

THE LETTER TO TITUS

Extras fără note de subsol

Excerpt from I.H. Marshall & P.H. Towner, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.

OPENING SALUTATION (1:1–4)

Berger, K., ‘Apostelbrief und apostolische Rede: Zum Formular frühchristlicher Briefe’, *ZNW* 65 (1974), 190–231; Hegermann 1970:47–64; Lieu, J. M., ‘“Grace to you and peace”: the apostolic greeting’, *BJRL* 68 (1985), 161–78; Prior 1989:37–59; Roloff, 55–7 (cf. 1965:255f.); Schnider and Stenger 1987; Stenger 1974:252–67; Vouga, F., ‘Der Brief als Form der apostolischen Autorität’, in Berger, K., *Studies und Texte zur Formgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), 7–58; Wolter 1988:82–90; Zmijewski 1979:97–118.

The opening salutation follows a pattern which is familiar from the earlier letters in the Pauline corpus. The Pauline pattern in its turn represents a Christianisation of a secular form of epistolary greeting. The typical form found in Jewish letters named the writer and the recipients and expressed a greeting, e.g.: ‘A to B: greeting and good peace’ (2 Macc 1:1; cf. 1:10). The Pauline form expands all three parts to indicate the Christian standing and authority of the writer, the Christian character of the recipients, and the Christian nature of the greeting expressed. The Christian gospel thus comes to brief and concentrated expression together with an indication that the presentation of it which will follow in the letter rests ultimately on divine authority.

Titus has the fullest salutation of the three Pastorals. As typically in the Pauline letters, this section sets the tone and introduces the concerns that the letter will later address. Its formality and fulness of content suggest that it is meant not only for Titus but also for the churches for which he is responsible.

The description of the sender is especially developed. Paul is presented as a slave and apostle, a combination of titles which expresses both his position under divine authority and his commission with divine authority to function in the church. His task is to forward faith and knowledge of the truth among God’s elect. This task derives its impetus from the hope of eternal life which (a) has been promised by God since time immemorial; (b)

has been revealed at the appropriate time as the word which is made known in the church’s proclamation; and (c) has been entrusted to Paul by the commandment of God in his role as Saviour. Thus the characterisation of Paul’s role develops into a brief statement of the gospel with which he has been entrusted, and the emphasis in the salutation lies upon God’s purpose of salvation.

Titus is addressed as his genuine ‘child’ who shares the same faith and therefore stands in the service of the same gospel by virtue of his fellowship with and appointment by Paul.

Paul sends greetings to him, praying for him to receive spiritual blessings from God the Father and Christ the Saviour.

The function of the salutation is therefore to set the tone of the letter at its outset by stressing (a) the authority which Paul has received from God, (b) the nature of his ministry, and also (c) the content of the gospel which is at the base of his ministry. The material is developed in terms of the nature and goal of Paul’s apostleship which is in effect shared by Titus who is the appointed representative of the apostle Paul.¹ It thus serves in effect to state the authorisation which Titus has for his task in the church.²

In length and complexity the salutation stands closest to Romans, with which it has some links in content (Holtzmann, 116, 462), and Galatians.³ It forms an introduction containing elements or themes that will receive further development in the course of the letter (but which are common to the PE): for example, πίστις (1:1, 4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15), εὐσέβεια (1:1; 2:12), ἐλπίς (1:2; 2:13; 3:7); ζωὴ αἰώνιος (1:2; 3:7), σωτήρ/σῶζω/σωτήριος (1:3, 4; 2:10, 11, 13; 3:4, 5, 6), and the concept of divine disclosure (1:3; 2:11; 3:5). The salutation thus to some extent lays the doctrinal foundation for the practical teaching which is about to be given (Johnson, 217–19). The stress is particularly upon the doctrine of salvation. God’s gift of eternal life is grounded upon the foundation of God’s promise, and has been revealed in the approved (apostolic) preaching which was entrusted to Paul.

Proponents of pseudonymity especially detect in this emphasis on Paul the claim by a Pauline community or student that the ‘Pauline’ message alone is to be regarded as the standard for the church. Only Paul is named as the author of the letter (in contrast to those genuine letters where others are associated with him). No

mention is made of other apostles (contrast 1 Cor 9:5; Eph 2:20; 3:5). The effect is to place him on a pedestal over against the recipients, Titus and Timothy, who are described in decidedly subordinate terms as compared with earlier mentions of them (Houlden, 46). He is presented as the sole channel of the message or guarantor of salvation, a role which he then delegates to his colleagues. Bühner claims that this motif is closer to Luke-Acts than to Paul.⁴ Paul and his successors are thus in effect the only commissioned preachers of the message and the other apostles have vanished from the scene.⁵

However, Paul writes in his own name in Rom and Gal (and possibly Eph); the language used here is no more exclusive than that which occurs in the openings of the undisputed Paulines (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1) and elsewhere (1 Cor 4:15); and Paul's references to 'my gospel' (Rom 2:16; 16:25; cf. Gal 1:11–12) were not claims to a higher degree of authority (cf. 1 Cor 15:8–9). There was a message which had been entrusted to Paul, and the implication is that this was an existing entity before it was entrusted to him. Furthermore, since the Paul of the earlier letters considered himself to be the only apostle in his own particular mission-area (cf. Gal 2:7–9), and deliberately refrained from entering the territory of other missionaries (2 Cor 10), the absence of reference to other apostles or missionaries need not indicate a limitation of authority to Paul himself. To see in this salutation, then, elements of an exclusive claim to apostolic authority depends more on the assumption of pseudonymity than on the text. The emphasis that the author creates in these verses reflects more the concern to protect the truth of the gospel and the authority of the messenger in the churches where Titus is active. It is true that, so far as the present passage is concerned, there is stress on the entrusting of Paul with the message that God has revealed (1:3), but this is no different from the apostolic self-consciousness in 1 Cor 4:1f. For Paul the proclamation of reconciliation was an integral part of God's initiative in reconciling the world to himself in 2 Cor 5:18–21; God's saving act is twofold: his action in Christ and the commissioning of the messengers of reconciliation. (See further 1 Tim 1:1 note.)

The line followed in the salutation thus establishes the authority of the Pauline apostolate and the necessity of its ministry

of proclamation within God's salvation plan without suggesting that Paul is the only apostle. The argument aims to reclaim the authority of Paul in a Pauline church in which it has been challenged by opponents. This authority is transferred to or shared by Titus in his status as 'true child'; the salutation establishes the authoritative basis upon which Titus will teach and correct the community.

a. The Sender and His Message (1:1–3)

The self-description of Paul consists of his name followed by two phrases which describe his position as God's servant and apostle in the mission established by Jesus.⁶ Following the apostle's self-designation comes a densely structured combination of prepositional phrases and relative clauses. Two prepositional phrases define further the nature and goal of Paul's apostleship. The second then becomes the basis for a detailed explanation of the nature of the eternal life, the hope of which is determinative of apostleship, and this is rounded off with a repeated reference to Paul's own commission. The structure is:

1a (ἀπόστολος...)

1b κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ
καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας
τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν

2a ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου,

2b ἦν ἐπηγγεῖλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς
πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων

3a ἐφανερώσεν δὲ
καιροῖς ἰδίοις
τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ
ἐν κηρύγματι,

3b ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγὼ
κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ ... θεοῦ.

The relative clause commences a revelation scheme in which three moments in God's plan of salvation come into view and the major thought of the section emerges. The pattern here is that of promised/revealed which in effect is a combination of hidden/revealed and promised/fulfilled.⁷

In comparison with the schema as it appears in Romans, 1 Corinthians, Colossians and Ephesians, however, the argument here and in 2 Tim 1:9–10 concentrates less on concealment and more on revelation, and it views the results from the perspective of salvation and specifically eternal life without explicit mention of the Christ-event. The shape of the schema and the argument here make Paul's ministry central to the revelation and fulfilment of the promise, but this is entirely natural in the context of a salutation which is introducing Paul to the reader(s) and does not imply that he is presented as the only guarantor of salvation.

The schema consists of two balanced clauses (2b, 3a) followed by an expansion (3b).

(2b). On the one hand, God's promise was made 'before time began'. It is, therefore, his settled will and purpose which is unchanging and cannot be thwarted.

(3a). On the other hand the fulfilment of his promise took place when 'he revealed his word at the right time' (ἐφανερώσεν; cf. 1 Tim 3:16; 2 Tim 1:10). The fulfilment implicitly substantiates the claim that God is ἀψευδής. But the concern of the argument here is not specifically to uphold the character of God, but rather to emphasise the divine purpose fulfilled in the revelation which determines salvation and the relation of Paul's apostleship to it.

(3b). This activity is what was committed to Paul himself. His commission came by way of a divine command (cf. Quinn, 70), and he and his colleagues can issue authoritative commands to the congregations. If one can be an apostle only by the direct command of God, the appointment entitles the apostle to respect and obedience from the congregation (see Fee, 35).

Where is the stress in this description? (a) It could be on the *responsibility and office* of Paul. He refers to himself as a κήρυξ in 2 Tim 1:11 in a similar context. The phrase could thus be a means of indicating the greatness of the responsibility which he feels as he stands under the compulsion of divine command. (b) But more probably, in view of the challenge posed by heresy, the stress is rather on his *consequent authority* and the indispensable role of the (in this context, 'his') apostolic preaching ministry in the salvation plan of God (hence the emphasis on ἐν κηρύγματι). He is, then, the authoritative channel of the message, and what he

says is to be accepted as God's truth within the churches for which he is responsible. Hence the instructions which Paul gives for life in the church and which arise out of the gospel possess the highest authority (cf. Brox, 281).

TEXT

1. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (A 629 1175 a b vg^{mss} sy^h Ambst; WH t; Kilpatrick); Χριστοῦ (D*; cf. WH mg Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ]). It has been suggested that the words appear in the order Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (or Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) so that the case may readily be apparent (since Ἰησοῦ could be gen. or dat.); this is not entirely satisfactory as an explanation, but a better one has yet to be given (see the full discussion in Elliott, 198–205). Similar problems arise at Tit 1:4; 2:13; 3:6; 1 Tim 1:1, 15; 2:5; 4:6; 5:21; 2 Tim 1:1, 10; 2:3; 4:1. Despite the weight of MS attestation for the text (for which cf. 1 Pet 1:1; 2 Pet 1:1), the variant should probably be accepted.

κατ' εὐσέβειαν κατὰ εὐσέβειαν (F G). Elliott, 232, apparently accepts the variant, despite expressing hesitation elsewhere, 119. The external evidence is surely too weak.

2. ἐπ' ἐν (F G H 365 pc; omitted by 33 pc). The variant is weakly attested; there is no firm example of the phrase ἐν ἐλπίδι in the NT: Elliott, 172f.

ἐπιγγεῖλατο προεπιγγεῖλατο (1908) is defended by Elliott, 173, despite the lack of attestation on the grounds that it is not Classical and that scribes objected to compound verbs followed by the same preposition. The external attestation is too weak.

ἀψευδής ἀψευστός (F G). The form ἀψευδής is Classical, and Elliott, 173, defends the variant, but this reading could be due to assimilation to the form in 1:12.

EXEGESIS

1a. Παῦλος δοῦλος θεοῦ All the Pauline letters begin in this way with Παῦλος, the name which he regularly used; Σαῦλος is confined to Acts (cf. 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1). 'Paul' was almost certainly his Roman surname (*cognomen*).⁸ As apostle to the Gentiles, working in a Gentile environment, his tendency to refer to himself as 'Paulus' rather than, in Hebrew fashion, 'Saul' is not surprising. The habit of using only the *cognomen* was not particularly unusual.

Nine of the thirteen letters attributed to Paul follow his name closely with a reference to his apostolic office (2 Cor; Eph; Col; 1 Tim; 2 Tim are identical; cf. Rom; 1 Cor; Gal; Tit). This, however, is the only place in the Pauline writings in which 'slave

of God' occurs as a self-designation of the apostle, 'slave of Christ' being much more common.

δοῦλος, 'slave' (in the literal sense 2:9; 1 Tim 6:1), expresses the lack of freedom of the individual rather than the service rendered (*TLNT* I, 380f.). The term is often applied to Christians in general as 'slaves of Christ' (2 Tim 2:24 [Κυρίου]**; 1 Cor 7:22; Eph 6:6; Col 4:12; Rev 2:20), and Paul uses this as a self-designation (Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1; cf. 2 Pet 1:1 of Peter; Jude 1 of Jude). Occasionally Christians are designated 'slaves of God'.⁹ For the application to leaders see Jas 1:1: 'servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ'.

Behind the expression δοῦλος θεοῦ lies OT and Jewish usage reflected in 15:3, which names Moses 'the servant of God'. The phrase is used of Israel as the servant of Yahweh but also of specific individuals, especially kings and also prophets as the recipients of divine revelation.¹⁰ In view of this pattern, it would not be out of place as a designation for an apostle; an apostle is on a level with them. Cf. the use of ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος of Timothy in 1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 3:17.¹¹

As a framework for understanding the relationship between God and his messenger or people, the social institution of slavery contained elements that were readily identifiable. In the OT or NT cultural settings, slavery implied servitude, submission, obedience, absence of rights, and the complete authority of the master. A slave was the property of his or her master, and in principle a slave's existence depended upon the master and upon pleasing the master.¹² The religious usage in the OT was a natural development. Even if 'slave(s) of God' would develop later into a title of honour within the church (with a subsequent loss of meaning), some of these original implications were meant to be understood. The OT, which portrays Yahweh's representatives as his slaves/servants and therefore as bearers of his authority, provides the essential background for the NT use of the theme. In particular, the articulation of Christ's incarnation with the same imagery (Phil 2:7) provided a significant model for his followers. At the same time, the exaltation of Jesus as 'Lord' led to the substitution of 'Christ' for 'God' in the phrase, and this became Paul's preferred usage.

It is not immediately clear what motivates the return here to the form 'slave of God' as opposed to the more usual form. Several explanations have been offered: (a) It might have better suited a Jewish-Christian audience (cf. Jas 1:1; Quinn, 61). (b) The tradition in Acts 16:17 provided the model for the author's designation of Paul (Holtzmann, 462). (c) The phrase could have been chosen to get rhetorical balance with the next phrase. (d) In any case, one effect of the designation is to bring out the parallel with the OT servants of God, which some see as the author's main intention (cf. Lock, 125). Hasler, 85, thinks that, whereas 'slave of Jesus Christ' expresses subordination, 'servant of God' expresses more his function as God's representative like the prophets and other bearers of divine revelation (cf. Rev 1:1; 10:7; *et al.*). (e) But the whole sentence is concerned with what God has done (note the five occurrences of θεός) in election, promise, manifestation and commissioning; as 'saviour' he is seen as the author of salvation (though the vital role of Christ is also affirmed; v. 4). Therefore, the designation 'slave of God' is adopted mainly to conform to the dominant line of thought. Hence the next phrase is added hardly as a contrast (δέ) but as additional information ('and besides'; cf. Jude 1).

ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολος is used throughout the NT as a Christian technical term for the authorised representatives of Christ or the churches who are engaged in particular tasks, usually connected with missionary work, including the establishment and supervision of churches, and who have delegated authority for the purpose.

The term ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs as the apostle's self-designation in 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Eph 1:1; Col 1:1, 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1 (cf. 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11**),¹³ and the same identification is formed in slightly different ways in Rom 1:1 and Gal 1:1. Paul does not use it in 1 and 2 Th (though cf. 1 Th 2:7), where apparently there was no need to stress his authority in this way, in Phil, where he links himself with Timothy (who was not an apostle) as δοῦλοι of Christ, and in the more personal letter to Philemon, where he makes his requests as a δέσμιος of Christ. Even in Phil and Philemon, however, the terms used express the authoritative position which springs from being in the service of

Christ (cf. the use of δοῦλος in Rom 1:1 alongside ἀπόστολος). Here the inclusion of the term may be because the church is intended to overhear the letter or (in the case of post-Pauline authorship) to stress the authority of Paul for later generations. The change of order to ‘Jesus Christ’ (*si vera lectio*; cf. 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1) has no apparent significance.¹⁴ Apostles are always apostles of Christ rather than of God the Father, although the latter appoints them; they are in the service of Christ. They are also in the Pauline corpus never apostles or servants simply of Jesus; the official designation ‘of Christ [Jesus]’ is used (Holtzmann, 370f.)

For Paul the term ἀπόστολος expressed his calling, given an appearance to him of the risen Christ, to be a missionary, a calling which carried with it the authority to be an agent of divine revelation and to exercise a position of leadership over the congregations which he founded. This sense of Paul’s being a missionary and agent of revelation is still alive in the PE, where ‘apostle’ is closely linked with ‘herald’ and ‘teacher’ as words that bring out its meaning (1 Tim 2:7*; 2 Tim 2:11*). An apostle is thus an authoritative witness and preacher of the gospel.¹⁵

1b. κατά πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ The first of the two prepositional phrases that qualify the concept of servanthood and apostleship contains two co-ordinated phrases. Paul’s activity takes place in relation to the faith of God’s elect and [their] knowledge of the truth that is in accordance with godliness.

Basically Paul as apostle is charged with the task of ‘promoting and furthering the faith of God’s people’ (‘the elect’). It includes evangelism but goes beyond this to developing the faith of Christians through the teaching of correct doctrine. The notion of salvation in the ‘elect’ concept must be taken in the widest sense to include not simply entry into salvation, but also the working out of and maintaining of salvation in the context of membership in God’s people (cf. 1 Tim 4:16). The apostle’s ministry is by definition concerned with the entire process of salvation (cf. 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11; Col 1:28; Phil 2:12).

κατά occurs four times in vv. 1–4 (cf. 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1). Its force here is uncertain.¹⁶

(a) ‘In accordance/in keeping with the faith held by God’s elect and the truth as known by them’.¹⁷ The point will then be to characterise the way in which Paul’s service is determined by the

authentic faith rather than by the Jewish religion or heretical ideas. In an epistle that is concerned with truth over against false teaching this would be appropriate. Yet the link is a difficult one: how is ‘apostleship’ in accordance with the faith? In fact, it is not Paul’s doctrine but his commission which would here be said to be in accordance with the faith of God’s people (cf. Parry, 72).

(b) ‘In regard/with reference to the faith’, referring in a general way to the sphere of apostleship (cf. NIV ‘for the faith’; Kelly, 226). Lips 1979:32 n. 33, draws attention to the parallel between κατά and ἐν in Tit 1:4 and 1 Tim 1:2, and concludes that κατά here has the same sense as ἐν in 1 Tim 2:7; it expresses a connection or relationship.

(c) Narrowing the focus of (b), the meaning may be more ‘in the service of/to further the faith of the elect’.¹⁸ The thought would then be similar to that in Rom 1:5: ‘apostleship [leading to] the obedience of faith among the Gentiles’. The purpose of apostleship is to bring about faith, here probably to strengthen and develop the faith already held by Christian believers (White, 185).

Brox, 279, and Holtz, 204, hold that both senses (a) and (c) can be present simultaneously (*contra* Holtzmann, 462). A comparison of the openings of each of the Pastorals may shed some light on the intention of the phrase. In 1 Tim 1:1 a κατά phrase (κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ) is used to ground Paul’s apostleship and ministry in God’s action. 2 Tim 1:1 achieves this with the phrase διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ. However, the corresponding phrase here is in v. 3. where the same κατά phrase as is used in 1 Tim 1:1 is found in connection with the entrusting of the ‘preaching’ to Paul. In 2 Tim 1:1, following the grounding of Paul’s calling in God’s will, the κατά phrase ‘according to the promise of life’ explains something more about this calling; the thought is probably ‘that Paul’s apostleship springs from God’s promise and is intended to bring it to fruition’. This is close to the thought here and therefore the κατά phrase is best understood as an expression of the goal or purpose of Paul’s apostleship (view c).

πίστις ‘faith’ (1:4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15*; 1 Tim 1:2 *et al.*; 2 Tim 1:5 *et al.* See **Excursus 4**) can be either the content of the faith (fitting (a) above) or the subjective act of believing (fitting (b) and (c) above).¹⁹

ἐκλεκτός is ‘chosen’ and hence ‘of special value’ (of the Messiah, Lk 23:35; cf. 1 Pet 2:4, 6); most commonly of persons chosen by God²⁰ and made members of his people.²¹ Behind the usage here lies the frequent use in the OT for God’s people.²² The reference of the term here is disputed. If we exclude Spicq’s unlikely suggestion (592) that it was a local designation of Christians in Asia Minor, there are three possibilities.

(a) It could refer to those people previously chosen by God to become believers and so receive salvation, but who are not yet believers. Paul’s task is then to bring such elect people to faith (NJB; Spicq, 592; given as a possibility by Holtzmann, 462). The stress is then primarily on the *evangelistic* nature of Paul’s task. This understanding is strengthened by the following reference to ‘knowledge of the truth’ which normally refers to ‘coming to know the truth’. But since there is no clear evidence elsewhere for ἐκλεκτοί signifying those chosen to believe *before* they have believed, and since alongside any stress on salvation there is at least an equal (if not greater) stress on orthodoxy and truth, this reference should be excluded.

(b) The view that the term refers to all whom God has chosen for salvation, whether they have yet believed or not, is open to the same objections as (a).

(c) More probably, therefore, the term refers to those who truly belong to God’s people, with the implication that the faith which they hold is the *true* faith.²³ This view fits in with the normal usage of ‘elect’ to refer to those who are members of the people of God (see Fee, 168: the term is OT, showing the continuation of the OT people of God in the NT church). The Pauline congregations, insofar as they hold fast to Paul’s gospel, are truly the people of God.

καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ’ εὐσέβειαν The second part of the goal statement explains ‘the faith of God’s elect’ (the connective καί is expegetic) in terms of ‘the knowledge of the truth which is in accord with godliness’.

ἐπίγνωσις*, ‘knowledge’, generally has the stress on the activity of getting to know (Rom 1:28; Col 2:2; Philem 6), but sometimes more on the content of what is known (Col 1:9f.)²⁴ In the PE it is found only in the combination ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας (1

Tim 2:4; 2 Tim 2:25; 3:7; Heb 10:26).²⁵ In the PE this formula describes salvation from the perspective of one’s rational perception of ‘the truth’. It may view salvation from the standpoint of conversion, particularly when it appears in the form εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν (1 Tim 2:4; 2 Tim 3:7; cf. 2 Tim 2:25). But in other contexts it is clearly a way of referring more broadly to salvation as the state of existence characterised by the actual grasp of ‘the truth’ (cf. 1 Tim 4:3; Heb 10:26) rather than to the process of coming to know it. Such knowledge may be a growing consciousness that develops after the initial act of faith (Dornier, 121).

ἀλήθεια, ‘truth’ (1:14*; see 1 Tim 2:4; 2 Tim 2:15; cf. ἀληθής, Tit 1:13**), was used of speech which refers to things as they really are, and in Biblical Greek it acquired some of the associations of Hebrew אֱמֶת, ‘faithfulness’.²⁶

In the Qumran writings several passages employ the phrase **אֱמֶת נֶטַח** (1QS 9:17–18; 4Q Sir Sabb 1:1, 18; 1QH 10:20, 29). ‘Truth’ by itself occupies an important place in the community’s self-identity (1 QS 6:15; 2:25), for ‘knowledge of the truth’ determined one’s standing in the community and in the covenant. It was the community’s belief that it possessed ‘the truth’ that marked it off from corrupt temple Judaism. The terminology thus had a polemical purpose.

Within the early church, ‘truth’ language was developed in the context of the Pauline missionary ministry (2 Th 2:10, 12, 13–14; Col 1:5–6, Eph 1:13; Wolter 1988:71). Here the key words λόγος, ἀλήθεια, εὐαγγέλιον, πίστις come together, along with various words denoting perception and acceptance of God’s message (ἀκούω, πιστεύω, δέχομαι, ἐπιγινώσκω). In this evangelistic dialogue this terminology served a polemical or apologetic purpose as it stressed the untruth of idolatry and pagan religion.

In the PE ἀλήθεια refers to the authentic revelation of God bringing salvation. Its content is in effect summarised in 1 Tim 2:3–6 (Oberlinner, 5). Already in the early Paulines ‘the truth’ had become one of several terms to describe God’s saving revelation. Both its content and its polemic thrust are evident in the contrast which is made (often with a characteristic verb) with the false teachers and their message in a number of passages (especially 1

Tim 6:5; 2 Tim 4:4; Tit 1:14 [ἀποστρέφω]; 2 Tim 2:18 [ἀστοχέω]; 2 Tim 3:8 [ἀνθίστημι]; see also 2 Tim 2:15; 2:25; 3:7). In view of this pattern and the strong statement in v. 14 below, ‘knowledge of the truth’ does not define ‘the faith of God’s elect’ simply as the embracing of God’s revelation, but as commitment to it and rejection of all competing messages. Salvation is thus inextricably bound to the apostolic doctrine and a right decision about it.

Whether or not the Qumran or the earlier NT usage of ‘truth’ language stands behind the language of the PE,²⁷ the two bodies of literature share in common both the belief in the necessity of possessing the truth for ‘salvation’ and the polemic application of the language. It may have been a polemical interest or need that occasioned the use of ἐπίγνωσις in the PE (as elsewhere in the Pauline corpus), which might be offered to counter the opponents’ claims to possess or teach a special knowledge (γνώσις) of God.²⁸ This interest is certainly evident in the frequent use of the term ἀλήθεια in reference to the apostolic message (see below).

For εὐσέβεια*, ‘piety, godliness’ see **Excursus 1**. The addition τῆς κατ’ εὐσέβειαν²⁹ further defines ‘the truth’ and, therefore, the nature of the faith of the elect. We have the same ambiguity with κατά as earlier in the verse. The phrase can indicate: (a) the truth that is ‘in accordance with godliness’ (NRSV; cf. REB; GNB; Holtzmann, 463; Spicq, 592–3; Fee, 168; Oberlinner, 1); (b) the truth that ‘furthers/leads to godliness’ (NIV; NJB; Calvin, 353; Ellicott, 167). (c) the truth that is ‘closely connected with godliness’ (Bernard, 155). It is strange for the criterion of the truth to be godliness unless there is a contrast with false claims to possess the truth (Holtzmann, 463). It is perhaps more likely that the truth is commended because (among other things) it leads to godliness, though even in this there lies an implicit challenge to the claims of the heretics.

Consequently, whether κατ’ εὐσέβειαν means that εὐσέβεια is the criterion (or test) of ‘the truth’ or its goal, ‘godliness’, as the all-embracing term for genuine Christianity, is directly related to ‘the truth’. Lack of godliness disproves competing claims, while a positive expression of it is the visible emblem of one’s genuine relationship to God. The qualification here indicates that there is a

concern for ‘right faith’, expressed elsewhere in the concern for sound teaching (cf. 1:13f.). This is a development in the usage of the term from Paul necessitated by the growth of heresy.

2a. ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου The connection of the second prepositional phrase is disputed: (a) It may stand in parallel with κατὰ πίστιν ... and thus further qualify ἀπόστολος. In 2 Tim 1:1 Paul is an apostle ‘according to the promise of life’; since God has promised life, therefore he has called apostles to proclaim the good news (Holtzmann, 464f.). So here Paul’s apostleship rests on the hope of eternal life and derives its impetus from it.³⁰ (b) Or Paul’s apostleship is intended to promote hope in eternal life (Spicq, 593; Kelly, 227). (c) Far less likely is the view that it qualifies πίστιν ... καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν: ‘the faith and knowledge which are based on hope’.³¹ View (a) gives the best sense. The phrase is most probably a further qualification of Paul’s apostleship, for it is the character of Paul and his apostolic ministry and message which are at issue in vv. 1–3. It establishes the present basis of Paul’s work in the certain expectation, based on what God has done in the past, of eternal life, to which he himself looks forward and to which his message invites his hearers (cf. Oberlinner, 6).

ἐπί with dat. conveys the sense of rest upon some object, ‘on’, ‘upon’. It is used only figuratively in the PE, ‘of that upon which a state of being, an action, or a result is based’ (BA). It is especially used with verbs of believing and trusting (1 Tim 1:16; 4:10; 6:17a, 17b), but is also used to express purpose, goal, or result (‘leading to’, 2 Tim 2:14**).³² The preposition here may introduce another goal of Paul’s calling (see 2 Tim 2:14). But here the force of ἐπί is more ‘resting on the basis of’.³³

For ἐλπίς, ‘hope’, see 1 Tim 1:1; Tit 2:13; 3:7** (cf. ἐλπίζω 1 Tim 3:14; 4:10; 5:17; 6:17**). In the NT generally it is a firm conviction concerning what will happen in the future based on knowledge or experience of what God has already done or is doing (this may well be the case even in 1 Tim 3:14). In this theological context it is thus a much more positive term than secular ‘hope’ which conveys the nuances of longing and uncertainty whether the longing will be fulfilled (Acts 27:20). Biblical hope is a function of faith in God, and consequently he himself (or Christ, 1 Tim 1:1) is the object of hope (1 Tim 4:10;

5:5; Acts 24:15; Eph 2:12; Col 1:27) in strong contrast to such uncertain bases as wealth (1 Tim 6:17). In the present context the hope is based on the unalterable promises of God (v. 2b). The word can also be used by metonymy for the object of hope (Tit 2:13; Col 1:5). That object is eternal life (Tit 3:7; cf. Barnabas 1:4, 6; Hermas, *Sim.* 9:26:2).³⁴

ζωή, 'life' (3:7; 1 Tim 1:16; 4:8; 6:12, 19; 2 Tim 1:1, 10**), is used in the NT for both ordinary physical existence (1 Cor 3:22; 15:19; Phil 1:20) and also (in the vast majority of cases) for the spiritual life, both now and in the next world, which is the gift of God. The word can be used by itself with this sense (e.g. Phil 2:16; Jn 3:36b), but in the PE there is always some qualifier to make this clear. It is 'real life' (1 Tim 6:19); 'life in Christ Jesus' (2 Tim 1:1); life 'now and in the future' (1 Tim 4:8); it is linked exegetically with ἀφθαρσία (2 Tim 1:10). But most frequently it is, as here, 'eternal life' (3:7; 1 Tim 1:16; 6:12).³⁵

αἰώνιος, 'eternal' (with ζῶη, 3:7; 1 Tim 1:16; 6:12; with other nouns, 1:2b; 1 Tim 6:16; 2 Tim 1:9; 2:10**), generally has the sense of 'everlasting'. It is used with reference to the exceedingly long periods of time (χρόνοι) before the present age (1:2b; 2 Tim 1:9; Rom 16:25). It is also used as a qualification of God (Rom 16:26), or of his attributes, such as κράτος (1 Tim 6:16), or the δόξα which is his and which he shares with his people (2 Tim 2:10). Through its association with God and with the world to come, the word gains a stronger meaning; eternal life is not only everlasting but also shares the qualities of the life of God himself, its indestructibility and its joy.³⁶

2b. ἦν ἐπηγγεῖλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων It is very common in the PE (and elsewhere in the NT) that a term which has been introduced at the end of a phrase becomes the basis for an expansion which assumes major importance in its own right. So here the mention of eternal life leads into a statement of God's activity as the one who promised and revealed it. Thus the certainty of the hope is given an impregnable basis in the purpose of God.

ἦν³⁷ refers back to eternal life, the substance of the promise. ἐπαγγέλλομαι is 'to promise'; also 'to profess, claim expertise in' (1 Tim 2:10; 6:21**); cf. ἐπαγγελία (1 Tim 4:8; 2 Tim 1:1**).

There is no real Hebrew equivalent in the OT, but the words came into use in the LXX and are used of God in 2 Macc 2:18; 3 Macc 2:10 (cf. also *Ps. Sol.* 12:8; *T. Jos.* 20:1; 4 Ezra 5:40; 7:119; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 57:2; 59:2). The belief that God makes promises to his people is well attested in early Christianity.³⁸

The same thought is found in 2 Tim 1:1 but without a clear allusion to time past. Here the reference may be to promises made in Scripture (cf. Rom 1:2; 9:4) (Parry, 73) but more probably to a premundane period (cf. the following phrase). Admittedly, this interpretation has to recognise that no recipient of God's promises comes into the picture; the promise is more a statement of intent by God for his own sake. All the stress lies on the fact that God's purpose is eternal and unchangeable.

ἀψευδής**, 'free from deceit, truthful', is Classical and Hellenistic (BA) and is found in Hellenistic Judaism,³⁹ but the thought is biblical.⁴⁰ That God is ἀψευδής may be a deliberate contrast with the lies of the heretics (1:12); the gospel of Paul is true because it is based on the promise of God.

χρόνος usually refers to a period of time rather than a point (Mt 2:7, 16; Acts 1:6). Here it is virtually equivalent to αἰών and refers to the long periods into which time is divided.⁴¹

The phrase πρὸ (2 Tim 1:9; 4:21**) χρόνων αἰωνίων indicates the time of the promise (cf. 2 Tim 1:9). It may mean: (a) 'before the ages', i.e. 'in eternity past';⁴² or (b) 'before ancient times', i.e. 'a very long time ago [sc. in OT times]'.⁴³ If Barr 1969:75 is correct, then a reference to χρόνοι αἰωνίοι would be to the whole period beginning with creation. In this case, the addition of πρὸ makes this a reference to the period before time began, just as in 2 Tim 1:9. The tendency to anchor the eschatological salvation in the premundane decision of God may have developed, along-side Israel's growing consciousness of being God's elect, as an anti-dote to insecurity (cf. 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 57; 4:3; 1 QS 3-4; b.Pes 54a). The church converted such themes for its own use, as it established a line of continuity back to Israel (cf. Mt 25:34; Acts 3:20; Rom 9:23; 1 Pet 1:20). Within the revelation pattern, the premundane 'time' element accentuates God's part in devising the plan of salvation, which in turn helps to

underline the certainty of salvation (cf. Wolter 1988:85–90) and the fact that it depends wholly upon God (Oberlinner, 9).

3a. ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίους τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι The second clause of the promised/revealed scheme is notable for placing the revelation in the gospel rather than in the Christ-event itself. φανερώω is literally ‘to cause what is unseen/hidden to be seen’ (Mk 4:22), but also figuratively ‘to make known’, especially of God making known (Rom 3:21). The latter sense can include the former, as in 1 Tim 3:16 which refers to the making known of Christ in a visible manifestation. The word is rare outside the NT and (apart from Herodotus 6:122:1) appears only in Hellenistic Greek; it was not used in a religious context. It is often said to be a synonym of ἀποκαλύπτω, but this is questioned by Bockmuehl who claims that the accent lies on making visible rather than on revealing.⁴⁴ It was used in a variety of contexts,⁴⁵ but especially of God/Christ revealing himself, his attributes (Rom 1:19; 1 Jn 4:9), his word (Col 1:26, which Hanson, 170, regards as the basis for the present passage), or the ‘mystery’ (Rom 16:26). It is used of the revelation in Christ, both past (see especially Rom 3:21)⁴⁶ and future (Col. 3:4; 1 Pet 5:4; 1 Jn 2:28; 3:2). Paul speaks of God revealing his message or his qualities in and through believers (2 Cor 2:14; 4:10f.).

Against this background the use of the aorist here (cf. 2 Tim 1:10**) might lead to the expectation of a specific reference to the Christ-event. But here the event is viewed from the perspective of its proclamation, through which its relevance is continued: Christ and the message concerning him are seen as one, unified event. There are similar indirect references to the Christ-event in 2:11 where God’s grace appears and teaches mankind, and 3:4 where God’s goodness and kindness are manifested. Eternal life is revealed in the coming of Christ and in the experience of it enjoyed by believers who have accepted the proclamation about it (cf. 1 Jn 1:2).

The construction of the sentence encourages the reader to think that the object is still ἦν (sc. eternal life), but there is anacolouthon, and a fresh object, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, is added after the verb.⁴⁷ It is possible that the fresh object is added loosely in apposition to the clause (Parry, 73). But it is better to assume that

the relative clause has been unconsciously replaced by a main clause at this point (Holtzmann, 465).

What has happened is that the reference needed to be made more precise. The promise/fulfilment argument required the content of the promise (ἦν = eternal life) to be expressed in some fashion. But the addition of the new object (with the resultant anacolouthon) was necessary to make the link with eternal life in a way that brought into sharp focus the role of the gospel ministry in fulfilling God’s promise of eternal life. Not the gift as such but the message is revealed (White, 186). Thus ‘his word’, understood as the gospel message, is a dual-reference to the promise *and* fulfilment of eternal life (Kelly 1963:228, Towner 1989:128; cf. Lips 1979:43).

Hasler, 85f., concludes that the author is not concerned with a historical realisation of salvation in Christ; the hope remains beyond history, and therefore it is only the message which begins to be active in history in and through Jesus. Thus the gospel is Hellenised into *teaching* about salvation and morality. This existential interpretation comes to grief on 1 Tim 2:5f.; 3:16; 2 Tim 1:10, passages which indicate quite clearly the historical facts which lie at the heart of the message. What has happened is rather that the promise/fulfilment schema has been modified from its original reference to promise/historical fulfilment of the promise to contrast the promise of God and the *declaration* that he has fulfilled his promise. The context of false teaching required that the emphasis should lie on the way in which God has manifested the true message about the salvation-event in contrast to the false teachings of the opponents.

λόγος, ‘word’, ‘saying’,⁴⁸ has a variety of references in the PE:

- (a) An individual saying, (3:8; 1 Tim 1:15; *et al.*);
- (b) In the plural, it may possibly refer to sayings of Jesus (1 Tim 6:3);⁴⁹
- (c) Specifically of the speech of Christians, their message and manner of speaking (2:8; 1 Tim 4:12; 5:17; [of heretics] 2 Tim 2:17); what is to be preached (2 Tim 4:2); plural of what has been said or preached (2 Tim 4:15);
- (d) As here, the ‘word of God’ as the divine revelation and the standard and content of Christian proclamation (1:3; 2:5; 1 Tim

4:5; 2 Tim 2:9). It is tantamount to the gospel message and the ensuing instruction for converts (2 Tim 4:2).⁵⁰ Almost certainly λόγον is not to be understood as the ‘Logos’.⁵¹

Within this framework of contrast between the secrecy of the promise and the openness of the present revelation (cf. Col 1:26), the present time of fulfilment (Mk 1:15; Rom 5:6; Gal 6:9) is indicated by καιροῖς ἰδίους (see 1 Tim 2:6; 6:15; cf. 1 Tim 4:1; 2 Tim 3:1; 4:3). The term corresponds to νῦν in 2 Tim 1:10 but brings out the fact that it is the time appropriate in God’s plans for the revelation (cf. Gal 4:4 for the same thought). While it might be tempting to take the plural both here and in 1 Tim 2:6 of a continuing time of revelation (Hasler, 86), its use in 1 Tim 6:15 in reference to a single point in time (the future epiphany of Christ) rules this out. More probably it is an idiomatic use of the plural for the singular, and whether the apostolic ministry or the parousia is in view, the term καιροῖς ἰδίους views it as a development in God’s redemptive history.

Like χρόνος, καιρός* can be used of a point of time (2 Tim 4:6) or a period of time (2 Tim 4:3). The older view that it specifically meant the former and especially time considered as opportunity (e.g. ‘the decisive moment’) has now been finally laid to rest by the work of Barr 1969. When it is used in the plural in the PE, it always has a qualifying adjective (ἴδιος, as here; 1 Tim 2:6; 6:15; ὕστερος, 1 Tim 4:1; χαλεπός, 2 Tim 3:1**). The plural is used of periods of time, similar to the plural ἡμέραι (Acts 3:19; 17:26; Eph 1:10).⁵² The dat. expresses the period of time within which something happens (cf. Rom 16:25).

Originally ἴδιος had a stronger sense than the possessive pronoun and signified what was ‘one’s own’ possession by contrast with what belonged to the community (Acts 4:32) or another person.⁵³ The force of the word grew weaker, especially in the LXX, and it is often no stronger than the personal pronoun (1 Tim 4:2; 2 Tim 4:3). It is used of the individual husbands/masters to whom wives/slaves are to be subject (2:5, 9; 1 Tim 6:1; 1 Cor 14:35; Eph 5:22; 1 Pet 3:1, 5) or the individual areas over which people have authority (1 Tim 3:4, 5, 12; 5:4). A person’s ‘own people’ are his relatives (1 Tim 5:8). In 1:12 the

force is that the prophet is actually one of their people. In 2 Tim 1:9 God’s own plan stands over against human works.

In the present phrase (cf. 1 Tim 2:6; 6:15) the problem is whether the referent of ἴδιος is God or the nearest noun (λόγον). It is more likely that the reference is to ‘God’s own time’, fixed and established by himself and suitable for his purpose (Lock, 126; cf. Acts 1:7).⁵⁴ The promise of salvation is brought to fulfilment at the time which he himself sets. The sing. form in Gal 6:9, however, is taken by some to mean idiomatically ‘at the appropriate moment’ (sc. for reaping; Bernard, 156), but this is unlikely to be the force here.

The revelation takes place in and through the preaching, more specifically Paul’s preaching. It follows that this is the message which Titus (and church leaders generally) must also preach. κήρυγμα can express both the activity and the content of the message, but generally the accent is on the former (2 Tim 4:17; Mt 12:41 par. Lk 11:32; Rom 16:25; 1 Cor 1:21; 2:4; 15:14***).⁵⁵ This language is very similar to Rom 16:25–26, where Paul links the revelation of the mystery to his preaching ministry which is continuous with the OT revelation through the prophets. The task is accordingly preaching the divinely authorised message, and κήρυγμα thus combines the ideas of the activity and content (Friedrich, G., *TDNT* III, 716–17). The proclamation would be useless if it did not communicate the intended message.

3b. δ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ

A third element is added to the promised/revealed scheme; strictly speaking it is an indication of the place of Paul within the act of revelation, and it serves to bring the sentence back full circle to the person of the missionary who has been commissioned by God. Using the same language as 1 Tim 1:11 (cf. 1 Cor 9:17; Gal 2:7; 1 Th 2:4), the passive ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ, with its object, depicts the divine commissioning as the entrusting of the gospel to Paul.⁵⁶ ὃ is acc. of respect with the passive verb ἐπιστεύθην. πιστεύω is most frequently ‘to believe’, ‘to trust in’ (3:8; 1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 1:12), but it can also mean ‘to entrust’ (Lk 16:11; Jn 3:24), and the passive is used with the sense ‘to be entrusted with’.⁵⁷

ἐπιταγή ‘command’ is used only in the Pauline corpus in the NT (2:15; 1 Tim 1:1; 1 Cor 7:25; with κατ’ in 1 Tim 1:1; Rom

16:25; 1 Cor 7:6; 2 Cor 8:8***). It is a strong word for a command by a superior person; it can be used for a decree by a ruler (1 Esdr 1:18; Wis 14:16; Dan 3:16; 3 Macc 7:20) or for divine instructions (Wis 18:16; 19:6), and in the NT it refers either to God's, the apostle's or his delegate's command and authority. Paul expresses the same idea by reference to the 'will' (θέλημα) of God in the earlier epistles (1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Col 1:1; Eph 1:1; cf. 2 Tim 1:1). The thought of divine command and consequent authority is somewhat stronger than in 1 Tim 1:11. The whole phrase has close parallels in 1 Tim 1:1; Rom 16:25–26 (κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ).⁵⁸

Wolter (1988:149–52) argues that the characterisation of the Pauline apostolate as κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ here and in 1 Tim 1:1 intends something entirely different from the διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ characterisation of 2 Tim 1:1, on the basis of which 1 Tim and Tit can be distinguished from 2 Tim and their pseudepigraphical nature becomes obvious. Seeing the apostle's call as arising from the will of God connects the person-as-apostle with the Christ-event and salvation and separates his call from any human authority; the person, and his position, is thus legitimated. The language of 'command', however, strikes a different note, that of a royal order; the emphasis is now on legitimating the mission, and the interest in preserving or reviving the authority of the mission (and message) associated with Paul is evident. While the two phrases may indeed intend different nuances, and may correspond to the purposes of the respective letters (i.e. 2 Tim being more personal in tone, 1 Tim and Tit more official), to conclude more than this is difficult.

The addition of 'our Saviour God' indicates that the keynote of the letter is the salvific purpose of God who is the source of all blessings (cf. Hasler, 11, who, however, regards the salvation as future). σωτήρ is 'saviour' in the sense of 'deliverer, preserver' from illness and calamity. The term was used of human deliverers and guides (e.g. philosophers such as Epicurus), but was especially applied to gods (including the supreme god Zeus but also many others as the protectors of cities and the helpers of the distressed, such as Asclepius, the god of healing) and to deified rulers. Behind the NT usage lies that of the OT/LXX in which

God is designated some thirty times as the deliverer of his people from danger and the bestower of benefits.⁵⁹ The term appears mostly in the later books of the NT where, as here, it is a designation of God⁶⁰ or of Christ.⁶¹ In the PE it is primarily God who is Saviour, but this leads directly to the naming of Jesus Christ as Saviour (1:4) inasmuch as God's plan is effected through him. It emerges that the term is especially characteristic of Tit, and its use in 1:3f. sets the theological tone of the letter as a whole. The use of the term in the NT is obviously linked with the early development of the use of other words from the same stem to denote the content of Christian experience and hope (cf. Ignatius, *Eph.* 1:1; *Philad.* 9:2).⁶²

The use of ἡμῶν emphasises the reality of the purpose of God as it is experienced by his people and is not meant in any kind of exclusive manner (2:11; 1 Tim 2:4; 4:10). There may even be a polemical note against any (enthusiasts) who may have used this term in an exclusive sense, denying the universality of God's saving purpose (cf. Fee, 64).

b. The Recipient (1:4a)

Τίτῳ γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινήν πίστιν After the lengthy description of Paul which has established the foundation for the instructions to be given in the letter, the recipient is introduced. Τίτος (2 Tim 4:10; Gal 2:1, 3; 2 Cor 2:13; 7:6, 13, 14; 8:6, 16, 23; 12:18***) is described, like Timothy, as Paul's child, more specifically as his 'true' child. For the metaphorical use of τέκνον (1:6*) see 1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; 1 Cor 4:17; Phil 2:22; Philem 10; 1 Pet 5:13. γνήσιος, 'genuine', was originally used of legitimate as opposed to bastard children, hence metaphorically 'true, authentic' or 'dear' (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Cor 8:8; Phil 4:3;*** adv. Phil 2:20***). Here the former sense is dominant, but the latter is also present. Such sons might be expected to serve their fathers faithfully (Philo, *Cont.* 72). The use of γνήσιος to designate the authorised interpreters of philosophers (so of Aristotle in relation to Plato), the transmitters of revelation (*CH* 13:3) and the helpers of ruling shepherds (Philo, *Spec.* 4:184; *Virt.* 59) may be relevant.⁶³

The force of the expression is debated, and may not be the same as in the cases of Timothy, Onesimus or John Mark.

