), plus an order of enrolled widows (5:4-16). 1 Timothy has grafted the widow stipulations not directly after the bishops and deacons (1 Timothy 3:1-13) where we would naturally expect to find it if the author were composing freely, but, more in catchword fashion, onto the end of the advice from Titus 3:3a on dealing with older women in the congregation (1 Timothy 5:3). The order of widows has become problematical, the charismatic, celibate women belonging to it assuming too many ministerial duties for the author's liking. Here, as in many subsequent church orders, their role is curtailed. By adding the deacon and widow material, as well as various instructions about the decorum for prayer and for women's adornment and behavior in the congregation (1 Timothy 2:1-4, 8-15), 1 Timothy establishes its character as basically a church manual posing as a letter of professional and personal advice from Paul to Timothy. We cannot help but think again of Matthew's compositional agenda, making Mark and Q, plus much new material on church order, into a comprehensive church manual. Just as Matthew places his

¹ James D. Miller, *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series # 93. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

stipulations into the mouth of the risen Redeemer, a new Moses, so does the author of 1 Timothy place his own instructions in the mouth of the Apostle to the Gentiles speaking to the subsequent generation. Both Matthew and 1 Timothy ought to be seen as fitting into the genre-trajectory including the Qumran *Manual of Discipline*, *The Book of Jubilees*, *The Didache*, the *Didascalia*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, etc. In a sense, all are “new Torahs” (like the Mishnah, too, one may venture), which is perhaps why 1 Timothy introduces its notoriously non-Pauline paragraph about the *law* early on (1:8-11).

Another parallel with Matthew’s church manual redaction occurs in a surprising place, providing a solution to a long-standing riddle. Why does 2 Timothy envision the ordination of Timothy at the hands of Paul himself (“I remind you to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands,” 1:6), while 1 Timothy credits the ordination to the presbyters (“Do not neglect the gift you have, which was given you by prophetic utterance when the elders laid their hands upon you,” 4:14)? Whether Paul or a single pseudepigraphist wrote the three Pastorals, we are at a loss to harmonize this contradiction. But we may readily explain it as a redactional change by the author of 1 Timothy. His goal was analogous to that of the authors of Matthew 18:18 and John 20:22-23 (not to mention 1 Corinthians 3:11 and Ephesians 2:20), which was to dissipate and distribute the pontifical authority granted Peter by the (post-Markan but pre-Matthean)² bequest of Jesus in Matthew 16:17-19. We see the same tendency at work in the redactional transition between Mark 2:1-12 and Matthew 9:1-8. Mark concludes with an acclamation of Jesus (“We never saw the like of this!”), but Matthew glosses: “they glorified God who had given such authority *to men*” — i.e., not only to Jesus but to his latter-day representatives as well. As Matthew’s final redactor sought to divide Peter’s apostolic authority among his successors (symbolized by the collectivity of the twelve, just as the eleven in Matthew 28:16-20 stand for Matthew’s community’s missionaries in the second century), so does 1 Timothy divide Paul’s apostolic authority among his successors (symbolized by the elders and Timothy).

Another similarity to Matthew and his redactional tendencies may be found in 1 Timothy’s dropping of the personal references

² Arlo J. Nau, *Peter in Matthew* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 1992).

that have led P.N. Harrison³ and many others to posit the incorporation of authentic Pauline notes into 2 Timothy (4:9ff.). Why would he omit them? For the same reason Matthew omitted most of Mark's unflattering references to the disciples of Jesus. Mark apparently sought to discredit the Christian communities (Jewish ones) who honored the Twelve as their figureheads, but Matthew himself represents a kind of Jewish Christianity for whom the Twelve are a new dodecad of patriarchs reigning over Israel (19:28, while the Lukan parallel, 22:28-30, incorporates the same understanding into a later, catholicized context). Mark's disciples failed miserably to understand their Master's parables (4:13); not so Matthew's, who are trusty scribes trained for the heavenly kingdom (13:51-52). Mark's Twelve are dumbfounded when Jesus walks on the sea (6:51-52), while Matthew's understand he must be God's son (14:33). In Mark James and John shamelessly jockey for position (10:35-37), but Matthew shifts the blame to their interloping mother (20:20-21). 2 Timothy shows the companions/disciples of Paul in a light not unlike that of the disciples fleeing their Master in Gethsemane; Paul reports that all abandoned him at an earlier trial (4:16), and that only Luke remains with him on the eve of the present one. Apparently everyone else has something more important to do, including Demas, Crescens, Titus, and Erastus (4:10, 20). While Paul says nothing about the reasons for the absence of most of them, the writer of 1 Timothy may have assumed (or may have feared the reader would assume) that the worldly hypocrite Demas was typical of the whole bunch, and he wanted to efface this slur against Paul's circle of disciples.

