Paul’s Pastoral Epistles

We will start today with the Pastoral Epistles. Before we pray together, let me ask you to turn in your Bible to 2 Timothy 3:10. Oftentimes you might hear this passage preached in an ordination service or used in a charge. Paul charges Timothy. Timothy’s grandmother and mother probably became Christians during Paul’s first missionary journey as he went through Lystra and Derbe. Timothy accompanied Paul throughout his second journey and represented him on short trips to solve pastoral problems. He became Paul’s right-hand man. Paul calls him “my son” in the faith. Second Timothy 3:10-17 reads,

You know, however, all about my teaching, my way of life, my purpose, faith, patience, love, endurance, persecutions, sufferings, what kind of things happened to me in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, the persecutions I endured. Yet the Lord rescued me from all of them. In fact, everyone who wants to live a godly life in Christ Jesus will be persecuted, while evil men and imposters will go from bad to worse, deceiving and being deceived. But as for you, continue in what you have learned and have become convinced of because you know those from whom you have learned it and how from infancy you have known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All scripture is breathed out by God and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting, and training in righteousness so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work.

Let us pray together.

Lord, thank You for Your love for us. Thank You for not only loving us so much that you tell us the truth, but thank You for loving us so much that You give us Yourself. You did not withhold Your own Son, but You freely gave Him for us that might see Your glory. We can know You because You have come all the way to us and taken on the tough challenges of our lives. You have taken on the brutality of the injustices of our lives and stood in our place for the sins of our lives. Not only did You give us Your Son, but You also poured out Your Spirit on us that we might be empowered for witness—so we might be empowered, enlisted, and equipped with gifts to be part of the advancement of Your kingdom reign in the world. What an incredible privilege, Lord, to know You as our God and have You as our God. It is a privilege to be part of what You are doing in the world. Lord, I thank You for my brothers and sisters. I pray, Lord, that You would continue to bless them. Keep us healthy. Lord, when we return to family, job, church, and citizenry in the different places You have scattered all of us, may we be refreshed. May we be hopeful, not because of our sufficiency, but because of the power of Your Spirit at work through us. Give us hope because of the power of Your Word and its ability to change things. Change us, Lord, by it we pray in Jesus’s name. Amen.

As we begin looking first at the Pastoral Epistles, it is a reminder as we have read together from 2 Timothy 3 of the nature of Pauline letters. They are very different from the Gospels in the sense that the Gospel writers’ personalities are pretty well hidden behind the fact that they put the events of Jesus’ life front and center. We only see their interests as they make choices about events to report. They make choices about the teachings of Jesus to record. They reveal in those choices the needs of their audience.

Hermeneutical Controls for Avoiding Three Common Fallacies

We have talked all along as we have looked at the New Testament about this bond. There is a bond between author, audience, and text. This is a very good test. My friend and mentor, Richard Pratt, calls these the controls for meaning. It is a very good test hermeneutically because if you fracture this bond you will misunderstand something. There are three main errors that are associated with fracturing the
various bonds. You could fracture the bond between the author and the text as is the popular thing to do in terms of the death of the author, declared by new literary criticism. Then what we do by cutting off the author is we make our concerns as readers the most important thing. Let me put it another way that is a little easier to remember. The error we can make with regard to audience if we make them most important and prominent is called the affective fallacy. The affective fallacy superimposes on the text our own ideologies. It is very clear to us as Evangelicals when we say that liberation theologians who write from the Marxist perspective put a Marxist agenda over the text about class distinctions, warfare, the bourgeoisie, and proletariat. We might criticize feminists for doing this in terms of saying, “This is a patriarchal society. We really need to read the text in the light of egalitarian concerns.” We have recognized the affective fallacy in others. I want to suggest we need to be careful for ourselves as well. All of us bring things to the text. We cannot change that. We just need to acknowledge it. In other words, it is very easy for us in terms of our tradition to bring strong assumptions shaped by the Westminster tradition to the text. We read certain theologies and ideologies and can impose them on the text if we are not careful. By overemphasizing audience concerns, we can commit the affective fallacy.