(a) It is possible that Titus was Paul's own convert (Holtzmann, 467; Bernard, 156; Dornier, 123; Knight, 63–4; *pace* Hasler, 86).

(b) He may have been 'ordained' by Paul (Jeremias, 68f.). Neither of these views does justice to γνήσιος.

(c) The phrase may express the relation of the younger to the older man, and thus be expressive of affection (Spicq, 594) or perhaps of subordination.

(d) The decisive factor is surely the phrase 'according to a common faith'. κοινός** is 'common' in the sense of being 'shared' between two or more people (Acts 2:44; 4:32; Jude 3).⁶⁴ The whole phrase κατὰ κοινήν πίστιν corresponds to ἐν πίστει in 1 Tim 1:2 (cf. 2 Tim 1:5) and expresses that in respect of which the metaphorical relationship exists. κοινός is similarly used by Jude to make a bond between himself and his readers (Jude 3; cf. 2 Pet 1:2). The qualification indicates that the relationship is a spiritual one between people of different ages who are now like members of a family to one another.⁶⁵

(e) The phrase may then be pressed to indicate the full agreement in doctrine between Paul and Titus (Quinn, 72), and so to authenticate Titus to the church and indicate that he is to receive the same respect and obedience as Paul (Hasler, 86; *TLNT* I, 138). But it does so on the level of the text by means of reassuring Titus of his position in the eyes of Paul.

c. The Greeting (1:4b)

TEXT

4. καί ἔλεος (A C² TR sy^h bo^{ms}): ὑμῖν καί (33); om. (1739 1881 *pc*). The substitution of the noun for the conjunction is by assimilation to 1 and 2 Tim (Metzger, 584; Elliott, 173f.).

Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1739 1881); κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. (D² F G TR sy; κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (1175)). Elliott, 201, 232, accepts the text as the normal word order in PE. The form with κυρίου is assimilation to the normal Pauline formula. See 1 Tim 1:1 note.

EXEGESIS

4b. χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν The background of the formula 'grace and peace' lies in Judaism, particularly in non-epistolary settings, and Paul's use of it is not confined to epistolary salutations; rather it reflects

an apostolic mode of oral discourse and thus may be connected with the church's meetings (Knoch, 19).⁶⁶ In any case, the form had become standard by the time of composition of the PE, and the interest lies in the theological significance of the formula as it is used here and in the peculiarities which it demonstrates.⁶⁷

The wording here resembles the normal Pauline form of greeting in omitting ἔλεος (contrast 1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2). No specific reason for the omission, as compared with 1 and 2 Tim, can be seen (Spicq, 595 claims that it is unnecessary in the context). The greeting resembles the form in 1 and 2 Tim in the transfer of ἡμῶν from its normal position after πατρός to the end of the whole phrase.⁶⁸

Originally the word χάρις meant 'graciousness, attractiveness' (cf. Lk 4:22; Col 4:6), but it developed the sense of 'favour, goodwill, loving care, grace'. This use is found in secular Gk. of the gods and rulers, but is especially developed in the LXX where it refers to the loving favour of God extended to his people.⁶⁹ The term occurs thirteen times in the PE. It is used twice in the idiomatic formula χάριν ἔχω ('to thank'; 1 Tim 1:12; 2 Tim 1:3). It is used six times, as here, in opening salutations and closing greetings; this usage is traditional and stereotyped, but none the less meaningful. This leaves a total of five occurrences (2:11; 3:7; 1 Tim 1:14; 2 Tim 1:9; 2:1) in the body of the letters, compared with some seventy times in the remaining ten letters of the Pauline corpus, i.e. once per 696 words compared with once per 412 words; this comparative infrequency is not significant in letters largely concerned with church order (see further on 1 Tim 1:14).

εἰρήνη, originally in the sense of 'peace' as opposed to war, developed the broader meanings of 'harmony' and well-being in general. In the OT it came to stand for the total well-being which comes from God, and which is then in the NT identified with Christian salvation. Apart from the salutations (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2), it is found in the PE only in 2 Tim 2:22** as a Christian virtue or quality (cf. Gal 5:22).⁷⁰

The greeting follows the usual Pauline form in linking God the Father and Christ together as the source of Christian blessings (cf. 1 Tim 1:1 note), though here Christ is designated as τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν instead of 'our Lord' (as in 1 Tim; 2 Tim). πατήρ (human

father, 1 Tim 5:1) is used of God in the PE only in the formal language of the epistolary salutations (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2**).⁷¹ This lack of use is viewed by some as a divergence from the characteristic Pauline mode of expression, and in the PE it is set alongside a tendency to stress the transcendence and unapproachability of God (cf. 1 Tim 1:17; 6:15–16; Simonsen 1980:61). However, the theological functions of ‘father’ are here in effect taken over by σωτήρ (1:3), a title that was better suited to the theme of salvation developed throughout the PE and especially in Tit.

The description of Jesus as Saviour replaces the use of ‘Lord’ found in other NT epistolary salutations.⁷² The use here anticipates that in 2:13 and 3:6 and expresses a key theme. The writer can thus use σωτήρ of God the Father and of Jesus in adjacent or almost adjacent verses (1:3; 2:10; 3:4). This interchangeability closely associates God, as the ultimate source or originator of the plan of salvation, and Christ, as the means of executing this plan.⁷³ The past appearance of Christ made salvation a possibility (2:11–14; 3:6; cf. 2 Tim 1:10). The future appearance will mean the final accomplishment of salvation (2:13; cf. Phil 3:20).

EXCURSUS I

εὐσέβεια in the Pastoral Epistles

MM, 265f.; Bertram, G., *TDNT* III, 123–8; Brox, 174–7; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 39–41; Fiedler, P., *EDNT* I, 85; Foerster, W., *TDNT* VII, 175–85; idem., ‘ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑ in den Pastoralbriefen’, *NTS* 5 (1958–9), 213–18; Günther, W., *NIDNTT* II, 91–5; Kaufmann-Bühler, D., *RAC* VI, 985–1051; Lips 1979:80–7; Mott 1978:22–48; Roloff, 117–19; Quinn, 282–91; Spicq, 482–92; Spicq, C., *TLNT* II, 196–9; Towner 1989:147–52; Wainwright, J. J., ‘Eusebeia; Syncretism or Conservative Contextualization?’, *EvQ* 65 (1993), 211–24.

The concept of εὐσέβεια is of major significance in the interpretation of the PE because of its importance for an understanding of the author’s view of the Christian life and ethics. This can be seen immediately from its frequency of occurrence. In the NT this word-group is confined to Acts, 2 Peter and the PE, and it is found chiefly in the PE (εὐσέβεια: 1 Tim 2:2; 3:16; 4:7–8; 6:3, 5, 6, 11; 2 Tim 3:5; Tit 1:1; Acts 3:12; 2 Pet 1:3, 6, 7; 3:11;

εὐσεβέω, 1 Tim 5:4; εὐσεβής Acts 10:2, 7; 2 Pet 2:9; εὐσεβῶς, 2 Tim 3:12; Tit 2:12).⁷⁴ It is one of a number of terms whose currency in pagan ethical thought has suggested to many the adoption of a secular morality indicative of a compromise with the world, the so-called ‘bourgeois’ ethic.

1. History of Interpretation

The history of modern interpretation of εὐσέβεια in the PE can be divided into two stages, the first being up to and including the work of W. Foerster, and the second consisting of subsequent interpretations.

Foerster* 1959 identified three previous approaches to an understanding of the term:

(a) Schlatter, 176, and Spicq, 482–92, argued that in a purely religious manner it designates conduct and an attitude that honours God.

(b) For Holtzmann, 176–9, the author’s use of εὐσέβεια was a reflection of developments in the church’s thinking about ‘Christian’ or ‘religious’ living related to the development of the church’s identity and ecclesiology into that of a monolithic institution in the world. What emerged, described as εὐσέβεια, was an uninspired but ‘churchly’ morality. It is not a manner of life that stems from any theological notion. It is rather a combination of good works and blameless living (i.e. morality, or a ‘religious’ way of life) which conforms to the ecclesiastical and practical shape of the church in the world.

(c) Dibelius defined ‘godliness’ as ‘that behaviour which is well-pleasing to God and men’ (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 39). But what he meant by this is understood clearly only when it is seen in the light of the broader term that he coined for the author’s ethical teaching, ‘good Christian citizenship’ (*christliche Bürgerlichkeit*). By this he understood a life lived in harmony with the orders of the world, peaceful coexistence (1 Tim 2:2), a Christian version of secular morality. The delay of the parousia forced the church to come to terms with life in a hostile world. If this life were lived in Pauline terms, the church’s continued existence would be doubtful. If, however, the church adapted itself to secular ideas of respectability, its longevity might be ensured. Εὐσέβεια, then,

drawn from the pagan environment, became the foundation stone of this ethic of Christian citizenship.

(d) Foerster's own view combines several elements.⁷⁵ One of the most significant of these is the importance he places on secular Greek usage. The term in its Graeco-Roman context referred to a general attitude of reverence or respect to various persons, gods and the orders of society, which were created or sanctioned by the gods. In popular usage 'piety' came to mean, not an attitude of respect towards the gods, but the actual worship paid to them in cultic acts. Yet this outward action was understood to be the result of the inner attitude. 'Piety' in both Greek and Roman thinking⁷⁶ was a highly regarded virtue and a duty.⁷⁷

Taken from this thought world into the Christian dialogue, εὐσέβεια served to describe a manner of life characterised by respect for world orders (such as marriage, family, creation). In the churches addressed by the PE these were being undermined by false teachers with their Gnosticising ascetic practices. This is seen above all in 1 Tim 2:2 and 5:4, which govern his interpretation of the concept throughout the PE. But, in contrast to Dibelius, Foerster emphasised that Christian εὐσέβεια is not a virtue, for it is grounded in πίστις, the Christ-event (1 Tim 3:16) and God's will (1 Tim 4:10). Nevertheless, as it is absent from the list of qualities in 2 Tim 2:22, εὐσέβεια is clearly not on a level with faith and love, nor is it central or indispensable within the thought of the PE. Ultimately, despite efforts to ground the concept theologically, adoption of the word-group would have negative consequences for the church. Its lack of a built-in christological norm (which is present in πίστις) and its primary reference to orders of the world and the conduct of man in relation to them would lead inescapably to moralism.

(e) Beyond Foerster. Each of the preceding interpretations suffers from certain limitations in approach. Holtzmann and Dibelius overlooked or minimised the theological dimension of 'godliness'. Although Foerster attempted to correct this error, he followed Dibelius into the cul-de-sac created by making one or two occurrences of the term determinative for his interpretation. Then, in each case the Graeco-Roman usage of the word-group, in

which εὐσέβεια plays the role of a virtue, was allowed to colour the understanding of the concept as it occurs in the PE.

Brox, 174–7, was one of the first to react to Foerster and his predecessors. His more thorough treatment of the word-group in the PE took him beyond the narrow conclusion of Foerster. Εὐσέβεια is more than 'respect for the natural orders'. Drawn from the secular Greek environment, the term gains a new sense through being used for the behaviour of Christians. Despite its appearing in a list as one virtue among others, more than respectable, reverent behaviour is meant; it is the response of faith, but that which is more appropriate in the later church's post-charismatic situation (cf. Bultmann 1952:II, 184–6).

With the work of Lips (1979:80–7) and Roloff (1988) the discussion advanced one step and then stalled. Lips introduced into the discussion the relation between 'godliness' and 'knowledge', which he demonstrated both from Hellenistic Jewish and Graeco-Roman sources, though clearly he sees the Greek background to be determinative (82–3). Secondly, he attempted to interpret εὐσέβεια on the basis of all of its occurrences in the PE. Passages such as 1 Tim 6:5–6; 2 Tim 3:5 and Tit 1:16 led him to conclude that the term describes the Christian life from the standpoint of the two interrelated aspects of religious knowledge (*Glaubenserkenntnis*) and corresponding conduct. Although Roloff, 117–18, agrees that Foerster's interpretation of εὐσέβεια as a virtue is too narrow, he does not take up Lips' idea that 'godliness' encompasses knowledge and conduct. It describes a visible life lived by the grace of God in all of its directions (118). But while observing the Christian element that has been inserted (especially Tit 2:12), it remains for him a concept of life which conforms to Graeco-Roman ethical categories, and which therefore functions within the Christian dialogue to justify the church's place in the world (see Schlarb 1990:29f.; Wainwright*, 221).

2. *The Hellenistic and Jewish Background*

In the Greek world εὐσέβεια connotes an attitude of reverence which can be directed to a wide range of persons and objects. In Classical Greek piety could be directed towards deceased

relatives, living relatives, the ruler, especially the emperor, judges, aliens, oaths and the law generally. Thus the word referred to ‘“respect” for the orders of domestic, national and also international life’. Since all these were under the protection of the gods, it is understandable that the words came to refer more and more to the gods.⁷⁸ Thus, according to W. Foerster, the concept had a broad sense but it became restricted to one’s proper attitude to the gods, namely piety. On occasion it is specifically defined as being shown towards the gods. Foerster documents the distinction between piety towards the gods and righteousness towards one’s neighbour and self-control as right conduct towards oneself (Xenophon, *Mem.* 4:8:11). In popular usage the terms came not to mean a reverent attitude to the gods but the actual worship paid to them in cultic acts. However, an inner attitude is always expressed in the outward act. Foerster sums up: ‘the true content of εὐσέβεια for the educated Greek is reverent and wondering awe at the lofty and pure world of the divine, its worship in the cultus, and respect for the orders sustained by it. It is not being under the unconditional claim of a personal power.’

The corresponding concept in the Roman world was *pietas*. It has been defined as ‘dutiful respect toward gods, fatherland and parents and other kinsmen’.⁷⁹ According to Cicero, ‘piety is justice directed towards the gods (*Est enim pietas iustitia adversum deos*, Cicero, *De Nat. Deorum* 1:116); ‘they refer to what happens in fear and worship of the gods as religion and the tasks which duty tells us to perform towards our native land or to parents or others linked to us by blood relationships as piety’ (*Religionem eam quae in metu et caerimonia deorum sit appellat, pietatem quae erga patriam aut parentes aut alios sanguine coniunctos officium conseruare moneat*, Cicero, *In. Rhet.* 2:66). Some Romans adopted the cognomen *Pius*; Virgil’s ‘Pius Aeneas’ expresses the Roman ideal.

The concept was very much at home in the Graeco-Roman world. The word-group had an eminently positive air to it.⁸⁰ Piety was a highly regarded virtue. It was essentially religious, being concerned with respect for the gods, shown in worship, but at the same time it included respect for the orders of society sanctioned by the gods. Sometimes the word was used narrowly for attitude

to the gods in distinction from a righteous attitude towards human institutions and people.

Until recently the importance of the usage in Hellenistic Judaism has been rather overlooked. The fruitfulness of this area has been demonstrated by Quinn, 282–91. In particular, we find that the word-group is important in certain strata of the LXX. Here the noun εὐσέβεια occurs 59 times. Four of these occurrences are in the canonical books, five in the Apocrypha, three in 3 Macc and 47 in 4 Macc.⁸¹ Where it occurs with a Hebrew equivalent the noun translates *יראת יהוה*, ‘the fear of Yahweh’ (cf. Prov 1:7; Isa 11:2; 33:6). Connected to such ideas as loyalty to the covenant, moral response and devotion to the law, this is the Hebrew term coming closest to ‘religion’. The word θεοσέβεια is used in the same manner (Gen 20:11; Job 28:28; cf. Eccles 1:24; Bar 5:4; 4 Macc 7:6, 22 *v.l.*; 15:28 *v.l.*; 16:11). The opposite attitude is ἀβεία which translates words expressive of rebellion against God. It is clear that εὐσέβεια was well-fitted to translate the Hebrew phrase, although the more literal translation was preferred in the LXX, and it is a good question why it was not adopted more widely.

The adjective εὐσεβής is found ten times in the canonical books (Judg 8:31; Job 32:3; Prov 12:12; 13:19; Eccles 3:16; Mic 7:2; Isa 24:16; 26:7 [2 times]; 32:8); for θεοσεβής see Exod 18:21; Judg 11:17; Job 1; 1, 8; 2:3; 4 Macc 15:28 *v.l.*; 16:11). It also occurs 28 times in the non-canonical books (2 Macc 1:19; 12:45; Eccles 15 times; 4 Macc 11 times). It translates ‘righteous’ (Prov 12:12; Isa 24:16; 26:7).

The verb εὐσεβέω is found only in the non-canonical books (Sus 64; 4 Macc 5 times; cf. *Sib. Orac.* 4:187) and the adverb εὐσεβῶς likewise (4 Macc 7:21).

The literature of Hellenistic Judaism reflects the attempt to translate traditional OT concepts into the Greek language. While it is certainly possible that in the process certain ideas were diluted, transformed or overpowered by Greek concepts, it is not accurate to conclude that this was unavoidably the case. In fact the concepts which the εὐσέβεια word-group converts remain thoroughly biblical. ‘Piety’ in Isa 11:2 and 33:6 brings together ‘knowledge’ of and ‘the fear of the Lord’ (cf. Prov 1:7).

Elsewhere (e.g. Prov 13:11; cf. Wis 10:12) εὐσέβεια comprehensively describes a kind of behaviour that pleases God. Applied in these ways, there is no reason to think that the word-group introduces an idea completely at odds with traditional Jewish teaching. Much more it sets the stage for the building of a significant bridge between the Jewish religion and the Greek culture. As Quinn suggests, modern languages would describe this interplay of the knowledge of God and appropriate conduct with the one term, 'religion', a term lacking in Greek and Hebrew. Εὐσέβεια appears to gather together into one comprehensive idea the knowledge of God and the appropriate response (fear of the Lord).

Similarly, the integration of the word-group into the theology of piety expressed in Ecclesiasticus is natural and does not dilute traditional Jewish teaching in any way. Essentially, its use here describes 'the pious' in terms of categories which are thoroughly traditional (they are the opposite of sinners, 13:17; 33:14; they have a knowledge of God, 43:33; they show obedience to the commandments, 37:12; they are holy and wise in speech, 23:12; 27:11; they are the recipients of divine blessing, 11:22). Εὐσεβής often translates forms of 'righteous' (קַדְוָה), and in 49:3 εὐσέβεια stands for the huge concept of Israel's appropriate response to God's covenant (הַשְׁמַרְתָּ הַבְּרִית; LXX: ἐν ἡμέραις ἀνόμην κατίσχυσεν τὴν εὐσέβειαν)

In 4 Maccabees the word-group plays a role in the argument designed to defend 'devout reason' (ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμὸς) over all human emotions. In this line of thought, εὐσέβεια (meaning the Jewish faith) is the measure of reason and not vice versa, and reason determines appropriate human conduct, which includes worship (see especially 5:22–24).

Philo appears to have been closely in touch with Greek usage; for him εὐσέβεια is the queen and source of the virtues (*Spec.* 4:135, 147; *Abr.* 270; *Decal.* 52, 119; cf. Mott 1978:22–48). However, his interest in the OT and the law is also clear. Consequently, the commandments are related to 'piety' (*Deus* 69), and 'piety' is a matter of one's relation to God (Foerster, *TDNT* VII, 180–1). Similarly, Josephus understands piety as an attitude

towards God which is expressed in keeping his laws (Josephus, *Ap.* 1:60; Foerster, *TDNT* VII, 180).

Rather than seeing the emergence of this word-group with its distinctive place in Greek thought as evidence that the traditional faith of at least certain groups of Diaspora Jews was becoming weakened through hellenisation (Foerster, *TDNT* VII, 182; Bertram, *TDNT* III, 123–8), Quinn argues that despite certain limitations, 'the *euseb-* language ... offered the Hellenistic Jew a means for explaining and expressing himself to contemporary society' (287f.). What was needed was a term that would be able to bring together into one concept the related ideas of 'the fear of the Lord', 'the knowledge of God' and response or conduct. The εὐσέβεια language met this need because, although in Greek thinking it was a virtue and tied to cultic acts, it was nevertheless broad enough in scope, with the necessary inner and outer dimensions and connotation of loyalty to God, to express adequately an OT/Jewish concept of 'piety' or spiritual life.

3. *The New Testament Usage*

In the light of the usage of the word-group in Hellenistic Judaism and the NT, the interpretation of εὐσέβεια as a virtue, part of a bourgeois moral attitude characteristic of secularisation, is mistaken. The word-group functioned in Hellenistic Judaism to describe 'the fear of the Lord' and the practical conduct which proceeded from it. It combined knowledge of God and behaviour. Evidence of this dynamic equivalence is equally apparent in the NT, though 'piety' develops further along specifically Christian lines. The use of the word-group outside of the PE is confined to Acts and 2 Peter.

In Acts 17:23 the verb denotes the actual exercise of religion, which, with the religion of Athens in view, must be understood in cultic terms. The adjective (meaning 'pious') describes the 'God-fearers', Cornelius and one of his soldiers, in Acts 10:2, 7. Worship of the God of the Jews is meant and the visible evidence of 'piety' is seen in such activities as almsgiving and prayer. The combination of knowledge of God and conduct seems obvious here (cf. the summary in 10:35 which brings together 'fear of the Lord' and appropriate behaviour). Acts 3:12 implies that Peter and John have a Christian 'piety', though it is not, in and of itself, the

source of the healing miracle being discussed. Although Acts 17:23 may well use the term as those in Athens would have understood it, the ‘Christian’ usages conform to the very biblical notion of ‘godliness’ consisting of reverent knowledge of God and conduct shaped by that knowledge.

In 2 Peter we appear to have both a broad usage of the word-group, i.e. to describe the entire life of a Christian as ‘godliness’, and a narrower usage, i.e. a type of action (a virtue) to be practised by Christians (1:6f.; 3:11). The author comments that God’s power grants us all that we need for life and ‘godliness’ (1:3)—i.e. eternal life and the way of life that goes along with it. In 2:9, much the same as in Ecclesiasticus, the word-group describes the ‘godly’ (after the pattern of Noah and Lot), whom God will rescue from trial, in contrast to the ‘ungodly’ (ἀσεβης, vv. 5f.; after the pattern of fallen angels, the sinners of Noah’s day, Sodom and Gomorrah) for whom judgement awaits. But 3:11 uses the plural (εὐσεβείαι) to denote deeds (which reflect piety), and 1:7 lists ‘godliness’ as one of several aspects of behaviour to be pursued.

4. The Usage in the Pastoral Epistles

The PE contain the greatest concentration of the word-group in the NT. In Tit 1:1; 2:12; 1 Tim 2:2; 3:16; 4:7f.; 6:3, 5f.; 2 Tim 3:5, 12 the word-group functions to describe the life (noun), or the manner of life (adverb) which is true Christianity (cf. θεοσεβεία in 1 Tim 2:10 which is synonymous). Several other connections are also clear. ‘Godliness’ has a theological basis in the Christevent (1 Tim 3:16; 2 Tim 3:12; cf. Tit 2:12), and it is integrally related to the knowledge of God (or of the gospel, the truth, etc.; Tit 1:1; 1 Tim 6:3, 5, 6, 11). It presupposes a knowledge of God’s requirements. Thus, in contrast to the superficial ‘form’ of godliness of the false teachers (2 Tim 3:5), genuine godliness proceeds out of commitment to God and the orthodox teaching of the faith. ‘Godliness’ to some extent means ‘teaching/knowledge about what godliness involves’. It does not consist narrowly of cultic acts, even congregational worship; rather it is concerned with the whole of Christian behaviour.

Moreover, it is a thoroughly dynamic description of life, one which the individual must actively (1 Tim 4:7f.) and consciously

decide to pursue (Tit 2:12). It is a comprehensive term for the Christian life, combining inner and outer dimensions, and is no more a virtue than are faith and love which are equally comprehensive terms for the characteristics of Christian living. It implies a serious approach to life and religion by contrast with the frivolous disputations of the opponents (1 Tim 2:2). The practice of piety can be seen in very specific ways, such as in honouring parents (1 Tim 5:4). In 1 Tim 6:11 and Tit 2:12 godliness describes one of several aims that the Christian is to pursue or one characteristic of the Christian life. To argue from this, however, that it is simply one of the virtues (cf. Mott 1978:22–48) is to ignore the much stronger tendency to characterise the whole of life in Christ with ‘godliness’. It is worth comparing the way Gal 5:22–23 subordinates πίστις in its list of characteristics of the Spirit-controlled life.

Finally, the word-group plays a significant role in the polemic which develops throughout the letters. This polemic was directed against the godless (ἀσεβεία) in the Hellenistic Jewish writings (e.g. Prov. 1:7; 3 Macc 2:31–32). The same contrast occurs in the PE, though here the godless are specifically false teachers (see especially Tit 2:12; 1 Tim 1:9; 2 Tim 2:16; cf. 2 Pet 2:6). There can be a counterfeit piety consisting of apparently religious acts divorced from upright living.

Why did the word-group reach such prominence in the PE? Some have argued from 1 Tim 6:5 and 2 Tim 3:5 that the author lifted a concept which figured prominently in the heretics’ vocabulary, in order to redefine it and correct misunderstandings about the Christian life introduced by their teaching (Fee, 63; cf. Lips 1979:82–3). But the usage in Acts and 2 Peter suggests a wider currency, and it seems to be used easily throughout the PE and is not confined to polemical passages. Others have seen in the choice of the term the possible influence of Luke on Paul (Knight, 118; Moule 1982; Wilson 1979:31, 50–2). It remains puzzling, however, why the historical Paul should have felt it necessary to adopt this vocabulary in letters addressed to his immediate colleagues rather than in letters addressed to a Hellenistic audience.

Quinn concluded that the occurrence of the εὐσεβεία wordgroup in the PE reflects ‘the attempt of Roman Christians to

identify themselves in terms of the society in which they lived, a city that had temples to personified Pietas ... The values grounded on *pietas* in pagan Rome offered a point of departure for showing what Christians meant by *eusebeia*, and they took the **seb/m-*language to explore that area' (Quinn, 289; cf. Simpson, 40). While Roman influence (or destination) may not be relevant, the observation that the word-group may have been chosen because it provided a contact point with pagan society (Greek or Roman) is worthy of consideration. Ironically, it may well have been the currency of the language in Graeco-Roman thought that delayed and then limited its use in the early church's vocabulary. In any case, as employed in the PE, εὐσεβεία expresses a strongly Christian concept of the new existence in Christ that combines belief in God and a consequent manner of life.

**BODY OF THE LETTER—INSTRUCTIONS TO THE
CHURCH LEADER
(1:5–3:11)**

The body of the letter consists of instructions on how Titus is to act as leader of the church, both on what he is to do and also on what he is to say to the church. Thus instruction is indirectly given to the church.

The instruction falls into two main parts. In the first (1:5–16) directions are given regarding the appointment of elders (1:5–9), followed by warning against the presence of opponents who would subvert the sound teaching which it is the task of the elders to provide (1:10–16). In the second part (2:1–3:11) Titus is instructed regarding the teaching that he is to give the church. This can be subdivided into teaching regarding the relationships of believers to one another within the congregational setting (2:1–15) and teaching regarding the way in which they are to live in society (3:1–11).

The indirect character of the instruction has given rise to the feeling that it is remote from the actual situation of the congregations and rather general in content by contrast with the very specific and concrete paraenesis in Paul (Gilchrist 1967). But it should be needless to say that if the PE are primarily written to

individual church leaders, then the indirect form of the instruction for the churches which they oversee is inevitable.¹

This somewhat official character of the letter, like 1 Tim, is reflected in the lack of a thanksgiving or prayer report which is characteristic of the Pauline letters (cf. Jas; 2 Pet).

In the situation presupposed in the letter, a certain urgency in carrying out the instructions arises from the fact that Titus himself was expected to leave Crete (3:12) and must therefore ensure the healthy continuation of the church after his departure (Holtz, 207).

**I. THE APPOINTMENT OF ELDERS AND THE DANGER
FROM OPPONENTS (1:5–16)**

The churches in Crete are represented as lacking in certain respects and as being menaced by unauthorised teachers with false doctrines. The first part of the answer to the problem lies in the appointment of good local leaders who will be able to give proper teaching to the church and to deal with the opponents. The first subsection (1:5–9) gives directions about the need to appoint good leaders and the kind of people to appoint. The second subsection (1:10–16) gives the basis for this command.

a. The Appointment and Duties of Elders (1:5–9)

Bartsch 1965:82–111; Dodd, C. H., 'New Testament Translation Problems II', *BT* 28 (1977), 112–16; Emmet, C. W., 'The Husband of One Wife', *ExpTim* 19 (1907–8), 39f.; Frey, J.-B., 'La signification des termes μόνανδρος et *umivira*', *RSR* 20 (1930), 48–60; Holtzmann, 233–8; Lattey, C., 'Unius uxoris vir (Tit 1, 6)', *VD* 28 (1950), 288–90; Lightman, M and Zeisel, W., 'Univira: an Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society', *CH* 46 (1977), 19–32; Lyonnet, S., '“Unius uxoris vir” in 1 Tim 3:2, 12; Tit 1:6', *VD* 45 (1967), 3–10; Page, S., 'Marital Expectations of Church Leaders in the Pastoral Epistles', *JSNT* 50 (1993), 105–20; Potterie, I. de la, "“Mari d'une settle femme” Le sens théologique d'une formule paulinienne', in *Paul de Tarse: Apôtre du Notre Temps* (Rome: Abbaye de S. Paul, 1979), 619–38; Trummer, P. 'Einehe nach den Pastoralbriefen', *Bib* 51 (1970), 471–84. See also bibliography to **Excursus 2**.

There seem to be two (interrelated) dimensions to Titus's task. He is, generally, to complete the work in the Cretan churches, and related to this is the specific task of appointing leaders in local

churches. The main interest is in the qualities of the people to be appointed so that they can adequately carry out their functions. The reason for the appointment is given in vv. 10–16 and lies in the presence of opponents of the writer in the churches who are promoting teaching that he regards as false in itself and as having deleterious moral effects. Therefore, the basic requirement for the elders is faithful adherence to the accepted teaching of the church and the ability to expound it positively and refute error. The preceding requirements are concerned basically with moral character and are fairly general.

The situation envisaged is different from that in 1 Tim 3, where elders already exist. The qualities required are also listed in greater detail with the ability to teach being spelled out. This suggests that the church situation in Crete is portrayed as being in a less developed state. There is no mention of the exclusion of new converts or the need for a good reputation in society at large. On the other hand, the ideal elder is the head of a Christian family. Fee, 171, notes that compared with 1 Tim 3 the list has a more orderly appearance.²

The main part of the section (vv. 6, 7–9) has the form of a *Pflichtenlehre* (duty code), more specifically a *Berufspflichtenlehre* (duty code for a specific occupation). This listing of qualities appropriate to a specific office or status is a specific category within the more general genre of lists of virtues and vices. Such lists are highly characteristic of the PE; for the former see 2:2, 3, 5, 7f., 9f.; 1 Tim 3:2–4, 8, 11; 4:12; 6:11, 18; 2 Tim 2:2, 2:4; 3:10; for the latter see 3:3; 1 Tim 1:9f.; 6:4f.; 2 Tim 3:2–4. They take a variety of forms, lists of adjectives or nouns, lists of negatives, and they may be developed in various ways to incorporate longer phrases. They can be used to describe the evil state of believers before conversion and the good qualities which they should show afterwards, or the evil qualities of those who fall away from the faith and give false teaching. They are used to describe the characteristics that should be found in believers in general, or, as here, of church leaders or particular groups within the church. The use of such lists was already well-established in the early church, especially in the writings of Paul.³ The question of their origin has been much debated, since they are rare in the Old Testament although common in Judaism. They are, however,

common in Graeco-Roman ethics as well as being found in Iranian sources.⁴

There are examples of similar lists of qualities in Greek sources for specific occupations.⁵ (They bear some relation to lists of virtues and vices, since the qualities may be the same.) They are often very general but adapted to specific offices.⁶

In the present case there are clear indications that traditional material is being employed and then adapted for use in 1 Tim 3 (or vice versa) (Cf. Verner 1983:103–6).

First, an identical form is used to introduce some of the material:

Tit 1:7	δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι
1 Tim 3:2	δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι

The connecting particles differ because of context. In 1 Tim 3:2 the statement is preceded by the faithful saying, which describes the office of the overseer/bishop⁷ as a good work, and the qualities that follow are introduced as a logical and necessary consequence of the faithful saying (thus οὖν). However, in the present setting of Titus 1 the statement is given in substantiation of the initial set of standards.⁸ The predicate adjectives, ἀνεπίληπτος and ἀνέγκλητος, are synonymous, with the selection of ἀνέγκλητος in the present passage perhaps determined by the term's appearance in v. 6. (Cf. further Verner 1983:104–6.)

Second, although the independent nature of v. 6 may suggest that it is an abbreviated or adapted form of a longer code, the conjoining of the two qualities at the head of each set of instructions points to a traditional configuration (cf. Trummer*, 473f.; Schwarz 1983:76–8; Verner 1983:70, 72).

Tit 1:6	ἀνέκλητος,	μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ
1 Tim 3:2	ἀνεπίληπτον ...	μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα

Third, the qualities in the two lists which are commended or prohibited are generally comparable (cf. Dibelius–Conzelmann, 133). However, the differences in the list in Titus are not necessarily incidental; they may reflect sensitivity to the more

rudimentary level of Christianity that prevailed in Crete (see below).

The list is regarded as very general and lacking in specificity by Dibelius–Conzelmann, 99; but this is a verdict typical of Dibelius, who tends to see the general rather than the particular right through the NT. What can be said is surely that the desired qualities are those which are expected in all church members, but it is recognised that people often fall short of the ideal and that leaders should be chosen from those who come closest to it. At the same time, there are specific qualities which are particularly associated with leadership which also appear in such lists, and some of the qualities may have been selected for their suitability to a more primitive Cretan church situation. Vögtle 1936:54 and Brox, 285, comment that the lists are incomplete, but this is characteristic of *all* ethical lists.

Various commentators have argued that the contents of the lists in the PE are often ‘secular’ in nature and not specifically church- or leader-related, and that the requirements are in some cases ‘banal’ (Brox, 283). Kelly, 232, rightly responds that the latter criticism betrays ‘an extraordinary lack of realism’ over against the temptations faced by church officials in every age. The former comment is substantially correct, but perhaps fails to recognise that a good deal of the concern is for the reputation of the church in the eyes of outsiders. In general, this verdict fails to take sufficiently into account (a) the fact that qualities of leadership would be similar in the church and the secular world and (b) the amount of specifically Christian colour in the lists.

The main problem posed by the material is the curious way in which the passage begins by discussing the appointment of elders and describes the kind of people to be appointed (vv. 5–6) but then proceeds to describe the character of the overseer at considerably greater length (vv. 7–9). The generally accepted solution to this apparent duplication is that two broadly similar lists of qualifications have been fun together, one for elders and one for overseers. It is also generally agreed that for the author elders and overseers are two names for the same functionaries, and that the duplication may be due to the amalgamation of two types of church order. The later emergence of monarchical

bishops out of the group of elders has not yet taken place. See **Excursus 2.**

This solution is not entirely satisfactory. There is clear evidence that the function of the elders was seen as the oversight (*episkopē*) or pastoral care of the congregation; this is proved by Acts 20:17, 28 and 1 Pet 5:1, 2 (where the participle ἐπισκοποῦντες is almost certainly original). What we have in the present passage is the same phenomenon. The writer begins by affirming the need for elders to be blameless, and he then details the two areas of marriage and family life in which this must be true. Then he proceeds to explain *why* it is necessary. In his capacity as an overseer the candidate must be blameless inasmuch as he is acting on behalf of God in his household. Then he continues his description, but with a syntactical change necessitated by the inclusion of v. 7a. The composition is similar to that in 1 Tim 3:2–7 where the whole description is set up in the ‘an overseer must be ...’ form, but there is equally a parenthetical justification of the requirements in v. 5, after which the list of requirements continues.⁹ Understood in this way, the appearance of two lists in Tit 1 is illusory and what we have is simply a parenthetical explanation of the first requirement followed by a change of style in the form of the list.

TEXT

5. ἀπέλιπον (ℵ* D* ψ 81 365 1505 1739 1881 *pc*; WH mg; Holtzmann, 468; Kilpatrick; Elliott): ἀπέλειπον (A C F G 088 0240 33 1175 *pc*); κατέλιπον (ℵ² D² TR; cf. Acts 18:19; 24:37); κατέλειπον (L P 104 326 *al*). Confusion of -ι- and -ει- is very common in MSS. The aor. is required here by the sense. Elsewhere the PE use ἀπολείπω rather than καταλείπω. Hence the text should be retained (Elliott, 162f.; cf. 2 Tim 4:13, 20 for similar variations).

ἐπιδιορθώση ἐπιδιορθώσης (A (D* F G) ψ 1881 *pc*) is by assimilation to the following verb (Elliott, 174)

8. ἐγκρατῆ ἐγκρατή (A D F G I). Elliott, 175f, adopts the variant spelling (for a similar problem see 2 Tim 2:3, 11); he argues that ἐν- was used for etymological clarity, but assimilation took place in pronunciation. MHT II, 104f. appears to prefer the assimilated form.

9. ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει (A); assimilation to 2 Cor 1:4.

There are lengthy additions here and in 1:11 in a trilingual XIII cent. MS (460) (Elliott, 176f; Metzger, 584); cf. 2 Tim 4:19.

EXEGESIS

5a. Τούτου χάριν ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτη Τούτου χάριν, ‘for this reason’ (Eph 3:1, 14) points forwards to the following ἵνα clause.¹⁰ ἀπολείπω can mean ‘to leave behind’ (2 Tim 4:13, 20),¹¹ but it is possible that the meaning intended here is closer to ‘dispatched’, ‘deployed’ or ‘assigned’.¹² Wolter (1988:183f.) develops this most extensively to show that both ἀπολείπω and καταλείπω functioned as technical terms for the installation of official deputies or representatives or royal governors; he concludes that Tit 1:5 (and 1 Tim 1:3) may consciously employ this literary device. If this is the case, it may be (as Wolter maintains) simply another element of the pseudepigrapher’s fiction, or it may be yet another reflection of the transference of apostolic authority to the appointed delegate.

The island of Κρήτη (Acts 27:7, 12f., 21***; cf. Κρήτες, 1:12; Acts 2:11***) is located south of the Aegean sea at a strategic navigational point in relation to the winds (Acts 27:7) for the maritime trade. Its location and importance for trade meant that it would be influenced by philosophies and religious teaching from all parts of the Mediterranean world. The people were adherents of a number of religions and cults, including the worship of Zeus, Leto, Apollo, Artemis, Aphrodite, Asclepius and Hermes (Dietrich, B. C., in *OCD* 408). There were communities of Jews (Tacitus, *Histories* 5:11; Josephus, *Ant.* 27:327; *Bel.* 2:103; Philo, *Leg. Gai.* 282) and by this time possibly Jewish Christians (Acts 2:11).

ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ The purpose clause outlines Titus’s commission in Crete. He is to set right what was lacking in the churches. The participle τὰ λείποντα signifies ‘the things remaining to be done’, which had not been included in previous activity (λείπω [trans. ‘to leave behind’] is used intrans. in the NT, ‘to lack, be in need of’, 3:13; Lk 18:22; Jas 1:4f.; 2:15***).¹³ Quinn, 83, regards the combination of the participle with its cognate verb, ἀπέλιπον, as part of a stylistic device, which, along with the emphatic change to the second person in this verse, signals the transition from the salutation to the instructions in the body of the letter. This is not very convincing.

ἐπιδιορθόω*** (here aor. mid.) is an extremely rare verb, unattested in Cl., the LXX and Fathers, with the sense ‘to set right, to correct in addition’. The use may reflect some local colour, since its only other occurrence is apparently in an inscription on Crete dating to the second century BC (*CIG* 2555, 9, in BA). The related term, διορθόω, occurs in legal contexts discussing lawmaking and treaties with Cretans (c. 200 BC; Dittenberger, *Syll.* 581:85).¹⁴ The term may thus express (in a way sensitive to Cretan nuance) the idea of authority to act (to make appropriate and needed reforms) such as might be given to lawmakers or by an apostle to his delegate.

In this the accent may fall on *completing* a task, the implication being that Paul himself or a colleague had begun to set up the churches and organise their structure, but had departed before the task was completed (cf. Fee, 172). This would accord with the nascent condition of the churches in which leaders have yet to be selected. Or the accent may be on correction and restoration of a good situation that had deteriorated, which makes sense in light of the need to deal with the false teachers and the damage they have caused (1:10–16; 3:9–11; Hanson, 172). In any case, the effect of the instruction is to tie in Titus’s present task with the broader commission that had been already given to him (Wolter 1988:180f.) The effect is that Titus is given authority to do more than the specific instructions in the letter (Oberlinner, 19).

5b. καὶ καταστήσῃ κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγώ σοι διαταξάμην Among these tasks that of selecting elders is particularly emphasised.¹⁵ The fundamental nature of this task in completing all that needs to be done in the churches is clear from the immediate attention given to it (vv. 6–9). The implication is that Titus is to take the initiative.

καθίστημι** (here aor. act.) is used here in the technical sense of the appointment of officials.¹⁶ Some scholars hold that the task was to be carried out primarily by Titus himself (Lock, 129, hesitantly; Spicq, 601; Holtz, 207); no weight, however, should be placed on the change to the active voice following the middle form ἐπιδιορθώσῃ (*pace* Bernard, 157, who regards the middle as expressing action to be taken by Titus himself!). However, ‘the

fact that Titus is told to institute them does not mean that the congregation was to play no part' (Barrett, 128f.; Parry, 74; cf. Acts 6:1–6). Knight, 288, argues that the verb refers to the actual induction or ordination of the leaders as the final stage on choosing and appointing them (cf. Lips 1979:182).

The actual scope of the project is difficult to determine; the impression gained from the letter is of a rather disorganised and immature church, and this may suggest some limits to the extent of the spread of Christianity on the island. Nevertheless, the geographical reference 'in each city' suggests that there were at least several different towns with house churches. κατά has distributive force (cf. Luke 8:1; Acts 15:21, 36; 20:23). Hence the phrase means 'in every city' (i.e. where there was already a congregation [cf. Acts 15:36]; it is less likely that Titus was to set up new congregations with elders).

Crete was proverbial for its 'hundred' cities (Homer, *Iliad* 2:649; [or 'ninety'] *Odyssey* 19:172–9; Horace, *Carm.* 3:27:33f.). During classical and Hellenistic times about thirty-five city states are attested. This number was reduced to about twenty in the Roman period as some were taken over by more powerful neighbours. Gortyna was the capital under Roman rule, but each city retained its own administration. They were notorious for their fierce rivalries, and only Roman jurisdiction ended the frequent inter-city wars. Whole the distribution of the population may mean that house churches had been planted throughout the island, the force here is to emphasise the thoroughness with which Titus is to attend to the task.

It is theoretically possible that the meaning is that elders are to be appointed one per city with oversight over several groups (Hasler, 87f.). But the picture that emerges from relevant passages (Phil 1:1; Acts 20:17, 28; 14:23; 16:4) suggests a plurality of leaders in a church (Fee, 21–2; Knight, 175–7, 288; Spicq, 601). Perhaps if 'church' (cf. 1 Cor 1:2) is a collective term for a number of house fellowships in a particular locale, then oversight of the smaller unit by a single leader is possible. One factor to be borne in mind is that the imagery of the steward may well imply one leader per group (Merkel, 90).

The appointments are to be made in accordance with instructions previously given by Paul. The reference is

presumably to oral instruction. Thus the letter backs up earlier instructions. This refutes the objection by Merkel, 89, that Paul would not have left off giving instructions to Titus about church organisation until after he himself had left the area.

πρεσβύτερος is 'old man', hence 'elder'. In this context, as also in 1 Tim 5:17, 19, the word refers to elders rather than 'old men' (*pace* Jeremias, 41f.; cf. 1 Tim 5:1; Titus 2:2). The term came into the early church's vocabulary naturally by way of the Jewish synagogue (cf. Acts 11:30; 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4; 21:18; Jas 5:14; 1 Pet 5:1), and has a traditional connection with the missionary activity of Paul (Acts 14:23; 20:17). See **Excursus 3**.

ὡς (1:7; 1 Tim 5:1a, 1b, 2a, 2b; 2 Tim 2:3, 9, 17; 3:9**) could simply mean 'in accordance with the fact that I told you to do so' or 'in the manner in which I told you to act'. The latter rendering is better, since it is followed by a list of specific instructions for the way in which the appointments are to be made.¹⁷ ἐγώ (1:3) is possibly intended to be emphatic; if so, the intent is to underscore the apostolic authority of the instructions (Spicq, 601; Knight, 289; cf. 1:3). Proponents of pseudonymity view this as designed to associate Paul with the system of eldership (Merkel, 89–90; cf. Wolter 1988:180f.; Oberlinner, 18). διατάσσω* is frequent in Paul (1 Cor 16:1; cf. 7:17; 9:14; 11:34; Gal 3:19) and Luke-Acts (9 times; Mt 11:1***). It can be used of instructions given by civil and military officials, masters, laws or fathers. It is one of the group of terms used in the PE to express authoritative instructions (cf. ἐπιτρέπω, 1 Tim 2:12; βούλομαι, 1 Tim 2:8; 5:14; Tit 3:8).¹⁸

6. εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ, τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα The main thrust of the instruction concerns the kind of people to be appointed as elders. On the whole, the code enumerates qualities that are to characterise the life of any Christian. The assumption to be made from Tit 2:12 is that such qualities have a basis in genuine faith (cf. Schwarz 1983:96–8); the officeholder is to model this life. The general quality (a) of being blameless is elaborated in terms of (b) being the husband of one wife; and (c) being the father of children who are of good Christian character.