It is even possible that the mention of Titus as absent, with Timothy soon to be on his way to Paul's side, led our author to choose the name of Timothy over that of Titus for his new epistle. (Is it a coincidence that Titus, unlike Timothy, has also vanished completely from Luke's Acts?)

Scholars have long puzzled over the identity of the opponents intended by the polemics of the Pastorals. Certain features imply clearly that the author has in view Judaizers. Other imply ascetical encratites, still others Gnostics or Marcionites. Again, Schleiermacher can help us clean all this up. For one thing, we have already seen that 1 Timothy's associating "myths" with "genealogies" results from a misunderstanding of

³ *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921).

Titus, where the myths are just false doctrines promoted by Jews who claim a priestly pedigree. There are no Gnostic Aions here. Taken on their own, without 1 Timothy gumming up the works, 2 Timothy and Titus seem to take aim unambiguously at “the circumcision party,” Judaizers, who use the Torah commandments to intimidate Gentile converts. While 1 Timothy retains from its sources confused elements of this scenario, scrutiny of anti-heretical material unique to 1 Timothy 4:3 reveals the author’s concern with encratites who forbid marriage and command vegetarianism, as per Dennis R. MacDonald.⁴ The Encratites proper were the sect of Tatian, Justin’s disciple, but the Marcionites were “small e” encratites as well, and 1 Timothy 6:20 certainly has them in mind when it refers to Marcion’s tract *Antitheses*, which invidiously contrasted the Jewish Scriptures with the Pauline. True, he confuses Marcionism with Gnosticism (ibid. “the *Antitheses* of the falsely dubbed *gnosis*”), but this was not uncommon. So whereas 2 Timothy and Titus were concerned with Judaizers, 1 Timothy updates the polemic to apply it instead to Marcionites.

Winsome Munro has shown⁵ how the Pastorals were all circulated as orthodox, catholicizing counterparts competing with (or seeking to control the interpretation of) the already extant Pauline Corpus favored among Gnostics and Marcionites (Tertullian called Paul “the apostle of the heretics and the apostle of Marcion”). The resulting thirteen-letter Pauline Corpus was then supplemented with various interpolations into most of the earlier letters, forming what Munro calls a “Pastoral Stratum” running throughout, inculcating a socially and theologically conservative “domesticated” Paulinism. Munro, like other scholars, assumed all three Pastorals were by the same author, and so she had to cobble together a synthetic tribe of Jewish Montanists as the Pastoral opponents. But once we follow Schleiermacher’s neglected insight, we can see that catholic authorities first issued a pair of Pastorals, one addressed fictively to Timothy, the other to Titus. Titus was more specifically an incipient church order, while 2 Timothy was a “Pauline Testament,” invoking the apostle’s “famous last words” in the manner of the *Testaments of the*

⁴ *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983).

⁵ *Authority in Paul and Peter: The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series # 45 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Twelve Patriarchs, The Testament of Job, The Testament of Abraham, Plato's Crito, etc. Aim was here taken at Paul's old enemies the Judaizers, those who maximized the continuity of the new religion with Judaism. Then the need was felt to issue a third, from the same circles, among other reasons, as we have seen, to redirect the guns at the Marcionites, who took the opposite tendency and minimized Jewish-Christian continuity. This is no doubt why 1 Timothy upholds the Jewish Scriptures as inspired and beneficial for Christian ministry (1 Timothy 3:16-17), something obvious to anyone but a Marcionite.

Under Schleiermacher's guidance, we might also venture to modify MacDonald's thesis that the three Pastorals all deal with the general and variegated Paulinist encratisms of Asia Minor, adopting the same body of oral traditions about Paul invoked on behalf of encratism in the *Acts of Paul*. He shows (admittedly not for the first time) that the autobiographical data in the Pastorals is shared with the *Acts of Paul*, though the moral stance of the Pastorals is decidedly anti-encratite, hence the "battle for Paul" between two factions that claimed him. But once we separate 1 Timothy from the other two, we discover that the material held in common with the *Acts of Paul* occurs only in 2 Timothy, the anti-encratite material only in 1 Timothy. The sole exception would be the mention in 1 Timothy 2:17 of Hymenaeus and Alexander, clumsily borrowed, as Schleiermacher shows, from 2 Timothy.