When we overemphasize the text and cut the author and audience out of the picture, we commit the graphic fallacy. This is a common problem in devotional reading. Devotional reading has its place. I do not want to say that there is not a very important part of our sanctification that makes a simple assumption that the Holy Spirit speaks to us through the text. That is something very precious that we want to maintain. However, oftentimes you will see this in devotionals, even from some of the people who have encouraged us the most. You will see Spurgeon, for example, in Morning and Evening take a little theme and a few snippets of words and then make it a metaphor for something he will talk about that has to do with the Christian life. That is okay as long as we understand that the text that he uses probably is not about that. It would have been better if he had gone to another part of the Bible where the Bible does teach that. He says things that are true because of other parts of the Bible. He does not always make this mistake, but you will see it especially with the Old Testament. For example, there is a devotional on Ruth dining on the gleanings from Boaz’s field. All of a sudden we are into the Lord’s Supper for some reason. The devotional leaps to the Lord’s Table. Do you see what I am saying? The graphic fallacy is that you cut the text out of its historical context, lift it up, and move it around wherever you want to put it. You put it in a different context and use it as a metaphor or theme. You put it into a different situation. It becomes free-floating. That is called the graphic fallacy.

The other fallacy is if we think that we can get in the head of the author and cut out the other things. Our thought might go, “I have been able to do psychological analysis of Shakespeare or Luther’s writings so well as a reader that I know even better than they what they meant to say.” This is called the intentional fallacy. The key way this is made is by using other writings or psychological or sociological analysis to build our idea of the author so big, but we disconnect it from the text. The interesting thing is that we have access to the author’s intent. Authorial intent is a very important hermeneutical principle. It is crucial. Otherwise we make the graphic or affective fallacy. Our only access to the author’s intent is through the text. Pratt makes a very good point when he says we cannot break this bond. These are the controls for meaning. Do not break the bond between author, audience, and text.

What we have to do is test knowledge of context by the text. We need to do some hard work of learning about that world. Remember the Lite-Brite® analogy. The light of the world shines behind the text through the text. As we work hard to get to know that world, it will be an ongoing process as well. We will make some mistakes about it, but we will keep learning as we go along. The key about that in relation to author, audience, and text is we have to keep coming back to the text. This goes back to audience as well. We have to test our assumptions about the world behind that text. We have to keep testing it by the limits of the text. That is our primary control.
There is another thing about what I have been talking about. I have been suggesting that discourse analysis holds a lot of promise for us. The thing about discourse analysis is that it emphasizes that the whole text works together. When you test out something about slavery, for example, it is not just about the phrase where Paul talks about slaves and sons. You have to ask the question, “How does this impact the whole of Romans? How does this understanding impact the whole of Philemon?” We really have to look at each letter or Gospel as a whole communicative event. It is an act of communication. That is part of what is a challenge for us in microscopic preaching. Sometimes we lose the forest because we have our teeth in the bark of the tree. We cannot see, and some of the things we say about what it is in the bark really need the perspective of an airplane flyover. That is what is so wonderful about a course like this. This is the airplane flyover of the New Testament. We have plunged down a few times because we have to test the airplane flyover by the trees, too. It goes both ways: forest and trees, trees and forest. The thing about discourse analysis is you could take a passage like Romans 6, for example, about being buried with Christ and being set free from the slavery of sin and you talk about its relation to the institution of slavery. What you say about interpreting that passage really has to be consistent with what is also said in other places in Romans as an act of communication as a whole. That is important as well. We have some tests and controls. We cannot just pin everything on the world behind the text. It has to be tested by the text. They all work together, and that is the control that we have. This idea is laid out in the first four or five chapters of Pratt’s *He Gave Us Stories*.

**Paul’s Pastoral Epistles: Letters to Individual Leaders**

That is an introduction to what we really need to talk about, which is the Pastoral Epistles. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, and I was making a comparison of the difference between the letters and the Gospels. In the letters Paul’s personality is front and center. We see that time and time again. We see his bewilderment with the Galatians and his affection for the Thessalonians and the Philippians. Here it is interesting because in the Pastoral Epistles we have something really different. All these other letters are to churches, but the letters to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon are to individuals. We really have to keep that in mind. Again, the author concerns are that Paul’s personality is front and center. He was trained as a Pharisee and raised in a Greco-Roman city of Tarsus. He was trained in Jerusalem. We see these things in his ability to communicate from the Old Testament Scriptures and to use Greek rhetoric, as we have talked about.