The syntax is slightly obscure. This has led to the suggestion that a source is being incorporated here (Quinn, 84–5).¹⁹ Ἄν εἴ τις

clause normally precedes the main clause (1 Tim 3:1, 5; 5:4, 8, 16; 6:3). This could be the case here with anacolouthon resulting from the insertion of the justifying clause in v. 7. The missing main clause would have been something like, ‘let him be appointed’. Alternatively, the clause has been added loosely to what precedes: ‘appoint elders ... if anybody is blameless ...’. In any case, the sense is clear enough.

ἀνέγκλητος, ‘blameless’ is repeated in 1:7 and used in 1 Tim 3:10 of deacons; it is synonymous with ἀνεπίλημπος (Vögtle 1936:55), used of an overseer in 1 Tim 3:2. It is a term limited to the Pauline corpus in the NT (1 Cor 1:8; Col 1:22***).²⁰ It identifies a basic requirement of the elder — that there be no accusation against him. The legal connotation present in judgement contexts (1 Cor 1:8; Col 1:22) is still present in this setting of less formal assessment. A good reputation both inside and outside the church is required, and one’s behaviour forms the basis upon which the reputation is evaluated. Needless to say, there is a difference between living a life which should not lead to accusations and facing unfounded accusations. The elder should as far as possible be able to carry out his task without fear of being denounced for misdemeanours.

Two qualities that should prevent accusations of misdemeanour are listed, each having to do with family life. They are paralleled in 1 Tim 3:2, 4 which is based on the same traditional teaching. The first is best interpreted as faithfulness in marriage. Our own age illustrates forcibly how the slightest suspicion of sexual irregularity is seized upon as a ground for accusation against Christian leaders.

μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ (1 Tim 3:12; see the female equivalent in 5:9)²¹ is literally ‘the husband of one wife’ and expresses a requirement not found elsewhere in ancient sources; this is thus a specifically Christian requirement. The sense is much disputed.²² There are five main interpretations:

(a) *A person who has not committed polygamy.*²³ This would presumably refer to polygamy before conversion. The fact that polygamy was banned at Qumran (CD 4:20–5:6) implies that it was considered a possible practice in some Jewish circles (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 17:14).²⁴ However, such a ban would not have been a necessary requirement in the Christian community

(Hanson, 78). Moreover, and decisively, this theory would require that polyandry is meant in 1 Tim 5:9, which is not known to have been a practice in that culture and therefore would not have needed to be addressed.²⁵

(b) *A married man as opposed to a celibate.* On this view the requirement could be a response to the heretical prohibition of marriage in 1 Tim 4:3: the leader must set a good example (see the discussions in Roloff 155; Holtz, 76). But it leads to a tautology in 1 Tim 5:9, and the emphatic position of μιᾶς is strongly against it.

(c) *A person who has not remarried after the death of his wife.*²⁶ This ruling would *a fortiori* also prohibit any who remarried after divorce from becoming elders. According to Knoch, 29, this shows that marriage is binding both in this world and the next. Support for this interpretation has been drawn from the frequent references on inscriptions to women who did not remarry after the death of their husbands as being *univira* and *monandros* (see Frey*; Lightman and Zeisel*; cf. Anna [Luke 2:36f.] and the widows in 1 Tim 5:9, though there is no way to know whether the latter had been married only once). However, the *univira* inscriptions cited refer to women, the Greek phrase phrase μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ (or rather ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή) was not used in this connection, and remarriage was certainly not regarded as being sinful (1 Cor 7:8f., 39f.; Rom 7:1–3). Emmet* states that celibacy after the death of one’s partner was a virtue in women but was not expected in men. Furthermore, in the light of 1 Tim 5:14, where young widows are encouraged to remarry, such a condition may be contradictory. If correct, it would suggest two standards in the church (so explicitly Holtzmann).

(d) *Anyone remarried after divorce.*²⁷ (This interpretation would permit remarriage after the death of the first wife.) Cf. Mt 5:32; Mk 10:11 where remarriage is prohibited. If this total ban was relaxed (cf. Mt 19:9; 1 Cor 7:15; Collins 1992), then there could have been a higher standard for leaders. More narrowly, the phrase might identify a person who had not married a non-Christian wife, then divorced her and remarried a Christian — i.e. who had not availed himself of the so-called ‘Pauline privilege’ (1 Cor 7:10–16; Easton, 212–15). Jeremias, 24, draws attention to the Qumran Scroll 11Q Temple 57:17–19, where the king is not permitted a second wife unless he has been widowed. However,

the limitation to remarriage after divorce is by no means obvious from the wording, and such a prohibition is not supported elsewhere in the NT.

(e) *A person who is faithful to his wife*. It is more widely held that the phrase refers to marital fidelity.²⁸ Some scholars take the term in a very broad sense as consciously intending to prohibit all forms of sexual immorality, including polygamy, successive divorces and remarriages, and marriage by those of forbidden degrees of kinship (Brox, 142; cf. Merkel, 30; Roloff, 156).

The root of the problem is that there is no evidence for use of the phrase outside the PE, and the basis of the interpretation is therefore extremely dubious. Quinn, 86, even doubts that the phrase has sexual morality in mind because other terms (cf. 2:4–5; 1 Tim 5:10–14; πορνεία) might easily have been used.

The limits of interpretation are set (i) by the use of the parallel phrase in 1 Tim 5:9 and (ii) by the improbability that the phrase envisaged a specific form of unacceptable behaviour that was either too well known or sufficiently infrequent to have warranted the special notice given to it here. The latter control rules out a reference to polygamy and remarriage after divorce (and even more specific versions of this sort of remarriage). Equally, the specific cases of remarriage after death of one's partner and prohibition of celibacy are ruled out by 1 Tim 5:9: the *univira* and *monandros* epithets are unlikely to be equivalents of the phrase here, and the permission and even encouragement to younger widows to remarry after the death of a spouse raises considerable doubts. Since the assumption is that the overseer/ elder is married with children (v. 6; 1 Tim 3:4), a statement with regard to a candidate's behaviour within marriage is appropriate (see especially Trummer*, 477–82). It can undoubtedly be assumed that the marriage would have to conform to the standards of acceptability within the church (i.e. monogamous and if a remarriage, then a legitimate one). What is stated is the ideal for all Christians but is prescribed for leaders (cf. Lyonnet*; Wagener 1994:173f.). Nothing is said about a second marriage. It is best to follow Theodore of Mopsuestia, II, 103 (Swete): ὃς ἀγαγόμενος γυναῖκα σωφρόνως ἐβίω μετὰ ταύτης, προσέχων αὐτῇ καὶ μέχρις αὐτῆς ὀρίζων τῆς φύσεως τὴν ὄρεξιν.²⁹ Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 120, comments that the author is here not concerned with legal rules to

be observed but with the quality of conduct displayed by the church leader within the marriage relationship.

The second quality has to do with the conduct of the elder's children; the phrase τέκνα ἔχων assumes that he will normally be a father with children still under his control, but it would be pedantic literalism to argue that childless men could not be appointed. They are to be πιστά, 'believing', 'faithful' (especially with reference to 'trustworthy' sayings 3:8; 1 Tim 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11; cf. Tit 1:9; cf. 2 Tim 2:13 of Christ). This word is used as a general term for Christians (as an adjective, 1 Tim 6:2a, 2b; 2 Tim 2:2; as a substantive, 1 Tim 4:3, 10, 12; 5:16). It refers to a quality shown by Christians and Christian leaders (1 Tim 1:12; 3:11). But the sense here is disputed: (a) 'believing'³⁰ (b) 'trustworthy' (1 Cor 4:17).³¹ The former view implies that if a person cannot teach the faith to his own family, he is ill-suited to nurture the church in the faith (so Chrysostom and Jerome, cited by Spicq, 602). The latter view is thought to explain better the prohibited behaviour that follows and to correspond better to the parallel in 1 Tim 3:4, where the overseer's children must be 'obedient' (ἐν ὑποταγῇ). In this case the point is that, if the elder cannot keep his family in subjection, how will he care for the church? But it is hard to see why 'trustworthiness' should be singled out for special mention in this context, and it is not synonymous with 'obedience'. Furthermore, the behaviour described next would be as much a sign of unbelief as of disobedience. It should also be remembered that in a patriarchal society the children would be more likely to accept the father's religion than in modern western society.

It is further required that as the outcome of their faith the children should live soberly and in obedience within the family. The point is made by describing the opposite type of character, which demonstrates unbelief. μή is used because the adjective is virtually a participle (Moule 1953:155f.). κατηγορία, 'accusation', is a legal term (Jn 18:29; 1 Tim 5:19***; cf. Lk 6:7 v.l.; Josephus, *Ant.* 2:49; *Ap.* 2:137), and the phrase ἐν κατηγορίᾳ with gen. of content is idiomatic, meaning 'not open to the charge of'. ἀσωτία, 'debauchery' (Eph. 5:18; 1 Pet. 4:4***), is a broad term which can have a number of nuances, such as drunkenness (Eph 5:18;

Athenaeus 11, p. 485a), excessive behaviour with regard to money (cf. Aristotle, *EN* 4:1; cf. ἀσώτως, Lk 15:13; cf. Lock, 130), gluttony (cf. Prov 28:7 MT), and fornication (2 Macc 6:4). A general lack of self-control and moderation is implied. Foerster comments that in the NT wild, disorderly living is in mind, but in the secular world this manner of life in itself would not have been considered as ἀσωτία, which was rather wasteful dissipation of one's resources. The word here, then, 'combines the spendthrift and the rake' (Simpson, 97; cf. Foerster, W., *TDNT* I, 506f.; *TLNT* I, 220–2). The younger son in the parable of Jesus is a vivid example of the character. ἢ (3:12*) here has the force of 'and'. ἀνυπότακτος, 'insubordinate, rebellious' is a Hellenistic term.³² It is also used to describe the writer's opponents (1:10; 1 Tim 1:9; cf. Heb 2:8***) and in such cases envisages something more serious than simply 'contrariness'. Here the reference is probably immediately to disobedience towards parents, but the link with 1:10 may be intentional, with the thought being that disrespect for authority at this level has wider implications (cf. Lock, 130).

The condition calls for leaders to be chosen from among those whose families in entirety had turned from pagan religions to embrace the Christian faith. The adherence of the children to the father's religion would probably have had implications for the father's reputation as a respectable patron both inside and outside the church. The implication is that the father has demonstrated in his own family life the qualities which will enable him to lead effectively in the church (so explicitly in 1 Tim 3:5), but at this point the emphasis is more on the blamelessness of his reputation.

7. δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον, μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ ὀργίλον, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην, μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ The first part of this verse appears to begin a parenthetical explanation of why the choice of an elder must be of a blameless person. It thus picks up the first part of v. 6 rather than the latter part. But the clause then continues to give a further list of qualities in the same syntactical form rather than resuming the syntax of the previous clause; in other words, what appears to begin as a parenthesis is never terminated but becomes a further list of qualifications in its own right. This anacolouthon has suggested that in fact a second alternative list of qualities for

leaders has been loosely attached to the previous one, a view that may be strengthened by the fact that different words for church leaders are used in each. See above, however, for the proposal that the author is now thinking more of the functions of the elder and therefore switches to this term before continuing with his traditional list of required qualities.³³

The statement begins with repetition of what has preceded about the need for the church leader to be blameless. The leader is here referred to generically as 'the overseer' (ἐπίσκοπος). The identity of the elder with the overseer is patent (Calvin, 359f.), and the more functional designation (cf. Barrett, 129) indicates the character of his task in broad terms. The need for a blameless reputation is grounded in the fact that he is God's authorised agent who must be free from any ground for suspicion that he is unfit for this task.

The metaphor of stewarding introduces the conception of the church as a household in this letter (cf. 1:11; 2:2–10), complementing the dominant theme in 1 and 2 Timothy (1 Tim 3:15; 2 Tim 2:20–21; cf. Quinn, 88; Hasler, 88). The rest of the verse is a list of five negative qualities which, along with the positive qualities that follow and the requirements listed in v. 6, serve to explain in detail the meaning of ἀνέγκλητος; (cf. the mixture of positive and negative in 1 Tim 3:2–7). The negative qualities create a conscious contrast with the image of the trustworthy οἰκονόμος (cf. Quinn, 89).

γὰρ as a connective gives the justification for choosing people who are blameless.³⁴ The verb δεῖ (1:11a, b) is used similarly in 1 Tim 3:2, 7; 2 Tim 2:24 where it is also stated what church leaders must be.³⁵ The basis for the statement lies in the character of the overseer's function as God's steward, but no such basis is given in 1 Tim 3 and 2 Tim 2 where it is stated as a simple matter of what is 'obvious'. According to Popkes the statement is tantamount to a divine decree: 'God's will and nature are the norms of ethics and piety.' Nevertheless, the present passage spells out the underlying basis. The representative of God must be worthy of his master by having the kind of moral character which is worthy of him and which commends rather than condemns him.

τὸν ἐπίσκοπον is clearly a generic phrase; it cannot refer to a specific, singular church leader who is to be distinguished from the elders,³⁶ a monarchical overseer, in the sense of a single leader to a congregation, is a possibility if it is to be assumed that Titus is to appoint one elder/overseer per city. In fact, the logic of the connection demands the identity of the two offices.³⁷ The change to the singular is entirely natural, especially after v. 6 has already been phrased in the singular. Thus the equivalence of the two designations demands the repetition of the ἀνέγκλητος requirement in v. 7. The reason why the overseer should be ἀνέγκλητος is that he is θεοῦ οἰκονόμος.

οἰκονόμος indicates the office of a steward (the Scottish ‘factor’), a person appointed by (e.g.) a landowner to administer his estates and oversee his workers, representing the master and having full powers granted by him, and answerable (only) to the master for his conduct of the property (cf. Luke 12:42; 16:1, 3, 8; cf. Rom 16:23 of a town official; Gal 4:2 of a child’s guardian). The designation contains an emphasis on faithfulness and trustworthiness (cf. 1 Cor 4:2). The word is used metaphorically of a Cynic preacher as a servant of Zeus (Epictetus 3:22–3).³⁸ The metaphorical use of church leaders assigns to them a position of authority under God (1 Cor 4:1f.); the description extends to all who exercise spiritual gifts (1 Pet 4:10***; Ignatius, *Poly* 6:1). The designation is appropriate for leaders in the οἶκος θεοῦ who act on his behalf (1 Tim 3:15; Lips 1979:145–50). Holtzmann, 470, claims that in Paul people are stewards of the divine mysteries, not of the church as a whole, and that in Paul the description is applied only to apostles. This generalisation is, however, made on the basis of only *one* passage, and in fact it applies to Apollos who is not an apostle. 1 Cor 4:1–2 indicate that a church may have several persons fulfilling this function.

Five negative qualities are now listed the first two of which deal with personal character and the remaining three with relationships (Oberlinner, 25).

(a) αὐθάδης ranges in meaning from the narrower ‘self-willed’ and ‘stubborn’ to the broader ‘arrogant’ (BA *s.v.*; for ‘arrogant’ see Josephus, *Bel.* 6:172; *Ant.* 1:189; Parry 75; Quinn 80). According to Field 1899:219 it is ‘not one who *pleases himself*,

but who *is pleased with himself*; and holds other people cheap, in one word, *self-satisfied*’.³⁹ Here and in 2 Pet 2:10*** it describes behaviour characteristic of false teachers (cf. Prov 21:24), which inclines to that of the brutal unbeliever, an application found suitable elsewhere (1 Clement 1:1; cf. 30:8; 57:2). As in *Didache* 3:6 this rude indifference to the feelings of others should not to be found in Christians or Christian leaders. It is a brutal, hateful and arrogant attitude characteristic of unbelief and spiritual death.⁴⁰ The fact that it is not paralleled in the list of 1 Tim 3 may suggest that the list in Titus 1 addresses a far more rudimentary level of life such as was commonly believed to be typical of Crete.⁴¹

(b) ὀργίλος***, ‘inclined to anger’, ‘quick-tempered’, perhaps of ‘explosive anger’ (see Schwarz 1983:69f.), represents a vice that belongs equally to the basest of human characteristics. It was especially viewed as a threat to human relationships (Epictetus 2:10–18; Prov 21:19; cf. Aristotle, *EN* 4:5), a quality unfitting in a king (Dio Chrysostom, 2:75 [verb]), and thus in the biblical tradition it aptly characterises an aspect of unbelief (Ps 17:49; Prov 22:24; 29:22; *Didache* 3:2).⁴²

(c) πάροις is ‘addicted to wine’, hence ‘drunkard’ (1 Tim 3:3***; not attested in LXX). Literally it refers to being drunk, to whatever extent (e.g. ‘tipsy, slightly drunk’);⁴³ but the word-group can also refer to the rowdy behaviour and loss of self-control characteristic of drunkenness.⁴⁴ The metaphorical force ‘not behaving like a drunkard’ is adopted here by Holtzmann, 470–1; Lock, 130, in view of the following contrast; but it is not as likely to have this sense here as νηφάλιος in 1 Tim 3:2. The context here describes the roughest behaviour, and drunkenness fits best. For the thought cf. Luke 12:45; *T. Jud.* 14:4.⁴⁵

(d) πλήκτης, ‘bully, pugnacious person’ (1 Tim 3:3***; not attested in LXX and early fathers), describes ruffians who engage in physical violence,⁴⁶ but the term may extend also to ideas of anger and violence and verbal abuse (Roloff, 158 n. 246). The word is applied to wine in Plutarch (*Mor.* 132D; cf. Quinn 80; Schwarz 1983:54), which might suggest that the combination μὴ πάροις, μὴ πλήκτην here and in 1 Tim 3:3 reflects a traditional association between drunkenness and bullying abuse. Otherwise it is not found in the secular vice lists (cf. Vögtle 1936:241).

(e) αἰσχροκερδής is ‘fond of dishonest gain’, ‘shamefully greedy’ (with reference to deacons, 1 Tim 3:8***).⁴⁷ It envisages generally ‘dishonest gain’ (Philo, *Sacr.* 32 [vice list]; αἰσχροκερδία, *T. Jud.* 16:1). The reference may be to teaching for profit, whether the false teachers are immediately in mind (cf. Tit 1:11; Lock 131; cf. 1 Tim 6:5), or whether the emphasis is more generally on the danger of allowing financial compensation to become the chief motivation for ministry (cf. 1 Pet 5:2; Goppelt 1993:346; Knoch, 29). Equally possible, however, is a reference to faithfulness in managing the church’s finances (Holtzmann, 471); or it may have in mind elders who engage in discreditable and dishonest trades. Probably the term is broad enough to cover all of these senses as needed. Holtzmann, 471, suggests that the idea is not so much of making money dishonestly as of being fond of gain in a situation where gain is wrong in itself (similarly, Barrett, 129; Fee, 174). αἰσχροκέρδεια was one of the legendary flaws of the Cretans (Polybius 6:46), and this might account for the inclusion of the related term in reference to the overseer in this code (cf. ἀφιλάργυρον in 1 Tim 3:3).

8. ἀλλὰ φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα δίκαιον ὄσιον ἔγκρατῆ The list of negative qualities is followed by a listing of six desirable qualities, followed by a seventh which is developed at some length and provides a transition to the instructions regarding the false teachers in vv. 10–16. No particular order is discernible in the list, except that the last one develops a point of especial importance. The other six qualities are such as might be expected in any Christian and all the more in leaders.

(a) φιλόξενος, ‘hospitable’ (1 Tim 3:2; 1 Pet 4:9***), refers to a virtue which was to be evident in all Christians,⁴⁸ and which the duty code applies specifically to the church leader. In the ancient world this virtue was widely extolled.⁴⁹ Philo held Abraham up as a model of hospitality, which he describes as a practical outworking of θεοσέβεια (*Abr.* 114). But it was largely practical circumstances that dictated the need for hospitality. In the Roman Empire the dangers of travel, poor conditions of inns, and pressures on Christians who often existed as refugees made hospitality indispensable for the church (cf. Quinn, 90–1; Spicq, 432–3). Furthermore, as Goppelt says, ‘hospitality was to a large

extent a presupposition for the Christian mission’ (1993:299; cf. Mt 10:11; Acts 16:15; 21:7; 28:14; Rom 16:4; *Didache* 11:2, 4). For worship to take place, homes had to be opened and provisions made (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Col 4:15). Consequently, the application of this virtue to the church leader is natural, since the burden of providing hospitality to travellers and those in need would fall on him (cf. 1 Clement 12:3; Hermas, *Mand.* 8:10; *Sim.* 9:27:2).⁵⁰

(b) φιλάγαθος*** is ‘loving what is good’ or ‘loving good people’ (cf. ἀφιλάγαθος in 2 Tim 3:3***). Aristotle contrasted it with love of self (φίλαυτος; *Mag. Mor.* II. 14:3:1212b, 18ff.) which is a trait of unbelief in 2 Tim 3:2. This suggests the meaning of a selfless attitude and desire for what is inherently good, hence ‘fond of doing good’ (Parry, 75). It was used widely as a title of honour and as a description of an aspect of royalty (*Ep. Arist.* 124, 292) and of the law-giver (Philo, *Mos.* 2:9). These connections made it a natural selection as a quality describing a model leader. Elsewhere in the biblical tradition it is linked to wisdom (Wis 7:22).⁵¹

(c) For σώφρων, ‘self-controlled’ (2:2, 5; 1 Tim 3:2), see **Excursus 3**.

(d) δίκαιος (1 Tim 1:9; 2 Tim 4:8**) does not appear in the list in 1 Tim 3, but the word-group plays an important role, alongside other terms prominent in Greek ethical thought, in the author’s conception of the Christian life.⁵² The common meaning is uprightness of conduct and justice in dealing with people. However, in the PE, primarily through 2:12 (cf. 2 Tim 3:16), behaviour that is δίκαιος transcends the secular notion of a cardinal virtue. Its orientation is the Christ-event.⁵³ Justification by faith in the Pauline sense is meant in Tit 3:5 (δικαιοσύνη; cf. 2 Tim 4:8: ‘crown of righteousness’) and 3:7 (δικαίω), and the passive ἐδικαιώθη in 1 Tim 3:16 means vindication (see 1 Tim 3:16 note).⁵⁴

δίκαιος was often paired with the preceding σώφρων and the following ὄσιος word-groups.⁵⁵ This pattern depends upon the duty-code, and the grouping of virtues and the virtues chosen suggest some sensitivity to secular thought; nevertheless, through

2:12 and developments in the LXX, the network of virtues has been applied to define Christian conduct.

(e) ὅσιος, ‘pure, holy, devout’ (1 Tim 2:8**), is likewise absent from the code of 1 Tim 3, and does not occur elsewhere in the Pauline corpus (except for the adverb in 1 Th 2:10). It comes in OT quotations in Acts 2:27; 13:34f. (applied to Christ) and in descriptions of God (Rev. 15:4; 16:5) and Christ (Heb 7:26***; for the noun ὁσιότης see Lk 1:75; Eph 4:24***). In Classical Greek the word means ‘clean, godly, bound to the obligations (established by the gods)’; it can allude to the practice of washing hands on entry to a sanctuary (cf. 1 Tim 2:8; Exod 30:17–21). The thought is of outward cultic purity and the inward piety expressed by it (Knoch, 26). The term generally characterises a person as a worshipper (Aristophanes, *Ranae* 327, 336; Thucydides 5:104; Xenophon, *Anab.* II 6:25), and it is basically in this sense that it describes a requirement of the people of Yahweh (equivalent to **טִּיבֵן**; Deut 33:8; 2 Kgs 22:26; Ps 11:2; 17:26; 31:6; a condition of the heart, Prov. 22:11; of the soul, Wis 7:27; cf. Deut 32:4; Ps 144:17 of God). Hauck claims that the background to the usage here does not lie in the Hebrew concept of the covenant but in the ‘general Gk. use for “what is right and good before God and man”’.⁵⁶ Clearly the form in which the term appears in this list suggests affinity with the use in Hellenistic literature (cf. Philo, *Prob.* 83), but the meaning ‘holy, pure or devout’ was readily adaptable to the Christian situation (cf. 1 Th 2:10; Eph 4:24; Heb 7:26).⁵⁷

The absence of the last two extremely basic qualities from the list in 1 Tim 3 raises the question of their presence here. It may simply be a desire on the part of the author to shape the code according to the fundamental virtues of secular ethics. It is also possible that the emphasis on the elementary qualities, just as the prohibition of certain behaviour patterns that would have seemed too obvious to mention, spoke to an immature church struggling to break free from depraved patterns of behaviour, such as were widely associated with Crete.

(f) For ἐγκρατής***, ‘disciplined’ see **Excursus 3**.

9. ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου The preceding qualities were fairly general, but included ones specific

to church leaders (hospitality). This seventh requirement, which is related more directly to the ministry of the word, is specific and essential for the church leader (for similar material cf. 2 Tim 3:14f.). He is to hold fast to the trustworthy word according to the teaching, in order that he may be able positively to ‘exhort’ and negatively to ‘refute’ error.

The stress on teaching ability and the specific positive and negative (corrective) purposes give a fuller form of the brief and general διδασκτικός in 1 Tim 3:2. It is possible that the greater detail corresponds to a more urgent need in this community (Brox, 285; Scott, 156), possibly because the heresy was more virulent. But, however urgent the situation was, v. 9 forms the transition to the direct discussion about confronting the opponents in vv. 10–16; the immediate application of the duty code to the confrontation with the false teachers may provide the reason for the greater attention given to the overseer’s commitment to and use of the word (cf. Herr 1976:81).

ἀντέχομαι (act., ‘to hold against’, ‘hold out’) is used in the middle voice: (a) ‘to take hold of, cling to, hold fast’;⁵⁸ (b) ‘to take an interest in, concern oneself with, help’ (1 Th 5:14, in the sense of ‘holding fast to’ and not neglecting needy people). The second meaning is preferred by BA (*s.v.*; see also Dibelius–Conzelmann 133), but there appears to be some misunderstanding of the LXX references; in the case of entities like the Torah ‘holding fast to’ and ‘concerning oneself with’ are much the same thing. The first meaning is surely appropriate here, with the threat posed by heresy and the thought of the possible capitulation of the church’s leaders in view.⁵⁹

τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου designates that to which the overseer is to hold fast or about which he is to be concerned. The sense could be either: (a) ‘the sure word as taught’, ‘the sure word which accords with *the* doctrine’, i.e. a reference to the *content* of the proclamation (NRSV; Holtzmann, 472; Kelly, 232–3; cf. for the idea Phil 2:16; 2 Th 2:15); or (b) ‘the preaching which is reliable as regards doctrine’, i.e. a reference to *participation* in the preaching ministry (cf. 1 Tim 5:17 for zeal in preaching; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 133; cf. Brox, 285). The latter sense will require ἀντεχόμενον to mean ‘have a concern for’ (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 133). In the former case, the content of

the proclamation is emphasised, to which the overseer is to ‘hold firm’. However, the following purpose clause is decisive: the purpose is that the overseer should be ‘able’ in exhortation and ‘sound’ (accurate) in correction and rebuke of false teachers. This makes a reference to the doctrinally pure Christian message much more suitable, and ἀντεχόμενον means ‘holding firm’. In any case, the assumption is that the overseer preaches and teaches (as explicitly in 1 Tim 3:2). But perhaps we should go further and ask whether the text does not require that people who are to be appointed to this office have already demonstrated their ability to teach; in that case, teaching would not be confined to those who held the office of presbyter/elder (Stott, 95).

The presence of heresy determines the emphasis on the approved doctrine and commitment to it; the ‘word’ is to be trustworthy in accordance with (κατά, 1:4) the standard contained in the ‘teaching’ (cf. Brox 285–6).

διδασκία can refer to the activity of teaching (2 Tim 4:2**; cf. 1 Cor 14:6), but also, as in this context, it can denote that which is taught. According to Rengstorf, the word tends to mean the whole of what is taught by a teacher. It thus takes on the sense of a normative body of doctrines and precepts (in the same sense, Rom 6:17; 16:17; 2 Jn 9–10; cf. Heb 6:2; 13:9; Lk 4:32; Jn 18:9; *et al.*). The present context requires this formal meaning.⁶⁰ Teaching is an important function in the PE, as the use of the word-group indicates (διδάσκω, 1:11; 1 Tim 4:11; 6:2; 2 Tim 2:2**); διδάσκαλος 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11; 4:3**; διδασκαλία, Tit 1:9 note; διδακτικός, 1 Tim 3:2; 2 Tim 2:24***). Paul identifies teaching as one of the essential gifts to the church, given for its maintenance and edification (Rom 12:7; 1 Cor 12:28–29; Eph 4:11). The task of teaching was apparently limited to those persons who had the appropriate charismatic endowment (see Towner 1989:215), and this seems to hold for the PE (cf. 2 Tim 2:2).

λόγος in effect picks up on 1:3 and refers to Christian proclamation in a broad sense. πιστός (1:6 note) is here ‘trustworthy, sure’ (3:8; 1 Tim 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11**; cf. Dibelius–Conzelmann, 134); not ‘which is to be believed’ (*pace* Quinn, 92). The adjective is almost unnecessary in view of the

κατά phrase, except to emphasise that the ‘trustworthiness’ of the gospel is measured only by the approved (apostolic) doctrine. It is highly unlikely that the whole phrase here refers to any specific ‘trustworthy saying’ of the type mentioned in 3:8; *et al.*

ἵνα δυνατός ἦ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῆ ὑγιαίνουσα καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν δυνατός is ‘able, capable’ (2 Tim 1:12** of God’s power).⁶¹ The double καὶ ... καὶ ... expresses the positive and negative tasks. Both are among the tasks assigned to Timothy in 2 Tim 4:2. But they are also the functions of the Paraclete in John, which may suggest that the picture of the Paraclete was modelled on that of the church leader (so Hanson, 174).

(1) The first task is to encourage. παρακαλέω can express a command in the form of a request; Spicq, 321, suggests that it is equivalent to βούλομαι but not as strong as διατάσσω (1:5). It is frequently used of commands by church leaders (Paul to Timothy: 1 Tim 2:1; Timothy and Titus to the churches: 2:6, 15; 1 Tim 1:3; 5:1; 6:2; 2 Tim 4:2**). The word is used broadly for giving encouragement; it suggests instruction with a practical bent, something more than simply detailing facts and doctrines, and it carries an element of persuasion and even command (cf. 2:6, 15). It is linked with διδάσκω in 1 Tim 6:2; cf. 2 Tim 4:2.⁶²

The exhortation is to take place ‘in the sphere of doctrine’.⁶³ διδασκαλία covers both the activity and the content of teaching (2:1, 7, 10; 1 Tim 1:10; 4:6, 13, 16; 5:17; 6:1, 3; 2 Tim 3:10, 16; 4:3; plural of false teachings, 1 Tim 4:1**). The frequency shows that this is a favourite word of the author. The thought is probably of a fixed body of teaching. It is synonymous with διδασκία (1:9; 2 Tim 4:2).

While the concept of a fixed body of approved (apostolic) teaching is not completely lacking from earlier writings in the NT, it becomes a dominant feature in the PE in the context of heresy. This comes to expression through other related terms (‘the faith’, ‘the truth’, ‘the deposit’), but the preferred term seems to be διδασκαλία. Attempts to distinguish rigidly between the contents of, e.g., κήρυγμα, εὐαγγέλιον, λόγος, on the one side and διδασκαλία on the other (cf. 1 Tim 5:17) have been largely unconvincing (cf. the discussion in Schlarb 1990:196–206;

McDonald. 1980). The author differentiated between them in some way (1 Tim 5:17), but decisions about contents and the relation to ‘the gospel’ must bear in mind the connection established in 1 Tim 1:10f., where τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is the standard (κατά) of ‘sound teaching’. This implies a close relationship in terms of content, with distinctions probably implied with regard to audience or perhaps purpose; the ‘gospel’ is the message turned to missionary purposes and the ‘teaching’ is for the edification of the community (cf. Rom 15:4; Quinn, 94; Lips 1979:47–53). But even this distinction should not be imposed inflexibly (cf. 1 Tim 2:7: Paul is διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν). In any case, teaching has now become a major function in the church, and the content of the teaching is both doctrinal and ethical.

As with the term ἡ ἀλήθεια as used in the PE (see 1:1 note), διδασκαλία intends a polemical contrast with the teaching of the opponents (cf. Brox, 107; Roloff, 78). This is particularly evident when the modifier ὑγιαίνουσα is present (1 Tim 1:10; 2 Tim 4:3; Tit 1:9; 2:1), but its frequent comparison with the false teaching (1 Tim 4:6; 6:1, 3; 2 Tim 3:10, 16) produces the same effect. ὑγιαίνω is ‘to be healthy, sound’, physically (Lk 5:31; 7:10; 15:27; cf. 3 Jn 2) and spiritually (1:13; 2:2). The participle is used with words expressive of doctrine and teaching (2:1; 1 Tim 1:10; 6:3; 2 Tim 1:13; 4:3***; cf. ὑγιής, 2:8**). The description implies that there is another kind of teaching abroad which is unhealthy and deleterious. It is propagated by a group called the ‘opponents’. As Malherbe 1980 has shown, the ὑγιαίνω-ὑγιής language often played a part in the polemical debates of the secular philosophers. Sometimes the imagery provided simply an assessment of the logic or rationality of one’s teaching.⁶⁴ But in other cases the language carried the full sense of sickness and disease (Philo, *Abr.* 223, 275). The graphic imagery of health and disease in relation to the apostle and his opponents seems to be applied in the PE in view of such counter descriptions as ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἔξει (2 Tim 2:17) and νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας (1 Tim 6:4), which follows immediately upon the conscious distinction — εἰ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1 Tim 6:3). Elsewhere the imagery is applied to the apostolic ‘word’ (2

Tim 1:13; Tit 2:8), and describes a believer’s soundness of faith (Tit 1:13; 2:2). The close relation between correct teaching and authentic Christian conduct throughout the PE (see **Excursus 3**; cf. 1:13; 2:1–14; 2 Tim 3:10–17) suggests the possibility that the imagery of health and illness does not imply simply that the false teaching is unreliable, irrational or illogical, but that it is palpably destructive in nature, damaging the faith and corrupting the life-style of the one affected (1 Tim 1:4–10; 19b; 4:1–3; 6:3–5; 2 Tim 2:17f.; cf. Quinn, 93–7).⁶⁵

(2) The second task is negative: τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας are the opponents. ἀντιλέγω is ‘to speak against, contradict’; hence more generally ‘to oppose’ (2:9**; Luke 2:34; 20:27; 21:15; Jn 19:12; Acts 4:14; 13:45; 28:19, 22; Rom 10:21 [LXX]; cf. Thucydides 8:53:26; for the noun see Heb 6:11; 7:7; Jude 17; *TLNT* I, 128). In this context (cf. esp. vv. 10–17) it has actually been debated whether the false teachers ‘stand in opposition’ to the sound teaching (cf. Rom 10:12) or ‘contradict’ it (Ecclus 4:25; Josephus, *Ant.* 3:217). Such distinctions are over-subtle: the ‘opposition’ was doubtless expressed through ‘contradiction’.

ἐλέγχω is ‘to bring to light, set forth’ (2:15); ‘to cross-examine, question’, hence ‘to prove, refute’ (cf. Ecclus 20:2; 31:31; Prov 9:7 *et al.*; *Didache* 2:7); but successful refutation may imply or include actual ‘rebuke’ of one’s opponent (1:13; 1 Tim 5:20; 2 Tim 4:2**; Lk 3:19; cf. ἐλεγμός, 2 Tim 3:16***; Knight, 294). In the context of mission, the term denoted both exposing and convicting of sin (Jn 3:20; 16:8 [cf. 8:46]; 1 Cor 14:24; cf. Eph 5:11, 13; Jas 2:9; Jd 15). But it also became a traditional part of the vocabulary of church discipline (Mt 18:15; 1 Tim 5:20; 2 Tim 4:2; Barnabas 19:4), and the ideas of correction and punishment (especially using fatherly imagery) may be implied (Wis 1:8; 12:2; Job 5:17; Prov 3:11 [cited Heb 12:5]; Ecclus 18:13; Rev 3:19). Since engagement with the false teachers seems to have come under the category of church discipline (1:13; 3:10; 1 Tim 1:20; 2 Tim 2:14f., 25f.; cf. 1 Tim 5:19–25; 2 Tim 4:2–4), it is within this context that the term is probably to be understood here of refutation on a more intellectual level (cf. διακατελέγχομαι, Acts 18:28). The reproof or rebuke itself can be a punishment. Spicq, 605, sees in this reference an indication that

the ability to argue is required of the overseer; it seems more likely that the ability to teach (v. 9a) was understood broadly enough to include both the positive and negative dimensions of ministry.⁶⁶

EXCURSUS 2

Overseers and their relation to elders

Beyer, H. W., *TDNT* II, 608–22; Beyer, H. W., and Kapp, H., ‘Bischof’, *RAC* II 394–407; Bornkamm, G., *TDNT* VI, 651–83; Brown, R. E., ‘*Episkope* and *Episkopos*: The New Testament Evidence’, *TS* 41 (1980), 322–38; Brox, 147–52; Campbell 1994a; 1995; Campenhausen 1969:76–123; Cousineau, A., ‘Le sens de «Presbuteros» dans les Pastorales’, *ScEs* 28 (1976), 147–62; Dassmann, E., ‘Hausgemeinde und Bischofsamt’, *JAC* 11 (1984), 82–97; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 54–7; Dornier, 163–75; Floor, L., ‘Church order in the Pastoral Epistles’, *Neotest.* 10 (1976), 81–91; Gnilka, J., *Der Philipperbrief*, Freiburg: Herder, 1968, 32–9; Goppelt 1962:121–38; Hainz 1976; Harvey, A. E., ‘Elders’, *JTS* ns 25 (1974), 318–31; Hatch, E., *The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches* (London, 1892⁴); Jay, E. G., ‘From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters’, *SecCent* 1 (1981), 125–62; Holtzmann, 207–12; Karrer, M., ‘Das urchristliche Ältestenamt’, *NovT* 32 (1990), 152–88; Kertelge 1972; Kertelge 1977; Knoch, O., ‘Charisma und Amt: Ordnungselemente der Kirche Christi’, *SNT(SU)* 8 (1983), 124–61; Lemaire, A., ‘Les Épîtres Pastorales. B. Les ministères dans l’Église’, in Delorme 1974:102–17; Lips 1979; Lohfink 1977; Lohse, E ‘Entstehung des Bischofsamts in der frühen Christenheit’, *ZNW* 71 (1980), 58–73; Meier 1973:323–45; Merkel, 90–3; Nauck, W., ‘Probleme des frühchristlichen Amstverständnisses’, *ZNW* 48 (1957), 200–20 (= Kertelge 1977:442–69); Osten-Sacken, P. von der, ‘Bemerkungen zur Stellung des Mebaqer in der Sektenschriften’, *ZNW* 55 (1964), 18–26; Powell, D. ‘*Ordo Presbyterii*’, *JTS* as 26 (1975), 289–328; Prast, F., *Presbyter und Evangelium in nachapostolischer Zeit* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979), 387–416; Roberts, C. H., ‘Elders: A Note’, *JTS* ns 26 (1975), 403–5; Rohde 1976; idem, *EDNT* 111, 148f.; Roloff, 169–89; Schlier 1977; Schweizer 1961:77–88 (ch. 6); Spicq, 65–83, 439–55; Thiering, B., ‘Mebaqqer and Episkopos in the light of the Temple Scroll’, *JBL* 100 (1981), 59–74; Towner 1989:223–41; Young 1994:97–111; Young, F. M., ‘On ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΕΣ and ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ’, *JTS* ns 45 (1994), 142–8; Ysebaert 1994:60–123.

The PE represent a stage in the history of the church when the contours of organisation are becoming more pronounced. In the earlier Pauline letters we have glimpses of a situation in which the founder of the churches is still in close personal contact with them, through visits, correspondence and the activity of

colleagues in the apostolic mission. Ministry of all kinds is carried out by any member of the congregation who has the appropriate spiritual gifts for the different functions. At the same time leadership is exercised by a groups of individuals who are entitled to respect by virtue of their work. It is probable that house-groups are led by the head of the family, and that the older men in the congregation are the natural leaders. There is thus an interesting combination of ‘charismatic’ ministry and leadership by the older people, especially the first converts (cf. Harvey*, 329f.). It is significant that the list of ‘charismatic’ ministries in 1 Cor 12:28f. can include both apostles and local ministers; the ‘mix’ is even more apparent in Rom 12:6–8. The term ‘elder’ is not attested in the earlier Pauline letters in this sense. Only in Phil do we read of ‘overseers and deacons’ as local church leaders. Paul and his itinerant colleagues are co-workers and brothers, and the concept of ‘service’ (διακονία) is fairly elastic.

By the time of the PE the situation has begun to change with the growth of the church and the consequent need for a firmer structure, and with the shift to a situation in which the apostles (in particular, Paul) are no longer there to exercise their former close supervision; the development of doctrines and practices that are not in accordance with Paul is beginning to cause serious problems. The PE, however, stand at the beginning of this process, and what we see is the beginning of a co-ordination of the organisation and ministry of the congregations (Sand 1976). We are far from the developed hierarchy of the second century (Meier*). Various points indicate that there is still a considerable degree of flexibility and informality.

The PE know nothing of a continuation of the apostolate, which indeed would have been impossible on the Pauline understanding of the apostles of Christ as eye-witnesses of the risen Lord (1 Cor 9:1; 15:8f.; Gal 1:1, 15f.). Nevertheless, they assume that Paul has passed on his authority and the sacred trust of the gospel to Timothy and Titus who are his trusted colleagues. They are related to him as junior colleagues but to the congregations they have the same authority as his own. The PE are addressed to them rather than to the congregations as part of the process whereby they are shown to be effectually his successors. Timothy has been appointed to his task by the laying

on of hands by elders. He is younger than them, and yet they must recognise his authority. The same circumstances may be presumed in the case of Titus. No specific designation is given to them, unless ‘evangelist’ (2 Tim 4:5) is to be understood in this way. There is certainly no indication that the term ‘overseer’ was applied to them.⁶⁷ The tendency in recent scholarship has been to argue that both they and their roles are fictitious, and that there never were persons acting as Paul’s assistants or successors in this kind of supervisory role. This claim underestimates the importance of the Pauline concept of the apostolic missionaries, a body of people charged with the creation, establishment and ongoing care of local congregations but who remained essentially separate from them. The terms in which they are addressed and their ministry is described do not diverge significantly from the picture of the apostolic coworker that emerges in the main Pauline letters (cf. Ollrog 1979:23).

Reference is made to elders and overseers as the leaders of local congregations, and 1 Tim also refers to deacons and women (deacons). The appointment of these people is motivated by the need to teach the gospel faithfully and to oppose opponents and their false teaching. Consequently, all the emphasis falls on their character and qualities, including their faithfulness to Pauline doctrine and their competence to teach, and virtually nothing is said directly about their actual duties and functions. Lohfink 1977 is correct in arguing against Schlier 1977 (originally published in 1948) that the PE do not lay down a normative structure of ecclesiastical offices but rather emphasise the normativity of the apostolic deposit and teaching, i.e. the gospel and the practical paraenesis based upon it.

1. The Nature of ‘Elders’

The exercise of authority in a community by the older men is characteristic of Judaism. Campbell has shown that elders are the senior men in a community, the leaders of the influential families, and their position is one that is recognised by custom and wont, and not by any kind of official appointment to a definable office. ‘Elders’ is generally used as a collective term. It ‘does not so much denote an office as connote prestige’ (Campbell 1994a:65). Such recognition was generally correlated with age but younger

men may have gained this prestige because of the prestige of their families. Similar respect for older people as community leaders is found in Graeco-Roman society, but here the actual term *πρεσβύτεροι* is rare and *οἱ γέροντες* (ἢ *γερούσια*) is normal. Harvey* has stressed that there is no evidence for elders forming a council or governing body of any kind in the OT. The Sanhedrin was composed of a wider group of leaders. Nor do elders appear to have responsibilities with regard to the worship and organisation of the synagogue, although they had administrative responsibilities with regard to the broader life of local Jewish communities. Consequently, there does not appear to have been a Jewish model for a council of elders in Christian groups (cf. Powell*, 302–4).

According to the evidence of Acts the early Christians in Jerusalem were led from an early date by a group of elders (Acts 11:30) who were associated with the apostles (Acts 15:2; *et al.*). For Campbell this group consisted of (or, we may say, at least included) the leaders of the individual house groups in the Jerusalem church. In the Pauline mission the local church leaders are called ‘elders’ (Acts 14:23; 20:17).

Harvey argues that the term ‘elders’ was used for the older men in Christian congregations who were regarded as leaders. The older men in question were the senior members of the congregation in that they were or included the first converts to the faith (cf. Powell*, 305). They did not form an organised council with a chairman or president.

It follows that the term had some flexibility and could refer to the older men in general or to those who were especially regarded as leaders. The objection has been raised that if people are elders by virtue of their age/seniority, then it is not possible or necessary to ‘appoint’ them. Campbell meets this objection by arguing that Acts 14:23 describes the laying on of hands to claim God’s blessing upon those who were already in effect the local church leaders.