Speaking of opponents, the author of 2 Timothy (3:8) compares the pesky Judaizers with the Egyptian sorcerer-priests who counterfeited Moses' miracles in Pharaoh's court. Apocryphal tradition had reduced their number to two and named them Jannes and Jambres (just as it would soon name the two thieves crucified with Jesus Demas and Gestas). Why are the names absent from 1 Timothy? Since he retained Hymenaeus and Alexander from 2 Timothy, he might have found it natural to brand the pair a latter-day Jannes and Jambres. But he has omitted them. Why? We will never know, but it is certainly possible that we have here the same tendency in a later document to clean up non-canonical references in an earlier source document. Likewise 2 Peter, though it borrows much verbatim from Jude, takes the trouble to omit Jude's references to 1 Enoch and the *Assumption of Moses*. Canon anxiety is a sign of lateness.

It is customary to note that, of all the New Testament epistles, only 1 Timothy refers to the Roman setting of the Passion of Christ. 1 Corinthians 2:8 and Colossians 2:14-15 imply that the fallen angels crucified Christ, perhaps in some transmundane realm, like the Vedic Purusha. Hebrews 9:11-12, 24-26 pictures him sacrificed in the heavenly temple. Treating of the Passion of Christ, 1 Peter can do no more than allude to Isaiah 53 (1 Peter 2:21ff.). Various attempts were eventually made to fix the earthly circumstances of the saving death. The *Gospel of Peter* ascribes the crucifixion to Herod Antipas, as did a source underlying Luke (as Loisy saw). A persistent Jewish and early Jewish-Christian tradition imagines Jesus crucified under Alexander Jannaeus. Irenaeus thought him executed in Claudius' reign. The gospels nominate Pilate, an item that apparently remained controversial enough to be stipulated in the Nicene Creed so as to silence lingering doubt. And of all the epistles, only 1 Timothy mentions Pilate as the one who interrogated Jesus (6:13, "Christ Jesus who in his testimony before Pontius Pilate made the good confession"). What does this tell us about the date and tendencies of 1 Timothy? It implies that the author was not merely familiar with the gospel tradition, but that he was specifically citing the Gospel of John. Of what does Jesus' "confession" before Pilate consist? Not much in Mark, Matthew, and Luke, where Jesus says merely "You say that I am." So equivocal is this reply that Pilate concludes the man before him is no revolutionary after all. It is only in John that Jesus is made to offer Pilate something more substantial: "So you are a king?" "You say I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, *to bear witness to the truth*" (John 18:37). Only here among the gospel Passion narratives do we find the clear language of testimony and bearing witness. And it is part of John's literary embellishment of some one of the Synoptic Passion texts, not some "fuller" Johannine tradition circulating independently as apologists might have it. So 1 Timothy knows the Gospel of John. To use it is, again, anti-Marcionite, since Marcionites used only a shorter version of Luke. And it marks 1 Timothy as very late indeed.

We have said that 1 Timothy represents the fusion of the church manual Titus with the Pauline Testament of 2 Timothy. By means of such conflation, 1 Timothy has sacrificed the most effective warrant invoked by 2 Timothy, the gravity of famous last words. 1 Timothy poses merely as another

letter of Paul posted during his career. That is still quite weighty, but certainly less so than 2 Timothy. Why make such a sacrifice? I suggest it has everything to do with the process of catholicizing rapprochement between Judaizing Christianity and radical Paulinism that led to emerging catholic orthodoxy. We can already see a hint, a minor sign, of this tendency in the replacement in 1 Timothy of the Judaizers by the Marcionites as Paul's opponents. But the treatment of Paul's biography is a major development along these lines: 1 Timothy has substituted the legend of Paul's conversion from persecutor to apostle for that of his glorious martyrdom.