Timothy had a Jewish mother and grandmother. We learn from Paul in the passage we read in 2 Timothy 3 that Timothy has been raised in the Scriptures. He knows the Scriptures, and his mother and grandmothers were probably converts on Paul’s first missionary journey. Then Timothy became Paul’s right-hand man.

**Pauline Authorship**

What we have in the scholarship on the Pastoral Epistles is a lot of questions about authorship. I want to say that the biggest reason for that, whether it is credit or blame, probably still goes to the Tübingen school and Ferdinand Christian Baur. Baur came up with this scheme of understanding early Christian history. It was based on the philosophy of Hegel, of thesis, antithesis, synthesis. That was Hegel’s idea of how the spirit of history and of the age works. You have an ideological push, an ideological push back, and then an ideological synthesis. It is more sociological and ideological, than historical. Baur’s genius was to use that and say this is the way early Christian history worked. He viewed Jewish Christianity as the thesis; the massive influx of Gentiles as the antithesis and what he calls “early Catholicism” as the synthesis. Baur places the Pastoral Epistles in the synthesis stage because they seem to be concerned with building an institution. There is a lot of emphasis on the qualification for officers, for example. Instead of the early dynamic movement that was brought about through charismatic...
speakers, now the church was beginning to become institutionally established. It needed institutional structures. But you do not start with that. You do that later in organizational development. This is his idea of this movement, and he says this is not Paul. Paul was early, but the Pastoral Epistles were much later. Whoever wrote the Pastoral Epistles, according to Baur and others, really paid attention to Paul and might have been in a Pauline school, but because their concern is institutional stability and development, it cannot be Paul. He says it was written later by someone else. There was not any significant challenge to Pauline authorship until Baur.

That historical schema has been largely undermined, especially by the work of Martin Hengel, most recently. He shows that there was no pure Jew or pure Gentile. What they had was Hellenistic Judaism. We talked about that earlier. This is Martin Hengel’s contribution. He says there is not a clear movement of first, second, and third generation like we were led to believe by Baur and others. History is a lot messier than that. Even though that schema has been undermined and we understand a lot more about the messiness of the early first century, we have not quite caught up with some of the ways the NT canon was pegged into different slots of the Baur schema. NT scholars have not adequately reevaluated this yet.

When we come to matters of authorship, here are some of the things that have been pointed out. Pauline terms like “faith, law, righteousness, and conscience” appear but with different emphases. Faith, for example, seems less an obedience response to God and more about a body of teaching (the faith). Look at 1 Timothy 5:8, for example. “If anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his immediate family, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.” You can see the way that faith is being used there. It is a Pauline word, but it is not used in the same way. Titus 1:1-2 says, “Paul, a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ for the faith of God’s elect and the knowledge of the truth that leads to godliness—a faith and knowledge resting on the hope of eternal life.” It is really true. There is no denying the fact that the letters to Timothy and Titus are very much about sound doctrine. They are very much focused on a body of teaching that needs to be protected and proliferated. The biggest challenge that is talked about in these letters is false teaching. Because that is the biggest challenge, then we talk about the faith and not faith as an obedient response, which is Paul’s earlier emphasis. Some people talk about that in terms of authorship.

Law is another area that is highlighted in Paul’s authorship. Notice what 1 Timothy 1:8-11 says. “We know that the law is good if one uses it properly. We also know that law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.” The law is primarily for the unbeliever or primarily anything that is contrary to sound doctrine. There is not the emphasis that we have in Romans, Galatians, or Philippians 3 on law as covenantal Torah, the law of Moses. This would be a good place to go to talk about Calvin’s second use of the law. We talked about how the law restrains evil in civil society. It is interesting that in both Ephesus, which is the context for Timothy, and Crete, which is the context for Titus, we have some really big cultural challenges. We have the proliferation of wealth, immorality, and occultism in Ephesus. We do not have so much the wealth issues at Crete that we have at Ephesus, but we do have brutal, uncivilized behavior that has even reached proverbial status. You call someone a Cretan, and you mean they are brutal, crass, and uncivilized. We have these contexts, and that is why we have a different emphasis on the law here as well.