The term is not used in the earlier Pauline letters; even if this silence implies that it was not actually used in the churches, there is no reason why Luke should not have referred to their leaders by the term with which he was familiar. In any case he is aware that the function of the elders is oversight (Acts 20:28).⁶⁸

Elders are found in the PE only in Tit 1:5 and I Tim 5:1, 17, 19. In 1 Tim 5:1, the parallelism with the feminine form in v. 2 clearly indicates that older men in general are meant.⁶⁹ In 1 Tim 5:17 reference is made to elders who perform leadership functions well. This may mean that some of the senior men acted as leaders (including teaching functions) or that some of the elders carried out fuller duties than the others. Here the word is more nuanced to the sense of ‘elder’ (= ‘leader’) and in v. 19 it is probable that it is the leaders who are in mind. Tit 1:5 is concerned with the appointment of elders in local churches, and here again the word is nuanced to mean ‘leaders’.⁷⁰ We are, therefore, dealing with a term which is somewhat flexible in its usage and is in course of transition from a general to a more technical meaning (Barrett, 78f.). The apparent equation of these elders with overseers (Tit 1:7) raises the fundamental question of the relationship between two sets of terminology.

2. *The Source of the Term ‘Overseer’*

In secular Greek society ἐπίσκοπος was a term that meant ‘overseer’, in one sense or another, and described supervisors or leaders in a variety of contexts.⁷¹ It was adopted in the LXX in reference to civil and military supervisors⁷² and for those involved in religious oversight (Num 4:16; 2 Kgs 11:18). There is certainly ample correspondence between this broad secular use and ‘official’ church use to suggest an origin in secular supervisor models, or to see the term as one that presented itself to the Greek-speaking church through the LXX.

It, therefore, seems likely to many scholars that the Christian adoption of the term resulted from the church’s interaction with Hellenistic culture,⁷³ and that the application of the term in the LXX may well have paved the way for this adoption.⁷⁴ In any case, the earliest attested use of the term in the Christian church is in Phil 1:1 (on the assumption that it was composed before Acts).⁷⁵

But it is also possible that the early church’s adoption of the title is to be linked with the development of the title *mebaqqer* (מבקר) in Jewish sectarian circles, as reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁷⁶ The basic similarity is quite clear (stressed by Spicq,

448f.). Critics claim that it is hard to see how (or why) the connection would have been made and note that the title seems to be connected with the church in Asia Minor and Europe rather than in Palestine (though cf. *Didache*).⁷⁷ Nevertheless, there is a good case that the functions of the *mebaqqer* would have been required in the earliest Christian house groups, and it is possible that this functional term came into use via this route (Campbell, 158).

3. *The Duties of the Overseer*

According to Hatch*, 39–55, in earliest times the function of the overseer was basically economic (cf. the warnings against misuse of money, Tit 1:7; 1 Tim 3:3, 8), including the care of the poor and perhaps duties with cult and correspondence. First, from the standpoint of the relation between spiritual gifts and office, it is thought that logically these routine types of duties would have been outside the territory of the free gifts of the Spirit. This hypothesis accordingly distinguishes fairly sharply between the overseer’s office (as technical and administrative) and the charismatic positions of ministry in the church. A second material proof is held to be the traditional connection in 1 Tim 3 and Phil 1:1 of this office with that of the deacon, whose tasks are assumed to have been mainly economic in nature (cf. *Hermas*, *Sim.* 9:27:2 of overseers). Third, support is sought from the use of the title for financial officers in Greek society (cf. Gen 41:34; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 54f.).

Although it need not be doubted that the finances of the congregations would have been handled by its leaders, it is highly questionable whether these were their main responsibilities. The overseers in the PE were concerned with the teaching given in the congregation and with the refutation of false teaching (Tit 1:9; I Tim 3:2; cf. 5:17 of the elders; 2 Tim 2:2 probably also applies to the same group). Nothing is said about so-called ‘cultic’ duties. They are also given authority which involves both care and discipline of the congregation. Young 1994:102f., has stressed the significance of the description of the overseer as θεοῦ οἰκονόμος, which is a term used of slaves placed in charge of a household and acting on behalf of the head (i.e. God).

The need for them to have a good reputation generally does not require the view that they were the congregation's link with the secular world; the point is surely that leaders in particular are exposed to the public gaze and therefore must be all the more transparently upright in character.

The tasks of the overseer need to be considered in relation to the tasks of ministry and leadership described in the earlier letters of Paul and also in relation to the problem of the nature of the elders, who are mentioned in Tit 1:5; 1 Tim 5:17; cf. 4:14.

The functional 'charismatic' terms used by Paul to characterise ministry (διακονία, Rom 12:7; προϊστημι, Rom 12:8; ἀντίλημψις, κυβέρνησις, 1 Cor 12:28; *et al.*) obviously overlap with the functions of the overseer, but this is by no means evidence that the office had entirely superseded or absorbed 'charismatic' ministry. It has become increasingly clear that the distinction sometimes drawn between an earlier charismatic ministry and a later institutional system of 'office' is inappropriate and should be dropped from the discussion.⁷⁸ Both 1 Th 5:12 and 1 Cor 16:15f. clearly presuppose the existence of local church leaders whose position of authority is recognised by the other believers. There are overseers and deacons in the church at Philippi, but the tasks of ministry are not confined to them. In terms of development, the PE appear to be at roughly the same stage as the church envisaged in *Didache* 15:1 (cf. Eph 4:11; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 55). What is reflected in Titus I is different from the missionary practice of Paul as described in Acts (14:23) only in terms of the detail of the description. Oversight is clearly the domain of the overseer, as the term itself, the household management parallel and the term προϊστημι (cf. 1 Tim 5:17) in 1 Tim 3:5, and the authority *vis-à-vis* the false teachers in Tit 1:9 suggest. Suggestions that the Holy Spirit is no longer active except in those appointed to office represent an argument from silence; those who adopt them have to find ways of explaining away the reference to prophets in 1 Tim 4:14. The existence of false teachers (both male and female), however objectionable they may be to the writer, is a further sign that the holding of office was not a precondition for such ministry. (The writer never requires that teaching be confined to those holding an official position,⁷⁹ and the description of the qualities required in

overseers and deacons is most naturally understood to indicate that they exercised their teaching gifts before their appointment.)

4. *The Relation of Overseers to Elders*

The question of the relation of overseers and elders in the PE has yet to be answered in a final way.

Since elders are not mentioned in the earlier letters of Paul, it has often been argued that a distinction should be made between two basic forms of early leadership models — a Pauline set-up of overseer-deacons and a non-Pauline one of elders — and that the PE represent a blending of these two systems.⁸⁰ There would then be different models of church organisation in different areas. Certainly different patterns appear in the Apostolic Fathers (cf. Jay*). Overseers and deacons appear together in 1 Clement 42:4f.; overseer, elders and deacons in Ignatius. *Mag.* 6:1; *Trall.* 2:2–4; 3:1; *Philad* inscr.; *Smyr.* 12:2; *Poly.* 6:1; elders and deacons in Polycarp 5:3; apostles, overseers, teacher and deacons in Hermas, *Vis.* 3:5:1. In 1 Clement there is clear attestation of a plurality of overseers and their equivalence with elders (1 Clement (42:4; 44:1 with 44:4–5; 47:6; cf also Clement, *Quis Dives* 42). The evidence of Acts 20:17, 28 suggests plurality and interchangeability, as well as a knowledge of the nomenclature in use in Ephesus; but the sequence and time of this development remain uncertain. One point that needs to be stressed is that in view of the variety of developments in the Apostolic Fathers it is not necessary to interpret the PE as a stage on the way to the explicit three-tiered organisation of Ignatius' letters where a single overseer presides over the elders and deacons.⁸¹

In the light of Acts 20 it is plausible that the title 'overseer' views the leader from the general perspective of function (oversight) and 'elder' is more to be associated with office or status (cf. Schweizer 1961:71; Towner 1989:223f.). If it is correct to identify elders and overseers in Tit 1:5–7, then the same would be true here. There may then have been a development which led to the overseers becoming a group distinct from the elders. But the interpretation of the evidence in the PE continues to be disputed.

(a) Although the tasks of the overseers and elders seem identical, the term 'overseer' is always in the singular. Some argue, therefore, that the pattern of rule assumed is a monarchical

bishop, ruling over the local church, who is distinct from the elders, but chosen from their number.⁸² For Oberlinner, 90f., this pattern is the author's ideal, not necessarily the actual reality in the situation with which he was dealing.

(b) Others maintain that a singular overseer is closely related to a college of elders; he may have been chosen, elected or appointed to preside over the college and over the church. According to Lips (1979:113f.), this explanation best accounts for the singular overseer and his close relation to the elders.⁸³ Hanson, 173, holds that the writer is dealing with monarchical bishops as they were in his own day, but retains a traditional formulation dating from a time when they did not yet exist as a separate office from the elders. Merkel, 90, comments that against the 'household' background only one overseer would have been able to act as the 'householder/steward'.

On either of these scenarios, it would be necessary to interpret Tit 1 to mean that Titus was to appoint one elder = overseer per town. In line with this suggestion it would be tempting to interpret the evidence in 1 Tim similarly, with the plural 'elders' referring to the leaders of the different churches for which Timothy had oversight. However, this is an unnatural rendering of 1 Tim 5:17–20 which presupposes a plurality of elders in any given congregation; otherwise there could be congregations lacking in teachers, and the reference to rebuking the sinful elders (plural!) before everybody (plural) likewise is most naturally understood of several elders in one congregation.

(c) It is more common to view the singular ἐπίσκοπος as a generic reference, belonging to the traditional code cited, similar to the singular elder of 1 Tim 5:1 and widow of 5:9.⁸⁴ Two possibilities arise.⁸⁵ The first is that the term is simply regarded as basically equivalent to 'elder'.⁸⁶ Within the local church, therefore, there was a body of leaders known in terms of their function as overseers and in terms of their status as elders.

(d) The other possibility is that there was a plurality of overseers who formed a subset of the larger group of elders (i.e. the 'double honour' elders of 5:17).⁸⁷ Related to this view is the hypothesis of Harvey that some of the first converts (i.e. the 'elders' or 'seniors') were appointed as overseers and deacons.

(e) A different route is followed by Campbell 1994a:176–209. He argues that originally the leaders of house-churches each acted as ἐπίσκοπος in their own households and were collectively the πρεσβύτεροι in that local area. What was happening was that Titus was to set up *one* overseer as leader in each of these local areas (κατὰ πόλιν); these people were the 'elders worthy of double honour' in 1 Tim. Thus the reference of 'overseer' was being shifted from the individual leaders of household groups to the overseers of town churches (each composed of several house groups),⁸⁸ and the reference of 'elders' was being shifted from the house-church leaders as a group to those of them who were not town overseers. The use of 'overseer' in the sing. in Tit 1:7 is then to be explained not as a generic use,⁸⁹ but as a particularisation for each individual appointment (town by town; cf. above). The PE accordingly reflect the development of moniscopacy and the separation of the roles of overseer and elder.

Campbell's view is not free from difficulty. The postulated terminological distinction does not become clear until the time of Ignatius, which for Campbell is considerably later. The hypothesis requires a difficult understanding of Tit 1:5 where 'appoint elders' is a curious phrase for 'appoint overseers'.⁹⁰ It is more likely that the phrase refers to the appointment of a group of leaders for each individual town. Or it may be that individual households grouped together to form churches and it was necessary to appoint those who should be the leaders in them (rather than automatically have all heads of households as leaders). A further problem is that the qualities desiderated in the overseer have to do with the leadership of a household and may suggest a junior position compared with that of a leader of a group of congregations. Finally, this view leaves us with the problem of the place of Timothy and Titus or 'Timothy' and 'Titus' if these are in effect 'ideal' figures. There does not appear to be room for a monarchical bishop alongside them (especially with Timothy in Ephesus), and the view that they are meant to represent the overseers is unlikely.

(f) A view somewhat inverse to that of Campbell has been proposed by Young 1994:97–111. She postulates that what is happening in the PE is a shift in the self-perception of the church from 'God's household' to 'God's people'. With this shift came a certain assimilation of the pattern of church life to that of the

synagogue, and this led to the development of a group of elders alongside the overseer who was now increasingly seen as equivalent to the *archisynagogos* or official in charge of the synagogue. On this view the overseer and the elders are separate from one another, and the ‘deacons’ correspond to the synagogue attendants. The attractiveness of this suggestion lies in its recognition that for the PE the household structure of the church is not the last word. The weakness lies in the fact that again a satisfactory explanation of the apparent identification of elders and overseers in Tit 1:5–9 is not provided.

5. Conclusion

Given the complexities regarding the possible use of traditional materials and the general uncertainty about the development of church order, any solution offered must be tentative. The following points are relevant:

(a) A factor that needs to be stressed is our uncertainty about the degree of organisation of the churches at this time. We do not know whether in a given locality (e.g. a town) there was one local congregation, or a set of independent house congregations, or a local congregation that consisted of smaller house congregations, and we do not know whether there was any organisation that brought different localities together in larger groupings. Nor again do we know whether a house congregation consisted of one household or several (as in a modern house fellowship, so called because it meets in a house rather than an ecclesiastical building). It would appear that Titus was responsible for several towns in Crete, but Timothy may have been responsible only for Ephesus, and nothing suggests that they bore the designation of ‘overseer’. There is no evidence for the use of the term ‘overseer/bishop’ for a leader covering a wider area than a town (and its hinterland) at this time.

(b) The period is one of transition and the PE reflect both the existing situation and the author’s attempts to regulate it. The slightly different pictures that we get from 1 Tim and Tit may well reflect different stages in development.⁹¹

(c) Tit 1:5–7 is concerned with the appointment of people to be elders and who are to act as overseers and stewards of God’s people.

The best explanation is that each recognisable Christian group has a group of senior persons out of which is crystallising a leadership group. The term ‘older men’ or ‘elders’ is in process of coming to mean the latter group and expresses their status. The term ‘overseers’ is also coming into use; it expresses their function. Some of the ‘seniors’ are active in leadership, specifically in preaching and teaching, but others are not. Some groups may have had only one overseer/elder because of their size, and if the household metaphor is pressed, this may well be the case. The situation in Crete, where no elders had been appointed previously, is anomalous. The closest analogy is in Acts 14:23 where Paul and Barnabas do not appoint elders in the new churches on their initial visit but only on their return visit. This may suggest that earlier organisation was informal and that the rise of heresy meant that some more formal procedure was required. There is a tendency to encourage the overseers to be active in teaching, since sound teaching is so important over against the rise of heresy. It may be presumed that these people are among the ‘faithful people’ to whom Timothy is to commit what he has heard from Paul (2 Tim 2:2).

Alongside the overseers were the ‘deacons’ who are described in 1 Tim 3. They appear to have had less responsible positions than the overseers, and it is likely that they too were largely appointed from the ‘seniors’ (see **Excursus 10**). (Nevertheless, in the Ignatian set-up the term ‘elder’ has come to be used for a group distinct from both the overseer/bishop and the deacons.)

On the significance of this conclusion for the nature of the church in the PE see **Excursus 11**.

EXCURSUS 3

The σῶφρων word-group and related concepts

The character of the instruction in the PE regarding Christian life-style is largely set by the presence of an extensive vocabulary which conveys the ideal of self-control and moderation. Some

eight words and word-groups are used in a total of 26 references; these are curiously distributed with twelve in Tit, thirteen in 1 Tim, and only one in 2 Tim (1:7). It would seem that the author did not picture Timothy as being in need of encouragement to develop this quality of character. They are found principally in the descriptions of the characteristics that should be seen in different groups of people. It is perhaps especially this emphasis which has led to the claim that the PE reflect the morality of the secular world and have lost the eschatological fervour of earlier Christianity.⁹²

1. Self-Control

Luck, U., *TDNT* VII, 1097–104; Quinn, 313–15; Schwarz 1983:49–51; *TLNT* III, 359–65; Wibbing, S., *NIDNTT* I, 501–3; Zeller, D., *EDNT* III, 329f.

This word-group is the most strongly represented in the PE. The primary word-group includes: σωφροσύνη, 1 Tim 2:9, 15; Acts 26:25***; σώφρων, 1 Tim 3:2; Tit 1:8; 2:2, 5***; σωφρονέω, Tit 2:6; Mk 5:15; Lk 8:35; Rom 12:3; 2 Cor 5:13; 1 Pet 4:7; σωφρονίζω, Tit 2:4***; σωφρονισμός, 2 Tim 1:7***; and σωφρόνως, Tit 2:12***. This gives a total of sixteen occurrences in the NT, of which ten are in PE. It is thus both characteristic and distinctive of the PE.

In Classical Greek σωφροσύνη is related to αἰδώς. Originally referring to a sound mind, it represented the virtue of restraint of desire, hence the sense of ‘rational’, intellectually sound, free from illusion, purposeful, self-controlled, with prudent reserve, modest, decorous.⁹³ It represented the opposite of ignorance and frivolity, and it was exalted as one of the four cardinal virtues (with σοφία, ἀνδρεία and δικαιοσύνη). In Plato, *Rep.* 427–434 these are listed as wisdom, courage, temperance and justice (σοφία, ἀνδρεία, φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη), but the group was somewhat flexible, and σωφροσύνη is included in Stoic writers. Applied to women (especially in funerary inscriptions), it suggests chastity, self-control (*moderatio cupiditatum rationi oboediens*, Cicero, *de Fin.* 2, cited by Simpson, 46), and purity, not giving in to passion.⁹⁴ It is thus close to ἐγκράτεια.

Wetstein drew attention to the work of Onasander, a philosopher (AD I) who wrote a treatise on the military commander (*De imper. off.*; Dibelius-Conzelmann, 158–60). It contains a description of the kind of person to choose as a general in the army. The list is remarkably general in character and is really more ethical than military. Because of this it is not surprising that it contains a set of qualities that were highly thought of at the time and that one might hope to find in a person in a leadership role. The general is to be chosen not on grounds of noble birth or possession of wealth but because he is ‘temperate, self-restrained, vigilant, frugal, hardened to labour, alert, free from avarice, neither too young nor too old, indeed a father of children if possible, a ready speaker, and a man with a good reputation’. Onasander explains what he means by ‘temperate’: it is in order that the general ‘may not be so distracted by the pleasures of the body as to neglect the consideration of matters of the highest importance’. Of the eleven qualities which he lists seven (or their close equivalents) are found in the PE. Other lists of qualities desired in rulers and the descriptions of occupations also contain this one (Vögtle, 73–81).

Although the word-group is very common in Hellenistic Greek (including honorific inscriptions), it has no Hebrew equivalent and is consequently rare in the LXX, being found only in Greek texts in which it is often one of the somewhat elastic list of cardinal virtues (e.g. 4 Macc 1:6, 18; 5:23; 15:10; Wis 8:7) or is extolled as a key to control of the emotions (e.g. 4 Macc 1:3, 6, 30, 31; 2:2, 16, 18; 3:17, 5:23; 35). However, the dynamic in σώφρων/σωφροσύνη thus conceived is not simply the power of reason or the mind. 4 Macc 5:23 states clearly the conviction that the law teaches ‘self-control’. The connections are clearer still in 4 Macc 2:21–23: God has given the mind (νοῦς) to govern the emotions, and to the mind he has given the law, which teaches ‘self-control’ (among other qualities) to make ruling the emotions possible (cf. Wis 9:11).⁹⁵ Thus self-control is closely tied to the law and thus ‘baptised’ into Judaism.

The cardinal virtues are never listed as a group in the NT. Justice is important, as is prudence (Tit 3:8; cf. Lk 1:17; Eph 1:8); but bravery (1 Cor 16:13) and wisdom (Eph 5:13; Jas 3:13) are not so significant. Nevertheless, Mott 1978 has argued that it was

possible to use three of the virtues to stand for all four, and that this is what happens in Tit 2:12. The same thing happens in Philo. Thus it is not necessary to suppose that here the PE are taking over ideas directly from Greek thought; Hellenistic Judaism has probably provided the bridge.

Elsewhere in the NT the word-group is used of normal sobriety and restraint, but it describes a Christian virtue in 1 Pet 4:7 and in the PE. It is a virtue of Timothy himself (2 Tim 1:7), overseers (Tit 1:8; 1 Tim 3:2), young men (Tit 2:6), and women (Tit 2:4, 5; 1 Tim 2:9, 15); it is in fact a fundamental characteristic of the Christian life (Tit 2:12). Its presence here, as with a number of other ethical terms in the author's vocabulary, has probably been influenced by the language of popular Hellenistic philosophy. In this respect, it communicates in readily understandable terms the idea of 'a suitable restraint in every respect', a self-control which leads to behaviour appropriate to the situation, and is to be seen as a positive virtue as the Christian faces the realities of life in the world.

As with εὐσέβεια (see **Excursus 1**), the author has consciously adjusted the aspect of behaviour expressed by the σώφρων word-group by relating it to the Christ-event. This is seen most clearly in Titus 2. In 2:2, 4, 5 and 6, the word-group functions to describe the respectable and acceptable Christian behaviour of older men, young women and young men (in v. 4 σωφρονίζω refers to the activity of 'training' in which the older women are to be engaged). Following the paraenesis, vv. 11–14 reflect back consciously on the life just described: Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ... παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ... σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι (vv. 11f.). The material employed here clearly grounds the life described (in very Greek fashion) in the grace of God (cf. 2 Tim 1:7: ... ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα ... σωφρονισμοῦ). Moreover, this same passage indicates a moral change from the old way of life (ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας; cf. Tit 3:3–7) which the grace of God in Christ effects (παιδεύουσα). In so doing, the author takes up the language and the theme of *moral* change familiar especially to Hellenistic Judaism (4 Macc; Philo) and establishes the basis for

communicating the Christian message effectively in the new environment (cf. Quinn, 314f.).

Thus σώφρων in its relation to the Christ-event depicts a balanced demeanour characterised by self-control, prudence and good judgement. Whatever be the source of this teaching, the theological foundation for life articulated in Tit 2:11–14 requires that it be understood as a quality which faith in Christ produces (see above on εὐσέβεια; cf. further Schwarz 1983), and throughout the PE it stands for one of the marks of the genuine Christian life.

2. 'Discipline'

W. Grundmann, *TDNT* II, 339–42; Baltensweiler, H., *NIDNTT* I, 94–7; Goldstein, H., *EDNT* I, 377f.

A closely related idea is that of 'discipline' (NIV, ἐγκράτεια); the noun occurs in Acts 24:25; Gal 5:23; and 2 Pet 1:6***; and the verb in 1 Cor 7:9; 9:25***; the adjective comes in Tit 1:8***.

The word-group was used for a recognised and important virtue in Greek thought. In the sense of self-control, the word occurred as one of the cardinal virtues in Greek writers⁹⁶ and is found frequently in lists of virtues.⁹⁷ 'Self-control' may be exercised in relation to specific appetites⁹⁸ or in a general sense it may apply to self-control over all of the sensual desires (Ecclus 26:15; Acts 24:25; 1 Cor 9:25). 4 Macc 5:34 links ἐγκράτεια to the law. It is a quality required in military leaders (Onasander 1:3).

The word-group is rare in the LXX (Ecclus 18. 15, 30; Wis 8:21). Josephus, *Bel.* 2:120, 138, speaks of self-control as a quality highly valued by the Essenes. In Philo it signified the power to overcome other desires (*Abr.* 24). It could become a virtue in itself, where asceticism is practised for its own sake.

The references in Paul show that the idea was current at an early stage in the development of the church and its ethics. Self-control is part of the fruit of the Spirit in the normal life of the Christian (Gal 5:23; cf. 2 Clement 4:3), and its significance can be appreciated by thinking of the corresponding negative list of the works of the flesh which include giving way to various sorts of

bodily passions. In Paul the word is used of restraint upon one's sexual desires (1 Cor 7:9) or of an athlete who has to exercise self-control over his body and his habits if he is to be fit to run a race; so too there is a spiritual self-control which must be exercised by the believer over his body so that he may not fail the spiritual test (1 Cor 9:25). In Acts 24:25 Paul addressed Felix about justice and self-control, the implication being that he was liable to partiality and corruption and also that his private morality did not bear too much inspection. Self-control in this sense is very much concerned with the restraint of bodily passions. When the use of the vocabulary of σωφροσύνη was developed in the PE, it was thus being used to express a concept that was already at home in the early church.

Grundmann argued, however, that the concept was not developed in Christianity because it was 'so essentially ethical' and that in biblical religion 'there was ... no place for the self-mastery which had a place in autonomous ethics ... belief in creation cut off the way to asceticism. It saw in the world with its gifts the hand of the Creator. Finally, the gift of salvation in Christ left no place for an asceticism which merits salvation' (*TDNT* II, 342). True as these comments on the nature of Christianity are, it is not clear that they are correct with regard to the use of this concept. It can be argued with greater plausibility that responsibility under the God who creates and saves requires the development of a self-control that frees the believer to serve God in love.

In the PE it is important to resist a false asceticism (contrast the thematising of 'continence and the resurrection' in *Acts of Paul and Thecla* 5 [*NTA* II, 354]), but this does not remove the need for self-control of the body and its desires. This is the focus of this word, whereas σωφροσύνη would appear to be more concerned with sobriety in one's thinking and in the resulting behaviour. It has more the nuance of acting thoughtfully and wisely. Perhaps through the influence of the PE, it became an essential quality of Christian leaders (Polycarp 5:2; Hermas, *Vis.* 1:2:40).

3. Sobriety

Bauernfeind, O., *TDNT* IV, 936–41; Budd, P. J., *NIDNTT* I, 514f.; Lövestam, E., 'Über die neutestamentliche Aufforderung zur Nüchternheit', *ST* 12 (1958), 80–109.

A further quality associated with self-control is being 'sober'. νηφάλιος is 'temperate' (in use of wine), 'sober' (Tit 2:2; 1 Tim 3:2, 11 ***; νήφω, 2 Tim 4:5; ** ἀνανήφω, 2 Tim 2:26***). In Cl. Gk. the word is used (mainly) of cultic materials, but implies sobriety on the part of those who use them; the word is not found in the LXX. Philo uses τὸ νηφάλιον for sobriety (*Sobr.* 2; *Ebr.* 123), and according to Bauernfeind it is he who first applies the word to people (*Spec.* 1:100; IV. 191⁹⁹); it is certainly so used in Josephus, *Ant.* 3:279 (cf. νήρις in Onasander).

The clear command against overindulgence in alcohol in Tit 2:3, in reference to older women, strongly suggests that νηφάλιος addresses the problem of drunkenness among older men in traditional Greek culture (Quinn, 130f.). Although the language may reflect a proverbial stereotype, there is ample evidence that the problem was a very real one. There are several references to the prevalence of drunkenness and similar excesses in the New Testament world and their incidence in the church. Paul's description of the church meal at Corinth is relevant here (1 Cor 11; cf. 1 Cor 6:10; *et al.*), as is also the reference to pressure to join with non-Christians in the way of life that they once followed (1 Pet 4:3f.; cf. Spicq, 616f., 619; Hanson, 179f.). The language, then, has a literal application to avoidance of the effects of alcohol in intoxication and other, unrestrained behaviour. Both overseers and female deacons must be temperate (1 Tim 3:2, 11) and it is the first characteristic mentioned for the older men in Tit 2:2. Further commands to avoid over-indulgence in alcohol are found in 1 Tim 3:2, 8; Tit 1:7 (all of church leaders) and Tit 2:3 (of older women).

A different way of life was exemplified by Timothy himself, who had to be counselled that he might take a little wine for his stomach's sake and his frequent ailments (1 Tim 5:23), the so-called medicinal use.

The presence of these literal prohibitions against drunkenness raises the question whether the commands to sobriety are simply redundant and repetitive or whether they are to be taken more

generally. The adj. in Tit 2:2 and elsewhere may then be intended in its metaphorical sense as ‘sober, alert, watchful’,¹⁰⁰ and certainly the verb νήφω is used elsewhere in eschatological contexts to encourage expectancy of the parousia (2 Tim 4:5; 1 Th 5:6, 8; 1 Pet 1:13; 4:7; 5:8; cf. ἀνανήφω, 2 Tim 2:26; ἐκνήφω, 1 Cor 15:34; Schwarz 1983:48f.). Nevertheless, the command coincides with the strong disparagement of drunkenness in the biblical tradition,¹⁰¹ and the literal sense is clearly important. Bauernfeind claims that ‘the use here is figurative, though with a hint of the literal sense’. The reference is thus probably to the freedom from dissipation and stupor which goes (for example) with abstinence from alcohol and keeps the person alert and active for the service of God.

4. Dignity

Fiedler, P., *EDNT* III, 238; Foerster, W., *TDNT* VII, 191–6; Günther, W., *NIDNTT* II, 91–3; *TLNT* III, 244–8; Schwarz 1983:61f.

A further set of words that played a significant role in Greek ethical thought is rather characteristic of the ethical descriptions in the PE. σεμνότης occurs in 1 Tim 2:2; 3:4; Tit 2:7***; and σεμνός in 1 Tim 3:8, 11; Tit 2:2; and Phil 4:8***. The English versions display an extraordinary variety of translations (for the adj. ‘worthy of respect; serious; dignified; a good character’ for the noun ‘holiness, proper respect, dignity, proper conduct’, etc.).

Frequently in the classical writers the adj. means ‘lofty, august, majestic, great’ it is used of the gods and of objects which are worthy of veneration, splendid, magnificent and noble whether aesthetically or morally. It described the honourable character of holy things (2 Macc 3:12; *Ep. Arist.* 171). Both outward and inward dimensions are noticeable.¹⁰² But it comes to be a dominant term to refer to the outward splendour and dignity of men, reflecting seriousness of purpose and solemnity which are visible in one’s conduct and speech.¹⁰³ Some scholars have associated the term with Stoicism, but it was apparently used much more widely. It was a standard expression of eulogy in the secular world; a son is commended ‘because of the dignity of his character and the nobility he inherited from his forebears’, and a

wife likewise is described as ‘most reverent, known for her restraint and dignity’ (*TLNT* III, 248).

It is used in a religious sense in Judaism. It is found twice in the Greek version of Proverbs to refer to things associated with God (8:6; 15:26; the force in 6:8 is uncertain). Then it is applied to things instituted by God, such as the law and the Sabbath day. The temple is likewise designated.¹⁰⁴ The word-group refers rather to what calls forth veneration, worship and wonder. There is thus a dignity about these things or people; they command respect. In particular, 2 Macc and 4 Macc use the term of the Jewish martyrs whose manner of witness and death was such as to call forth respect (2 Macc 6:28; 4 Macc 5:36; 7:15; 17:5). In this way there is some basis for Foerster’s suggestion that the force of the word is expressed by ‘holy’ (*TDNT* VII, 194). In effect the word may have two nuances, being used either of the quality which commands the respect or to describe people as ‘worthy of respect’. When people are told to be ‘dignified’, the thought is that they should do the things or practise the characteristics which deserve respect.

In Phil. 4:8 σεμνός is one in a list of qualities of things which are commended to the thoughts of Christians. Although these might appear to be aesthetic qualities—that we should fill our minds with what is beautiful—they are in fact basically moral qualities. The interesting thing is that σεμνός, here translated ‘noble’, comes second in the list after ‘true’.¹⁰⁵ In the PE the word-group signifies serious, dignified behaviour that is worthy of respect. It is a quality especially expected in church leaders (1 Tim 3:4 [unless this refers to their children], 8, 11), but from 1 Tim 2:2 (alongside εὐσέβεια) and in Tit 2:2, 7 it is clear that the writer requires it of the congregation generally (cf. 1 Clement 1:3; 48:1). A Christian’s behaviour should be such as to win respect from other people because they take life seriously and devoutly and do not trifle. The outward orientation is especially evident in the ἵνα clause of Titus 2:8, and the contrasting kinds of behaviour (dishonesty, drunkenness, slander, 1 Tim 3:8, 11, Tit 2:2) make the visible dimension all the more clear. 1 Tim 2:2 implies that the Christian’s expression of this quality (or the freedom to express it) can be affected by external conditions; but the inner dimension of

σεμνός/σεμνότης and its grounding in the Christ-event suggest that the quality is to find expression consistently regardless of circumstances.

Other terms used with much the same significance are αἰδώς (1 Tim 2:9***); ἱεροπρεπής (Tit 2:3***), and κόσμιος (1 Tim 2:9; 3:2; cf. κοσμέω, 1 Tim 2:9; Tit 2:10; 1 Pet 3:5; Rev 21:2).

5. Conclusion

The piling up of terms which are not found earlier in the NT and which are more at home in Greek culture indicates a significant change in vocabulary in the PE. Clearly they are using the language of Hellenism, but equally clearly they are doing so to make points that were made in Judaism and in the early church in other ways. For example, criticism of female show and adornment is as much at home in the OT and in Judaism as in Hellenism (Isa 3!). At the same time the sheer concentration on this particular aspect of character may raise questions as to whether the life-style in the PE is over-concerned with a dull respectability. Nevertheless, there are sufficient indications that the author faced a situation in which frivolity and a failure to take matters seriously were problems.

We have a picture of people engaging in foolish discussions about trivialities. The speculative concerns of the opponents, their myths and genealogies, and the resulting controversies (1 Tim 1:3f.; Tit 3:9) were a diversion from the serious business of Christian theology and action. Much of it is characterised as being simply foolish and stupid talking (2 Tim 2:23) that was not edifying (1 Tim 1:6f.). Church leaders are warned not to be tempted to waste their own time in tackling these people on their chosen level of empty arguments. Timothy is counselled against people who delighted to listen to lots of teachers teaching them what they wanted to hear (2 Tim 4:3). The same thing was happening in the churches for which Titus was responsible (Tit 1:10f.). Quarrels went on that produced all kinds of evil talking (1 Tim 6:4f.). Godless chatter, as the author calls it, was leading people away from the faith (1 Tim 6:20f.; 2 Tim 2:16, 25f.). There were people who paid no attention to what conscience should have said to them (1 Tim 1:19).

Some of the women in the congregations are singled out for special mention. We hear of women gadding about instead of getting on with their duties. Some were concerned with extravagance in dress and hairstyles (1 Tim 2:9); some of them were teaching to the neglect of their other tasks. The writer talks about 'silly women' who are easily led astray. Godless myths and old wives' tales circulated (1 Tim 4:7). There were widows who lived for pleasure (1 Tim 5:6), and the younger ones are said to have gone around acting as tale-bearers and busybodies (1 Tim 5:13).

The rise of people who were lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God is seen as a characteristic of the last days (2 Tim 3:4). Other people were intent on making wealth for themselves and were falling prey to the attendant temptations (1 Tim 6:9f.).

The sum total of all this is that the churches were in danger of becoming hotbeds of useless discussion which diverted people from the gospel and indeed was liable to lead them into error; it was accompanied by time-wasting activities. There were people whose minds were set on activities that were empty and useless in comparison with the service of God.

We should further note that the writer was concerned that the church should be taken seriously by people outside it and not become the object of ridicule or contempt because its members did not take their religion seriously or were engaged in undignified behaviour (1 Tim 3:7; Tit 2:8).

It is not surprising, then, that in this situation we have a call to the church to sober up. It may be concluded that to some extent at least the concentration on this concept was due to the pastoral situation. The writer wanted to see churches where the gospel and Christian living were taken seriously. He used language that was already at home in Hellenistic Judaism and the Hellenistic world generally to emphasise his point; its prominence in the letters is not a sign of a falling away from earlier expressions of Christian spirituality and morality but is rather due to the specific needs of the situation.

b. The Rise of Opponents and How to Treat Them (1:10–16)

Findlay, G. G., 'The reproach of the Cretans', *Expositor* II:4 (1882), 401–10; Folliet, G., 'Les citations de Actes 17,28 et Tite 1,12 chez Augustin', *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 11 (1965), 293–5; Haensler, B., 'Zu Tit 1, 15', *BZ* 13 (1915), 121–9; Harris, R., 'The Cretans always liars', *Expositor* VII:2 (1906), 305–17; Harris, R., 'A further note on the Cretans', *Expositor* VII:3 (1907), 332–7; Harris, R., 'St Paul and Epimenides', *Expositor* VIII:4 (1912), 348–53; Harris, R., 'St Paul and Epimenides', *Expositor* XV:1 (1915), 29–35; Heyworth, S., 'Deceitful Crete: *Aeneid* 3:84. and the *Hymns* of Callimachus', *CQ* 43/1 (1993), 255–7; Lee, G. M., 'Epimenides in the Epistle to Titus (I 12)', *NovT* 22 (1980), 96; Lemme, L., 'Über Tit 1, 12', *TSK* 55 (1882), 113–44; Plumpe, J.C., 'Omnia munda mundis', *TS* 6 (1945), 509–23; Pohlenz, M., 'Paulus und die Stoa', *ZNW* 42 (1949), 69–104; Riesenfeld, H. 'The meaning of the Verb ἀρνεῖσθαι', *ConNT* 11 (1947), 207–19; Stegemann, W., 'Antisemitische und rassistische Vorurteile in Titus 1,10–16', *Kirche und Israel* 11 (1996), 46–61; Thiselton, A. C., 'The Logical Role of the Liar Paradox in Titus 1:12, 13. A Dissent from the Commentaries in the Light of Philosophical and Logical Analysis', *BibInt* 2 (1994), 207–23; Winiarczyk, M., *Euhemeri Messenii Reliquiae* (Stuttgart/Leipzig:Teubner, 1991), 2–4; Zimmer, C., 'Die Lügner-Antinomie in Titus 1, 12', *LB* 59 (1987), 77–99.

This section gives the reason why elders apt at teaching are required. There are many active rebels in the church spreading human teaching with a Jewish basis; they are upsetting the whole church. Therefore the church leaders must attack falsehood as well as commend the truth. What we have here, then, is concerned with the problem that church leaders need to face and with the way in which they must deal with it, and, although the writer addresses his injunction directly to Titus in v. 13b, he envisages that Titus will instruct the new elders accordingly (cf. Oberlinner, 32). The theme reappears in 3:9f.

The structure of the section is fairly complex. Verses 10f. give the basic reason why the opponents are to be rebuked: there are many bad people (who must be muzzled) who are causing the upset of households of believers, all for the sake of gain. In vv. 12–13a, the writer appeals specifically to a 'Cretan' testimony to demonstrate their bad character and thus support the command to Titus. The command is then repeated in vv. 13b–14: Titus must rebuke them, so that the opponents might return to a sound faith and the congregation will not give heed to their false teaching. Verses 15f. identify and respond to the false teaching and

teachers: As a general principle there are people with pure and impure minds; the latter (= the opponents) are false professors of the faith and unteachable. Any claim to possess exact knowledge of God is refuted by the behaviour of the false teachers themselves.

The denunciation of the false teachers and their followers is extremely harsh. The apostolic invocation of the Cretan stereotype brands the heretics and perhaps attempts to get the attention of those who would follow their lead. In this way, the author categorises the movement as one which will take believers back into an extremely ungodly ('Cretan') life which is the antithesis of genuine Christianity and from which faith in Christ has freed them.

The false teachers are described as having denied the knowledge of God that they profess to have by lives which show no evidence of genuine knowledge of God and faith. Adherence to extreme ascetic practices designed to help them guard their purity reflects ignorance of 'the truth' and the apostle's sound teaching of the faith. Life so marked is antithetical to the Christian life with its fruit of 'good works'.

The heresy described is similar to that in 1 Tim 1:3–11; 4:1–7; 6:5 (cf. Knight, 296). Attention is drawn to its Jewish origin and to the specific character of the Cretans. Although the same terminology is used to describe the heresy ('myths', 1:14; cf. 1 Tim 1:4; 4:7; 2 Tim 4:4; 'genealogies', 3:9; cf. 1 Tim 1:4), and a 'Jewish' character ('Jewish myths', 1:14; cf. 'teachers of the law', 1 Tim 1:7) and tendency towards asceticism are indicated (1:15; cf. 1 Tim 4:3), separate (perhaps closely analogous) developments are probably envisaged. There is no mention of the over-realised belief in the resurrection of believers at work in Crete (cf. 2 Tim 2:18), nor, apparently, has marriage been banned.

It has been suggested that the whole description of the opponents is fictitious, partly because of an alleged lack of coherence in vv. 13f. (see notethere). It is said to be simply a part of the fictional 'Pauline' paradigm of the PE, which here employs the traditional picture of the Jews or Judaisers as the opponents of Paul (cf. Wolter 1988:263; Houlden, 144). However, the Jewish (and presumably, therefore, Jewish Christian) presence in Crete is

extremely well attested, and if indeed the heretics were Jewish-Christian, the designation is to be expected.¹⁰⁶

This tendency to regard the heresy in the PE as part of the pseudepigrapher's fiction is not warranted by the descriptions provided by the letters. Differences in description and local colour suggest analogous heretical movements which resulted from the combination of judaising and widespread (dualistic) influences and shaped to some degree by local settings. Since most of the more bizarre teachings show affinity with developments in Corinth and Colossae, there is no need to claim that these kinds of opponents have no historical precedents (cf. Towner 1987:94–124; and Introduction).

A keynote in the description of the opponents is insubordination and refusal to submit to authority. It contrasts with the subordination expected of the elder's children. Oberlinner, 33f., observes that in essence Titus is summoned to call them summarily to obedience rather than to enter into discussion with them. He sees here the danger of an attempt to deal with heresy by powerful suppression: the opponents are simply to submit to authority, and submission can become more important than faith and good works. The problem is resolved by a struggle for power rather than by 'speaking the truth in love'. 'What ought not to be taught' (v. 11) is determined by the church leader's fiat. The temptation to use one's position to settle disputes by fiat is certainly a danger, but it may be unwise to blame the author of Titus for yielding to it, since we do not know the precise circumstances and since there is a danger of failing to reckon with cultural differences between the world of the commentator and the world of the PE.

TEXT

10. [καί] (D F G I K Ψ 33 1739 1881 TR d g vg Lcf Spec; [WH]; Kilpatrick). The conjunction seems pleonastic after πολὺς, but BD §442¹¹ notes that the construction is Cl.; Metzger, 584f., explains the construction as hendiadys. Elliott, 211, also retains the conjunction (cf. 1 Tim 6:9 *v.l.*; cf. Acts 25:7, but there it is a case of two adjs. with a noun) and comments that it could also be a Semitism (cf. Gen 47:9); it seems most likely that it was dropped by scribes who thought it unnecessary.

ματαιολόγοι praem. καί (F G P *et al.*). The variant is accepted by Elliott, 211, who argues that scribes tried to reduce the frequency of καί in the verse.

τῆς Omit (A¹ D² F G Ψ TR; Tisch.); Elliott, 177, argues that the NT prefers anarthrous nouns after ἐκ and other prepositions. This particular phrase is anarthrous elsewhere in NT. Contrast, however, Rom 3:1; 1 Cor 7:19; Col 2:11. It seems more likely that it is scribes who have omitted the article to conform to the idiom.

11. For the addition in 460 see 1:9 note.

12. εἶπεν δέ (N* F G 81 *pc*); γάρ (103). The conjunction was probably added to make a smoother connection.

13. ἐστὶν ἀληθῆς inverted order (D 823 *it vg sa*). Elliott, 178, argues that ἀληθῆς followed by the verb is the normal NT word order, whereas the majority reading here is a rare order. He therefore prefers the variant. However, the evidence for the variant is decidedly scanty.

ἐν Omit (N* *pc*; cf. [WH]). Scribes tended to avoid use of prepositions, Elliott, 178.

14. ἐντολαῖς ἐντάλμασιν (F G) is a word found in LXX, not Classical and therefore possibly original, the usual text being an Atticistic correction (cf. Mt 15:9; Mk 7:7; Col 2:8; Elliott, 178). The evidence for the variant is very weak. γενεαλογίας (075 1908 *pc*) is assimilation to 1 Tim 1:4.

15. πάντα πάντα μέν (N² D¹ Ψ TR *sy^h*); πάντα γάρ (*sy^p bo^p*). See BD §447⁵; MHT III, 331; Elliott, 179. Probably these are simply attempts to remove asyndeton.

16. καὶ πρὸς Omit καί (N* 81 Ambst). Elliott, 211, retains the text. ἀγαθόν Omit (N* 81); a case of homoioteleuton (Elliott, 143; cf. 2 Tim 2:21).

EXEGESIS

10. Εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ [καί] ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται, μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς The reason for selecting leaders who are properly equipped to teach is given in vv. 10f. There is a widespread attitude of insubordination in the churches; those infected by it are characterised by foolish talk and deceitfulness. Those responsible are identified as being largely or exclusively Jewish Christians.¹⁰⁷ The present tense is used of an actual heresy; contrast the use of the future tense in prophetic contexts (1 Tim 4:1; 2 Tim 3:1f.; 4:3; cf. Brox, 286). πολλοί (2:3*) indicates the strength of the opposition and the threat it poses. In 1 Tim 1:3 the reference to 'some people' is vaguer.

The opponents are characterised in three ways. First, the repetition of ἀνυποτακτός (1:6 note) introduces a deliberate contrast between the behaviour typical of the opponents and that of the Christian teacher (Brox, 287; Merkel, 93) and of mature Christians in general (ὑποτάσσεσθαι, 2:5, 9; 3:1; cf. Quinn 105–6). It identifies the heretics' refusal to submit to (apostolic)

authority. Spicq (606) contrasts receiving the word with meekness (Jas 1:21).

Second, their teaching is empty in content. ματαιόλογος***, ‘idle talker’, ‘empty prattler’, and related words¹⁰⁸ are used to denounce the speculative teaching of the opponents in a way that suggests that the term has almost a technical function in the author’s polemical vocabulary.¹⁰⁹ Generally in the NT the word-group classifies pagan and unregenerate beliefs (idolatry, Acts 14:15; legalism, Jas 1:26; 1 Pet 1:18) and behaviour (Rom 1:21; Eph 4:17) as futile.

Third, the teachers are deceitful.¹¹⁰ In context (esp. v. 11), the reference would seem to be to the propagation of a false doctrine by which others are deceived.¹¹¹ It is not impossible that the thought of ‘deceivers’ is meant to tie in with the ‘Cretan’ stereotype under construction, already introduced through the overseer code and coming fully into view in the quotation of v. 12: ‘Cretans are liars ...’. There is a tendency to regard the whole of this description as nothing more than polemical language without concrete reference, designed to prejudice the readers’ minds against the opponents. This is unjustified; at least from the writer’s point of view the problem with the opponents was precisely that they talked attractive nonsense.