We can discern in various early Christian documents a tendency to magnify diverse apostolic figures to Christlike proportions until they virtually become Christs in their own right. Already in 1 Corinthians (whether it be judged Pauline or not) there is some toying with whether Paul, Cephas, and Apollos are on a par with Christ, whether perhaps some thought, or might as well think, that Paul was crucified for them instead of Christ (1:12-13). In the pseudonymous Colossians Paul does function as a co-redeemer with Christ (1:24). In the *Acts of Paul* he dies, abandons his empty tomb, appears alive to his disciples and ascends into heaven. In the Nag Hammadi *Apocalypse of Paul*, he is, without any reference at all to Jesus Christ, himself commissioned to act as the Gnostic Redeemer in his own right! We know from the canonical Acts that the process of catholicizing rapprochement entailed the concession that Paul was not a true apostle like the Twelve. It may well be a similar concession that the Passion of Paul, though clearly anticipated in Acts (20:25, 38; 21:11), is conspicuous by its absence. The narrative leads right up to it and comes to a screeching halt. Acts means to downplay the martyrdom of Paul, an event of which too many Paulinists were making far too much. And this may well be the reason that the Passion of Paul, so important in 2 Timothy, does not survive into 1 Timothy, which otherwise could easily have passed as another "Prison Epistle" anticipating Paul's death, like Philippians. Perhaps the writer of 1 Timothy read 2 Timothy 2:10 ("Therefore I endure everything for the sake of the elect, that they may obtain the salvation which in Christ Jesus goes with eternal glory") and did not like the seeming echo of Colossians 1:24.

On the other hand, of Paul's miraculous conversion from persecutor to apostle (1 Timothy 1:12-16) we hear absolutely nothing in either 2 Timothy or Titus. Titus 3:3-7, perhaps sur-

prisingly, seems to place Paul in the general category of redeemed sinners, straying from the path until Christ's salvation came along — just like everyone else. There is no hint of his being a worse sinner than anyone else, much less a blasphemer of Christ and a torturer of Christians. 2 Timothy 1:3 posits direct continuity between Paul's piety and that of his Jewish ancestors. 2 Timothy 1:11 and Titus 1:3 mention Paul's call to ministry, but nothing is said of any radical reversal. Reading these two Pastorals, we might be excused for supposing Paul to have come to the ministry from an uninterrupted life of traditional (Christian) piety, pretty much the same impression one receives from Romans 16:7, where one reads of Paul's relatives who preceded him into the Christian ministry.⁶ None of this would remotely hint of a man making a complete and total break with his religious tradition and making a meteoric rise to the leadership of its rival (as in Philippians 3:5-9; Galatians 1:14-15), much less of his having been a bloodthirsty inquisitor.

I have argued elsewhere ⁷ that the familiar story of Paul's persecutions issuing in his miraculous conversion is a secondary development of the Pauline legend, grafted onto the story of his apostolic call (before which, originally, he may well have already been a Christian believer). It is a story created by Luke and based specifically on the miraculous conversions of Heliodorus, lieutenant of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, in 2 Maccabees chapter 3, and of Pentheus, persecutor of Dionysus and his Maenads, in Euripides' *The Bacchae*. The story does not appear in the earlier strata of the Pauline Epistles, but it has been inserted in those texts at several points. Galatians 1:13-14, 22-24, as J. C. O'Neill has shown,⁸ is secondary. The passage also features a number of words less characteristic of Paul than of the Pastorals and Ephesians, as well as sentence structure atypical for Paul. It parallels "Judaism" and Christianity as separate religions, an anachronism, and it uses the phrase "the faith" to refer, in the manner of the Pastorals, to the Christian religion. 1 Corinthians 15:9-10, which recalls Paul the converted persecutor, belongs to an interpolated passage, consisting of verses 3-11 (as I, following

⁶ Anthony J. Blasi, *Making Charisma: The Social Construction of Paul's Public Image* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1991), p. 26.

⁷ "The Legend of Paul's Conversion," *Journal for the Critical Study of Religion*, vol. 3/1 (Fall/Winter 1998).

⁸ *The Recovery of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London: SPCK, 1972), p. 24.

the hint of scholars including Arthur Drews, J.C. O'Neill, George A. Wells, and Winsome Munro, have argued at some length elsewhere.)⁹ The interpolated passage manifests plain signs of a catholicizing origin, namely the fusion of originally competing pro-James and pro-Peter apostolic lists of resurrection appearances, the declaration of gospel unity between Paul and the Twelve, and the outrageous notion (contra Galatians 1:11-12) that Paul learned his gospel message from the Jerusalem apostles! And of course we find the miraculous conversion story no less than three times in Luke's Acts (9:1-19ff.; 22:3-21; 26:9-23), as well as in 1 Timothy. I would suggest these interpolations fit the program of the "Pastoralizing" stratum indicated by Munro, as does the promotion of the story in Acts, which stems from the same ecclesiastical quarter.