Righteous is also a Pauline word. It does not signify the right relation with God through the Gospel, but it is more focused on a virtue in the sense of justice and fairness. Look at 1 Timothy 6:11. Paul’s charge
to Timothy is, “You, man of God, flee from all this, and pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, endurance, and gentleness.” This is similar to the list of the fruit of the Spirit. The emphasis of righteousness here is more on the issue of sanctification, not justification.

Tradition, as the deposit of the truth, is to be protected. The use of *paradosis*, which means “I give over” or “the tradition” in 1 Corinthians 15 says, “I give to you what I first received.” There is a similar phrase in 1 Corinthians 11 about the Lord’s Supper. There is more of a transfer of something that has been given. The tradition that is referred to in the Pastoral Epistles is more the idea of a body of teaching, like the faith. It is something to be protected and revered rather than the dynamic of generational transfer.

Some people, beginning with Baur, have focused on differences with style and vocabulary with Paul to challenge Pauline authorship. There is also the presence of a highly developed leadership structure, including elders and deacons. He points out that institutional development comes later. There is the use of Gnostic elements by opponents, so there is an emphasis on knowledge. There is also a view that there is a lack of continuity with Acts.

In response to that I would say this: The differences in the use of Pauline terms like faith, law, righteousness, and conscience could be attributed more to the needs of a different context. It could also be attributed to the unique roles of the individuals that are being written to. Again, let us appreciate the difference between the purpose of Romans and Galatians, for example. In those books Paul writes to an entire congregation. There is also a purpose of why he might write to a pastor. That pastor is beleaguered by false teachers in a context of immoral, brutish behavior where he is being persecuted. You see, this author/audience thing has an impact on the words you choose and even the way you use those words. I would suggest we think about that before we throw Pauline authorship out. Let us think about the fact that Paul’s purposes in writing to a congregation are different from his purposes in writing to an individual who is a pastor in a particular situation like Ephesus and Crete.

In terms of the question of leadership structures, Timothy and Titus do not establish it. They merely pick up a structure that is already clear in Philippians 1. No serious scholar doubts that Philippians is Pauline, so let us turn there. Philippians 1:1 is a passage that Paul writes from Rome. “To all the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi, together with the overseers and deacons.” In the congregation this is already clearly established. Look back at Acts 14:23 to Luke’s account of Paul’s first missionary journey. Notice what he did on his first journey, “Paul and Barnabas appointed elders for them in each church and, with prayer and fasting, committed them to the Lord, in whom they had put their trust.” It is interesting that by these texts this schema of generational change does not correspond with the different documents of the New Testament. You see institutional issues happening from the beginning. That happens because in the synagogues where Paul’s ministry began they had elders. He took over things that were already well-known structures and incorporated them into the institutional growth and stability of the church.

We will talk about this last issue about continuity with Acts in just a moment. There are actually some strong correlations between Timothy and what happens at Ephesus and Acts 19. Let us go ahead and turn there. Let me remind you of Paul’s farewell to the elders at Ephesus. Look at Acts 20 and notice a couple of things. We read this passage before when we were in Acts, so we will not read the whole thing. Let me point out to you Paul’s concerns in his farewell. Acts 20:28-29 says, “Be shepherds of the church of God, which he bought with his own blood. I know that after I leave savage wolves will come in among you and will not spare the flock. Even from your own number men will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them. So be on your guard! Remember that for three years I never stopped warning each of you night and day with tears […] I have not coveted anyone’s silver or gold or clothing.” He is referring to the church at Ephesus here. It is interesting that what we see in 1
and 2 Timothy is exactly the same concerns as Paul’s farewell. You have a focus of difficulty with false teachers from inside the church. The other big issue that he deals with is greed and the problem with riches. Those two concerns that are reflected in Acts 20 are right there, front and center in 1 and 2 Timothy.

This is a good example of what some have asked about. It is important to test these things by the text. We thought we knew certain things about the world out there. From Baur’s schema we thought we understood that there was Jewish Christianity, Gentile Christianity, and a synthesis and build-up of institution. It does not stack up against a reading of Acts and the Pastoral Epistles together, though. In other words, I defend Pauline authorship. There are too many assumptions that need to be tested in terms of the main concerns that have been raised about authorship.