Finally, the source of the opposition is identified. μάλιστα usually means ‘especially’, which would emphasise one part of a larger, more diverse group (BA *s.v.*), but it may mean ‘namely’, which would simply make the preceding general reference specific (1 Tim 4:10; 5:8, 17; 2 Tim 4:13**); cf. Skeat 1979:173–7; Knight, 297). Given the ‘Jewish’ tinge of the heresy (1:14; 3:9), the latter use seems probable here. περιτομή is ‘circumcision’, both the rite and the resulting state.¹¹² In Paul the word can refer to Jews outside of the Christian faith (Gal 2:7–9) and figuratively to Christians (Phil 3:3; Col 2:11–13). The phrase here with ἐκ, however, is used mainly of Jewish Christians (Acts 10:45; 11:2; Col 4:11), who were secondarily ‘Judaizers’ (Gal 2:12), and once of Jews (Rom 4:12).¹¹³ Since activity in the church is implied, the reference must be to Jewish Christians.¹¹⁴ The phrase thus identifies the opposition. It does not necessarily imply that circumcision was an issue in the situation.¹¹⁵ Nor are racial discrimination and anti-Semitism present (*pace* Stegemann 1996).

11. οὐς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν The crux of the problem is identified here as being false teaching which has penetrated the church to a dangerous extent. Consequently, action must be taken to prevent the trouble going any further. The phrase οὐς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν is almost parenthetical syntactically in the description of the opponents, but it contains the main practical point of the section: the opponents must be silenced in view of their subversive effects on the congregations.¹¹⁶ It is usually assumed that argument and discussion with them are not envisaged. However, Simpson, 99, thinks that ‘silencing by force of reason’ is meant, and this possibility should not be entirely excluded (see 2 Tim 2:14 and note), even though the means to be used is apparently an authoritative ‘rebuke’ (ἐλεγχε, v. 13; cf. v. 9; 2:15; 3:10 [παρατιτοῦ]). In view of the procedure envisaged in 3:10, it is unlikely that the force here is tantamount to ‘excommunicate’ (*pace* Hanson, 175).

The false teachers are to be withstood because they have already in some sense disturbed ‘whole households’.¹¹⁷ The households are assumed to be Christian, and it is probable that the household would have been the place in which the local church gathered for worship and instruction. The combination of ὅλος** (whole) and οἶκος (‘household’, 1 Tim 3:4, 5, 12, 15; 5:4; 2 Tim 1:16; 4:19**) occurs also in Acts 2:2; 7:10; 18:8; Heb 3:2, 5. The emphasis is on completeness, and here the dangerous extent of the heresy is stressed. ἀνατρέπω is ‘to upset’, hence ‘ruin, destroy’ (2 Tim 2:18; Jn. 2:15**), here with reference to the ‘faith’ or the people who hold it.¹¹⁸ The view that this statement indicates that the opponents demonstrated a Gnostic disregard for institutions of the world, i.e. here the family (Schmithals 1961:145; Haufe 1973:330), is speculative without further indication. It is also not clear that the tactic of going from house to house preying on defenceless women in homes (2 Tim 3:6; cf. 1 Tim 5:13) is implied here.¹¹⁹ The ‘upset’ in mind is almost certainly the defection of entire families to the false teachers, or the destruction of the faith once professed by members of a household by the false teaching such as 2 Tim 2:18 and 1 Tim 1:20 envisage. Alternatively, since it was typical for the church to meet in

houses, it is possible that the reference is to the capitulation of whole house churches.¹²⁰

The activity of the opposition is teaching. διδάσκω ‘to teach’ (1 Tim 2:12; 4:11; 6:2; 2 Tim 2:2; cf. Tit 1:9 note) occurs here only in the PE in reference to the opponents (but cf. νομοδιδάσκαλοι, 1 Tim 1:7). The present participle διδάσκοντες indicates the means by which the destruction is occurring and indicates an actual situation. Brox, 287, thinks there is a contrast between the secret activity of the heretics in houses compared with the open teaching of the truth in the church; however, this is a false contrast, especially if house churches are in mind (cf. Quinn, 106f.). ἃ μὴ δεῖ refers to ‘what ought not to be taught’ rather than ‘what they have no right to teach’ (cf. τὰ μὴ δέοντα, 1 Tim 5:13).¹²¹ As in 1 Tim 1:7, the indefinite reference to the doctrines of the opponents is pejorative and stands in vivid contrast to the descriptions of the apostolic teaching as τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου and τῆς διδασκαλίαν τὴν ὑγιαίνουσιν in v. 9 (cf. Quinn, 106). This may correspond to the technique of referring to the opponents vaguely as τινες (see 1 Tim 1:3 note).

The content of the teaching is not specified. The similarity of expression to 1 Tim 5:13 (see note) leads some to think this is an allusion to magic arts (Holtz, 212; Kelly, 234, and Spicq, 608, allow the possibility). Surrounding references to the apostolic teaching, however, suggest the general meaning of false teaching (Roloff, 298; Hanson, 175); what can be known of its content is described in vv. 14f. below.

Greedy motives mark the heresy as deceptive and contrary to the apostolic ministry (cf. v. 7).¹²² For the proper attitude to wealth see 1 Tim 6:17–19. αἰσχρὸς, ‘shameful’ (1 Cor 11:6; 14:35; Eph 5:12***), is applied to the thing instead of the person.¹²³ κερδὸς is ‘gain, profit’ (Phil 1:21; 3:7***).¹²⁴ The phrase is devised to give a contrast with the true teacher who should not be αἰσχροκερδῆς (1:7; cf. 1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:10f.), and at the same time brings the ‘Cretan’ stereotype to bear on the false teachers’ behaviour.

With different and more allusive language, the same motive is attributed to the heretics in 1 Tim 6:5. But the Cretan quotation that follows in this case suggests that this criticism is more than

simple adherence to a heresy topos,¹²⁵ or at least that the geographical factors called for this aspect of the polemic to be expressed in Cretan terms (though many view this as simply an attempt to provide ‘local colour’ as part of the fiction). Greed and dishonest gain were well-known elements in the traditional criticism of Cretan behaviour.¹²⁶

There was a general suspicion that teachers of philosophy and religion had financial motives (Dio Chrysostom, 32:10; Sophocles, *Ant.* 1055f.), and actual cases of exploitation made a similar impact in the early church (cf. 2 Pet 2:3; Rom 16:17f.; cf. Lips 1979:81f.), so that Paul himself had to give answer to such a charge (1 Th 2:5; cf. Acts 20:33). As to the actual situation, it has been suggested that by gaining the confidence of church members, the opponents managed to draw support meant for itinerant missionaries and prophets from the church’s very limited resources.¹²⁷ Without legitimate authority and teaching false doctrine, this would constitute ‘dishonest gain’, but so would trading unauthorised teaching for food and shelter (Quinn 106), or accepting gifts from pupils (Holtzmann, 474).

12. εἶπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης Proof of the low character of the Cretans is now offered. It comes in the shape of a self-testimony by a Cretan, who is of course offering an opinion on the rest of his fellow-countrymen in general. τις ἐξ αὐτῶν is a typically vague reference (cf. 1 Tim 1:3, 19) which might suggest that it should be to one of the heretical teachers (so Findlay*, 403–10; cf. Quinn, 109). This identification was suggested by Lemme*, who thought that a Christian prophet might be meant, and it has been defended by Thiessen 1995:327f. The difficulty with this hypothesis is that it leaves unexplained why the prophet should have attacked the Cretans in this way, but it is just possible that he was building on their well-attested reputation and perhaps even citing or echoing a proverbial saying. But the connection is loose and most commentators assume that the reference of αὐτῶν is determined by the following plural Κρήτες and the implied originator of the quotation, Epimenides.¹²⁸ On this view, προφήτης is used here for a non-Jewish person.¹²⁹ The prophet is not named but is usually identified as Epimenides, who (like some other Greek poet-philosophers) was regarded as a prophet by

Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and others.¹³⁰ The language may therefore simply reflect his common reputation. Nothing requires us to think that the author of the epistle regarded him as prophet in the biblical sense. But the point might be that, like Caiaphas (Jn 11:51), this man spoke the truth without realising that he was God's mouthpiece (Spicq, 609; Barrett 131–2; Fee, 179; *contra* Hanson, 177, who asserts that Paul could not have used the term of a pagan poet).

Epimenides was a religious teacher and wonderworker in Crete (see below). In Plato, *Leg.* 1:642D–E, he was active as a priest and prophet in Athens c. 500 BC, but Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 1, dates him about a century earlier. According to Diogenes Laertius, 1:109–12, the Athenians sent for him during a pestilence; he is said to have purified the city after the slaughter of Cylon's associates and to have sacrificed to the appropriate god (as a result of which altars to unnamed gods were to be found in various places in Attica; cf. Acts 17:22f.). There are legends of his great age (as much as 157 or 299 years) or of a miraculous sleep for 57 years, and stories of his wanderings outside the body.¹³¹

Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί The quotation forms a hexameter line.¹³² The thought is similar to Hesiod, *Theog.* 26: ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κακ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 136).

The source of the quotation is disputed.

(a) Its attribution to Epimenides is found in Christian writers, Clement of Alexandria¹³³ and Jerome,¹³⁴ it is said to come from a book variously called *Θεογονία* or *περὶ χρησμῶν* (Pohlenz*, 101). Harris* (1906:305–17; 1912:348–53), following a statement recorded by the ninth-century Syrian commentator Isho'dad, which he attributes to Theodore of Mopsuestia, suggested that the quotation might be from another poem by Epimenides, *Περὶ Μίνω καὶ Ῥαδαμάνθους*.¹³⁵ However, Isho'dad's accuracy has been questioned (Pohlenz*, 101–4). MHT I, 233, notes that the dialect of the phrase is Attic and not Cretan, but reminds us that Epimenides did visit Athens and might have written his verse there.

(b) Quinn, 108, cites the view of Huxley that the association of the saying with Epimenides is mistaken, and that originally it was

a Delphic criticism of Epimenides (who claimed too much for Crete), which was gathered into a collection of Epimenides' sayings.¹³⁶

(c) The first phrase of the quotation is found in Callimachus (300–240 BC), *Hymn to Zeus*, 8 (Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται· καὶ γὰρ τάφρον, ὦ ἄνα, σειο/Κρήτες ἐτεκτήναντο· σὺ δὲ οὐ θάνες· ἐσσι γὰρ ἀεὶ).¹³⁷ Pohlenz*, 102, and Bruce 1990:384f. follow the suggestion of Epiphanius and Jerome that Callimachus was 'adapting' Epimenides.¹³⁸ At least two Christian sources maintained that Callimachus was the author of the quotation (Theod. Mops. II, 243 Swete; Theodoret, III, 701 Schulze = *PG* LXXXII, 861). The problem is complicated by the statement in Acts 17:28a which appears in combination with the present citation in Isho'dad.

(d) Lemme* (see above) argued that the evidence for Epimenides as the author is flawed. It rests merely on the assumption that the writer was quoting a Cretan poet. He proposes that the 'prophet' was a member of the Jewish-Christian group opposed to the writer, and that the writer uses the term 'prophet' sarcastically and turns his prophecy against his group (rather than against Cretans in general). On this view the term prophet is not applied to a pagan source, and the wholesale condemnation of the Cretans disappears.

We are left with some uncertainty regarding both the origin of the material cited and the source from which the saying of Tit 1:12 derives. But the probability is that the author thought that he was citing Epimenides (Oberlinner, 38f.).

Three separate criticisms are contained in the statement, and it is likely that it was quoted primarily for the sake of the first comment, namely the proverbial deceitfulness of the Cretans, which was widely attested. The second characteristic of the Cretans is stated to be boorish, wild behaviour. Again, this was a long-standing description of Cretan behaviour. The third comment concerns their laziness and gluttony, and this is perhaps to be taken as a reference to the desire of the writer's opponents to make money easily by duping their pupils.

For Κρήτες (Acts 2:11***) see 1:5 note. The nub of the accusation lies in the first of the three descriptive phrases. ἀεὶ**,

‘always’, means here ‘from time immemorial’. For ψευστής, ‘liar’, cf. 1 Tim 1:10**.¹³⁹ The basis for the accusation contained in the first phrase is that the Cretans claimed that Zeus was buried on their island and erected a tomb as proof.¹⁴⁰ While Greeks in general could be accused of being liars (Spicq, 610), the reputation of the Cretans for lying was such that κρητίζειν meant ‘to lie’.¹⁴¹

The second phrase accuses the Cretans of wild behaviour, like animals. κακός, ‘evil’ (cf. 1 Tim 6:10; 2 Tim 4:14, of deeds), can be used of inanimate things.¹⁴² Used with θήριον, ‘[wild] animal’,¹⁴³ it gives the sense ‘beast of prey’. The word was often applied to rude, coarse people.¹⁴⁴

According to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 8:83, and Plutarch, *Mor.* 86C, Crete was known for its lack of wild beasts. It is therefore possible that the line is mildly ironic in alluding to the wild and barbaric behaviour of Crete. Behind this aspect of the Cretan reputation was a history of inter-city wars,¹⁴⁵ piracy¹⁴⁶ and selfishness.¹⁴⁷ Some religious rites local to Crete which sanctioned homosexuality were despised as coarse.¹⁴⁸ All of this made Crete a place well-known for rough and dangerous behaviour.

The third phrase accuses the Cretans of sensuality. γαστήρ**, literally ‘stomach’ (1 Clement 21:2; cf. Prov 20:27) or ‘womb’ (as elsewhere in NT), is used in the figurative sense of glutton.¹⁴⁹ ἀργός is ‘lazy’, here in the sense ‘lazy, not wanting to work’.¹⁵⁰ For the combination γαστέρες ἀργαί, ‘lazy gluttons’, cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* 4:107, ‘*venter tardus*’. For the thought see Phil 3:19.

Brox, 288, and Merkel, 94, hold that the citation is used purely as a means of discrediting the heresy (cf. Findlay*; Fee, 179), and that it is most unlikely that it would have been used in a genuine letter to a church in Crete, since it would also be regarded as derogatory of the church-members in general.

However, as to the saying’s applicability to Crete, it is surely taken for granted that the converted members of the church would be regarded as delivered from the sins of their race, and that the attack is on those who were never converted or have fallen away. The earlier Paul spoke in equally strong terms (Gal 5:12), and the application of his words to the congregations addressed was similar (cf. 3:3; 1 Cor 6:9–11; Gal 5:19; Spicq, 611). For this

reason (and possibly for the reason that the saying was so common that it had lost its original barb), there would be little danger of hurting the Cretan fellowship’s collective feelings. If the religious lie behind the first part of the saying were invoked (see below), then the most obvious application is to the false teachers and any that would follow them. Nevertheless, the broad ‘Cretan’ stereotype that has been employed may suggest that the Cretan believers in general are to understand the precarious nature of their situation — that they are liable to fall easily if they are not careful. Spicq (611) warns against taking the verse too literally (cf. the positive evaluation in Plato, *Leg.* 1:635).

If it is taken literally, the first part of the quotation contains a famous logical conundrum - namely, whether the saying of a Cretan who testifies that Cretans always lie is itself a lie. The so-called ‘liar’s paradox’, which has traditionally been linked to this statement attributed to Epimenides, was linked by the ancients to Eubulides, an opponent of Aristotle,¹⁵¹ and Chrysippus.¹⁵² Heyworth*, 256f., argues that the quotation of Epimenides’ dictum in Callimachus (*Hymn to Zeus* 1:8) is employed precisely because of the paradox it intends: ‘for Epimenides’ dictum to have point it must be spoken by a Cretan; at issue here is whether Zeus is a Cretan or not. If he is, he would lie to us: the debate can never be resolved by asking the god himself for information’ (257 n. 6).

In any case, the use of the material here gives no evidence of any awareness of a logical problem. There does not appear to be any ancient evidence that the saying was regarded as paradoxical, or as intending a paradox. Its force seems to be that of a self-admission or self-condemnation, as if somehow a Cretan’s own testimony (one of Epimenides’ stature, that is) on the matter is weightier than that of a (biased) foreigner. Presumably ‘always’ was not taken *au pied de la lettre*.¹⁵³

13. ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής The author affirms the truth of the quotation. The word μαρτυρία characterizes the saying (αὕτη) as a ‘piece of evidence’ or testimony given by a witness.¹⁵⁴ For the Johannine phraseology cf. Jn 1:19; 5:32; 19:35, *et al.*; 1 Jn 5:9. Paul uses μαρτύριον in this way (1 Cor 1:6; 2 Cor 1:12; 2 Th 1:10; Holtzmann, 475). ἀληθής** (1:1 note) here has the sense of ‘veridical’, or ‘dependable’ (BA). Hanson (1982:177) thinks that

the comment is necessary lest 1:12 be thought to be self-refuting, but it is doubtful whether the saying would have been taken this way. The confirmation of the testimony's truth may simply be a way of applying it directly to the false teachers troubling this church.¹⁵⁵

δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἔλεγε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως The force of the conjunctive phrase is: 'because of the character of the Cretans, which we know to be a fact'.¹⁵⁶ The author summons Titus himself (like the overseer, 1:9) to refute strongly those who hold to the false teaching. The force of the adverb ἀποτόμως, 'severely, rigorously' is extremely strong.¹⁵⁷ The sharpness is called forth presumably because the opponents talk nonsense and will not listen to reason.

The objects of the reproof (1:9 note) are somewhat unclear.¹⁵⁸ The difficulty arises in part because v. 14b seems to distinguish these people from a further group who twist the truth. The possibilities suggested are that αὐτούς refers to: (a) [only] the false teachers (Quinn, 109); (b) in a slightly broader sense, the opposition, including both the leaders and adherents to the false teaching (Fee, 180); or (c) [only] the people who are deceived by them (Knight, 299f.). If view (a) is adopted, it would be possible to take vv. 13b–14a to refer to the members of the congregation who are misled by the opponents, with an unexpressed change of subject in the ἵνα clause.

The most probable solution is that the lines between the teachers and their followers are rather fluid, and the writer does not sharply distinguish between them. The reference in vv. 10f. and 15f. must at least include the leaders of the heretical movement. Further, there is nothing in vv. 13f. that requires the change of groups that Knight suggests: 3:10 holds out hope for the successful discipline of the 'factious' person, that is, the one promoting divisive teaching;¹⁵⁹ προσέχοντες and ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀλήθειαν in v. 14 are equally suitable to describe both false teachers and followers (1 Tim 4:1; 2 Tim 4:4). Clearly, the first concern is to put a stop to the false teaching and to deal with the leaders of the movement; but the problem in the Cretan church is the whole movement, leaders and followers (the teaching and its results), and the broad application of the Cretan

quotation suggests a condemnation not just of the false teachers but also of those whose rejection of the faith fulfils the Epimenidean dictum.

There may be more weight in the observation that the description in v. 10 appears to be of a Jewish group, who are giving false teaching and upsetting the faith of others (cf. v. 14). If v. 12 refers to the same group of opponents, their attitude is explained (in part, at least) by being linked to a well-known trait of Cretan behaviour. But would a description of the Cretans as liars be applicable to the predominantly Jewish group who are the main source of the false teaching? The difficulty is partly solved by the suggestion that the people who twist the truth are non-Christian Jews whose false teaching has influenced the opponents (Parry, 77). Barrett, 131, suggests that the Jewish members of the church had been strongly affected by the surrounding Cretan culture. Again, it seems best to suppose that the opponents and those misled by them and the Cretan and Jewish members of the congregations are not sharply distinguished.

ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει The purpose of the sharp reprimand is that the people may be healthy in the faith.¹⁶⁰ ὑγιαίνω (1:9 note) can mean 'to become healthy' and so may imply the possible restoration of the heretical teachers (cf. 3:10; 2 Tim 2:25–26).¹⁶¹ Hence it is not necessary to take the clause to refer to the avoidance of upsetting the faith of the congregation generally. The reference of τῇ πίστει appears to be either to 'the faith', i.e. the Christian religion (cf. 1 Cor 16:13), or to the 'creed' (Lock, 135); see 1:1 note and **Excursus 4**. Thus the purpose of Titus's rebuke will be achieved if the false teachers and those who have gone after them can be restored to an orthodox understanding of doctrine.

14. μὴ προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀλήθειαν The character of a healthy faith is expressed negatively in terms of not adhering to what is false and thus antithetical to belief in 'the truth'. προσέχω, 'to pay attention to' (1 Tim 1:4; 3:8; 4:1, 13**); *EDNT* III, 169f.), has the implication of being interested in it and even believing in it.

The false doctrine is ‘Jewish’ in nature and characterised in terms of quality and perhaps also content as ‘myths and commands of men’. Ἰουδαϊκός** is ‘Jewish’ (cf. Ἰουδαϊκῶς, Gal. 2:14).¹⁶² Adjectives in -ικός signify ‘related to, bearing the nature of something’ and are used of derivation, origin, connection; hence the usage need not be derogatory (Gutbrod, W., *TDNT* III, 382f.). The myths in question circulate among Jews, but are not necessarily Jewish by nature.

μύθος ‘myth’ (1 Tim 1:4; 4:7; 2 Tim 4:4; 2 Pet 1:16***; 2 Clement 13:3; μύθευμα, Ignatius, *Mag.* 8:1) is always used in the NT in the plural and in a pejorative sense. The word originally meant ‘thought’ (cf. Ecclus 20:19, the only occurrence in the LXX, but cf. μυθολόγος, Bar 3:23), then thought expressed as a word or account, especially a fairy story or fable, a fabulous account of gods and demigods, the plot of a drama, etc. It could refer to ‘a fairy tale or marvel as distinct from credible history’; ‘the mythical form of an idea as distinct from the deeper meaning (the kernel of truth) to be extracted from it’.¹⁶³ The pejorative nature of the classification, however, goes beyond simply making the judgement of untruthfulness. Greek and Roman critics denounced certain myths because they had been taken as justification for the practice of perverse and immoral kinds of behaviour.¹⁶⁴ Consequently, the label applied here and elsewhere in the PE may target not just the fallacious interpretation of OT passages but also applications of this material to conduct that contradicted traditional patterns of godly behaviour. Manifestly this term was not used by the opponents themselves (Thiessen 1995:321).

Along with ‘myths’, the phrase ‘commandments of men’ (ἄνθρωπος, 2:11; 3:2, 8, 10; 1 Tim 2:2 *et al.*; 2 Tim 2:2 *et al.*) classifies the false teaching as human and therefore inferior to the apostle’s teaching which is truth from God (cf. Holtzmann, 477–8; Brown 1963:43). In the NT ἐντολή normally refers to divine commands, but here they are qualified as being human.¹⁶⁵ The phrase is traditional for human teaching that is added to (and thus denies or veers from) the teaching of God. Mk 7:7 (Mt 15:9) and Col 2:22 employ the term which derives from Isa 29:13. The application to ascetic teachings in Col 2:22 is perhaps nearest to

this passage’s intent. It is possible that the phrase also intends to continue the contrast of plural teachings (‘myths’, ‘commandments’) with the singular ‘truth’ in the same way that Mk 7:7–9 contrasts ‘the commandments of men’ (διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων, v. 7b; Mt 15:9) and ‘the commandment of God’ (τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, vv. 8–9; Mt 15:3; Quinn, 112; cf. Col 2:8, 22). The allusion may well be to actual patterns of behaviour (Col 2:22), especially since v. 15 suggests some sort of ascetic food regulations (cf. 1 Tim 4:3; Brox, 289).

But the teaching is not simply human. Those who promote it are actively opposed to God and his teaching. ἀποστρέφομαι is ‘to desert’ (2 Tim 1:15; Mt 5:42) or ‘to turn away from, repudiate, reject’ (2 Tim 4:4**). The thought here with the middle voice is ‘to turn [oneself] away from’, hence reject ‘the truth’ (Josephus, *Ant.* 2:48; 4:135).¹⁶⁶

In the light of other references¹⁶⁷ the content of ‘Jewish myths’ is almost certainly related to the OT. The association elsewhere with the term γενεαλογία (3:9; 1 Tim 1:4) helps to establish the reference. Rabbinic interest in creation stories and genealogies (halakah and haggadah) is probably the most relevant parallel (Kittel 1921:49–69; Jeremias, 13; Spicq, 322–3; Gunther 1973:78). Philo’s use of the term ‘genealogies’ as a category pertaining to the OT history (*Praem.* 1–2; *Mos.* 2:46–7) suggests that it was not limited to the lists of generations, but referred to OT biographies of famous personages, from whose sacred histories spiritual lessons might be drawn (cf. 1QS 3:13–15; 1QapGen). This means that the materials in view may well be OT or OT-related, but further precision is not possible.¹⁶⁸ There is nothing in this description to suggest Gnostic doctrines (so rightly Holtzmann, 476f.; *pace* Hanson, 178; Oberlinner, 43f.; see 3:9 note).

15. πάντα καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς. τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρὸν, ἀλλὰ μεμιάνται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις There is no explicit connection with what precedes. It is likely that the commandments taught by the opposition included embargoes on certain things as being unclean, such as foods (cf. 1 Tim 4:3–5; Holtzmann, 479; Spicq, 612; Brox 289–90). In answer to this, Titus reiterates the apostolic principle governing purity

and impurity. Brox, 290, thinks that this goes beyond Paul who allowed people to live as they wished, but it is more likely that some kind of Jewish teaching is being foisted on Gentile believers here.

The saying has verbal parallels in Lk 11:41 (πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστίν; cf. Mk. 7:14f.; Mt 15:11) and Rom 14:20 (πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ ... ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι; cf. v. 14: οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκεῖνῳ κοινόν; cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3:208; Plotinus, *En.* 3:2:6; Spicq, 612). The verbal contact point consists of πάντα καθαρὰ: nothing is [ceremonially] defiling. Luke adds 'for you', *sc.* the disciples. Paul implies [for everybody], unless you are eating so as to make someone else fall. But although the tradition is articulated differently in different contexts (cf. Acts 10:14f., 28; 11:8–9; 1 Cor 8:4–6; 10:26; 1 Tim 4:3–5; Ps 24:1), the fundamental assertion is that the 'created' nature of foods makes them all 'clean' in principle.

Clearly, then, the tradition is about ritual purity and abstinence from foods. Applied by Jesus, the effect was to abolish the Mosaic law on foods as well as the traditions of the elders. The application here is a reminder that 'Jewish'-type food rules and regulations have already been overturned as irrelevant (cf. Lock, 135; F. Hauck, *TDNT* III, 424; Schlarb 1990:84). The saying moves between different senses of 'clean'. All foods are ritually clean to people who are spiritually clean and cannot defile them in any way. Unbelievers who are spiritually defiled (although they doubtless thought of themselves as ritually clean) in fact make everything they handle spiritually unclean. Their minds and consciences are so incapable of judging in accordance with God's truth that they sin at every turn.

καθαρός can be used of ritual or spiritual purity.¹⁶⁹ The phrase here classifies 'everything' as 'ritually pure', probably in the sense that it applies the traditional interpretation of Jesus which ruled that moral purity is not related to the superficial nature of things, but determined by the condition of the heart. τοῖς καθαροῖς is the peculiar addition of Titus. Merkel, 95, takes it to mean 'the baptised', but a broader moral sense is intended.¹⁷⁰ In view of the

contrast that follows (τοῖς δὲ μεμιασμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις), the reference is to 'believers' (cf. Rom 14:20). They have been cleansed by the self-offering of Jesus Christ (2:14; Schlarb 1990:84f.; Oberlinner, 45). The parallel in 1 Tim 4:3 suggests that τοῖς καθαροῖς here is equivalent to τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν there. Further, it takes the thought of purity and defilement to a deeper, spiritual level (as references to νοῦς and συνείδησις suggest), and relates them to acceptance or rejection of 'the truth' and genuine knowledge of God (vv. 14, 16). Because believers have been washed from their sins (cf. Acts 15:9), they are clean and are no longer defiled by anything. The dat. indicates either that all things are clean in the opinion of pure people or that all things are clean for their use (so Bernard, 162).

But what did the false teachers regard as being 'defiled'? Was it foods, including Gentile food, regarded as unholy by some kind of religious rules (cf. Col 2:22; 1 Tim 4:3 and note)? Dibelius–Conzelmann, 137f., and Brox, 37f., argue that Gnostic asceticism is in mind, since marriage is also defiling, but this may be to bring an aspect of asceticism into the Cretan setting that does not belong. The 'Jewish' classification is more suggestive of food rules, but the question remains open.

Using anthropological language more typical of the PE (νοῦς, συνείδησις), the contrast introduced at v. 15b locates the source of defilement and purity within the human being in the same way that the Jesus-tradition did (Mt 15:11, 18–20; Mk 7:15). This is a strong attack. The author is saying that people who subscribe to the 'Jewish' views of the false teachers about 'the pure and impure' are not really believers but are still in their old sins (cf. 2 Pet.; Jude for a similar line).

μιαίνω, 'to defile',¹⁷¹ describes moral defilement in the NT (1:15b; Jude 8; Heb 12:15; cf. the variant reading Acts 5:38D) and ceremonial defilement (Jn 18:28***).¹⁷² The LXX employs the term for ceremonial impurity,¹⁷³ but also in a way that connects defilement to immoral behaviour.¹⁷⁴ Elsewhere the term is applied to corruption of the mind (*T. Iss.* 4:4). It belongs to the word field which includes καθαρίζω (e.g. Lev 13:59), ἀκαθαρσία, and ἀκάθαρτος (Lev 13), which makes it at home in this context, contrasted as it is with the preceding τοῖς καθαροῖς.

Defilement and unbelief are linked. The people who are defiled are unbelievers (cf. Rev 21:8: τοῖς δὲ δειλοῖς καὶ ἀπίστοις καὶ ἐβδελυγμένοις καὶ φονεῦσιν καὶ πόρνοις ...). Presumably they thought themselves to be pure (cf. 1:1, 6), but the author argues that because they are sinners and unforgiven, they themselves are impure. For ἄπιστος (1 Tim 5:8**) as a description of unbelievers, see **Excursus 4**.¹⁷⁵

οὐδὲν καθαρὸν could mean: (a) They regard nothing as clean (Hanson, 178); (b) Nothing can make them clean; (c) They make everything they touch unclean (Fee, 181; Knight, 303; Barrett, 133; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 138). If the doctrines of the opponents are being assessed, view (a) would correspond best to the contrast with v. 15a. If, however, the comment addresses their actual condition, then view (c) might be closer. The point would be that since actual pollution comes from an inner source (which will be explained in the remainder of the sentence) nothing used in any way will be pleasing to God. The view that defilement begins with the person, not with the thing, is already widely expressed.¹⁷⁶ As with the next statement, the comment is probably hyperbolic.

ἀλλὰ μεμιάνται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις explains the implications of the preceding participle, τοῖς μεμιαμμένοις. Actual purity and impurity are matters which depend upon the spiritual condition of the inner person. ἀλλά is not ‘but even’, but ‘but nothing is clean because ...’ (Holtzmann, 480). The contrast thus states either that their own moral uncleanness causes them to regard everything as unclean and therefore in need of purification, or that it makes it impossible for them to use anything in a way that pleases God. Either way, the comment locates the problem in the condition of the inner person — it is a comment on their morality.

μεμιάνται¹⁷⁷ indicates a condition resulting from prior actions or decisions (cf. the perfect participle τοῖς μεμιαμμένοις in v. 15a).

νοῦς, ‘mind’,¹⁷⁸ is used in the PE only in reference to the false teachers. In each case an appropriate modifier indicates that the νοῦς has become corrupted and ineffective (1 Tim 6:5: διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν; 2 Tim 3:8**: ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν). Lips 1979:55 describes it generally as

the organ of perception (or knowledge, ‘*Erkenntnisorgan*’), which functions to apprehend and process the revelation of God (ἡ ἀλήθεια, ἡ πίστις; 1979:55f.; cf. Rom 12:2; Ridderbos 1977:117–19). Jewett is perhaps correct to expand the meaning beyond function to include the patterns of thought that determine the direction of the process (1971:450, 358–90). In 1 Tim 6:5 and 2 Tim 3:8, the νοῦς is aligned with ἡ ἀλήθεια in a way that suggests its corrupt condition prevents apprehension or leads to rejection of ‘the truth’. In the present passage, the defiled mind (and conscience) lies at the root of rejection of the truth (v. 14) and the specific ascetic regulations that evolve from this rejection (v. 15a). If the perfect tense of the negative modifiers in each case is to be stressed, it would appear that present ungodly behaviour and resistance to the truth are connected to past decisions to reject the apostolic faith (cf. the combination of tenses in 2 Tim 3:8: οὗτοι ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν). For συνείδησις see **Excursus 5**.

16. θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι The description of the heretical leaders becomes direct and explicit at this point. Their situation is paradoxical; their claim to know God is cancelled by behaviour in which they deny him. ὁμολογέω, ‘to confess, profess’ (1 Tim 6:12*), is used of declaring solemnly one’s religious adherence and beliefs.¹⁷⁹ In different language 2 Tim 3:5 emphasises the same contrast of profession and reality. The word thus has a religious nuance and goes beyond simple affirmation (*pace* Holtzmann, 480). The phrase ‘knowing God’ is used here (cf. 1 Jn 2:4) of absolute, complete knowledge (Jn 7:28–29; 8:55; 11:12, 24; 1 Cor 2:2; cf. Spicq, 613).¹⁸⁰ This claim could be Gnostic (Holtzmann, 480; Merkel, 95; Kelly, 237; Schmithals 1983:116), but Parry (77) points out that Gnostics would have claimed a superior and exceptional knowledge of God. It is thus more likely a Jewish (or judaising) claim to more accurate knowledge of God as demonstrated through vigorous ritualism and a better insight into the Torah (cf. Fee, 182f.; Quinn, 114).

τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται It is assumed that ‘knowing God’ is evidenced by righteous behaviour. These people deny God by rejecting his good creation (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 104), i.e. by asceticism (Knight, 303). But their confession is hollow and false.

The contrast actually functions as a challenge to the claims of the opponents. ἀρνέομαι, ‘to deny’, describes the opposite of confession.¹⁸¹ Spicq, 614, suggests the force is ‘not to take account of’, citing 1 Tim 5:8 and 2 Tim 3:5, for the denial is a matter of what can be inferred from their deeds (cf. Fridrichsen 1942:96). However, the contrast it forms with ὁμολογοῦσιν and the implied failure of their consciences in guiding their conduct (v. 15) suggest that the force is that their corrupt behaviour is a tacit denial of God (the object to be supplied), amounting to apostasy from the faith (Lips 1979:85; Riesenfeld*, 215f.).

ἔργον, ‘deed’, ‘action’, ‘work’, ‘task’,¹⁸² is used in the PE especially to refer to the outward deeds which demonstrate faith or the lack of it. Thus there is frequent reference to good or noble deeds (2:7, 14; 3:1, 8, 14), but it is argued that people who are not [yet] believers are not able to do righteous acts on which they might depend for favour from God. That the deeds in the present verse are evil in character is plain from the context.

Merkel, 95, maintains that the relation between faith and works assumed by the author corresponds to a later tendency (Jas 2:14f.; 1 Jn 2:3–4; 3:6, 10; 4:7–8) which reflects an inversion of the earlier Pauline model in which works are the result of faith. But if the point is (as it seems to be) that corrupted faith produces substandard works, and that the latter are evidence of corrupted faith, Merkel’s conclusion is questionable (cf. Gal 5:19–23; 2 Cor 13:5; Mt 7:15–20; Lk 6:43–45; Ecclus 27:6).

βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι Three sharp phrases sum up the character of the false teachers in relation to God.¹⁸³

First, they are βδελυκτοί***, ‘abominable, detestable’.¹⁸⁴ This word is used in Hellenistic Judaism with reference to persons who pervert moral distinctions,¹⁸⁵ and with reference to things.¹⁸⁶ In the LXX, the βδέλυγμα word-group describes things (or people) which God abominates. The verb is frequent, and especially βδέλυγμα is used for ἴδω. ¹⁸⁷ It is the typical description of idols and things which are unclean and therefore from which Israel is to keep separate or be defiled (cf. Lev 11:10–42). Thus OT language for cultic and moral pollution is used to describe these people

who, ironically, strive to protect their ritual purity (cf. Dibelius–Conzelmann, 138; Quinn, 115).

Second, they are ἀπειθής, ‘disobedient’,¹⁸⁸ a word used elsewhere of pagans and to describe life out of which believers have come (3:3; Rom 1:30; Lk 1:17). Here and in 2 Tim 3:2 the term forms a connection between pagan disobedience and the behaviour of the false teachers.

Third, they are ἀδόκιμος, ‘rejected’,¹⁸⁹ a term applied to those who do not pass the test, hence ‘rejected’, ‘below standard’, ‘useless’, ‘worthless’. πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν shows that the testing ground is human actions. It is here that the test will be passed or failed. The question being asked is, What fruit has their faith (profession of knowledge of God) produced? The conclusion is that the opponents are useless, unfit for good works.¹⁹⁰ The whole phrase is used positively in 2 Cor 9:8 of good people who have abundant resources [to use] for all kinds of good works (cf. Eph 2:10). Equally, in Tit 3:1 (cf. 1 Tim 5:10) the phrase describes people after their conversion. So the heretical teachers have either gone back to their former state or never been converted. The man of God is fitted for good works, 2 Tim 3:17; cf. 2:21; heresy thus leads to and is characterised by a non-Christian way of life which is useless (cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 4B: πρὸς πᾶσαν πραγματείαν ἄχρηστον). See further **Excursus 6**. The thought here is manifestly of what is approved and commended by God as being morally good and acceptable.

EXCURSUS 4

The πίστις word-group in the Pastoral Epistles

Bultmann, R., and Weiser, A., *TDNT* VI,174–228; Bultmann 1955:II, 183f.; Easton, 202–4; Kretschmar 1982:115–40; Lips 1979:25–93; Marshall 1984:203–18; Marshall 1996b; Merk 1975:91–102; Michel, O., *NIDNTT* I, 593–606; Quinn 271–6; Towner 1989:121–9.

The vocabulary of faith plays a central role in the PE. The various items occur a total of 57 times, which is almost three times as high as one would have expected in comparison with the use of the word-group in the earlier epistles of Paul. In addition, negative forms occur four times.

πίστις itself occurs 33 times (1 Tim 19 times; 2 Tim 8 times; Tit 6 times). Five main types of usage can be distinguished.

(a) The usage which predominates is the articular form, ἡ πίστις.¹⁹¹ In this usage the reference is often to the content of what is believed, ‘the Christian faith’, i.e., a fixed body of doctrine comparable to ‘the truth’ (cf. 1 Tim 6:21 with 2 Tim 2:18). The usage could lead to the risk of faith becoming merely assent to certain revealed truths (cf. 1 Tim 3:9, ‘the mystery of the faith’), but a more active sense is apparent in 1 Tim 6:12; 2 Tim 2:18. In several cases the thought is of apostasy from ‘the faith’. This indicates that the subjective attitude of accepting Christian truth is present, i.e. that the point of using πίστις here is that it refers to that which is to be believed and which one is to continue to believe. Similarly, believers are nourished on the words of faith (1 Tim 4:6), a phrase which indicates that more than an intellectual grasp of truth is involved.

The tendency towards an objectification of ‘the faith’ has been seen as a ‘later’ development (cf. Lips 1979:29). The tendency, however, is found earlier in Paul (Gal 1:23: εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν; 1 Cor 16:13; 2 Cor 13:5; Phil 1:27). Moreover, in the PE the presence or absence of the article alone may not be a clear indication of the objective or subjective meaning. The usage in 2 Tim 3:10 (cf. Tit 2:2; Quinn, 273) shows that the presence of the article does not automatically demand an objective meaning. The anarthrous usage may on a few occasions refer to ‘the content of what is believed’ (especially in the phrase ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, 1 Tim 2:7, but possibly also in 1 Tim 3:13; 2 Tim 1:13). Consequently, the context and the verb or verbal ideas related to ‘faith/the faith’ will be better guides to meaning.

(b) Faith is associated with conversion (1 Tim 1:14; 5:12; 2 Tim 1:5; 3:15). On several occasions it is a continual activity or process (1 Tim 2:15; Tit 2:10; 3:15; cf. 1 Tim 3:13; Bultmann, R., *TDNT* VI, 212) and thus a key element in genuine Christian existence. In all these cases the emphasis lies on the continuance of an attitude which began at conversion, just as in 1 Peter where faith is the continuing attitude of the believer rather than the means of conversion (1 Pet 1:5, 7, 9, 21; 5:9).

(c) The phrase ἐν πίστει expresses the new situation brought about by the coming of faith. In 1 Tim 1:2 and Tit 1:4 ‘faith’ (in Christ) is the sphere or basis of the relationship between Christians (cf. Roloff, 58; Fee, 36). The parallel with Paul’s use of ‘in Christ’ in similar statements (Rom 16:3, 9f.; Gal 1:22; Philem 16, 23) is significant; the phrase expresses the nature of being a Christian in active terms and forms a complement to the Pauline objective description ‘in Christ’. The usage confirms that for the writer faith is the key characteristic of the Christian (cf. 1 Tim 1:5 [ἐκ]; 2 Tim 3:15 [διὰ]; Tit 1:1 [κατά]; ἐν πίστει, 1 Tim 1:2, 4; 2:7, 15; 3:13; 4:12; 2 Tim 1:13; Tit 1:13; 3:15).

(d) Faith is one of the qualities promoted by Christian teaching. The objective (1 Tim 2:7) and subjective (1 Tim 2:15) aspects are hard to disentangle (cf. 1 Tim 1:4; 4:12; 2 Tim 1:13; Tit 1:13).

(e) Faith is characteristically linked with other Christian virtues in lists of between two and nine items (1 Tim 1:5, 14, 19, 2:7, 15; 4:6, 12; 6:11; 2 Tim 1:13; 2:22; 3:10f.; Tit 2:2). Here it may appear to be simply ‘another Christian virtue’ of no greater importance than its companions. Faith is frequently paired with other virtues and is most frequently linked with love. A similar phenomenon is found in Gal 5:22 where it is part of the fruit of the Spirit, but occupies a subordinate position (cf. how it is not even mentioned in 2 Cor 6:4–10, and that here ‘Holy Spirit’ occupies an odd, subordinate position). In the lists in the PE faith appears each time except in the lists of qualities of church leaders, and in pairs it is generally the first named quality. It is a fair conclusion that faith is the attitude which determines the presence of the other qualities and is not simply one ‘virtue’ among many.

The verb πιστεύω (6 times) denotes the action and decision of believing in Christ or God (1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 1:12) and in the gospel (1 Tim 3:16) and those whose existence is now determined by that belief (Tit 3:8). In all of these cases the element of trust appears to be present, especially in 2 Tim 1:12.

God’s entrustment of the gospel ministry to Paul is expressed by ἐπιστεύθη (1 Tim 1:11; Tit 1:3) in a manner reminiscent of Paul (1 Cor 9:17; Gal 2:7; 1 Th 2:4; cf. Rom 3:2). On the use of πιστώ*** see 2 Tim 3:14 note.

The adjective πιστός (17 times) describes a characteristic of believers nine times.¹⁹² In an active sense, the meaning is ‘trusting’ (or ‘believing’) and the object is Christ or God (1 Tim 4:3, 10, 12; 5:16; 6:2a, 2b; Tit 1:6); in some of these cases the usage is tantamount to categorising a person as ‘Christian’. The thought of active belief, expressed in an appropriate way of life, is present (1 Tim 4:10; cf. 1 Tim 3:11; 6:2; Tit 1:6). The term is thus no formal or empty cypher. In the remainder of the occurrences ‘faithfulness’ in one sense or another is in view. Female deacons are to be faithful in every respect (1 Tim 3:11). πιστός is used once of Christ (2 Tim 2:13) in a context where his faithfulness is a foil to the possible unfaithfulness of Christians. Twice the term is used with special reference to church leaders who will not falsify the tradition and who will stand up to opposition and heresy (1 Tim 1:12; 2 Tim 2:2).

The negative forms in the πίστις word-group characterise existence outside of Christ. ἀπιστία is the state of unbelief (1 Tim 1:13**). ἄπιστος (1 Tim 5:8; Tit 1:15**) and ἀπιστέω (2 Tim 2:13**) view that state of existence from the perspective of behaviour that reflects unbelief.

This survey has shown that the usage is not significantly different from that of Paul. Nevertheless, questions persist regarding the trend in the PE. Various scholars have insisted that a form of ‘works righteousness’ is to be found in the PE, and that faith no longer has the consistently central position which it occupies in Paul.¹⁹³ This verdict flies in the face of the evidence. In 2 Tim 1:9 and Tit 3:4–7 we have pivotal statements which assert that the basis for God’s saving action lay not in works done by human beings but in his own gracious purpose. The language reflects tradition (cf. especially Eph 2:8–10), but the way in which it is put together is the work of the author himself. Here grace and works are placed in sharp contrast in an opposition which goes even deeper than the faith/works contrast which is characteristic of Paul’s *Hauptbriefe*. It has been claimed that there is no mention of faith in these two passages; Easton, 204, went so far as to claim that for the PE faith is not the basis of justification but its result. But faith is so widely present in the PE that its absence from explicit mention in these passages can hardly be regarded as a sign

of its unimportance for the writer. In any case, the absence is only apparent, since there is clear reference to it in 2 Tim 1:12 and Tit 3:8. It is to be explained by the thrust of the passages which is not to set up a contrast between faith and works as ways of receiving God’s salvation but rather to demonstrate that God’s saving action took place quite independently of what we had done (cf. Rom 9:11f., 16). The total disqualification of works is a clear indicator that the only possible response to grace is faith.

As in Paul, the need for faith to express itself in a new way of life is taught. For the use of the characteristic phrase ‘good works’ see **Excursus 6**.