The notion of Paul the persecutor must have originated in Ebionite (Jewish Christian) polemic. As a preacher of a rival Christian sect (i.e., an opponent of the Judaizers), setting aside the Torah for Gentiles and perhaps even for Jewish believers in Jesus (Acts 21:21), Paul appeared to them as the veriest Anti-christ and is so represented in the Pseudo-Clementines as Simon Magus. Whether they pictured him as actually shedding the blood of Torah-Christians, they saw him as a bitter opponent of the Saints, the Poor, those of the Way, the Jewish Christians. This was the Ebionite account of Paul the *Christian* "persecutor" of Christians and enemy of the (true) gospel. It in no way suggested that as a Jew without Christian faith he had shed the blood of Christians. This last was a reinterpretation in the wake of the catholicizing rapprochement of the second century. Now, in rose-colored retrospective, Christians had always been simply Christians (except for Gnostics, yet beyond the pale), so the tale of Paul the opponent of the faith became the tale we know today. But why was it not simply dispensed with as slander?

I believe the persecutor legend was retained as a way of mitigating Paul's authority (i.e., that of the Epistles and Apocalypses assigned to him), diluting the influence and impact of Paulinism in the emerging catholic church. The case is precisely parallel to that of the story of Peter's threefold denial of Jesus, really the story of Peter's damning apostasy. Whether there was any historical basis to it or not, the story circulated to vilify Peter

⁹ "Apocryphal Apparitions: 1 Corinthians 15:3-11 as a Post-Pauline Interpolation," *Journal of Higher Criticism*, vol. 2/2 (Fall 1995), 69-99.

and thus to undermine the tradition/community that claimed his authority, including Torah-Christianity. Paulinists entering into the catholicizing synthesis of the second century were not about to allow this story to be buried, because it served at least to qualify the authority of Peter's legacy. The retention of both Petrine and Pauline derogatory legends was the price for each faction's entrance into the rapprochement. We witness the same sort of thing in Matthew, where the evangelist retains Mark 8:33's anathema on Simon Peter as the Great Satan (Matthew 16:23) but juxtaposes it alongside the bestowal of universal regency on Peter (Matthew 16:17-19). Again, as F.C. Baur showed long ago, Luke's Acts likewise parallels the achievements of Peter and Paul in so inescapably obvious a way in order to enforce a kind of "equal time rule" to mollify the factions of Peter and Paul in their new and uneasy alliance.

The vilification of Mary Magdalene (by Christians, as I have argued elsewhere)¹⁰ as both a prostitute and a demoniac with seven devils (the number indicating the folk-fictive origin of the whole idea) is probably yet another example of the same tendency. Mary Magdalene as we encounter her in the gospels appears to be a very important figure, yet for whose importance we cannot really account—until we read of the theological stature accorded her in various non-canonical books of the second and third centuries, where she appears as the fountainhead of egalitarian, encratite, and proto-gnostic doctrines. She, too, finally made it into the canonical New Testament, but with a high admission price. Shorn of her authority and real significance, she is handled gingerly and in contradictory ways: did she alone see the Risen One? Or along with others? Or did she see him at all? Or only angels? Though redeemed and a companion of Jesus, Mary Magdalene was still, as Celsus put it, a hysterical female, and this even by the Christian account of her! So if Christians, say, in southern Gaul heard heresies ascribed to her, they should turn away.

So 1 Timothy replaces the dangerous Passion of Paul in 2 Timothy with the ecumenically safer story of his miraculous conversion from butcher to teacher of Christians. But as a sort of place-saver for the Passion of Paul where it stood at the end of 2 Timothy, he has added the otherwise gratuitous note about the

¹⁰ "Mary Magdalene: Gnostic Apostle?" *Grail*, June 1990, vol. 6/7.

Passion of Jesus (1 Timothy 6:13), his interview before Pilate. Otherwise, what is it doing there?

Only once we adopt Schleiermacher's sadly ignored discovery that 1 Timothy is not only not from the hand of Paul but not even from the falsifying hand of the pseudepigraphical author of 2 Timothy and Titus are we in any position to understand the hitherto-baffling differences and similarities between 1 Timothy on the one hand and 2 Timothy and Titus on the other. Once we appreciate Schleiermacher's insight we can bring to bear on 1 Timothy the whole battery of redaction-critical techniques, and in this way we will be able not only to understand what 1 Timothy is *not*, namely an epistle of Paul, but, just as importantly, what it *is*: a unique document that both illuminates a corner of early Christian history and is illuminated by it. In this way we hope to have extended Schleiermacher's insights, which others have extended to clarify the nature of 2 Timothy and Titus, to clarify the true character of 1 Timothy itself.



Friedrich Schleiermacher