**Can Paul’s Writing of the Pastorals Fit into the Scheme of Acts?**

I have a little bit of a different spin on the Pastoral Epistles. It is rooted in a book called *Reclaiming Paul’s Letters*, and Bo Reicke is the primary author. He is an important Swiss New Testament scholar. One of my mentors, David Moessner, edited this after Dr. Reicke’s death. To be sure, the traditional view for Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is that they are reflective of a fourth missionary journey. At the end of Acts we see that Paul is under house arrest in Rome. If we compare Philippians and Philemon, there is some expectation that he might be released. We have also in 1 Clement 5:6 some indications of this. He talks about the farthest boundaries of the west in regard to Paul’s ministry. We also have the hint at the end of Romans that Paul is on his way to Spain. The traditional view, which is also based somewhat on Eusebius, is that Paul was released from house arrest, and then he continued his mission to Spain. He then was arrested again and martyred by Nero after a second imprisonment in 68 AD. This is the idea of the fourth missionary journey. You see how some of the locations are mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles. Nicopolis is mentioned at the end of Titus. Crete is where Titus was, and Paul mentions Spain. Paul went across to the west to Spain and came back around through the Mediterranean via Crete. He then had to come back to Rome again. That is the traditional view. I mentioned Philippians 1:25-26 and Philemon 2 and the likelihood of Paul possibly being released. We have indications of these various locations in Titus 1, where Paul talks about Crete. Philemon 22 mentions Paul’s intention to go to Colossae. First Timothy mentions Ephesus. Then we have references to Nicopolis in Titus and Rome in 1 Clement.

I want to suggest, on the basis of Reicke’s work, that it is possible to integrate these locations into the structure of Acts. Turn to Acts 19. In other words, I want to suggest the possibility, and likelihood in my view, that Paul was not released for a fourth missionary journey. These locations that are talked about in relation to Timothy’s ministry to Corinth, Ephesus, and Titus to Crete can be integrated into what is going on in Acts. There is time and opportunity for them to move to these places such that the Pastoral Epistles and everything that goes on with the Pastoral Epistles is integrated into the framework of Acts, instead of being placed after the end of Acts. Let me give you an example. It is a little bit complicated, but I will do my best to make it clear.

In Acts 19:22 we see that Timothy is sent to Macedonia. “He sent two of his helpers, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia, while he stayed in the province of Asia a little longer.” Paul is at Ephesus, and he sends Timothy probably to Corinth. We also have read about Paul’s farewell to the Ephesian elders in the next chapter. He warns that “Savage wolves will come in,” and he anticipates a problem with greed. In 1 Corinthians 4:17 we see that Timothy is sent from Ephesus to Corinth. “I am sending to you Timothy, my son whom I love, who is faithful in the Lord. He will remind you of my way of life in Christ Jesus, which agrees with what I teach everywhere in every church.” The phrase “my way of life” corresponds to what Paul says to Timothy in his charge. That phrase echoes right out of 2 Timothy, and
there is a really close correspondence there. Timothy is sent from Ephesus to Corinth, which means that Timothy was already in Ephesus. He already has relationships with the leaders in Ephesus. At the end of Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 16:5-11 we see that Paul awaits Timothy’s return. “After I go through Macedonia, I will come to you—for I will be going through Macedonia. Perhaps I will stay with you awhile, or even spend the winter […] If Timothy comes, see to it that he has nothing to fear while he is with you […] No one, then, should refuse to accept him. Send him on his way in peace so that he may return to me. I am expecting him along with the brothers.” Paul is in Ephesus when he says this. He leaves to go to Troas and Macedonia. On the basis of Acts 19 and 20 and 1 Corinthians 4 and 16 we have a framework that Timothy is expected to return to Ephesus. Paul was going to wait for him there, but he ends up leaving. Timothy probably just returned to Ephesus anyway. Paul writes back to Timothy to encourage him at Ephesus.

In other words, it is not irreconcilable to understand the Pastoral Epistles in relation to Acts and the earlier Pauline letters. You do not need a fourth missionary journey. The problem I have with that view, which is the traditional view based on the report of Eusebius, is Paul’s second arrest. Why did that happen? There are a lot of questions about that. It seems more understandable to me that he never was released. The expectation at the end of Acts is that he will go before Caesar. It is a big deal and a huge case. It is like a case before the Supreme Court. He made an appeal to Caesar. That does not get wiped off the books and all of a sudden reestablished very quickly. I acknowledge my case is not the traditional view, and I want you to hear that, but I want to make a case for seeing the Pastoral Epistles as integrated into the chronology of Acts and the earlier Epistles, particularly the Corinthian epistles and the movements of Timothy to Ephesus.