EXCURSUS 5

συνείδησις in the Pastoral Epistles

Bultmann 1952:I, 216–20; Chadwick, H., *RAC* X, 1025–1107; Conzelmann, H., *Grundriss der Theologie des NT* (München: Kaiser, 1968), 204–6; Eckstein, H.-J., *Der Begriff Syneidesis bei Paulus* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983); Gooch, P. W., ‘“Conscience” in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10’, *NTS* 33 (1987), 244–54; Harris, B., ‘ΣΥΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ (Conscience) in the Pauline Writings’, *WTJ* 24 (1961–2), 173–86; Jewett 1971: 402–46; Lewis, C. S., *Studies in Words* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967²), ch. 8; Lips 1979:57–65; Lüdemann, G., *EDNT* III, 301–3; Maurer, C., *TDNT* VII, 898–919; Pierce, C. A., *Conscience in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1955); Roloff, 68–70; Spicq, C., *TLNT* III, 332–6; Stelzenberger, J., *Syneidesis im NT* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1961); Thrall, M. E., ‘The Pauline use of ΣΥΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ’, *NTS* 14 (1967), 118–25; Towner 1989:154–8. Wolter, M., ‘Gewissen II’ in *TRE* XIII (1984), 213–18.

1. Conscience in the Secular World and the Earlier Pauline Epistles

συνείδησις occurs six times in the PE, four times of the believer, modified by ἀγαθή or καθαρά (1 Tim 1:5, 19; 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3; cf. Acts 23:1; 24:16), twice of the opponents (1 Tim 4:2; Tit 1:15**). It occurs 14 times elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, and altogether 31 times in the NT (including Jn 8:9). It is virtually absent from the LXX (Wis 17:11; Job 27:6 [verb]; the use in Eccles 10:20 is non-technical; cf. Eccles 42:18 *v.l.*). The older view that the word in its developed moral sense was a technical term of Stoic philosophy has been refuted by Pierce* and Eckstein* who have shown that the usage is much more widespread. Up to the

Christian era conscience is always concerned with the consciousness or lack of consciousness of having committed a negative action. Only from the second century AD onwards do we find the ‘good conscience’ in secular Greek writings, although it can be traced earlier in Philo and Josephus¹⁹⁴ as well as in Latin literature.¹⁹⁵ Over against Pierce* who argued that the effect of conscience was to cause inward pain, Eckstein* claims that its effect is not so much to *cause pain* as rather to *act as a judge* on individual human actions.

The term may have entered the vocabulary of the NT through Pauline developments in anthropology.¹⁹⁶ According to Eckstein*, 312, in general conscience in Paul is an aspect of human beings, whether Jews, Christians or Gentiles, which has the function of controlling, assessing and bringing to consciousness the conduct of oneself or of other people according to given and recognised norms (cf. Rom 2:13; 9:1; 13:5; 1 Cor 8:7, 10, 12; 10:25, 27, 28, 29 [twice]; 2 Cor 1:12; 4:2; 5:11). It tends to be a neutral anthropological mechanism; when Paul qualifies it, he does so less directly with an adverbial participle construction (ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὕσα μολύνεται, 1 Cor 8:7; cf. 8:10), or present participle (αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν, 1 Cor 8:12). It is thus not in itself the source of moral norms but acts in accordance with given norms, and it is common to all people. For Paul the source of such norms is the mind (νοῦς). Consequently, the conscience is not the voice of God nor the mediator of revelation. It is not, as Philo might have it, the voice of God (*Det.* 145f.; *Post.* 59; Maurer, C., *TDNT* VII, 911–13), nor does Paul connect it explicitly with God. Nor is it the source of guidance for conduct.¹⁹⁷ Rather it acts as the judge on individual acts. Although in pre-Christian Greek the concept of the bad conscience predominates, in Paul we also find that conscience can establish his freedom from guilt, and therefore it is not a basically negative judge on human behaviour. Here Eckstein offers a correction to the rather onesided position of Pierce. He sums up: ‘For Paul conscience is a neutral, anthropological judge in human beings which assesses their conduct objectively according to given norms and makes them aware of it correspondingly, whether by criticising it or affirming it, and human beings stand in a relationship of being answerable to it’ (Eckstein*, 314).

2. *The Usage in the Pastoral Epistles*

The basis for the use in the PE is disputed. The problem is whether there is development of the earlier Paul’s use¹⁹⁸ or a more distinct divergence from Pauline thought.¹⁹⁹

The term certainly continues to be an anthropological idea in the PE, and clearly functions in relation to norms and behaviour. However, the qualification of the term in each occurrence (good, clean, defiled, seared) and its relation to acceptance or rejection of the faith, shows that it is viewed from a theological perspective and that the interest is in its condition, which is the result of belief or unbelief. Thus the use is not at all neutral, as in the earlier Paul; rather, in the setting of conflict, the writer views behaviour according to the positive possibilities and negative limits which the condition of the conscience permits (cf. Roloff 69). The opponents’ consciences are defiled (μεμιάνται, Tit 1:15²⁰⁰) and seared (κεκαυστηριασμένων [perf. pass.], 1 Tim 4:3).²⁰¹ In each case, the context indicates that the condition of the conscience results in some way from rejection of the apostolic faith (1:13, ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει; 1:14, ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν; 1 Tim 4:1, ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως) and that one outworking of this is false teaching and related, extreme behaviour patterns (cf. Lips 1979:58f.). Conversely, the condition of the genuine believer’s συνείδησις, described as ἀγαθὴ (1 Tim 1:5, 19; cf. Acts 23:1; Heb 13:18; 1 Pet 3:16) and καθαρὰ (1 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3), is closely related to adherence to the sound teaching of the apostolic faith, which issues in love and service.

Dibelius–Conzelmann, 18–20, comment that in Paul conscience is a general human phenomenon which judges and convicts past wrongdoing (so also in Jn 8:9; Heb 9:14; [10:22]). But they claim that this judging and convicting activity is different from what is expressed by the fixed formula ‘good conscience’; this phrase is found only in literature which ‘expresses a thought world both more strongly Hellenistic and closer to the vernacular, especially in those instances where one can see the influence of the Hellenistic synagogue and its language’. They further state that the opposite to a good conscience in the PE is not a ‘weak’ one as in Paul but an ‘evil’ one. Further, they allege that ‘The term

here implies the necessarily binding moral alternative, whereas in Paul it expresses the critical possibility of freedom in relation to the alternatives posed.’ They then go on to claim that the ‘good conscience’ ‘belongs among the qualities which characterize “Christian good citizenship”’. In a world which has no end in sight and where Christians must come to terms with life in society, ‘this view must work out lasting norms for behaviour’. Finally, the possession of a good conscience is ‘the best pillow’ for enjoying a peaceful Christian life. The whole phenomenon ‘is a sign of the transformation of an unbroken eschatological understanding of the world into a view which must reckon with the fact that, for the time being, the world is going to remain as it is (and that the Christians are to exist within it)’. No doubt they would be able to back up this interpretation by a contrast with 1 Cor 7:29–31:

What I mean, brothers, is that the time is short. From now on those who have wives should live as if they had none; those who mourn, as if they did not; those who are happy, as if they were not; those who buy something, as if it were not theirs to keep; those who use the things of the world, as if not engrossed in them. For this world in its present form is passing away.

Although this view is presented as a single comprehensive summing up of what conscience means in the PE, it raises in fact several distinct problems.

The issues may be sharpened by bringing in the verdict of Roloff. His argument is structured around the proposition that the concept of conscience in the PE cannot be seen as a development from the Pauline understanding in view of two deep-rooted differences. He comments:

1. The PE speak of a good conscience or of a pure conscience, in the sense of a reality or a positively given possibility, whilst the negative opposing concept (a bad or impure conscience) is significantly missing. The conscience is consequently here not as in Paul the authority that judges human conduct on the basis of previously given norms, but a state of consciousness which presents itself as the result of behaviour that corresponds with previously given norms. This talk of a good conscience stands in a clear tradition-historical continuity with the OT motif of a καθαρά καρδιά.

2. According to this the conscience is not a neutral anthropological entity for the PE but is theologically qualified through God’s action. In this it corresponds with πίστις with which it is closely tied up in 1:19: Faith and good conscience appear here as the two characteristics of Christian existence: faith signifies holding fast to the true preaching and teaching, whereas the good conscience signifies correspondence with the previously given norms for conduct (cf. 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3). But this correspondence to existing norms is not the ontological basis but only the cognitive basis for the presence of the good conscience. The PE are controlled by a basis in baptismal theology according to which the good conscience is the fruit of the end-time renewal of the heart given through the Spirit in baptism. The difference from Paul, therefore, consists primarily in the anthropological terminology, not however in the basic direction of the theological basis. Somewhat simplifying we can say: For the PE the good or pure conscience stands in the place which is taken in Paul by the νοῦς renewed in the end-time by the Spirit or the heart that is cleansed by the action of God. In no way is the good conscience in the PE the expression of an uncritical self-satisfied moralism; to assign it to the qualities which characterise bourgeois Christianity is an inappropriate simplification. (Roloff, 69f.; my translation)

The points raised by these scholars can be summed up as follows:

(a) There is a *significant difference* in the understanding of conscience from that which we find in Paul. For Roloff the shift is of such a kind that we cannot regard it as a simple development from the Pauline view; it is rather the development of a different set of theological ideas.²⁰² For Dibelius in particular, the understanding of conscience is part of his general theory of a serious deterioration in the dynamic understanding of Christianity that he finds in the PE in comparison with Paul himself. It is linked to the collapse of a living belief in the nearness of the parousia.

(b) The function of conscience is now seen as *prescribing conduct* rather than judging (mainly) past conduct. It corresponds more to the mind in Paul than to the conscience.

(c) Conscience is more a *continuous feeling* rather than an occasional judgement. The PE speak of a good conscience, i.e. a

continuing feeling that one is not guilty but rather is pleasing God, instead of the conscience as a seat of judgement which actively condemns or commends specific actions.

(d) Conscience operates *on the basis of fixed norms* rather than acting in some kind of freedom.

(e) For Dibelius the norms for conscience are now developed *on the basis of worldly standards* rather than being based on an eschatological view of the world. Instead of criticising the world, it goes along with its highest standards.

(f) Again for Dibelius the *idea of satisfaction* that one has done one's duty and can go to bed at peace with God and the world has come in. However, Roloff does not go along with this or the previous judgement.

3. Reassessing the Evidence

(a) A brief summary of the Pauline material is necessary. Bultmann argued that for Paul conscience involves a knowledge that there is a difference between right and wrong and it judges us for doing what is wrong. Its knowledge 'applies to that which is demanded of man' and the decisive thing is that it knows 'that there is such a thing [sc. a divine demand] at all', for it may err regarding the content of the demand (Bultmann 1952, I, 216–20, citation from 218). It is thus subject to a transcendent source of authority. Hence the question arises as to how conscience is aware of the demands placed upon us. H. Conzelmann comments that for Paul conscience does not set its own norms; 'the content is determined by God's command, i.e. by revelation and not by an autonomous moral code. The conscience is not the source of revelation but the understanding of the concrete requirements of God' (Conzelmann 1968:204). Conscience is common to all people, including non-Christians (Rom 2:15). Thus for Paul conscience acts on the basis of a prior knowledge of God's demands rather than in what Dibelius called 'critical freedom'.

Paul can refer to conscience when he wants to back up something that he has said or done which is right. When he makes a statement that might be challenged as false, he insists that his conscience bears witness in the Holy Spirit that he is telling the truth (Rom 9:1) or his conscience assures him that he has acted in a holy and sincere manner (2 Cor 1:12); in the same way he feels

that he can submit himself to the test of everybody's conscience in the church at Corinth that he has not acted deceitfully but has faithfully proclaimed the word of God (2 Cor 4:2; cf. 5:11). The same construction is used in Rom 2:15 where Paul talks of Gentiles who do the works of the law and show the work of the law written in their hearts — in their case their conscience bears witness to them and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even defend them. Here we see clearly that conscience bears witness in accusation or defence on the basis of obedience or disobedience to a knowledge of God's law which is independent of knowledge of the Jewish Torah. Thus conscience does not so much prescribe conduct as evaluate conduct in accordance with given norms.

In Rom 13:5 we have a somewhat stark reference to the Christian duty of submission to rulers 'not only because of the wrath but also because of conscience'. The point is that we should obey not merely because we shall suffer the penalty imposed by the ruler as the agent of God in maintaining justice if we do not do so, but much rather because of conscience. We shall be condemned by our conscience if we do not obey. Paul assumes that conscience will judge in accordance with the principle that rulers must be obeyed, but he does not say whether conscience formulates this principle or is already aware of it. In fact, of course, Paul has already formulated the principles on which conscience operates in this regard.

Finally, in 1 Cor 8–10 we have the discussion of people whose consciences are active in respect of the eating of food sacrificed to idols. The important point which emerges here is that different people's consciences may react in different ways to eating certain types of food. I need not be subject to another person's conscience (1 Cor 10:25–29). Further, some people have a 'weak' conscience (1 Cor 8:7–12). It is hard to distinguish here between the prescriptive and the judging activities of conscience.²⁰³ It should be noted incidentally that there is no suggestion that good and weak consciences are being contrasted, not least because Paul does not use the term 'good conscience' in this context. The weak conscience is to be respected, whereas the evil conscience is something to be condemned.

It seems, then, that for Paul conscience is so bound up with existing norms held by its bearer that there is no question of

freedom for the bearer in relation to his own conscience, even if other people's perceptions vary. In other words, conscience is prescriptive in the sense that for the individual its authority is absolute. In effect, conscience says to a person: if that is what you consider to be right, then you are condemned if you do not do it, because you are deciding to do what is not right — even if your perception of what is right is mistaken. Paul commends following conscience in that to do so is to recognise and follow moral principles, even if the principles may be somewhat mistaken.

(b) In the PE the terminology is somewhat different, but it is hard to see any real difference so far as prescriptiveness is concerned. On the contrary, conscience is closely tied to faith (1 Tim 1:5, 19; 3:9; cf. Tit 1:15): it is the knowledge of the faith which forms the basis for the judgements of conscience. Just as conscience is bound to given judgements in Paul, so too in the PE. Moreover, we find that the mind is also part of the psychological framework of the PE. The false teachers are corrupt in their minds (1 Tim 6:5; 2 Tim 3:8) and, most importantly, in Tit 1:15 both the minds and the consciences of the heretics are polluted. This shows that a clear distinction exists between these two organs, and we may suspect that the mind is connected with the knowledge of God and his will which forms the basis for the operation of conscience (Towner 1989:158). Conscience in the PE is thus not the equivalent of the 'mind' in Paul (Rom 12:2). It appears to operate just as much on given principles, and there is the same close connection with the mind or heart or Christian teaching which can lead to the conscience being thought of loosely as the source of moral judgement.

Further, if we ask whether it is the case that conscience is a judge in Paul and a continuing consciousness of not having done wrong in the PE, it can be replied that the line between the two is very thin in 2 Cor 1:12, which expresses a continuing verdict and consciousness; the same is true of Rom 9:1, which is about Paul's standing attitude to his people. Certainly it is a judge on specific actions in 1 Cor 8–10, but this passage deals with a different kind of topic; it is very much concerned with a specific situation, and therefore the judgement on specific actions is to the fore.

We may conclude that there is no great difference between the accepted letters of Paul and the PE as regards the place of moral

norms in relation to conscience and as regards the idea of conscience as expressing a continuing state of approval or lack of disapproval of one's actions.

(c) The major problem is the development of the use of attributes with conscience, such as a 'clean conscience'. For Roloff this expression is based on the 'clean heart' in Ps 51:10 (LXX 12) and has been developed in the baptismal theology reflected in Heb 10:22 and 1 Pet 3:21. In Hebrews believers are people whose hearts have been sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with clean water, while in 1 Peter baptism is a request to God for a good conscience (or a pledge from a good conscience). Curiously, Roloff makes no reference to Heb 9:14 where the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

The concept of a clean heart is found in 1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 2:22. The various interpretations of this phrase include: (i) a heart that has been forgiven and cleansed from guilt at conversion on the basis of the death of Christ; (ii) a heart that has been purified from evil thoughts and wrong ideas; (iii) a heart that is not conscious of guilt. 'Cleansed from past sin and wholeheartedly directed towards God' is F. Hauck's summary (*TDNT* III, 425). These motifs cannot be sharply separated from one another. In 1 Tim 1:5 a good heart appears to be one that has been cleansed from sin and is therefore a source of good motives; it is closely linked to a good conscience which also appears to be one that is in good working order. Similarly in 2 Tim 2:22 the good heart is the cleansed heart that is associated with calling on the Lord in prayer and is the source of right thoughts. It is not necessarily the same thing as a conscience that does not condemn, although they are linked.

We have, then, the concept of heart and conscience being cleansed from sin at conversion as part of the total renewal of the personality reflected in Tit 3:5. If this is not said explicitly about the conscience in Paul, it is at least strongly implied by the reference to the renewal of the mind in Rom 12:2.

Further, it is significant that the writer does distinguish between the heart and the conscience in 1 Tim 1:5 where they stand in parallel. When he refers to those who call on the Lord from a clean heart in 2 Tim 2:22 he is echoing biblical language.

There is no reason to suppose that he could equally well have used 'conscience' here, as if the two words were synonymous. This speaks against the view that we have a simple development from the idea of a 'clean heart' to a 'clean conscience'. Rather we have what I would call a cross-fertilisation of related ideas. The concept of conscience has not unnaturally acquired the concept of goodness/cleanness from the concept of the good/clean heart. But this does not mean that the use of conscience here should be disassociated from the Pauline usage. It was a natural development.

From this it follows that the concept of a good conscience may include the motif that it is in good working order rather than simply that it approves of all that I do. Arichea-Hatton, 73, make a careful distinction: 'A good conscience enables a person to make good judgement. A clear conscience, on the other hand, is possessed by people who have the conviction that they have done nothing wrong, and whose actions are not motivated by selfish desires.' The problem in the PE is opponents whose consciences do not work at all or are not heeded. It is not that they have bad consciences which condemn them. It is rather that they have given up obeying them, and so they fail to register. The absence of the phrase 'bad conscience' is said by Roloff to be 'significant'. On the contrary, the problem in the PE is manifestly that of people whose conscience is a stage worse than 'bad' in that it has been seared and has ceased to operate at all.

It has to be admitted that in other literature a good conscience appears to be the same as a clean conscience, one that is free from passing blame because the person has not done wrong. So Paul talks of his good conscience in Acts 23:1 and makes it his aim to have a conscience free of offence in Acts 24:16, and the author of Hebrews says that he and his companions have a good (καλός) conscience, as they endeavour to live properly in every way (Heb 13:16).

What we have in the PE would appear to be a development of this motif. On the one hand, it is essential that the conscience works in accordance with the norms it gains from the mind or from faith. The conscience is useless if it has been defiled, so that it gives wrong judgements, or seared, so that it does not operate at all. Hence the idea of being in good working order, operating on

true norms, is essential to the concept of a good conscience. On the other hand, the believer's aim is that this good conscience will also be 'clean' in that it does not condemn for an inconsistency between faith and action. Both motifs are present, but the emphasis may well shift to and fro between them.

(d) In all of this there is no basis for seeing any deterioration from the teaching of Paul. To be sure, Dibelius insists that he is not making a value judgement when he insists on recognising a difference in the teaching of the PE; rather there was a general change in the church's situation which meant that 'generally acceptable ethical standards' had to be formulated. Even so, it is impossible to avoid a certain pejorative tone in his characterisation of the teaching about conscience, including the suggestion that one can go peacefully to bed without worrying and live 'a peaceful life in blessedness and respectability'. Other scholars have not assented to this view. Roloff is sceptical of Dibelius' view that there is a somewhat debased understanding of conscience and the Christian life in general in the PE. Similarly, C. Maurer comments: 'At this point, then, the Pastorals are not the product of Christian respectability; they are a deliberate echo of the Pauline message of justification out of which they grew' (*TDNT* VII, 918). We should, in other words, trace the origin of the renewed conscience to that renewal by the Holy Spirit of which Tit 3:5 speaks so eloquently.

(e) A final question concerns how the PE see the source of the norms for conscience. The answer lies in such terms as 'the word', 'the teaching', and 'the gospel' which lay down a basis for Christian living in the revelation in Christ and through the apostles. A key verse here is Tit 2:12 which speaks of the educative role of the saving revelation of God: it teaches us to deny impiety and worldly lusts and to live soberly, righteously and piously in this age'. Here we have the clear evidence that the writer saw a very sharp distinction between the ways of life typical of the surrounding world and the way demanded of believers. He had to battle against the asceticism of his opponents who regarded foods and marriage as unclean and against the sinful desires and actions of the non-Christians, and he found the answer in the revelation of divine grace in Christ. P. Towner 1989:156 makes the important point that in each case the failure of

conscience to operate was due to ‘repudiation of the apostolic faith’ and that, correspondingly, conscience ‘stands on the line connecting correct belief and corresponding conduct’.

Whether defiled and ineffective or good and clean, the conscience functions to direct, evaluate and control behaviour along lines set by given norms. The connections suggest that correct, morally good decisions leading to godly conduct require acceptance of the apostolic faith (‘the truth’, ‘the sound teaching’, etc.), which forms the knowledge and thought patterns of the mind. Rejection of the truth is related to the ineffective conscience, which cannot translate corrupt doctrine into godly conduct.

EXCURSUS 6

Goodness and good works in the Pastoral Epistles

Grundmann, W., *TDNT* I, 10–18; Baumgarten, J., *EDNT* I, 5–7; Lock, 22f. Marshall 1984:203–18; Grundmann, W., and Bertram, G., *TDNT* III, 536–56; Beyreuther, E., *NIDNTT* II, 102–5; Wanke, J., *EDNT* II, 244f.: White, 101.

In Greek thought the concept of the *καλόν* refers to what is perfectly good in the moral sphere. The word can be used of what is organically sound, beautiful and morally good, and comes to mean that which has order and symmetry. It is obviously closely associated with *ἀγαθός*. However, in the LXX the concept of beauty is not important, and *καλός* is used of what is morally good. Paul uses *καλός* in the same sense as *ἀγαθός*.

καλός occurs twenty-four times in the PE, seven times of good works (1 Tim 5:10, 25; 6:18; Tit 2:7, 14; 3:8a, 14), once of a ‘good work’ (sing. Tit 3:1), and then of things that are pleasing to people (Tit 3:8b) or God (1 Tim 2:3). It can be a general term of approbation (1 Tim 1:8; 3:7, 13; 4:4, 6a; 6:19; 2 Tim 2:3), but it also develops a kind of technical sense to refer to something specifically Christian (‘the good teaching’, 1 Tim 4:6b; ‘the good warfare’, 1:18; ‘the good fight of faith’, 1 Tim 6:12a; 2 Tim 4:7; ‘the good confession’, 1 Tim 6:12b, 13; ‘the good deposit’, 2 Tim 1:14**).

By contrast *ἀγαθός* is found only ten times in the PE (1 Tim 1:5, 19; 2:10; 5:10; 2 Tim 2:21; 3:17; Tit 1:16; 2:5, 10; 3:1*). It is

used six times of good work(s) (*πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν*, 1 Tim 5:10; 2 Tim 2:21; 3:17; Tit 1:16; 3:1; *ἔργα ἀγαθά*, 1 Tim 2:10), twice of a good conscience (1 Tim 1:5, 19), once of the character of younger women (Tit 2:5) and once of faith (Tit 2:10).

The preponderance of *καλός* over *ἀγαθός* is also found in Mt; Mk; Jn; and Heb. Grundmann*, 550, suggests that apart from the phrase *καλὰ ἔργα*, which comes from Hellenistic Judaism, ‘the term derives from the popular usage influenced by Stoic ethics, and that it bears much the same sense as we found in Plutarch’. It thus expresses ‘a Hellenistic sense of values’ (Beyreuther*, 104), but Grundmann notes that the content of the term is derived from the gospel.

The two terms are, to be sure, largely synonymous. Both are grading terms used of persons, things and conduct. It may be helpful to list the definitions of usage of the two words given by LN. *ἀγαθός* (a) expresses ‘positive moral qualities of the most general nature’; (b) pertains ‘to having the proper characteristics or performing the expected function in a fully satisfactory way’; (c) pertains ‘to being generous, with the implication of its relationship to goodness’ (LN §§ 88:1; 65:20; 57:110). *καλός* has a wider, overlapping field of meaning. It pertains (a) ‘to a positive moral quality, with the implication of being favourably valued’; (b) ‘to having acceptable characteristics or functioning in an agreeable manner, often with the focus on outward form or appearance’; (c) ‘to providing some special or superior benefit’; (d) ‘to being fitting and at the same time probably good’; (e) ‘to being beautiful, often with the implication of appropriateness’; (f) ‘to having high status, with the possible implication of its attractiveness’ (LN §§ 88:4; 65:22; 65:43; 66:2; 79:9; 87:25). According to this analysis *ἀγαθός* is more expressive simply of inherent goodness and appropriateness and implies a strongly positive feeling of satisfaction, whereas *καλός* often has the additional element of outward attractiveness and beauty.²⁰⁴ *καλός* may thus carry the nuance of ‘beautiful’ in that the good deeds done by believers are seen as ‘attractive’.

The concept of ‘good work(s)’ plays an important role in the description of the Christian life in the PE. Apart from other usages (1:16a; 3:5; 2 Tim 1:9; 4:14) *ἔργον* occurs fourteen times in

singular and plural expressions, with either ἀγαθόν or καλόν (see above). In the Pauline corpus the singular ἔργον ἀγαθόν occurs most often (Rom 2:7; 13:3; 2 Cor 9:8; Phil 1:6; Col 1:10; 2 Th 2:17). But the plural does occur in Eph 2:10 (cf. Acts 9:36). The idea of ‘every good work’ (πᾶς with ἀγαθόν) generalises the singular to the point that it approaches a habitual activity. This appears in 2 Cor 9:8; Col 1:10 and 2 Th 2:17. The use of καλόν with ἔργον is unattested in the earlier Paul, but appears in the Synoptic tradition in plural form (Mt 5:16; 26:10; Mk 14:6; cf. Jn 10:32–33). Michel (1948:86) suggested that the Synoptic tradition may lie behind the καλόν configuration in the PE.

‘Good works’ in the earlier Paul describes the activity of the believer and the result of salvation.²⁰⁵ The concept in the PE is cast in the Pauline mould, depicting activities or a life of service that results from the experience of conversion and regeneration. The Christ-event is linked closely with ‘good works’. Tit 2:14 declares that the self-offering of Christ was designed to create a people zealous for good works. The thought is similar to Eph 2:10, which describes the goal of salvation in terms of a life characterized by ‘good works’.²⁰⁶ The linkage between Christ-event and life-style established in 2:14 and 3:3–7 forms the basis for the implicit command issued in 3:8 — ἵνα φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων—which applies to those who have placed their faith in God (προϊστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ). In 1 Tim 2:10 a similar connection is expressed by linking ‘good works’ to one’s profession to be a genuine Christian (θεοσέβεια = εὐσέβεια; see **Excursus 1**).

The concept of ‘good works’ is theologically determined. It is a way of characterising the whole of the Christian life as a work of God’s grace (the Christ-event) with visible results, the fruit produced by genuine faith (cf. Schwarz 1983:142–5). They manifest themselves in a variety of specific services done for others (1 Tim 5:10, rearing children, showing hospitality, humbly serving other believers; Tit 3:14, meeting practical needs; 1 Tim 6:18, sharing one’s wealth).

According to J. Baumgarten, good works have become ‘autonomous’ in the PE and are ‘viewed as the mark of being a good Christian’; (EDNT I, 7). J. Wanke goes further in asserting

that the PE have moved close to Stoic ethics so that ‘good works ... refers primarily to good social conduct on the part of Christians’; he claims that the frequency of use, especially as a qualifying adj. (12 times), which is not found in Paul, suggests an altered view of Christianity incorporating the idea of “‘reasonable’ and bourgeois conduct’ (EDNT II, 245). However, while the motif of maintaining a good reputation among people outside the church is present, here and elsewhere the stress is more on the fact that certain things are good because they are ordained or approved by God. To be sure, Wanke concedes that ethical conduct continues to be a consequence of divine grace, and the paraenesis is tied to the gospel. Nevertheless, it may be queried whether this assessment is a basis for asserting that the PE show ‘an altered understanding of Christianity’. Concern for the effect of actions on outsiders is found already in Paul (Rom 12:17; 13:1–7; 1 Th 4:12), and he stresses the importance of good works (2 Cor 9:8; Eph 2:10; Col 1:10; 2 Th 2:17) which would be seen as good by outsiders (Rom 13:3; cf. 1 Pet 2:12). It is undeniable that there is a greater stress on good works in the PE, but this is no basis for claiming an ‘altered understanding of Christianity’. The difference from Paul is one of degree rather than of kind.

IIA. TEACHING FOR THE CHURCH — HOW BELIEVERS ARE TO RELATE TO ONE ANOTHER (2:1–15)

Padgett, A., ‘The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1–10’, *EvQ* 59 (1987), 39–52; Weiser, A., ‘Titus 2 als Gemeindepäranese’, in Merklein, H. (ed.), *Neues Testament und Ethik. Festschrift für R. Schnackenburg* (Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 397–414.

The whole of 2:1 to 3:11 forms a single instructional unit that may be broken into two sections: 2:1–15; 3:1–11.

2:1–10 addresses the lives of believers according to their social position. The material is concerned not so much with how people should believe in the church but rather with their behaviour in the home and society at large (cf. Johnson, 232). 2:11–14 provides the theological support and grounds for the paraenesis, and is followed by v. 15 which connects the inserted piece of doctrine into the flow of the letter.

3:1–2 and 8–11 take up the Christian's relation to the State and the matter of false teachers respectively; the former instructions seem to be based on traditional material, which circulated independently (cf. Rom 13:1–7) or was attached (perhaps loosely) to one line in the development of the household code paraenesis (cf. 1 Pet 2:13–3:12) to apply it to the Cretan community (see below). In the midst of this last teaching section is another piece of theology (3:3–7), which grounds the practical teaching in a way similar to 2:11–14.

The whole section (2:1–3:11) is not so much teaching (*Lehre*) but rather information, advice, and instruction (*Belehrung*) in the form of instructions about what Titus is to teach others and how he himself is to be an example to them; the material is directed to the church leader, who will then mediate it to the groups (cf. Hasler, 91). Through Titus church leaders are addressed.

At the beginning of the section (2:1) the author intentionally introduces a sharp contrast with the opponents and turns his attention to the believers in the community. The progression from discussing how heretics behave to how Christians/leaders should behave is common in the PE (1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 2:1; 3:10, 14; 4:5; cf. Brox, 292). At some points the instructions intentionally contrast Christian qualities with the failings of the opponents. Genuine Christian behaviour, that which results from conversion (2:11–14; 3:3–7; cf. Wolter 1988:130–5; Weiser*, 407), is presented as the antithesis to the behaviour characteristic of heresy. The contrasting picture (σὺ δέ, v. 1) is summed up in the immediate reference to ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία (v. 1; cf. 1:9) which is then filled out with more detailed ethical instructions. Christian behaviour is 'sound in faith' (v. 2, ὑγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει; cf. 1:13), marked by 'good deeds' (vv. 7, 15; cf. 1:16), and corresponds to and adorns the teaching of God (vv. 5, 7, 10; cf. 1:11, 14). The concluding use of ἔλεγγε (v. 15; cf. 1:9, 13) underlines the connection of this paraenesis to believers with the polemic.

There may be additional points of contrast (cf. Weiser*, 405f.). It is possible that the destructive activity of the false teachers 'in households' is to be counteracted by the 'good teaching' (καλοδιδασκάλους) of older women (2:3).

Insubordinate behaviour characterises the opponents (ἀνυπότακτοι, 1:10), but subjection in certain relationships (ὑποτάσσομαι, 2:5, 9; cf. 3:1) is what adorns the gospel.

Within the description of Christian behaviour, the stress is on being σώφρων (2:2, 4, 5, 6, 12), and there is frequent justification of the rules with purpose clauses (2:4, 5, 8, 10; cf. vv. 12, 14). The aim is to avoid outside calumny. The language used indicates a tacit acceptance of the natural and social order, in contrast to revolutionary behaviour (cf. Spicq, 616). Above all, however, the teaching is grounded in the Christ-event. This theological foundation indicates that the life enjoined here transcends a secular lifestyle (Hasler, 91f.; *pace* Brox, 294; Merkel, 97). Conversion is necessary, and respectability serves the gospel ministry.

In view of the contrast thus created and the repetition of key ethical themes, it is extremely unlikely that the teaching was adopted in a haphazard and thoughtless manner. The writer enjoins believers in their respective household and community positions to conduct themselves in ways that will neutralise the deleterious effects of the heresy.

The material is presented in the form of instruction that is to be given by Titus. The general command in v. 1 is developed in terms of four categories of people, older men (v. 2); older women (who are to teach the younger women in their role as wives, vv. 3–5); younger men (vv. 6–8); slaves (vv. 9–10); it is backed up by a doctrinal statement (vv. 12–14) and a final exhortation to Titus to teach with authority (v. 15).

EXCURSUS 7

Household codes and station codes

Balch 1981; Balch, D. L. in *ABD* III (1992), 318–20; Berger 1984a:1049–88; Berger 1984b:135–41; Crouch, J. E., *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Household* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972); Dunn, J. D. G., 'The Household Rules in the New Testament', in Barton, S. C. (ed.), *The Family in Theological Perspective* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1996), 43–63; Easton, B. S., 'New Testament Ethical Lists', *JBL* 51 (1932), 1–12; Fiedler, P., *RAC* XIII. 1063–72; Fitzgerald, J. T., in *ABD* III, 80f.; Gielen 1990; Goppelt 1982:168–71; Goppelt 1993:162–79; Goppelt, L., 'Jesus und die "Haustafel"-Tradition', in Hoffmann, P. (ed.), *Orientierung an Jesus. FS J.Schmidt* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), 93–106; Hartman, L., 'Some Unorthodox Thoughts on the "Household-

Code Form". in Neusner, J., *et al.*, *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 219–32; Lips 1994:261–80; Lührmann, D., 'Neutestamentliche Haustafeln und antike Ökonomie,' *NTS* 27 (1981), 83–97; Martin, R. P., *NIDNTT* III, 928–32; Motyer, S., 'The relationship between Paul's gospel of "All one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28) and the "household codes"', *Vox Evangelica* 19 (1989), 33–48; Müller, K.-H., 'Die Haustafel des Kolosserbriefes und das antike Frauenthema: Eine kritische Rückschau auf alte Ergebnisse', in Dautzenberg, G., *Die Frau im Urchristentum* (Freiburg: Herder, 1988), 263–319; Schrage, W., 'Zur Ethik der neutestamentlichen Haustafeln', *NTS* 21 (1974–5), 1–22; Schroeder, D., 'Die Haustafeln des Neuen Testaments' (unpublished Th.D dissertation, Hamburg, 1959); Streckler, G., 'Die neutestamentliche Haustafeln (Kol 3, 18–4,1 und Eph 5, 22–6, 9)', in Merklein H. (ed.), *Neues Testament und Ethik, FS R. Schnackenburg* (Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 349–75; Thraede, K., 'Zum historischen Hintergrund der "Haustafeln" des Neuen Testaments', in Dassmann, E. (ed.), *Pietas. FS B. Kötting* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1980), 359–68; Towner, P. H., *DPL*, 417–19; Wagener 1994:15–66; Weidinger 1928:53f.

The understanding of the church in the PE is largely based on the concept of the household of God (1 Tim 3:15; cf. 2 Tim 2:20f.). Overseers are to act as God's stewards placed in charge of his household (Tit 1:7), and an analogy is drawn between the human household and the church (1 Tim 3:5). This theological development is partly to be explained by the way early Christian groups met in houses and may have consisted largely of members of individual households. It is understandable that in this context teaching developed on the relationships between the different members of the household.

A carefully structured form of such instruction, commonly referred to as a 'household code', is seen in Col 3:18–4:1 and Eph 5:21–6:9 where the respective reciprocal duties of wives and husbands, children and fathers, and slaves and masters are set out. In both cases the duties of the first-named in each group are expressed in terms of subjection and obedience, while the second-named are to show such qualities as love, care and justice.

A similar, related structure is found in 1 Pet 2:13–3:7. The term 'station code' may be more appropriate here for teaching that is concerned with behaviour appropriate to one's position or 'station' in society generally. Here a general instruction on subjection to human authorities precedes instruction to household slaves (but not masters), wives and husbands, and there is no

mention of children and parents. A general instruction to all believers follows. Later in the epistle instruction is given to elders followed by a command to younger people to be subject to the elders (1 Pet 5:1–5). Here a shift in address from the members of the household to the members of the church appears to have taken place.¹

In the PE relationships within the church and the family similarly appear to be principally in mind.² In Tit 2 there is instruction categorised by age and sex. It is addressed first to older men and older women concerning their deportment in general terms. The latter are to instruct the younger women on their marital duties; Titus himself is to instruct the younger men (but no mention is made of their marital situation). Slaves are to be subject to their respective masters and everybody is to be subject to the rulers of the State. There is no instruction given to husbands or to masters of slaves; reciprocity within family relationships is not used as a framework for the instruction. In 1 Tim 2 women are to be in subjection (apparently to their husbands or guardians). In 1 Tim 6:1–2 slaves are to be subject to their respective masters, and this applies whether the masters are non-believers or believers. Again, there is no corresponding instruction to husbands and masters.

The 'codes' in 1 Pet and Tit 2–3 thus differ from those in Col and Eph in significant features: (a) the absence of the parent/child category; (b) the addressing of only slaves and not masters; (c) the absence of instruction to husbands in Tit (here 1 Pet stands with Col and Eph); (d) the teaching on subordination to the State; (e) the preference for *ὑποτάσσομαι* (used throughout) over *ὑπακούω* (used in Col and Eph of slave and child) and *δεσπότης* of the masters (Col and Eph use *κύριοι*) (f) the care taken to ground instruction with theological material (Tit 2:11–14; 3:3–7; 1 Pet 2:21–24; 3:18–22). The differences are sufficient to justify restricting the term 'household codes' to those which are structured in terms of reciprocal relationships in the household and to use the term 'station codes' for those which are structured in terms of positions in society both within and outwith the household.

The existence and character of this teaching raises a number of problems regarding its origin, development and significance.

A full discussion of the origin lies outside the scope of the present treatment. Weidinger's formative work (1928) stressed the influence of Stoicism³ and argued that the household code found its way into NT paraenetic teaching through the teaching codes used in Hellenistic Judaism which had been influenced to greater or less extent by Stoic duty codes. Crouch* pointed to non-Stoic features and claimed that the household codes were essentially Jewish. Goppelt* and Schroeder* stressed the need to take into account the Jesus tradition and early Christian paraenesis, while not disputing the presence of other influences.

More recent scholarship has shifted attention to the social institution of the οἶκος. The ancient household and the teaching that grew up to regulate and preserve that institution have been thought to provide the most instructive background to the categories and method of instruction of the NT household codes. The use of teaching structured according to household roles and distinctions between persons in the household, as well as the devices of addressing three pairs of people and inculcating reciprocal duties (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1:1253b:1–14), provide a credible background to the structure of the household codes in Ephesians and Colossians (Thraede*; Luhrmann*; Balch* 1981; Lips 1994:262f.).

Attention has been drawn to the existence of a 'tract' literature which includes the Neopythagorean letters to wives, stressing the need for subordination (Berger* 1984b:140; cf. Malherbe 1986:82–5 [§§ 34f.]), and this has been taken up critically by Wagener 1994:54–63 who argues for an especially close relationship with the material in the PE.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that there is no exact parallel to the form that has been called a NT household code (Thraede*, 360; Hartman*; Lips 1994:280), and in the NT itself there is a variety of forms of such instruction. The term *Gattung* is thus obviously an inappropriate description of the form. The common features present in Col 3:18–4:1; Eph 5:21–6:9; 1 Pet 2:18–3:7; Tit 2:1–3:2 suggest a relationship perhaps better described with a term like *topoi* (Lips 1994:265).

What may be regarded as the 'purest' household codes are those found in Col and Eph with their discussion of the reciprocal

groups found in the typical household. The pattern in Tit and 1 Pet is somewhat different. As Lips argues, the common shape of the tradition in Tit and 1 Pet is not accidental; the addition of the instruction about the State is evidence of a new, common schema. But the way in which this has developed is disputed.

On the one hand, the tendency to drop the reciprocity in addressing only slaves and the absence of the parent and child category in 1 Pet and Tit lead some scholars to the conclusion that the form was developed further, in almost evolutionary fashion from an original form, in the direction of a 'church order' and the content reduced or otherwise altered (e.g. Herr 1976).

On the other hand, Lips regards it as more probable that something like two parallel traditions are indicated rather than one which has suffered loss or been transformed. He argues that the similarities between the household codes in Tit and 1 Pet over and against Col and Eph show that a new form developed along a line different from that followed in Col and Eph, and that the teaching contexts will have determined the resulting forms. When Tit 2 deals not with husbands and wives, parents and children, but rather with older men and women and younger women and men (cf. 1 Pet 5:5 and the structure of the brief instruction to Timothy in 1 Tim 5:1f.), these represent groups in the church on the basis of age, and hence reflect a 'patriarchal' hierarchy in society which formed the framework within which the church had to structure itself. That the process was not without difficulty is seen in the elevation of younger people like Timothy and (in all probability) Titus to office and the resultant difficult relationships with older people who probably resented their position and found it hard to come to terms with it.

There are also differences between 1 Pet and Tit. The theology used to ground the ethical materials is not the same. Tit uses confessional material to emphasise the ethical consequences of the Christ-event. 1 Pet uses christological material that depicts Christ as the model of suffering. The situations are different. 1 Pet addresses a church in the midst of suffering; Tit is dealing with problems caused by heretical teachers, problems which also necessitated laying down careful guidelines for the selection of leaders. These factors influence the form and manner of

instruction (e.g. the theological material chosen to ground the ethical teaching).

The codes in 1 Pet and Tit 2 further differ in terms of literary style. 1 Pet addresses the church directly, while Tit, written to an individual, transmits instructions indirectly through the apostolic co-worker to the church (cf. Wolter 1988:156–202). To a much greater degree than in other NT codes, the instructions to various groups in Tit 2:2–3:2 incorporate lists of qualities to be pursued and vices to be avoided. This shape may have been consciously created to conform to the duty code employed in Tit 1:5–9, with the intention being to link the conduct required of leaders with that required of Christians in general and to surround the negative description and denunciation of the false teachers (1:10–16) with a contrasting picture of genuine Christian behaviour.

A great deal of effort has gone into discovering the motives or intentions underlying the NT household code tradition: accommodation to secular ethics (Weidinger*, Dibelius); mission (Schroeder*, Goppelt); quieting enthusiastic unrest (Crouch*) and the endeavour by some women to practise church leadership and sit loose to family duties (MacDonald 1983; Verner Wagener); defence-apologetic (Balch* 1981). On the whole, though not exclusively, the NT household codes take up the issue of Christian living at the point of everyday life, for which household roles and the household context provided the typical forum. Lips suggests that the household represents a ‘third’ unique category within (or alongside) the church. Pauline teaching, he argues, makes a distinction between those within the church, believers to whom the language of ‘one another’ applies (1 Th 4:9, 18; 5:11, 15), and those on the outside, unbelievers, described as οἱ ἕξω (4:12) or ‘all’ (5:14, 15). The two categories also appear in Romans; ‘one another’ in 12:5, 10, 16; 13:8 and ‘all’ in 12:17, 18; 13:7. The household code represents a teaching formula addressed to a third group, the household, which Paul also identified and addressed as a separate (though not unrelated) entity in the church, consisting of men (husbands)/women (wives) (cf. 1 Cor 7; 1 Th 4:3–5); masters/slaves (cf. Philem). It might be added that in this third group it was possible to have believers and unbelievers existing side by side (cf. 1 Pet 3:1; 1 Tim 6:1).

Goppelt is certainly correct that life lived at this level in the various social roles gave Christians and the church automatic access to unbelievers and daily opportunities to testify to the faith (Goppelt* 1982:170). But whether the household codes were specifically missionary in orientation in every NT application is another question. What can be said is that through them the NT writers reflect sensitivity to the expectations of society at large and seem to encourage Christians to live according to patterns that were widely accepted as respectable. In Tit 2, as also elsewhere, the obvious grounding of a lifestyle described in popular ethical language (σώφρων, σεμνός) in the Christ-event (2:11f.) reveals the attempt to communicate something about Christian values.⁴ The writer uses understandable terms, that are by no means arbitrary (*contra* Brox, 292, 297) and works in the context of social roles that are fundamental to society (see Excursus 1). The intention of the teaching must be determined from statements of motivation (the ἵνα clauses of 2:5, 8, 10), secular perceptions of the behaviour encouraged and prohibited, and other contextual factors (theological basis, 2:1–14; 3:3–7; the contrasting picture of the false teachers).

a. Preface (2:1)

The opening sentence is a general instruction to Titus that acts as a heading for what follows. The pronoun and adversative take up the contrast motif, which sets apart Titus’s ministry from the activities of the false teachers. Titus is to give the following teaching, the whole of which represents the antithesis and apostolic response to the false teaching (1:10–16; Weiser*, 405; Holtzmann 481; cf. Wolter 1988:134f.). The command also establishes a connection that is fundamental to the teaching of the PE, namely, that Christian conduct (which Titus is to address in this passage) bears a direct relationship to the accepted, apostolic doctrine of the church. This connection is completed with the insertion of the theological material in 2:11–14.

EXEGESIS

1. **Σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ** σὺ δέ, ‘But you, for your part’, is a paraenetic device in the PE for commanding or commending pursuit of a course that is the opposite of the false teachers (1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 3:10; 3:14; 4:5;

cf. Rom 11:17; 2 Tim 2:1 [σὺ οὖν]).⁵ It functions similarly elsewhere in the NT to distinguish approved behaviour and responses from those which are disapproved.⁶ The device was widely used in paraenetic materials.⁷ λαλέω (2:15; 5:13**) originally meant ‘to babble, stammer’, then ‘to chatter’, and finally simply ‘to speak, talk’. According to Hübner, it differs from λέγω in that it is rarely used in the NT in the sense ‘to say that ...’ or followed by indirect discourse. It tends — but it is only a tendency — to be used more of the ability to speak, and the accent lies more on the act of speaking than on the content of what is said; there is the possible implication of more informal usage than with λέγω (LN I, § 33:69–70). In any given case the context will determine what kind of speaking is meant. Here the verb is used formally of Christian proclamation, instruction and teaching (rather than of conversation in accord with wholesome instruction, Parry, 78). For its connection elsewhere with διδαχή/διδάσκω and other revelatory activities, see Acts 17:19; 18:25; 1 Cor 2:6; 14:6 (cf. 1 Tim 5:13 where the reference is perhaps to false teaching). The section is closed with a summary using the same verb (2:15).⁸ Oberlinner, 105f., suggests that the verb is chosen, however, because the context is what the church members are to do, and Titus is to be an example to those who do not teach but who do converse in ways that are in accord with sound teaching.

ἄ is used without an expressed antecedent, as in 1:11. The content is explained by vv. 2–10 or 2:2–3:11. Ethical conduct that befits orthodox teaching is the theme. πρέπει, ‘to be fitting, seemly, suitable’, describes actions which are appropriate according to the people or circumstances concerned.⁹ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ (dat. of respect) indicates that in respect of which Titus’s teaching is to be ‘appropriate’. Thus the apostolic teaching provides the norm. For ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία see 1:9 note. The implication would seem to be that here Titus is to teach people about the kind of behaviour that is in accordance with sound doctrine.

b. To Older Men (2:2)

The first category of instructions concern older people. They call them to a life that is respectable in every way. There is nothing particularly applicable to older people here, the qualities being

those expected in all believers. Rather, the qualities associated with self-control and decorous behaviour alone are singled out as especially important. Four qualities are described, the last of which is developed with the triad of Christian qualities, faith, love, patience. The first three (νηφάλιος, σεμνός, σώφρων) are also used in the duty codes of Tit 1 and 1 Tim 3 of church leaders, who are to exemplify the qualities which typify the normal Christian life. The second and third terms (σεμνός, σώφρων) especially were standard items in the secular description of respectability. The difference lies in the theological grounding of behaviour in the Christ-event (see Excursus 3).

TEXT

2. νηφάλιος The spelling is varied (cf. 1 Tim 3:2, 11); see Elliott, 48.

EXEGESIS

2. Πρεσβύτας νηφαλίους εἶναι, σεμνούς, σώφρονας, ὑγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ In the NT πρεσβύτες, ‘old man’,¹⁰ always refers to older men rather than to church ‘elders’, whereas πρεσβύτερος can refer to either group; if the qualities required in them are the same as for elders, it is because the elders would be largely chosen from this group, and in any case there was no double standard for the congregation and its leaders (cf. Fee, 185). The determination of what is meant by ‘old’ is not clear. The Greeks divided life into various ages. Dio Chrysostom 74:10 gives four ages: παῖς; μεράκιον; νεάνισκος; πρεσβύτες. Philo, *Spec.* 2:33 follows Lev 27:7 in regarding people over 60 as old; cf. CD 10:7f. which forbids men over 60 from holding office (Nauck 1950:80f.). A more detailed division is given in *Abot* 5:21. According to the rather stylised comment in Philo, *Opif.* 105, following Hippocrates, human life was divided into seven ages: παιδίον (0–7); παῖς (8–14); μεράκιον (15–21); νεάνισκος (22–28); ἀνὴρ (29–49); πρεσβύτης (50–56); γέρων (57–). In terms of this list, the group addressed here would consist of all people over 50. But there was also a rough division into young and old with the boundary set at the age of 40, and the NT writers appear to follow this. There is no doubt that people aged 30 were still ‘young’ (Polybius 18:125 refers to Flaminius as young at this age; cf. Bernard, 70n.). Agrippa, aged c. 40 was a ‘young man’ (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:197). According to Aulus Gellius

10:28 soldiers are *minores* up to age 46. Irenaeus, *A.H.* 2:22:5, states that one was young up to age 40.

The construction is not clear: the phrase *πρεσβύτας εἶναι* may be (a) acc. and inf. dependent on *λαλεῖ* (Holtzmann, 481; Lock, 139; Spicq, 616); (b) dependent on *πρέπει*; (c) dependent on an implied *παρακάλει* as in 2:6 (BD § 389; Oberlinner, 104f.); (d) an example of the imperatival inf.¹¹ Although household tables normally use imperatives, this section with its adjectives has more the appearance of a ‘catalogue of duties’ than of a set of rules to be obeyed (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 139). Nevertheless, whether a verb of exhortation (in the second person singular to Titus) is to be supplied, or it is dependent on *λαλεῖ/πρέπει* above, or functions on its own, the force and intention of the teaching is not obscured.

The first quality required is sobriety. *νηφάλτος* means ‘temperate’ (in use of wine), ‘sober’ (see Excursus 3). Here the term may have the metaphorical sense ‘sober, alert, watchful’ but the literal command in v. 3 suggests that a literal sense is required here also. A reference to temperate use of wine might also have been an apt rejoinder to the gluttony in 1:12 (Spicq, 617).

The second quality is seriousness. *σεμνός* is ‘worthy of respect’, ‘serious’ (1 Tim 3:8, 11; Phil 4:8***). It is a quality or bearing which is observable, will elicit the respect of other people, and which is exhibited before God and people. It was regarded as a desirable virtue in older men (Cicero, *De Sen.* 4:10, cited by Quinn, 131). See Excursus 3.

The third quality is self-control. *σώφρων* (Excursus 3) is ‘sensible’, showing the proper restraint in all things. It is one of the basic marks of the Christian life in the PE (just as in Greek culture), being a possibility which the author links directly with the Christ-event and conversion (2:12).

ὕγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ The fourth requirement indicates that ‘soundness’, the fourth quality, is to penetrate to the whole of Christian life.¹² For the three qualities being linked (but not necessarily forming a group, so Holtzmann, 482) cf. 1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 3:10; 1 Th 1:3; Ignatius, *Poly.* 6:2. Essentially, the traditional triad, faith, hope (for which patience is substituted here), and love is an abbreviated way of referring to

the whole of the Christian life. For *ὕγιαίνω* see 1:9 note; 2 Tim 1:13. It expresses the opposite of being spiritually sick (cf. 1 Tim 6:4). The command is to avoid unsoundness or disease in the Christian life, depicted by the triad of Christian virtues.

The use of the verb (*ὕγιαίνω*) in the polemic already shows that being healthy in faith means being firm and free from contamination by error (cf. Spicq, 607). *πίστις* (see Excursus 4) with the article may mean the objective content of the faith (the Christian religion), but in view of the link with love and endurance here and of the similar lists of virtues in 1 Tim 4:12; 6:11; 2 Tim 2:22; 3:10, it is more likely the act of believing which then defines the Christian life in terms of loyalty to God and Christ (cf. Bernard, 165; Knight, 306; Quinn, 132).

ἀγάπη is always a quality of Christians in the PE, and is always linked with other qualities, especially faith.¹³ ‘In love’ signifies, negatively, hating evil. Positively, it defines the Christian life in terms of cleaving to the good and expressing that good in selfless service to others (Towner 1989:300 n. 77).

Of the thirteen occurrences of *πίστις* in the PE, nine are in connection with *ἀγάπη* (1 Tim 1:5, 14; 2:15; 4:12; 6:11; 2 Tim 1:13; 2:22; 3:10; Tit 2:2). This combination also occurs eight times in the earlier Paul (1 Cor 13:13; Gal 5:6, 22; 1 Th 3:6; 5:8; Eph 6:23; Col 1:4; 2 Th 1:3; Philem 5), which suggests the use of a Christian paraenetic tradition (cf. Vögtle 1936:51, 171; Lips 1979:79). The Pauline expression in Gal 5:6 reduces Christian existence to the lowest common denominator as *πίστις δι’ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* — fellowship with God/Christ in the Spirit (Gal 5:22) yielding practical fruit in the form of service to others.¹⁴

This pair of qualities may have formed the essential combination out of which the threefold (and longer) lists developed. The ‘faith, hope, love’ triad of 1 Cor 13:13¹⁵ is probably a set paraenetic summary of the essential Christian qualities. But the tendency to expand and develop is readily seen in Paul (Rom 5:1–5; Gal 5:22f.; Eph 6:23), and the influence of the Hellenistic virtue list upon the shape of Paul’s teaching is likely.¹⁶

ὑπομονή, ‘endurance, patience’ (1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 3:10**) ¹⁷ is the element of constancy and perseverance which maintains

faith and love in the face of opposition and every temptation to discouragement until the believer reaches the end of the long journey. It thus puts up with difficulties caused by other people (often expressed by μακροθυμία, 1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 3:10; 4:2) as well as with trying circumstances. It may well be a replacement for 'hope', the traditional element in the triad (1 Tim 6:11; cf. Ignatius, *Poly.* 6:2; 1 Th 1:3), and the reason may be the need to stress the ingredient of patient perseverance in the face of opposition to the faith (Kelly, 240; Fee, 186; cf. Hanson, 179); Radl claims that in the PE the motif is that of not lapsing from the faith but remaining true to Christ throughout the long wait till death or the parousia. The quality is prominent in Heb (10:36; 12:1) and Rev (1:9; *et al.*) as well as being a key term in the earlier Paul (Rom 5:3f.; *et al.*).

c. To Older (and Younger) Women (2:3–5)

Trummer, P., 'Einehe nach den Pastoralbriefen', *Bib* 51 (1970), 471–84.

The next section concerns older women and continues syntactically in the same way as v. 2. Through the purpose statement, vv. 4–5, younger women are indirectly instructed. The qualities required for the older women are very similar to those for the women in 1 Tim 3:11 and those for the younger women match 1 Tim 5:14 (Hanson, 180). The virtues commended are also found in secular writers.¹⁸

In this household (or community) code paraenesis, the sense is that they are also, like the old men, to exhibit the appropriate qualities. These are described with a general reference to demeanour which is holy, followed by two specific kinds of behaviour to avoid and one to pursue.

The general reference is clearly to holy conduct, as befits God's people. Two activities which are strongly inconsistent with such a demeanour are forbidden; loose talk of a slanderous and scandalous character and addiction to alcohol are linked together in ancient sources and frequently condemned.

The final quality is transitional to the next point: the older women's responsibility to the younger women: they are to be their teachers, largely through example and informal instruction. They are to encourage the younger women to be fully engaged in carrying out their domestic duties as befits Christian women. In view of the authority structure implied by the household code¹⁹

and in view of 1 Tim 2:12, the reference can hardly be to a recognised teaching office (*contra* Trummer*, 476; cf. Theodoret III, 703 Schulze = PL LXXXII, 863). The context implies that the primary object of the teaching pertains to conduct that befits a Christian wife (vv. 4–5, including the kind of qualities mentioned in v. 3). This would suggest informal teaching by example and admonition.²⁰

TEXT

3. ἱεροπρεπεῖς ἱεροπρεπεῖ (C 33 81 104 *pc* latt sy^p sa Cl.). Elliott, 181, suggests that the variant arose because scribes did not realise that the adjective qualified 'older women'.

μη (2) (Σ² D F G H Ψ 33 TR latt sy^h Cl; WH mg): μηδέ (Σ* A C 81 1739 1881 *pc* sy^p WH non mg.; Holtzmann, 482; Kilpatrick; Elliott, 137). Elliott, 137, argues that μη is assimilation to 1 Tim 3:8, and cites 1 Tim 2:12; 6:7 for the usage. A similar textual problem arises in 2:10.

σωφρονίζουσιν σωφρονίζουσιν (Σ* A F G H P 104 326 365 1241 1505 *pc*; Holtzmann, 482) is an orthographical variant, Elliott, 181; cf. 3:8. But it could also be indicative, as in 1 Cor 4:6; Gal 4:17.

5. οἰκουρούς The word is a Hellenistic variant of οἰκουρός (a Cl. word found here as a *v.l.* in Σ² D² H 1739 1881 TR). The text is preferred by Elliott, 181f.; Metzger, 585. Bernard, 163 and 167, preferred the Cl. word on the grounds that it gave a better meaning in the context, but this argument holds only if the two words had different meanings. See below.

ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ Add καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία (C *pc* vg^{ms} sy^h). The addition is assimilation to 1 Tim 6:1; Elliott, 182.

EXEGESIS

3. Πρεσβύτιδας ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς, μη διαβόλους μη οἴνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας, καλοδιδασκάλους πρεσβύτις*** is 'old, elderly woman'.²¹ ὡσαύτως, in the same way' (2:6; 1 Tim 2:9; 3:8, 11; 5:25**), compares a fresh comment with a preceding one, and is used in lists of instructions. This use of ὡσαύτως is peculiar to the PE, but it corresponds to the use of ὁμοίως in the household code of 1 Pet 3:1, 7 (and the instructions to younger men, following elders in 5:5) to mark the transition in the household code paraenesis from one group to another or from one pair of the group to the other (cf. Gielen 1990:329f., 332f.). The verb must be supplied from what precedes (λάλει εἶναι; BA s. v. ὡσαύτως).

Four qualities are listed.²² The first is a holiness of character which commands respect. καταστῆμα*** is ‘condition, state’ (Hel.; Josephus, *Bel.* 1:40), hence ‘behaviour, demeanour’ (3 Macc 5:45).²³ The word does not refer to clothing (*pace* Oecumenius, cited by Holtzmann, 482, although this possibility exists for καταστολή in 1 Tim 2:9). It can be used of general demeanour (*Ep. Arist.* 122, 165, 210, 278), but a corresponding inward dimension that yields outward calm and poise may at times be indicated (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 15:236; Ignatius, *Trall.* 3:2). Here both are probably meant (cf. Dibelius–Conzelmann, 139f.; Brox, 292).

The choice of the adjective ἱεροπρεπής*** may reflect a liking for compounds and solemn speech. The usual translation is ‘reverent’. However, the word properly means ‘befitting a holy person, thing’, hence ‘holy, worthy of reverence’. It was used specifically in relation to temples and their personnel, religious processions and cultic ceremonies.²⁴ But there was also a broad use in reference to God, holy things and people (4 Macc 9:25; 11:20; Philo, *Abr.* 101; *Decal.* 60; *L.A.* 3:204); it could also be used more generally of moral life: ‘it is ἱεροπρεπέστατον to accustom boys to the truth.’²⁵ It is used in 4 Macc 9:25; 11:20 of the young men who were martyred.

This range of usage leads to several possible nuances here:

(a) ‘like a priest(ess)’ (BA) with a conscious reference to the narrower usage. A kind of ‘priestly dignity’ may be specifically in mind: the deportment of Christians should be like that of priests going about their duties in a manner that commands respect.²⁶

(b) ‘as befitting people in holy service’ (Holtzmann, 482);

(c) ‘holy or godly in deportment’, in effect summarising 1 Tim 2:10 (Fee, 186; ‘as women should who lead a holy life’, GNB).

There is nothing in the context to suggest a priestly reference (so rightly Brox, 292f.; cf. Oberlinner, 108), and we should probably interpret it here in this more general way (cf. 4 Macc 9:25; 11:20).²⁷

The demeanour and bearing thus indicated is the counterpart to that required of older men, described with σεμνός/σώφρων. The term at least conveys the idea that the conduct of women is to be holy and ‘in relation to God’. Although there is some verbal

resonance with 1 Tim 2:9–10 (ὡσαύτως καὶ γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ... ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν), the choice of ἱεροπρεπής instead of θεοσεβής makes a conscious connection difficult to prove. The bearing and conduct of older women is to reflect dedication to God. It should, therefore, inspire respect on the part of those who observe them. The English term ‘reverend’, formerly used of persons ‘worthy of respect’ because of the quality of their lives (but now restricted to a purely formal designation for clergy), may give the sense (Bernard, 166; so Oberlinner: ‘ehrwürdig’).

The description is followed by commands not to be slanderers and tipplers but to be good teachers. There is presumably nobody less dignified in behaviour than the person who has lost selfcontrol under the influence of alcohol. Slanderers and drunkards commanded no respect and brought the church into disrepute. We appear to be in a society where these things were not uncommon — and yet were contemptible to informed opinion.

διάβολος is here ‘slandorous’ (1 Tim 3:11; 2 Tim 3:3; Poly 5:2), but is more common in the NT as a noun, ‘devil’.²⁸ This prohibition (Philo, *Sacr.* 32; Menander, *Fragment* 803) fits in with the typical proverbial character of old women in the ancient world.²⁹ The presence of slanderers in the church among the opposition may also be in mind (v. 5).

The third requirement, μὴ οἴνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας (equivalent to μὴ πάροινον), is also a requirement of church leaders (1:7; 1 Tim 3:3, 8).³⁰ Intemperance in language and alcohol were associated in the ancient world (Spicq, 619). The adj. πόλλω is emphatic; excess is forbidden (cf. 1 Tim 3:8). δουλόω**, ‘to enslave’, can be used of passions (2 Pet 2:19; cf. the use of δουλεύω, Tit 3:3).³¹ The use of the verb with reference to alcohol is well-paralleled.³²

Brox, 293, thinks that the mention of addiction to alcohol is not especially relevant and is included rather mechanically from existing lists. However, drunkenness was a serious enough problem to warrant apostolic correction (Eph 5:18; 1 Pet 4:3; cf. Rom 14:21) and even very stern rebuke (1 Cor 11:20–34) in the early church. Furthermore, drunkenness and talkativeness or slanderous talk were common elements in the typical description

of old women in Hellenistic culture.³³ In view of these observations, and considering the ‘Cretan stereotype’ constructed with some care in 1:5–16, it seems more likely that the prohibition is not only relevant but meant to be taken seriously (cf. Quinn, 134–5; Scott 164). As with older men, the instructions here seek to encourage Christian older women to live in a way that makes the stereotype inapplicable to the church. It goes without saying that what is commended here was not required merely of the older women.

The fourth and final quality is, typically, developed more fully. *καλοδιδάσκαλος**** is a real hapax. There does not seem to be any justification for the translation ‘the right teachers’, apparently meaning that the appropriate teachers for the younger women are the older women rather than Titus himself (Quinn, 134f.). There would seem to be two possible meanings: (a) ‘teaching what is good’;³⁴ (b) ‘good at teaching’.³⁵ The parallel forms *κακοδιδασκαλέω* (2 Clement 10:5) and *κακοδιδασκαλία* (Ignatius, *Philad.* 2:1) show that the former meaning is the correct one.

4. *ἵνα σωφρονίζωσιν τὰς νέας φιλόανδρους εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους* Embedded in the paraenesis to older women is instruction for younger women. The transition comes in the purpose clause that begins in v. 4 and concludes with v. 5. Clearly the older women are to be examples to the younger, and therefore the qualities listed are expected in both age-groups. They are grouped in three pairs concerning their duties at home, their personal piety and their sphere of activity in the home, followed by a seventh characteristic of submission to their husbands (Knight, 308f.). The qualities are largely those which would be recognised and approved by contemporary ancient society.³⁶ The first pair, stressing love for husbands and children, is often mentioned on commendatory epitaphs. The second pair stress the basic qualities of self-control and moral purity which are a central concern of the writer, and which are specifically applied to the sexual morality of women. Their proper way of life is summed up in the third pair as managing their households and doing so in a spirit of kindness. The final instruction to be submissive to their husbands suggests that there was a danger of Christian freedom

and equality leading to behaviour with which the ancient world found it hard to come to terms.³⁷

The apostolic instruction thus inculcates a patriarchal structure for this relationship that is consistent with the rest of the NT.³⁸ Merkel, 97, comments on the lack of any complementary command to husbands or christological motivation and sees this omission as a retrograde step compared with Eph and Col. Even so, the middle voice implies willing subjection and makes it the responsibility of the wife to give it rather than for the husband, who has his own responsibilities in the relationship, to take it (cf. Kamlah 1970:241–3; Quinn, 137). No theological basis is given here for the subordinate relationship of the wife (though see Spicq 621, who says that grace sanctions the order of nature, and Knight, 308f.). However, the assumptions of Graeco-Roman society about the relative positions of wives and husbands are clear enough (Plutarch, *Mor.* 142E; cf. Balch 1981:98f., 147); the instruction encourages order in the household at the very point that pagans would be bound to notice innovation or disruption (as the *ἵνα* μὴ purpose/motivation confirms).

ἵνα expresses the purpose of their being teachers. *νέαι* is used as a substantival adj.³⁹ and is the antonym to *πρεσβύτερες*, referring to a defined age group and position in the household and community. *σωφρονίζω**** is ‘to make somebody sober, bring them to their senses, make of sound mind’,⁴⁰ hence ‘to encourage, advise, urge’.⁴¹ The slang ‘wise them up’ (Fee, 187) gets close to the force of the Greek word. Perhaps the word was used because the teaching was to be more by personal example than by any kind of ‘official’ verbal instruction in the church. The sense is to encourage the young women to a like sobriety (as spelled out in concrete, domestic terms) which corresponds to the word of God (cf. Schlarb 1990:334). This suggests that one of the goals of the teaching is to prevent younger women from adopting patterns of careless, flighty living that would attract criticism. The choice of the verb corresponds to the thematic use of *σώφρων* to describe the authentic Christian life in the PE (2:2, 5; see **Excursus 3**). Thus the specialised meaning in this context is ‘to inculcate Christian values’. In view of the prohibition of women teaching in the church meeting in 1 Tim 2 some commentators think that the

injunction here implies that the women are to devote themselves to this form of teaching the younger women only and are excluded from other forms (Wagener 1994:92; Oberlinner, 110).

The first pair of qualities have to do with attitudes in the family. The instructions assume that as a rule the younger women are married (Brox, 293) and have children (Holtzmann, 483). φίλανδρος*** is ‘loving men’ (Cl.), hence ‘loving [her] husband’ (cf. 1 Pet 3:1). As the numerous references to this quality show, it was highly prized in Graeco-Roman and Jewish cultures and considered the mark of a good wife.⁴²

φιλότεκνος***, ‘loving one’s children’, expresses a quality equally expected and admired in wives⁴³ and linked with φίλανδρος.⁴⁴ Occasionally it is used in a critical sense (e.g. Hermas, *Vis.* 1:3:1: ‘indulgent’; cf. BA) but certainly not here.

5. σώφρονας ἀγνὰς The second pair of qualities has to do with the self-controlled and chaste demeanour of the women. σώφρων (**Excursus 3**) signifies the sensible life of balance and restraint and, in the PE, a characteristic of true Christianity. For the quality in women, see 1 Tim 2:9, 15. It is again a quality commended in secular society.⁴⁵ ἀγνός is originally ‘ritually clean’, then with a moral sense, hence ‘[sexually] pure, chaste’ (cf. 2 Cor 11:2; 1 Pet 3:2); more broadly ‘pure, sincere’ (2 Cor 7:11; Phil 1:17; 4:8; Jas 3:17; 1 Jn 3:3; ἀγνεία is used of women in 1 Tim 5:2; and ἀγιασμός in 1 Tim 2:15; cf. 1 Tim 5:22).⁴⁶ Sexual fidelity to the husband is meant.

οἰκουροῦς ἀγαθὰς The third pair of qualities is concerned with status and function in the household. οἰκουροῦς*** ‘working at home, domestic’,⁴⁷ is a variant of the Cl. οἰκουρός, found as a textual variant here. It is found elsewhere only in Soranus p. 18, 2 *v.l.* οἰκουρός means ‘watching, keeping the home’; it can be used of a woman as the housekeeper (Euripides, *Hec.* 1277). It is found as a praiseworthy attribute, being linked with σώφρων and φίλανδρος.⁴⁸ However, the word could also have a pejorative sense when applied to men who were ‘stay-at-homes’ instead of going to war (Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1225). The verb οἰκουρέω is used in the same senses as the adjective.

Bernard, 167 (following the powerful statement in Field 1899:220–2), suggests that οἰκουροῦς is a rather weak term,

whereas οἰκουροῦς was a recognised term of praise, and therefore prefers to read the latter despite the weaker attestation. Most commentators prefer the text as being better attested, the rarer word, and a Hellenistic form. If the two terms were synonymous, the argument for the Classical word falls. The term envisages efficient running of the household (cf. οἰκοδεσποτέω 1 Tim 5:14) and marks a strong contrast with the peripateticism in 1 Tim 5:13 (cf. Prov 7:11).

ἀγαθὰς (1:16) either modifies the preceding word or stands as an independent quality. (a) With the preceding word it means ‘good’ (NA; GNB; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 141; Hanson, 180); (b) On its own it means ‘kind’, ‘considerate’ (so *vg benignas*; Kilpatrick; NJB; NIV; NJB; REB; NRSV; Holtzmann, 483; most commentators; cf. 1 Pet 2:18; 1 Clement 56:16).⁴⁹ Normally in the PE ἀγαθός occurs in set combinations.⁵⁰ In this case, the rhythm of the sentence and the lack of qualifiers with the other qualities favour view (b) (Arichea–Hatton, 284): the wife is to exhibit kindness towards all those with whom she comes in contact as she applies herself to her domestic duties.

ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν The final quality is submissiveness by the wife to the husband. Although ὑποτάσσομαι, ‘to subject oneself’ (2:9; 3:1**); ὑποταγή, 1 Tim 2:11; 3:4) is used variously in the NT (Luke 3 times; Paul 20 times; Heb 5 times; Jas once; 1 Pet 6 times), it has become a fixed part of the household code tradition and of teaching that deals with relationships.⁵¹ Spicq comments that subjection should not be confused with obedience (although it is shown in obedience), and that the concept of reverent submission, involving respect and willingness to serve, has no secular parallels (*TLNT* III, 424–6). Roloff (322) suggests that the adjective ἴδιος is used for emphasis — i.e. ‘their own husbands (masters)’.⁵² The point, in the case of both slaves and wives, is to limit the subordination command to the relationship that exists within the household, rather than applying it to the community in general: the subjection of wives is to their husbands, not to men in general; slaves are to be subject to their specific masters, not to all free men in the community.

ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῆται Finally, the purpose or motivation behind the life to be pursued by younger women is

stated. It is expressed in negative terms as a consequence that may be avoided through godly behaviour.⁵³ The clause applies to all that has preceded and especially to the command to subordination to husbands (Holtzmann, 484).

ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is ‘the gospel message which originates with God’.⁵⁴ The use of βλασφημέω, ‘to blaspheme, revile’ (3:2; 1 Tim 1:20; 6:1**), is reminiscent of Isa 52:5; Ezek 36:20–36 (cf. 1 Tim 6:1; Rom 2:24; Jas 2:7; 2 Clement 13:2a), where the concern is that the ungodly behaviour of God’s own people will cause the nations to blaspheme God’s name.⁵⁵ It is possible that the wives of non-Christians are especially in mind, as in 1 Pet 3; but in any case, it is clearly believed that disrespectful behaviour on the part of younger women reflecting insubordination would attract criticism from unbelievers that would undermine the credibility of the Christian message.

As a result of the conversion of the ‘subordinate’ member, the relationships of wives to husbands and slaves to masters would come under close scrutiny by unbelievers. This may explain why all household codes address wives and slaves without fail (cf. Bartsch 1965:144–59). Women and slaves were held to be particularly susceptible to foreign religions (e.g. Cicero, *Laws* 2. 7:19–27), and it was essential to the reputation of the church that an example of godliness be given to unbelievers at this level. In these relationships, particularly if only one member were Christian, the tension set up between believer and unbeliever and belief and practice would be most acute and insubordination or ‘emancipation’ of any sort would be easily felt. The interest in the reaction of outsiders (cf. 2:8, 10; 1 Tim 3:6–7; 1 Tim 6:1) and the positive motivation of 2:10 suggest that some degree of apologetic-missionary interest may be in view (cf. Quinn, 138; Padgett 1987).

d. To Younger Men (2:6–8)

The instruction for young men which follows that concerning older people is at first sight remarkably brief and bland in comparison (cf. the relative lengths of 1 Tim 2:9–15 and 2:8, Brox, 294). But the appearance is deceptive, since, although the statement is rather curt on its own, it is backed up by the qualities which Titus himself is to exemplify for the young men in vv. 7f. Some of these are generally applicable; the others refer more to

Titus’s own conduct as a teacher, but the character which he manifests as a teacher and the content of his message will influence others by example. Just as the older women are to be an example to the younger, so is Titus to the men (Hasler, 92).

If an existing household table has been taken over, it is arguable that vv. 7–8 (or 7–8a) are an insertion into it (Brox, 295). But the extreme brevity of the basic statement to the young men rather speaks against the hypothesis of use of a source at this point.

Titus himself is regarded as a younger man (Holtzmann, 484) and therefore he can be directly a pattern to this age group. He is thus like Timothy (cf. 1 Tim 4:12; 5:1f.; 2 Tim 2:22). Brox, 295f. thinks that this motif is a further element in the pseudepigraphical framework of the letter, just as in 1 Timothy where it also appears in conjunction with paraenesis and the concept of exemplariness.⁵⁶ He also finds it inconsistent that Titus’s age is not made explicit. The omission is intelligible. Timothy may well have been younger than Titus (Bernard, 168, thinks that the latter was more of middle-age), and appears to have had a rather timid character, as a result of which people did not readily respect him (1 Cor 16:10f.). Brox overlooks the fact that it is the *authority* of Titus as a leader that is at stake in 2:15.

Instruction to the young as a specific group in the church is not common (1 Pet 5:1; it is possibly implied in 1 Tim 5:1). In the new social relationships within the church it may be that roles were not as sharply defined as elsewhere in society. There was need to emphasise that groups generally regarded as ‘subject’ in society should not abuse their equality in Christ. The opposite problem is reflected in 2:15 where the youthfulness of appointed leaders was not acceptable to the older generation.

The command here is a very broad one to sobriety of conduct, i.e. the same as to the other members of the church in vv. 1, 5. It is followed by what is in effect a command to Titus himself to exemplify the qualities that should be seen in the young men. Two areas are specified. The first is the practice of good deeds. This suggests that the writer is again concerned with frivolity in the church, lack of serious purpose in life, and the wasting of time on fruitless discussions instead of aiming to live usefully (cf. 1:16). The second area is more Titus’s own responsibilities as a teacher,

where three requirements are listed. The first is incorruptibility in his teaching; this apparently refers to its upright quality springing from a pure mind (by contrast with that which comes from depraved people [1 Tim 6:5]). The second is seriousness and dignity, which again suggests that the teachings of the opponents were regarded as frivolous and contemptible. The third is that the actual content is health-giving and free from anything that can be reproached by opponents. The purpose is that opponents may in fact be reduced to silence because there is nothing that they can latch on to and attack in the teaching (cf. Weiser*, 405f.).

TEXT

6. τουνς νεωτέρους Omit τούς (103, 1739, 424** Theophyl.). The omission is favoured by Elliott, 182, who compares 2:2, 3, 9; 1 Tim 3:8, 12. The MS evidence is too weak.

7. πάντα σεαυτόν (Σ A C D² F G 1739 1881 TR lat): πάντας ἑαυτόν (Ψ 33 104 326 pc); πάντα ἑαυτόν (D*); πάντας σεαυτόν (pc); πάντων σεαυτόν (P). Wrong word division is responsible for the variants (Elliott, 182).

ἀφθορίαν ἀδιαφθορίαν (Σ² D¹ Ψ TR; Kilpatrick); ἀφθονίαν (³² F G 1881 pc — transcriptional error). The word is rare and this caused textual problems (see Metzger, 585). The insertion of ἀγνεϊάν (Ψ^c 604 326 88 *et al.* vt⁸ vg) is accepted by Elliott, 183, who compares 1 Tim 4:12; 5:2, and argues for loss by homoioteleuton, despite the weak evidence.

σεμνότητα Add ἀφθαρσίαν (D² Ψ TR sy^h). Elliott, 183, includes on analogy with 2 Tim 1:10. arguing that it could have been omitted because of its close similarity in meaning to ἀφθορία, but the meaning does not fit well here.

8. περί ἡμῶν περί ὑμῶν (A pc a vg^{mss}). There was frequent confusion of the pronouns. Elliott, 123, accepts the variant (cf. 2 Tim 1:14), but the evidence is very weak.

EXEGESIS

6. Τοὺς νεωτέρους ὡσαύτως παρακάλει σωφρονεῖν νεώτερος is a comparative form of νέος (2:4), but with little comparative force (but so in Lk 15:13) and often equivalent to the simplex form.⁵⁷ The precise identity of the group is disputed. The term refers to age. It contrasts with πρεσβύτερος in a simple twofold classification of young and old with no ‘middle-aged’ (2:2 note). Behm, J., TDNT IV, 897, suggests the range 20–30 for the young men. The suggestion that the reference is to newly baptised believers over against the leaders⁵⁸ is improbable in the context of 2:1–5 with its reference to young women (Hanson, 181). Nor is

there a reference to some kind of association similar to those found in secular contexts (for which see Schürer, III, 103). Earlier, Holtzmann, 238f., argued that the young men stand over against the elders and are in fact deacons (cf. Lk 22:26; Acts 5:6, 10; 1 Pet 5:1); but the young men and the deacons are distinguished in Polycarp 5:2f. Nothing more than the obligation of the younger people to carry out menial duties may be implied in the references (cf. Schneider, G., *EDNT* II, 462f.).

ὡσαύτως (2:3 note) serves to add the next item in a set, but in the present context it may stress the repetition of the concept of σωφροσύνη which is required of each of the groups to be addressed. παρακαλέω (1:9 note) is stronger than λαλέω (2:1) but synonymous. The repetition of a verb instructing Titus what to say is necessary after the lengthy previous instruction (contrast 2:3). σωφρονεῖν** can mean: (a) ‘to be of sound mind’, as opposed to being insane, mad (Mk 5:15; Lk 8:35; 2 Cor 5:13); (b) ‘to be reasonable, serious’ (1 Pet 4:7; Rom 12:3⁵⁹). It was used of chaste, virtuous women (1 Clement 1:3; Polycarp 4:3). The basic idea appears to be that of self-control⁶⁰ rather than prudence (*pace* Dibelius–Conzelmann, 141; see further **Excursus 3**)

7. περὶ πάντα, σεαυτόν παρεχόμενος τύπον καλῶν ἔργων περὶ πάντα, ‘in all respects’, is a phrase found here only in NT.⁶¹ Its reference, however, is disputed, as to whether it qualifies (a) what precedes;⁶² or (b) what follows.⁶³ On the one hand, Dibelius–Conzelmann argue that the infinitive in v. 6 is rather bare by itself. One might add that the phrase is not altogether appropriate with the following words. On the other hand, Holtz holds that, if it is linked with what precedes, the phrase forms a conclusion to which nothing should be added, whereas more does follow. This is a subjective opinion. On the whole option (a) is to be preferred.

παρέχομαι is act. ‘to offer, provide’ (1 Tim 1:4; 6:17**); Lk 6:29; Acts 17:31; 22:2; 28:2; *et al.*); in Cl. it can also have the force ‘to show oneself to be, and the mid. can be used in the same way in Hel.⁶⁴ σεαυτόν (1 Tim 4:7, 16a, 16b; 5:22; 2 Tim 2:15; 4:11**) occurs comparatively frequently in the PE because of the amount of exhortation addressed to the recipients. τύπος is ‘archetype, pattern, model’ (Acts 7:44; Heb 8:5); hence ‘moral

example, pattern' of a determinative nature.⁶⁵ Paul himself functions in this way, and both Titus and Timothy must do so also (1 Tim 4:12; Phil 3:17; 1 Th 1:7; 2 Th 3:9; 1 Pet 5:3.; Ignatius, *Magn.* 6:2f. [cj.]). For the thought cf. 1 Tim 4:15; 1 Cor 4:6; 11:1; 1 Th 1:6; 2 Th 3:7, 9⁶⁶ Wolter 1988:191–5, stresses that Titus (and Timothy in 1 Tim 4:12) are called not so much to be examples to the congregation as rather examples of the ideal believer. It is the older people and the leaders who are given this role in the ancient world, and therefore one is not to deduce from this passage that Titus himself was necessarily a young man (Wolter 1988:192f.; Oberlinner, 116f. contrast 1 Tim 4:12 and see below on 2:15).

ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν, σεμνότητα (8a.) λόγον ὑγιῆ ἀκατάγνωστον The construction in the rest of the sentence is not clear. Although some scholars have linked ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ (cf. 1:9; 1 Tim 5:17) with what precedes, with the result that the following accusatives refer to Titus's own character (WH mg; cf. Parry, 79), it appears rather to denote the sphere of the following qualities. It may refer to the manner (Kelly, 242; Arichea–Hatton, 286, since the content comes later) or to the content of the teaching. As for the following nouns in the acc., these may be regarded as (a) the objects of the preceding παρεχόμενος (Holtzmann, 485) or (b) an example of anacolouthon. There would seem to be a case of syllepsis, since the participle is used first with a double acc. ('show yourself as a model of good deeds') and then with plain acc. ('[show] soundness in your teaching'; cf. Brox, 296; Foerster, W., *TDNT* VII, 195). Calvin, 371, took ἀκατάγνωστον to be in agreement with σεαυτόν and λόγον ὑγιῆ as an acc. of respect (cf. Quinn, 142f.).

There are three qualities, the last one being developed more fully. ἀφθορία must mean 'incorruption, soundness', i.e. freedom from guilt. It is a rare word,⁶⁷ but the corresponding adjective ἄφθορος is found with the sense 'uncorrupt, chaste'.⁶⁸ The reference is uncertain; Holtzmann, 485, lists: (a) the content of teaching (cf. Spicq, 623: free from any deviation from the truth); (b) the integrity and purity of the teacher's convictions (so most translations; Kelly, 242); (c) the form of the teaching, as corresponding to the essence of the gospel (cf. 1 Cor 2:1f.). Harder holds that the word refers to the 'moral attitude of Titus'

over against the false teachers and their teaching. He claims that 'we are not to think in terms of the impregnability against false teaching that Titus is establishing in the churches [Schlatter], nor in terms of doctrine safeguarded by the truth [Wohlenberg], but rather of innocence in the sense of not being, or not able to be, corrupted' (103). Brox, 296, claims that both (a) and (b) are possible (cf. Schlarb 1990:298).

σεμνότης is 'reverence, dignity, seriousness' (1 Tim 2:2; 3:4;*** cf. σεμνός, 2:2; 1 Tim 3:8, 11; Phil 4:8;* see **Excursus 3**). Here the idea is of serious and worthy behaviour on the part of the leader. It is not certain whether it refers to Titus's demeanour in general or specifically to a quality of his teaching. If the latter, the reference is hardly to the content of what Titus is to teach, but to the way in which he is to teach. (Spicq, 623, however, thinks that it means the exclusion of all worldly material, such as genealogies and speculations, from the teaching.) It will refer to a seriousness in teaching which contrasts with the crudity and folly of the false teaching, which the writer regarded as contemptible and even laughable. It is a quality which should win respect from other people because the teacher takes life seriously and devoutly and does not trifle. Foerster holds that it is the reputation of the church among outside opponents which is at risk (cf. v. 8b); this would fit in with the general tenor of the passage (2:5b, 10b). But it is more likely that a contrast with the heretics in the church is primarily in view.

8. λόγον (1:3) probably refers here to 'teaching' (cf. Holtz, 221; Lips 1979:40 n. 43), but some commentators think that it may have a broader reference to Titus' speech in general. Again there is a transition in the construction in that the previous noun referred to the manner of the teaching, but this one must refer to its content. Elsewhere in the PE the phrase is in the pl. ὑγιής**, 'healthy', is used here only in the PE instead of the part. of ὑγιαίνω (1:9 note).⁶⁹ The metaphorical use of the adjective is common.⁷⁰ Quinn, 142f., apparently takes the adjective as descriptive of Titus with an acc. of respect, and similarly with the next adjective. Such a further change in construction is unlikely.

ἀκαταγνώστος*** is ‘irreproachable’, i.e. ‘not open to just rebuke’ (Bernard, 169), used of a person who is acquitted (2 Macc 4:47). Here, applied to speech, it must mean ‘beyond reproach’.⁷¹

8b. ἵνα ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐντραπή μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας [sc. χώρας] is the ‘opponent’.⁷² ἐντρέπω** here has the Hel. sense ‘to make someone ashamed’ (1 Cor 4:14); pass. ‘to be put to shame, be ashamed’.⁷³ The hope is that such people will not only have nothing to say against the faith but will be converted (Holtz, 222). περὶ ἡμῶν may refer specifically to Paul and Titus or to Christians generally. φαῦλος**, ‘worthless’ (Jn 3:20; 5:29; Rom 9:11; 2 Cor 5:10; Jas. 3:16***), is used as a transferred epithet—‘no report of our worthlessness’. For the thought see 1 Tim 3:7; 1 Pet 2:12. The critic is to have no legitimate ground for censure. Bernard, 169, holds that the word is used of deeds rather than words; hence the point is that the teacher’s way of life must be above reproach (similarly, Fee, 189). But Quinn, 126, notes that in the LXX four out of the ten uses apply to words.

If specific opponents are in mind, their identity is uncertain. Chrysostom (*PG* LXII, 684) took the sing. reference literally to Satan. Hanson, 181f., draws attention to the sing. form, but seems to think of a plurality of opponents. Three main proposals have been made, and several scholars would hold that more than one group may be in mind: (a) heretical teachers;⁷⁴ (b) pagan critics;⁷⁵ (c) Jewish opponents (Quinn, 143, on flimsy grounds). Whereas 2:5 and 10 clearly refer to the effect on outsiders, this verse is more concerned with Titus’s own conduct within the church, and therefore (a) is to be preferred as the primary reference.

e. To Slaves (2:9–10)

This passage should be considered in conjunction with 1 Tim 6:1f. where different teaching is given, but with a similar motive. There are three negative and two positive commands followed by a purpose clause. The first two commands are in the infinitive, followed by three participles. The basic instruction is that slaves are to be subject to their masters, i.e. obedient to their commands. This is followed by two positive and two negative commands stated chiasmically. Slaves are to please their masters and not to enter into disputes with them. They are not to steal but to be fully

trustworthy. By so doing they will not only avoid outsiders condemning the Christian message because it leads to insubordination (1 Tim 6:1) but they will rather add lustre to the message by showing that it leads to good moral living in society. As pointed out above in connection with younger women (2:6 note on βλασφημέω), slaves were held to be susceptible to foreign religions — exemplary behaviour on their part would demonstrate the validity of the Christian message.

Weiser*, 408f., observes that whereas the first four groups in this section are constituted naturally by age and addressed regarding their duties in the congregation, the fifth group is constituted by their social status and are addressed regarding their household duties to their masters, and the instruction is concerned entirely with subordination (cf. Oberlinner, 119). This sharp distinction is achieved at the cost of underplaying the significance of vv. 4b, 5a and not observing that the qualities to be shown are required both in the congregation and in ordinary life. The boundaries are more fluid than Weiser allows. No hard and fast line can be drawn between the congregation and the household, so long as the congregations met in houses. It must be recognised, therefore, that for all the emphasis on oneness in Christ in the teaching of Paul and the recognition of a brotherly relation between masters and slaves, the church had not yet reached the point of recognising consistently and universally that the new status in Christ posed sharp questions regarding the subordination that was a part of the hierarchical society in which it lived. Modern Christians, members of churches which have been just as slow to recognise the social implications of their oneness in Christ, to say nothing of the ecclesiastical implications, should not be too quick to criticise them.⁷⁶

As, then, with the previous instructions, here the conduct of believers in their own households is a matter on which the Christian leader is to give instruction and exhortation. The evaluations of commentators vary widely.

On the one hand, Brox, 296f. affirms that pagan ethics are simply Christianised by the addition of a Christian motive, but not really questioned. The absence of any reference to possible injustices or to the duties of masters is said to display the danger of upholding the status quo without changing it from within

(Merkel, 97). This may be an indication that the churches in Crete did not contain persons sufficiently wealthy to be masters (contrast 1 Tim; Hasler, 93; Holtz, 222). But the lack of reference to masters may be simply because this section is about the duties of ‘subject’ members. Moreover, masters are never told here or elsewhere to make their slaves subject to them, and neither in Stoicism nor in Judaism is there teaching on the duties of slaves (Quinn, 147).⁷⁷

On the other hand, it has been observed that the passage shows that even the lowliest in society can contribute to the splendour of the Christian life (Spicq, 626). According to Hasler, 93, the passage shows that people can live a Christian life within the existing orders of society; they are not displaying servility but rather recognising the will of the Creator within society and seizing the opportunities for living to his glory.⁷⁸ This is not a ‘bourgeois’ transformation of Christian ethics. Similarly, Murphy-O’Connor comments:

To us there is little striking in what is demanded of the Christian slave — simple honesty and loyalty. It can hardly be said to command respect and admiration. However, in the first century the vast majority of slaves lived in a state of such degradation that it had disastrous effects on their moral character. In this perspective the comportment of a slave who was utterly devoted and scrupulously honest could not fail to provoke wonder that turned to attentive respect when the source of this miraculous change was claimed to be the gospel.⁷⁹

TEXT

9. ἰδίοις δεσπόταις δεσπόταις ἰδίοις (A D P 326 1739 1881 *pc*; Kilpatrick). The variant is adopted by Elliott, 184, on the ground that, when a noun is anarthrous, ἴδιος follows it (1 Tim 2:6; 6:15; Tit 1:3) as a more Semitic construction. This is possible here, as the MS support is reasonable.

10. μή μηδέ (C² D*^c F G 33 *pc* sy^p; WH *mg*); Elliott, 137, accepts the variant (cf. 2 Tim 2:14; Tit 2:3); Quinn, 127, hesitates.

πάσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν (Σ² A C D P 81 104 326 365 1505 1739 1881 *pc*). The word order varies: 1–3–2–4 (F G); 1–4–2–3 (629) 2–1–3–4 (Ψ TR); 1–3—ἀγάπην (33 WH *mg*); 1–3–4 Σ* WH t). Elliott, 185, supports the text. He suggests that πίστιν was omitted because of the awkward position of ἀγαθήν, and notes that πᾶς normally precedes the noun.