Ephesians is also important with regard to the movements of Titus. Titus is very important for the whole matter of the collection at Corinth. Let me remind you of 2 Corinthians 8 and 12. Paul talks to them and encourages them to make good on their promise to contribute to his collection to help the churches in Judea. In 2 Corinthians 8:6-7 he says, “So we urged Titus, since he had earlier made a beginning, to bring also to completion this act of grace on your part. But just as you excel in everything—in faith, in speech, in knowledge, in complete earnestness and in your love for us—see that you also excel in this grace of giving.” Then verses 16 and 17 say, “I thank God, who put into the heart of Titus the same concern I have for you. For Titus not only welcomed our appeal, but he is coming to you with much enthusiasm and on his own initiative.” Titus is the one who will help bring their part of the contribution with him back to Jerusalem to meet Paul. It is interesting when you look at Titus 1:5 that it might suggest Paul’s presence in Crete. “The reason I left you in Crete was that you might straighten out what was left unfinished and appoint elders in every town, as I directed you.” It is not necessary to understand that as Paul actually being there. He could have been close by and sent Titus to the island of Crete. Because Paul was in the area he could say, “I left you in Crete.” He went on somewhere else. It is not necessary to understand that as Paul having been there.

Second Timothy 4:20 says, “Greet Priscilla and Aquila and the household of Onesiphorus. Erastus stayed in Corinth, and I left Trophimus sick in Miletus. Do your best to get here before winter. Eubulus greets you, and so do Pudens, Linus, Claudia and all the brothers.” Paul wrote 2 Timothy from Rome. This is Paul’s last letter, and he is about to be “poured out.” As he left that part of the world he could have left Titus in Crete as he went on to Rome. The end of Romans and Acts show us that Paul gets arrested in Jerusalem because of the civil disturbance there. That is in Acts 21. He appeals to Caesar, and then the rest of Acts tracks him as he is brought back to Rome. Acts ends, and he is under house arrest in Rome to see Caesar for a high-stakes court case. We have looked at Acts 19 and 20, the movements of Timothy in relation to the Corinthian and Ephesian churches, and the movements of Titus in his involvement with the collection and the trip from Jerusalem to Rome. Titus gets left in Crete after
helping get the collection to Paul in Jerusalem. Titus appoints elders in Crete and establishes the church there. Because he is in custody, Paul has to go to Rome. That is my view. It is based on the hard work of Bo Reicke and David Moessner. It shows how the Pastoral Epistles fit within the structure of Acts.

Eusebius had the idea of a fourth missionary journey for Paul in that he preserved the tradition of release from house arrest. It is not like Eusebius and Clement exactly to say there was a fourth trip. The language of Clement calls it “the furthest bounds of the west,” in terms of Paul’s mission. That could mean Rome. Clement was in Corinth. The biggest thing is Rome. It does not have to mean Spain, but it could mean that. I acknowledge that my view is not watertight either. It is somewhat unclear what Clement and Eusebius are talking about. I acknowledge that could be an issue. The language is not clear enough, and yet the text of the Bible is clear enough. My focus is on the text of Scripture. But at the same time I do not want to deny early traditions, because the fathers give us very important information. I do not make a claim to have all the answers. I just suggest that the things that are talked about in terms of Timothy and Titus’ ministry can actually fit within Acts. You cannot say, as Baur and others said, that the Pastoral Epistles do not connect with Acts. That much I want to assert. You just cannot say that. In addition, the Pastoral Epistles connect with 1 and 2 Corinthians. That is the main point I want to make. I do not want to necessarily say we cannot believe in a fourth journey.

My sense of the end of Acts, even though Luke does not record Paul’s death, is that the Miletus speech makes it clear that Luke is aware of Paul’s death. That is very much implied, and part of what Acts is about is strengthening these congregations despite the fact that their leader has been killed. There are questions on both sides. I do not want to spend too much time on this, but I really wanted to outline this for you. To me it has been immensely helpful for defending the Pastoral Epistles on an historical basis.