τὴν διδασκαλίαν τήν The article after the noun is omitted by 1739 1881 TR, but the PE often have it (1 Tim 1:4; 3:13; 2 Tim 1:1; 2:1, 10), and it should be retained (Elliott, 186).

EXEGESIS

9. Δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν, εὐαρέστους εἶναι, μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας δοῦλος is used in the lit. sense here and in 1 Tim 6:1 (cf. metaphorical use in 1:1; 2 Tim 2:24). The situation of slaves at this time is well summarised in Bartchy 1973:72–82. δεσπότης is the regular term for the ‘master, owner’ of property (cf. οἰκοδεσποτέω, 1 Tim 5:14); of a vessel (2 Tim 2:21); of slaves (1 Tim 6:1, 2; 1 Pet 2:18; Hermas, *Sim.* 5:2:2).⁸⁰ The word was used by Christians as an equivalent to *dominus* as a technical term for human slave masters; κύριος with its sacred meaning tended to be avoided (but see Eph 6:5; Col. 3:22). Although Spicq, 625, claims that the plural here is because slaves could have more than one master, it is surely distributive.⁸¹ The infinitive ὑποτάσσεσθαι (2:5 note) is probably dependent on παρακάλει (2:6) understood. It is unlikely to be an imperatival infinitive addressed directly to the slaves (so Spicq, 624), since in this case a nominative would be needed. Spicq, 624, insists that the word connotes not so much obedience as rather ‘keeping to one’s position and developing attitudes of humility (cf. *Ep. Arist.* 257), respect and love towards every superior authority, whatever it may be’ (cf. Delling; G., *TDNT* VIII, 45; Quinn, 147). ἐν πᾶσιν clearly goes with ὑποτάσσεσθαι rather than with the following phrase (*pace* RV; GNB; NRSV); Holtzmann, 486, notes that the phrase always goes with what precedes in the NT; cf. the similar pattern in Eph 5:24; Col 3:20, 22, which is surely decisive.

The situation envisaged is not certain: (a) Christian slaves in Christian families (Fee, 190; Knight); (b) Christian slaves in non-Christian households (Holtz, 222; Hanson, 182; Hasler, 93; mainly non-Christian masters, Knoch, 42). In fact there is no specification (cf. 1 Tim 6:1f. and note), and the duty of slaves in any situation is in mind. There is no reference to the service being really to God or Christ, as in Col 3:23; Eph 6:6; 1 Pet 2:19, but this is compensated for by the purpose clause in v. 10.

The general command is developed in four further phrases. There are two positive and two negative commands arranged chiasmically. Good service in the broadest sense is expressed by

εὐάρεστος, ‘pleasing, acceptable’. Although the adv. εὐαρέστως (Heb 12:28) is found in Xenophon, the adj. is Hellenistic.⁸² It is used here in a general sense, but elsewhere of pleasing God.⁸³

For μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας see 1:9 note; 3 Macc 2:28. In ancient comedy slaves are typically portrayed as having considerable freedom of speech towards their masters (Spicq, 625).

10. μὴ νοσφιζομένους, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν Theft was a further standard failing of slaves; cf. *Pesah.* 113b: ‘love one another, love theft, love debauchery, hate your masters and never tell the truth’ (Spicq, 625). νοσφιζομαι is ‘to purloin, pilfer, put aside for oneself, misappropriate’ (Acts 5:2f.***; 2 Macc 4:12; *TLNT* II, 546f.); it covers petty larcenies (Simpson, 106).

The positive contrast is expressed in terms of demonstrating utter dependability. ἐνδείκνυμι ‘to show, demonstrate’, hence ‘to do something to somebody’, is found almost exclusively in the Pauline corpus in the NT and here is always mid.⁸⁴ The verb means not merely to ‘prove’ but ‘to demonstrate’ powerfully and visibly (Spicq, 625f.; cf. Roloff, 97 n. 221), with reference to qualities of character, as in 3:2;⁸⁵ it is used of demonstrations of the divine character in 1 Tim 1:16 (cf. Rom 9:17, 22; Eph 2:7; cf. ἔνδειξις, Rom 3:25f.). The use of the adj. πᾶς to mean ‘in all respects, on all occasions’ is common (2:15; 3:2; cf. White, 98). πίστις (1:5 note) is here ‘fidelity, faithfulness’ shown towards other people.⁸⁶ It was a secular virtue.⁸⁷ The use of ἀγαθός (1:16) here is odd, and the translators tend towards renderings like ‘perfect’ (NRSV). The force is not the same as in ‘good deeds’ or a ‘good conscience’. Possibly it means ‘true, genuine’ (Ellicott, 185). Probably it refers to whatever people would regard as good and praiseworthy in fidelity, and Ellicott’s proposal remains the best. Holtz, 223, notes how dictators and tyrants have always demanded utter loyalty from their subjects, and suggests that in contrast fidelity that is good in the sight of God is what is demanded of Christians (Eph 2:10; Col 1:10). Cf. Quinn, 149, for similar comments. In any case, what is required is not bourgeois morality, but heroic (Spicq, 626).

ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοσμῶσιν ἐν πᾶσιν ἵνα introduces a positive purpose which should act as

motivation (cf. 2:5, 8); contrast the negative formulation in 1 Tim 6:1. The aim is to adorn the teaching (διδασκαλία, 1:9) τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (1:3; cf. 3:4; 1 Tim 2:3). The reference is to God, not Christ, and the phrase prepares the way for the doctrinal backing in vv. 11–14. The gen. is objective, ‘teaching about God our Saviour’ (*pace* Holtz, 224). ἐν πᾶσιν is probably neut. (BA; Knight;) rather than masc. (Holtzmann, 486; Easton, 93 [‘possibly’]). κοσμέω is lit. ‘to put in order’ (Mt 25:7), ‘make beautiful’, both physically (Mt 12:44 par. Lk 11:25; Mt 23:29; Lk 21:5; Rev 21:19; of dress, hairstyle, Rev. 21:2) and spiritually (1 Tim 2:9; 1 Pet 3:5); hence ‘to adorn, do credit to’ something or somebody.⁸⁸ Bernard, 170, says that the word was used for setting jewels in such a way as to enhance their beauty, but gives no evidence. It appears rather that the word was used of adding to the beauty of a person or thing by adornment.⁸⁹ A good parallel occurs 3 Macc 3:5, where the Jews ‘adorned their style of life with the good deeds of upright people.’ What is required is a working out of Rom 12:1f. (Knoch, 26). And this can be done even by slaves!

f. The Doctrinal Basis for the Preceding Exhortation (2:11–14)

Couser 1992:155–64; Giese, G., ‘ΧΑΡΙΣ ΠΑΙΔΕΥΟΥΣΑ. Zur biblischen Begründung des evangelischen Erziehungsgedankens’, *Theologia Viatorum* 5 (1953–54), 150–73; Haubeck, W., *Loskauf durch Christus* (Giessen/Basel: Brunnen, 1985), espec. 205–13; Läger 1996:92–8; Lau 1996:150–60, 243–57; Mott 1978:22–48; Schlarb 1990:164–72; Towner, 1989:108–11; Trummer 1978:200–2, 232f.; Wilson 1979:17f., 85f.

On the reference of θεός in Tit 2:13; Abbot, E., ‘On the construction of Titus II:13’, *JBL* 1 (1881), 3–19 (= *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays* [Boston, 1888], 439–57); Harris, M. J., ‘Titus 2:13 and the Deity of Christ’, in Hagner, D. A., and Harris, M. J. (ed.), *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980), 262–77; Harris, M. J., *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 173–85; Wainwright, A. W., ‘The Confession “Jesus Is God” in the New Testament’, *SJT* 10 (1957), 274–99.

The establishment of ethics on the basis of doctrine is familiar throughout the Bible. The present pattern of exhortation followed by a justification or grounding for it introduced by γάρ is not infrequent in the PE (cf. 1:7 note). Tit contains two extended

sections of doctrinal backing for the ethical paraenesis which is given in the letter (2:11–14; 3:3–7), in each case followed by a phrase that integrates the backing into the flow of the letter. Although this passage has been described as the heart of the letter (Spicq, 635), it could be argued that 3:3–7 is equally significant.

The way for the present statement was prepared by the reference to the teaching about God as Saviour which believers are to adorn by their way of life (v. 10), and the passage can be regarded as a statement of this teaching.

In form the passage is a single sentence which can be set out analytically as follows:

Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις
 παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς,
 ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας
 σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν
 αἰῶνι,
 προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα
 καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης
 τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
 ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,
 ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας
 καὶ καθάρσῃ ἑαυτῶν λαὸν περιούσιον.
 ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων.

The initial statement on the appearance of God's grace is extended by a participle which bears the weight of the sentence and stresses that grace has an 'educative purpose'. Thus, the command to teach the believers how to live (2:1) is backed up by a statement which says that, when the grace of God was manifested, its purpose was to educate them in how to live in a godly manner (Lock, 143). The main verb ζήσωμεν is preceded by a participial phrase describing what must be renounced; the renouncing of worldly, sinful desires forms a strong contrast to godly living 'in this age'. It is further flanked by a second participial phrase describing the content of the Christian hope centred on the epiphany of the Saviour; this phrase contains a further contrast between 'this age' and the future hope which believers have while they live in it. Tied to this reference to the coming Saviour by a relative pronoun is a

description of his selfgiving which leads into a statement of its purpose. Thus doctrine (vv. 12a, 13, 14a) and its ethical consequences (vv. 12b, 14b) are strongly tied together. The nearest parallel in the PE to a sentence of this complexity is 3:4–7.

The picture is not unlike that of pilgrimage in which believers are committed to an ongoing journey or process, and the parameters are similar.⁹⁰ The central motif of the guidance is living a life that is characterised by virtue; the qualities inculcated are in fact those approved by the secular world of the time. They are flanked, on the one hand, by a rejection of what should belong to the past, the way of life characterised by irreligion and self-centred desires, and, on the other hand (v. 13), by an attitude of looking forward to the future revelation of the glory of the Saviour. It is at this point that the distinctively Christian element enters which corresponds to the introduction in v. 11 and with it colours the whole statement so that the apparently 'secular' picture of the virtuous life undergoes transformation. The passage then culminates in a kerygmatic statement about the past action of the Saviour which provides the basis for the injunction to godly living and positive goodness. In the same way believers can be exhorted to forget what is or should belong to the past and to run the race with their eyes set on their Saviour who endured for their sakes (Heb 12:1f.; cf. Phil 3:13f.).

The passage thus forms the basis for the preceding instruction on Christian living by reminding the readers that the purpose of God's saving intervention in the world in the self-giving of Christ was to deliver people from evil behaviour and make them into a community characterised by good works; God's grace has an educative transforming effect on people which enables them to turn away from godlessness, to live lives of positive goodness, and to look forward to the final revelation of God's glory in which they will share. Consequently, it is appropriate that they should accept the instructions given to them as part of the educative process in which they have been enrolled.

An interesting question is how far the passage is based on preexisting material in the form of a Christian confession or hymn. One could certainly envisage the passage being recited as a congregational baptismal or eucharistic confession.⁹¹ Only a minimal use of tradition is allowed by Merkel: an 'old formula' in

v. 14 is placed in a 'modern' framework, using contemporary phraseology (Merkel, 98). At the opposite extreme Ellis 1987 views the whole of vv. 2–14 as a reworking of tradition and categorises vv. 11–14 in two ways: (a) in terms of topic as 'admonition' (cf. 1 Tim 6:7f., 11f.; 2 Tim 2:11–13); (b) in terms of literary form as 'hymn' (cf. 3:4–7; 1 Tim 2:5f.; 3:16; 6:11f., 15f.; 2 Tim 1:9f.; 2:11–13). He gives as criteria for the recognition of cited and traditioned material: (a) the presence of an opening or closing quotation formula; (b) the self-contained and independent character of the passage; (c) unusual vocabulary and a different idiom, style or theological viewpoint from that of the author; (d) the use of similar material in an independent writing.

Ellis discusses only the first of these points in any detail. The present passage has a closing formula, 'These things speak...' (cf. 1 Tim 4:6, 11; 2 Tim 2:14; cf. 1 Tim 6:2); along with 2:1 ('But as for you speak') this brackets off the whole of the chapter including the 'confessional hymn'.

As for vocabulary and ideas, the notes will show that the only words which do not appear elsewhere in the PE are: σωτήριος, κοσμικός, προσδέχομαι*, λυτρώω, άνομία, καθαρίζω, περιούσιος*, and ζηλωτής*. Apart from the words marked with*, the writer uses cognate forms elsewhere, so that the list is drastically reduced. Consequently, it can hardly be claimed that the passage contains vocabulary that is foreign to an author who is characterised by the width of his vocabulary compared with that of Paul. The passage is self-contained, but it has no significant parallels in independent writings (with the exception of v. 14a = 1 Tim 2:6a = Mk 10:45b).

The case for use of tradition thus rests largely on the closing formula (which covers the whole of 2:2–14), on the detachable character of the passage and on its confessional style. But against these points must be placed the set of strong links with the writer's thought elsewhere. Granted that tradition has been used in v. 14, it is difficult to argue that there is a recognisable tradition behind vv. 11–13. The case for the use of formulated tradition as opposed to traditional language here is thus weak.

Another hypothesis is put forward by Hanson 1968:78–96, on the basis of earlier work by M.-E. Boismard.⁹² He claims that 2:11–14 and 3:4–7 are two parts of a baptismal, liturgical tradition

also used by the authors of Eph and 1 Pet. There are a number of phrases in common between the epistles. The present passage has links with 1 Pet 1:13b–19 (renunciation of ἐπιθυμία, holy conduct, hope of the future appearing of Jesus, redemption, and [1 Pet 2:9] God's own people). This would suggest that such themes as these were part of the stock teaching given to converts, but the links are not sufficient to confirm the existence of a common 'source', still less to reconstruct it.

The passage uses contemporary language from the imperial cult precisely to make the contrast between it and Christian worship (cf. the excursus in Hanson, 186–8). Dibelius–Conzelmann, 145, stress the closeness in tone of the material to what is said about Hellenistic gods and rulers. They argue that the material came to the author via Hellenistic Judaism and that he was able to use formulaic material from various sources without reflection on their differing origins and significance. This procedure is not found in the accepted letters of Paul. Similarly, Hasler, 93f., stresses that the language of Hellenistic ethics is used, precisely in order that Christians might achieve a high moral level in the eyes of the surrounding world and so gain a hearing for the gospel. Yet this morality is given a firm Christian basis in the doctrinal statement into which it is integrated.

One needs to distinguish carefully here between ideas that were at home in Hellenistic Judaism and in Hellenism generally. The explanation offered is not clear at this point.

The thought here is of an educative process giving instruction in how to live. Brox, 298, suggests that the instruction is regarded as actually producing its intended results, since it is the work of grace which has the power to transform lives.

Nevertheless, the concept has aroused negative comment from critics. For Scott, 168: in Paul 'the grace of God consists in a single overwhelming gift which is received in a moment by the act of faith. In the Pastorals it is conceived as working continuously through a steady persistence in Christian belief and practice.' 'In Paul the accent is placed upon justification, here upon education in the faith' (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 142; similarly, Barrett, 137). 'The church appears as an educational institute' (Hasler, 94). 'It is hard to imagine anything more unlike Paul's fervent, far-reaching and profound theology' (Hanson, 184). 'For our writer, the fruit of

God's saving grace was less a life of sacrificial suffering than a process of disciplined training' (Houlden, 150).

These comments are wide of the mark. In the context this is but *one* aspect of grace's activity — the one relevant to ethics — which is carried out by 'healthy teaching'. The once-for-all revelation is in view (note again the aorist in v. 11) and the development in v. 14 indicates that salvation is seen in Pauline terms; the thought is clearly paralleled in the importance of persistence in 'faith working by love' in Paul and in the continuing experience of grace in Paul. Nevertheless, the language is fresh and may indicate some influence from the Greek idea that education leads to full attainment of an ideal (Merkel, 99). Grace is active in the knowledge of the truth and sound teaching, Brox, 298. Cf. 1 Clement 59:3; Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ... δι' οὗ ἡμᾶς ἐπαίδευσας, ἡγίασας, ἐτίμησας. Barrett, 137, notes that grace does not offer a once-for-all deliverance from evil ways but trains people to renounce them.

TEXT

11. γάρ Omit (104 1311 69 460 *et al.*). Elliott, 44, 237, thinks the conjunction may have been added to avoid asyndeton, but it is characteristic of the author's style (1:7; 3:3, 9, 12) and should be retained.

σωτήριος Praem, ἡ ((C³) D² Ψ 33 1881 TR; Kilpatrick). Other variants are the substitution of σωτήρος (**Σ*** t vg^{mss}); τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν (F G a b vg^{cl} ^{ww} co Lcf.). Elliott, 186f., holds that 'saviour' is substitution for a rare word or a simple error, and assimilation to the previous verse. He would retain the article, saying that its omission is due to the desire to avoid Semitism. However, in fact it is good Greek. BD § 269³ notes that an adj. or part, following after a gen. must have the article if it is attributive (Mt 3:17; 2 Cor 6:7; Eph 6:16; Heb 13:20) unless it is predicative, as here. Holtzmann, 487 takes it as attributive.

13. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Inverted order (**Σ*** F G b; WH mg.; Kilpatrick); so Elliott 201. Omit Χριστοῦ (1739). Cf. 1 Tim 1:1 note.

EXEGESIS

11. Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις The basis for the Christian behaviour described in the preceding verses is grounded theologically in the saving epiphany which results from the character of God as Saviour. γάρ introduces the theological basis for 2:1–10 as a whole (Holtzmann, 487) and not just for vv. 9f. Nevertheless, the section is in fact an unpacking of the description of God as Saviour in v.

10. The present section thus gives the content of the 'teaching about our Saviour God' which believers are to adorn by their way of life (Knight, 318; Pax 1955, 239), and it does so by reference to the manifestation of his grace which brings salvation. Four points are made in this opening statement.

First, the content of the Christian message is summed up in terms of God's grace. χάρις (1:4 note) refers to the whole of God's saving act in Christ. Easton, 93f., states that grace here is practically 'the Christian message as a whole', and compares 1 Pet 5:12. The reference must include the historical revelation of grace in the whole event of Jesus Christ and its repeated fresh actualisation in the ongoing proclamation of the gospel (Brox, 298). In the same way we find the inclusion of the act of reconciliation in Christ and the proclamation of the word of this reconciliation in the one action of God in 2 Cor 5:18–21, especially v. 19.

Grace is thus almost personified (cf. *Odes Sol.* 33:1; Spicq, 635f.). For Mott*, 36–46, the passage is an example of the personifying of divine qualities or virtues similar to what is found in Philo. But it is more likely that the personification results from the fact that the essential element in the epiphany is the revelation of Jesus Christ as God's gracious gift to humanity. There is in any case no hypostatizing of grace (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 142).

χάρις is a virtue associated with benefactors (cf. Windisch 1935:223–6), described in language which may echo that used of imperial gifts; it is a 'demonstration of a ruler's favour, gift' or the disposition that lies behind the gift.⁹³ The noun is equivalent to φιλανθρωπία in 3:4. The whole phrase 'the grace of God' is strongly Pauline.⁹⁴ Nevertheless, Dibelius–Conzelmann, 144, curiously maintain that the use here does not recall Paul but rather 'the "graces" of the epiphanous gods in their manifestations (as they are praised, e.g. in the cult of the ruler)'. Rather, the author sets the Christian revelation of grace in its traditional sense over against the pagan manifestations.

The grace has been concretely manifested in the world. For ἐπιφαίνω see **Excursus 8**. The statement refers to the appearing of grace rather than of the Saviour himself, but this is similar to the way in which in v. 13 believers await the manifestation of the glory of Christ rather than the manifestation of Christ himself.

Nevertheless, the language can equally be used of the manifestation of a person. The passive may imply something sudden and unexpected — of light coming from on high (Holtzmann, 487). The word conveys ideas of the sudden and surprising appearance of light, of its entrance for the first time, and of its effect in illuminating those in darkness (Spicq, 636). Lührmann. 1971 shows how the word-group stresses the idea of the helpful appearances of the gods, displaying their virtue and power.

The manifestation of grace conveys salvation — in accordance with the character of God. σωτήριος***, ‘saving, with saving power’ (‘with healing’, REB) is found here only in NT as an adj.,⁹⁵ but the neut. occurs as a noun (Lk 2:30; 3:6; Acts 28:28; Eph 6:17***).⁹⁶ The stress is on God as the source of salvation. The wording may reflect the language of the imperial cult (note see on πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις), although the adjective does not seem to be attested in this context.⁹⁷

The intended beneficiaries of God’s action are ‘all people’. For πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις cf. 3:2; 1 Tim 2:1, 4; 4:10. This phrase must go with σωτήριος (cf. Thucydides 7:64:2 in BA; Holtzmann, 487), not with the verb (AV; NIV); the latter construction would in any case produce a false statement. Similar language was used of emperors.⁹⁸

The motivation for inclusion of this final point is not clear. It may be that it is intended to show that the sphere of grace includes all the different groups in the church mentioned in vv. 2–10. The possibility that the writer’s opponents limited the scope of salvation is raised by Brox, 298; Oberlinner, 129. Or it may be that it is simply part of the author’s basic belief in the universality of the offer of salvation which he repeats here although it is not essential to his argument (cf. 3:2; 1 Tim 2:3–5; 4:10).

The force is clearly that the salvation is intended for all people (Acts 17:30; 22:14f.; cf. Lk 2:10, 14; 1 Tim 2:4–6). It is not confined to Jews. White, 194, Lock, 143f., and Knight, 319, stress that it is for *all kinds* of people, including even the slaves who have just been mentioned.⁹⁹ However, there is no implied limitation that would exclude any person from the embrace of divine grace, e.g. by suggesting that not all people literally but ‘[only some individuals from] every class of people’ are meant (as

Knight, 115). If the provision of salvation is thus universal, it is implicitly affirmed that there is no salvation for anybody anywhere else.

12. παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς The grace of God is pictured in a somewhat unusual way as a teacher who guides people into a new way of life. παιδεύω* here must mean ‘to train, educate’,¹⁰⁰ although Quinn, 163f., argues that teaching of the young was inseparably linked with corporal punishment on the refractory in the Hellenistic world (cf. 1 Tim 1:20; 2 Tim 2:25 — but note the stress on gentleness here).

The process of education by grace was doubtless understood in practical terms as taking place in part through teaching of the sound doctrine which is part of the content of the Christian message. But education is not confined to formal teaching; it includes elements of persuasion, encouragement, practice and discipline, and a good teacher is able to help his pupils to develop new patterns of thought and behaviour. The Greek term is able to accommodate these various nuances. Dibelius–Conzelmann, 142f., note that παιδεύω shows ‘an important change in meaning here’ from Paul. The word is certainly used in a different way, but the importance is that this is the first use in this sense of training in Christian spirituality and practice. Bertram demonstrates that the ideas expressed here fit in well with the proverbial wisdom of the OT and the practical piety of Judaism. Fee, 199, notes that the word is already used in the same way as here in Ecclus 6:32; Wis 6:11, 25 (cf. 11:9 for the sense of disciplining). We thus have an example of Christian piety being moulded within the context of ideas already at home in Hellenistic Jewish piety. ἡμᾶς refers to regenerated Christians, not people in general (Spicq, 637f.) There are three elements in the educative process envisaged, two in this verse and one in the next.

ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας First, the negative side is seen in the renunciation of ungodliness and a worldly way of life. These two phrases probably refer to such sins as idolatry and impiety on the one hand and selfish and immoral desires on the other.

The clause introduced by ἵνα may be one of purpose dependent on the main verb¹⁰¹ or on the participle, possibly giving

the force ‘leading us to’ (BA; cf. Holtzmann, 488). But it is better taken as indirect command, giving the content of the ‘education’ (cf. 1 Tim 5:21).

ἀρνέομαι (1:16; 1 Tim 5:8) here has the sense ‘to renounce’. Elsewhere it is generally something good or positive which is renounced, so that the word has a negative sense; the use here of renouncing something evil is unusual (cf. however, Lk 9:23). Possibly baptismal language is reflected (Bernard, 171; Jeremias, 72; Dornier, 143; Brox, 298). The aorist may stress the decisive break with the past (Spicq, 638). But Oberlinner, 131f., emphasises that the thought cannot be limited to what should happen at conversion; there must be a continual turning away from godlessness.

ἀσέβεια*, ‘godlessness, impiety’,¹⁰² refers broadly to ungodly conduct, especially idolatry and the associated behaviour, in contrast to evil conduct towards other people, but this distinction is not always observed. Hence the reference is to the conduct associated with disbelief in God. There may be an intentional contrast with εὐσέβεια (Lock, 144; see **Excursus 1**).

ἐπιθυμία (‘desire, longing’; 3:3; 1 Tim 6:9; 2 Tim 2:22; 3:6; 4:3; Tit 2:12; 3:3**) is in itself neutral about the goodness or badness of the desires, but the context may indicate that the objects, and hence the longings, are natural and good or bad.¹⁰³ Here the adjective κοσμικός and the link with ἀσέβεια indicate that the latter is meant (cf. 3:3; 1 Tim 6:9; 2 Tim 2:22; 3:6; 4:3). Similarly, ἐπιθυμέω has a good sense in 1 Tim 3:1 and the bad sense ‘to covet’ in Exod 20:17; Rom 7:7; *et al.* There was in fact a growing tendency to use the word, as here, of bad desires, temptations, including sexual desire.¹⁰⁴

κοσμικός** is ‘belonging to the world’, hence ‘earthly, as opposed to heavenly’ and hence ‘transitory and of lesser worth’.¹⁰⁵ In Christianity the word came to mean ‘worldly’ as opposed to God and morally reprehensible.¹⁰⁶

σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι Second, the positive side is expressed by three qualities of life. These coincide with three of the four cardinal virtues (the missing one is ἀνδρεία) which functioned as ideals in Gk. ethics.¹⁰⁷ Christians are to live up to worldly standards and

impress the world (Hasler, 94). Nevertheless, Brox, 298f., insists that despite all the use of Greek terms the thought is genuinely Christian with its deep orientation to the salvation-event in Christ (cf. Vögtle, 242 n. 22). Mott argues that the language here is similar to that of Philo who uses the cardinal virtues to express the goal of ethical deliverance from vice. The goal of παιδεία is virtue (ἀρετή), and hence it is natural that the goal of education here is the development of these cardinal virtues. Interestingly Philo speaks of παιδεία as being σωτήριος (*Ebr.* 140f.; *Plant.* 144).

Whether by chance or intent, the three adverbs express relations to self, neighbour and God,¹⁰⁸ but this categorisation should not be taken too strictly (Brox, 299). For σωφρόνως***, ‘soberly’ (Wis 9:11), see **Excursus 3**. The adverb is common in Hellenistic moral writing (Spicq, 638f. and is found in combination with ζάω.¹⁰⁹ δικαίως** describes life in accordance with standards of justice and fairness.¹¹⁰ The same adverb also forms part of a series characterising Christian conduct with δόσιως and ἀμέμπτως in 1 Th 2:10. εὐσεβῶς*, ‘in a godly manner’ (2 Tim 3:12***. See **Excursus 1**) is likewise common in secular moral writing and often found in inscriptions.¹¹¹ The qualities listed here are often linked to one another.¹¹² Righteousness and godliness are also linked in 1 Tim 6:11.

The sphere of godly living is ‘this age/world’. αἰών* (cf. αἰώνιος, 1:2 note) has three main senses: (a) ‘era’; (b) ‘universe’; (c) ‘world system’ (LN). In the first sense it can refer to time up to the present or to time in the future, in each case conceived as stretching into eternity. It can also refer, as here, to a specific period of time, often of the present era and the future era in contrast to each other. When it refers to the present age it is often qualified as here (cf. 1 Tim 6:17; 2 Tim 4:10; Polycarp 9:2). The phrase may carry connotations of temporariness and of its evil nature in contrast with the age to come, and suggests the idea of a world system which is dominated by evil and opposed to God. But it also emphasises that the Christian life must be lived out in the here and now (Oberlinner, 133).

The phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is used to refer to the distant future (e.g. Ps 111:9 = 2 Cor 9:9); the rhetorical form εἰς (τὸν) αἰῶνα (τοῦ) αἰῶνος is also found (Ps 44:7 = Heb 1:8). The plural form is

used rhetorically in an intensive manner to signify the immeasurable stretch of time whether past (1 Cor 2:7) or future (Lk 1:33); in the latter case the even more rhetorical form εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (Ps 83:5) is found (1 Tim 1:17b; 2 Tim 4:18). In 1 Tim 1:17a** the temporal and spatial aspects of meaning are hard to distinguish.¹¹³

νῦν* (2 Tim 1:10) is used adjectivally, ‘present’ (1 Tim 4:8; 6:17; 2 Tim 4:10**).¹¹⁴ The present age is here referred to in a neutral manner, but stands in contrast with the future age which is characterised by the appearing of the Saviour. Hence there is a certain negative quality about it, and elsewhere it can be regarded as a period of godlessness and evil to which people can be tempted to apostatise (2 Tim 4:10).¹¹⁵

13. προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ The third element in the new way of life which is ‘taught’ by grace is expressed by a loosely coupled participial phrase. Life in the present world is accordingly lived in the context of a hope which reaches out beyond it to the new world when the Saviour is fully revealed in glory (cf. 1 Cor 1:7; Jude 21; 1 Pet 1:13); the renouncing of worldliness is thus not asceticism for its own sake but is an aspect of the path to a greater joy than the world can offer. Suggestions that the eschatological outlook is here unemphasised and has a different force from what it had in earlier Christianity where it was the primary factor in determining how believers lived are not convincing.¹¹⁶ Rather, in conjunction with v. 14 the statement shows that balance of realised and future divine action and salvation which is characteristic of the NT generally.

The act of expectation is expressed by the verb προσδέχομαι**.¹¹⁷ It has two senses: (a) ‘to accept, receive, welcome’ a person (Lk 15:2; Rom 16:2; Phil 2:29) or thing (Acts 24:15;¹¹⁸ Heb 10:34; 11:35); (b) ‘to await’, usually with eager longing, a person (Lk 12:36) or a thing (Mk 15:43; Lk 2:25, 38; 23:51; Acts 23:21; Jude 21). For the present combination with ἐλπίδα there is a close parallel in Job 2:9, προσδεχόμενος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας μου.¹¹⁹ The usage is thus a Hebraism (Spicq, 639).

The content of the expectation is given in two nouns followed by a lengthy gen. phrase. ἐλπίς (1.2 note; 3.7 note) is used here by metonymy for the content of the hope, its fulfilment (Spicq, 639; cf. Acts 24:15; Rom 8:24; Gal 5:5; Col 1:5). The hope is of something that is confidently expected (Archiea–Hatton, 293).

In a somewhat rare turn of phrase the hope is described as ‘blessed’. In Cl. μακάριος* refers predominantly to the state of bliss, free from earthly worries and cares, enjoyed by the gods of the Greeks. This sense is never found in the LXX which uses εὐλογητός in its place and thereby avoids the associations of a word that seems inapplicable to Yahweh. It is, however, found in Philo (*Sacr.* 101) who describes God in Greek terms. The word is also used of people who are free from worries and cares, like the gods. In the NT the word is used of God only in the PE (1 Tim 1:11; 6:15**), but it is frequently used of persons who are the objects of God’s favour. Such people are happy or count themselves fortunate on the basis of favourable circumstances (e.g. Acts 26:2), usually on account of some divine action or gift. The LN translation ‘happy’ is generally inadequate; the traditional translation ‘blessed’ now sounds archaic but brings out the fact that a person is μακάριος because of the action of the gods or God. To pronounce a person ‘blessed’ (as in the Gospel beatitudes) is to declare the happiness of somebody who has experienced God’s blessing (Rom 4:7f. = Ps 32:1f.) or to declare that people, e.g. mourners (Mt 5:4), who apparently are in a state of misery and deprivation, are really in a fortunate state and should therefore be able to be glad here and now because of some divine action (like the future comfort which God will bestow on them). Here only in the NT is μακάριος used of a thing.¹²⁰

There may be more than one nuance in the usage here: (a) The hope is closely associated with the blessed God and therefore itself shares in his incorruptibility and ‘blessedness’.¹²¹ Consequently it has a quality about it which is absent from other things that one might hope for in this world. The effect of the use is to bring out the positive character of the hope (Spicq, 639). (b) The word-group can be used of praising people by acknowledging their fortunate state (cf. the use of εὐλογητός), and therefore the thought may be that the hope is one for which thanks should be

given to God. (c) The hope is one that confers a blessing on those waiting for it because it is associated with God.¹²² It is not clear whether the blessedness is regarded as something already possessed by those who have this hope (cf. the present blessedness of those who look forward to future divine gifts in the Beatitudes) or as the state into which people will enter in the future. It appears to be the latter for Knight, 321, who writes of the hope that ‘embodies and brings the blessedness for which Christians hope’; he refers to Rom 5:2 which implies that believers will share in the glory of God (cf. Rom 8:17, 30; 2 Cor 4:17).

The second object of the participle is added without repetition of the article; hence it is probable that we have an expegetic addition, ‘a hope that consists in the revelation of the glory’ (cf. Acts 23:6; BD § 276³). On the meaning and significance of ἐπιφάνεια* see **Excursus 8**. δόξα* (1 Tim 1:17; 3:16; 2 Tim 2:10; 4:18**), expresses the glorious character of God, originally his splendid shining appearance, and then all that makes him the transcendent God. This could be the reflection of his power and holiness, but in Christian usage the glory of God is more and more seen as the wonder of his grace and love expressed in his saving act in Christ.¹²³

The syntax and reference of the whole genitive phrase are matters of debate. As regards the syntax there are four possibilities:

(a) ἐπιφάνειαν is followed by two parallel gen. phrases, ‘glory’ and ‘saviour’, i.e. ‘the epiphany of the glory of the great God and [the epiphany] of our saviour Jesus Christ’ (H. Windisch 1935:225). The epiphany of Christ is accompanied by the epiphany of the glory of God (cf. Kelly, 246f.). However, the parallelism of the personal Saviour and the impersonal glory is strange. Further, the phrase ‘God and Saviour’ is a well-attested pairing, and it is more likely that readers would take the two nouns as being linked together than that they would supply ‘epiphany’ before the second noun (see below, note on ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτήρ). The absence of the article with ‘Saviour’ also speaks against paralleling it with ‘of the glory’ (cf. Harris* 1980:267; although Moule 1953:109f. states that it is not decisive).

(b) τῆς δόξης is a Hebraic gen. of quality, giving the translation ‘the glorious epiphany’, and the following genitives are then directly dependent on ἐπιφάνειαν (cf. AV; NIV). The difficulty is whether there is any precedent for the combination of a Hebraic gen. with an ordinary gen. Moreover, the phrase can be taken straightforwardly to refer to the epiphany of the glory of God, just as in v. 11 we have the epiphany of the grace of God; a parallelism between the two phrases is likely.

(c) The two nouns form a hendiadys: ‘the epiphany, namely the glory of...’¹²⁴ But this construction gives a second hendiadys, since ‘epiphany’ is already linked to ‘hope’ in this kind of way (cf. Ellicott, 187); this is surely impossible.

(d) The straightforward translation, ‘the epiphany of the glory of our God...’, is surely the correct one. Knight, 322, notes that ‘glory’ is used elsewhere of the splendour accompanying the parousia (e.g. Mk 13:26); that ‘glory’ is often followed by a gen. referring to God; and that the phrase is parallel to v. 11 (the epiphany of the grace of God).¹²⁵ The parallels in 1 Pet 4:13 (at the revelation of his glory) and 1 Pet 5:1 (the glory to be revealed) strongly favour this view.

As regards the reference, the whole phrase ἡ ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ...θεοῦ has been taken here to refer to:

(a) the epiphany of the personal glory of God (gen. of content; Fee, 196);

(b) the epiphany of the Glory of God, namely Christ, who is the glorious manifestation of God (see below);

(c) ‘the full manifestation of all that Christ is in Himself and in His saints’ (Lock, 144). Believers are changed from one degree of glory to another (2 Cor 3:7–18; 4:4–6) and Christ is glorified in them at the parousia (2 Th 1:10). Since the term ‘epiphany’ tends to refer to God’s saving intervention rather than simply to his manifestation, and in view of the parallelism with hope, this interpretation has much to be said for it. It receives important corroboration from 2 Tim 1:10.

God is described as μέγας*, a word used metaphorically of important things (1 Tim 3:16) and people (e.g. the high priest, Heb 4:14; a prophet, Luke 7:16). It is commonly used of gods and

goddesses (Artemis, Acts 19:27f., 34f.; MM 392f.). According to Grundmann, in Classical Greek it is used of almost all the gods, and has its place in cultic epiclesis. It stresses transcendence, majesty, supremacy, and can have a superlative sense ('das schlechthin Überragende, Erhabene und Unvergleichbare', Roloff, 201). It is very frequent in Hellenistic sources and can be used of several gods together.¹²⁶ It is equally at home in Judaism with reference to Yahweh¹²⁷, his attributes¹²⁸ and his name.¹²⁹ In the NT it is also used of Christ as Shepherd (Heb 13:20), but this is hardly a parallel to the present use, where it is the title of 'great God' that may be used of him. The noun μεγαλειότης is used in 2 Pet 1:16 of Christ. The adjective is not used elsewhere of God in the NT, but the noun is used of him in Lk 9:43; 2 Pet 1:16; Heb 1:3; 8:1; Jude 25.¹³⁰ For God as Saviour see 1:3 note.

But to whom is the reference being made? At this point we encounter the major exegetical problem of the verse. It would not be surprising to read of 'our [great] God and saviour', since this is a familiar collocation (see below), although a reference to the epiphany of *God* would be unique in a NT context. The problem arises because of the addition of the words 'Jesus Christ' at the end of the phrase, which forces us to reconsider the question of its syntax: did the writer really intend us to take it as 'our great God-and-Saviour, namely Jesus Christ', or did he mean something else? Is the term 'God' used to refer to 'God [the Father]' alongside Jesus Christ or is it part of a description of Jesus as God and Saviour?¹³¹ There are three main interpretations to be considered.

(1) The passage refers to two persons.¹³²

(2) The passage refers to Jesus as being the glory of God (the Father).¹³³

(3) The passage refers to Jesus as 'our God and Saviour'.¹³⁴ Some scholars leave the question open.¹³⁵ In any case, the doctrinal implications of these renderings are much the same; if Christ is not explicitly declared to be in some sense 'God', his equality with God is expressed in no uncertain terms.

1. The Passage Refers to Two Persons

This interpretation gives the rendering: 'the epiphany of the glory of the great God and [of the glory] of our Saviour Jesus Christ'.¹³⁶ The following arguments are offered in favour of this view:

(a) It would be unprecedented in the NT to use θεός as an attribute of Jesus (Winer, 130 n. 2, cited by Knight, 323). To this it may be replied that 2 Pet 1:1 offers a parallel (Harris* 1992:229–38), and the same is probably true of Rom 9:5 (Harris* 1992:143–72). There is, of course, ample precedent in early church writings.¹³⁷

(b) It is unlikely that the word 'God' would be applied to both the Father (v. 11!) and the Son in the same sentence. However, in other places where 'God' is used of Jesus, a differentiation between him and God (the Father) is found in the immediate vicinity (Jn 1:1; 1:18; 20:28–31; Rom 9:5f.; Heb 1:8f.; 2 Pet 1:1f.).

(c) The use of μέγας is more likely with God than with Christ, since the writer will have used an accepted title of God, never applied elsewhere to Christ, to combat the degrading of the Creator by Gnostic heretics (Klöpper 1904:83). The force of this argument is weakened if the background to the heresy in the PE assumed by Klöpper is absent. Grundmann claims that 'with its cultic and polytheistic background the phrase is better adapted to refer to Jesus Christ as God than to God the Father in the narrower, monotheistic sense' (TDNT IV, 540).

(d) In 1 Tim 1:11 there is a reference to 'the gospel of the glory of the blessed God', where God [the Father] is apparently meant (Holtzmann, 490). However, the writer is so free in saying the same things about God [the Father] and Christ that not too much weight can be attached to this (e.g. the designation of each of them as σωτήρ).

(e) On the analogy of Lk 9:26 there can be one epiphany which is of the glory of God and of the glory of Christ (Holtzmann, 490).

(f) 'Saviour' is a word 'which gradually dropped the article' and became quasi-technical (Bernard, 172). However, in the PE it always has the article except for good grammatical reasons (1 Tim 1:1; 4:10).

Alternatively, it is argued that the addition of ἡμῶν renders the repetition of the article unnecessary, or that the phrase ‘our Saviour Jesus Christ’ is so similar to ‘our Lord Jesus Christ’ that it did not require the article (Hasler 1977:200). (See below.)

(g) Since the past and present are determined by the saving activity of God and of Christ, it is likely, indeed necessary, that the consummation similarly will involve the epiphany of God and of Jesus Christ (Oberlinner, 137). Oberlinner goes on to comment that the structure of the section really requires only a reference to God at this point, corresponding with v. 11, but the mention of Jesus as Saviour is included in order to provide a peg for the following soteriological confession. But, as he recognises, a ‘double parousia’ is an odd concept (cf. Hanson, 184f.)

2. *The Passage Refers to Jesus as Being the Glory of God (the Father)*

On this view ‘Jesus Christ’ is in apposition to ‘glory’, giving the translation: ‘the epiphany of the glory of our great God and Saviour, [which glory is] Jesus Christ’.¹³⁸ In favour of this view it can be argued:

(a) The combination θεός καὶ σωτήρ is a stereotyped one which is preserved by this interpretation instead of being split up, as in the previous interpretation.¹³⁹ However, the phrase was frequently applied both to ‘divine beings’ and to deified rulers.¹⁴⁰ The combination is equally preserved by interpretation (3) in which it is applied to Christ.

(b) The phraseology reflects the PE usage which refers to God (the Father) as Saviour (1:3; 2:10; *et al.*). But when v. 14 goes on to describe a saving action, it is the work of Christ as Saviour, not God, and in any case ‘Saviour’ is a title used of him (1:4) as well as of God.

(c) Elsewhere Christ is placed in apposition to the mystery of God (Col 2:2) and is the reflection of God’s glory (Heb 1:3). Whereas, however, in Col 2:2 the apposition is quite clear, here it is anything but obvious. The language is ambiguous, and the ambiguity could have been easily removed by inserting ἥτις ἐστιν or the like.

(d) Harris suggests that ‘glory of God’ may have been a primitive christological title (cf. John 1:14; 12:41; Acts 7:55; 2

Cor 4:6; Eph 1:3 compared with 1:17; Heb 1:3). But in none of the passages listed is δοξά remotely titular.

Moule 1953:109, rightly describes this view as ‘highly improbable’.

3. *The Passage Refers to Jesus as ‘Our God and Saviour’*

The third possibility is that the phrase refers to one person: ‘the epiphany of the glory of our great God and Saviour, [namely] Jesus Christ’. In favour of this view it can be argued:

(a) ‘God and Saviour’ is a well-attested formula (see note above), and it is unlikely that it should be split up (Moule 1953:110; Easton, 95). The description of Yahweh as Saviour was common, and it would not be surprising if the appellation of Christ as Saviour led to his closer identification with God the Saviour.

In the context there is a use of semi-technical terms for the royal epiphany of Christ. The author may well be combatting worship of Artemis or human rulers. Thus MHT I, 84, comment: ‘Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times, lends strong support to Wendland’s contention that Christians, from the latter part of the first century onward, deliberately annexed for their Divine master the phraseology that was impiously arraigned to themselves by some of the worst of men.’¹⁴¹

(b) This interpretation gives the best explanation of the omission of the article before σωτήρος.¹⁴² Other explanations fall short, such as that Σωτήρ was regarded as a proper name and therefore did not need the article (cf. Bernard, 172), or that the article was unnecessary where ἡμῶν is used,¹⁴³ or that the distinction of the two persons was so obvious that the article was not needed (Abbot*, 13–16); as Harris notes, elsewhere in the PE σωτήρ ἡμῶν has the article, and therefore it is the absence here that needs to be explained.¹⁴⁴

(c) The use of ‘great’ is better explained if it refers to Christ. Nowhere else in the NT is the adjective ‘great’ used of God [the Father].¹⁴⁵ Bernard, 172, holds that there must be some special reason for using this unique term here, that it is somewhat pointless if applied to God [the Father], but is significant if applied to Christ, whose epiphany is awaited. Harris argues that

the adjective is fitly used of Jesus as ‘God and Saviour’ and that it is then explained in v. 14. More convincing is Houlden’s suggestion (151) that the writer is contrasting ‘our deity’ with the pagan divinities of surrounding peoples.

(d) Harris claims that this view gives parallelism between the two sections of v. 13, each of which has the structure: article — adjective — noun — καί — anarthrous noun — genitive:

τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης
τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν

If so, just as the hope *is* the appearance, so the God *is* the Saviour (Harris* 1992:183). This is hardly compelling!

(e) Schnackenburg 1970:357f. holds that the argument points to a christological climax. Just as the grace of God appeared in the first epiphany of Jesus, so the full divine glory will appear in him at his second epiphany. This is more a statement of the implications of this interpretation than an argument for it.

(f) Stauffer commented that the use of ἡμῶν links God and Saviour together so that they both refer to Christ; what was originally a doxology to God has been changed into a doxology to Christ.¹⁴⁶ But he presented no substantiation for his assertion (cf. Turner, N., MHT III, 181). In 2 Pet 1:1, 11 ἡμῶν comes after the first noun rather than the second.

(g) The way in which the PE use the term ‘Saviour’ both of God and of Christ would help towards the assimilation of the two persons.

(h) ‘Epiphany’ is a term elsewhere applied to the appearing of the Son, not of God (the Father). Nowhere do we hear of the parousia of the Father (Hanson, 184f.; Schnackenburg 1970:358). To this it can be objected that it is the glory of God, not God himself who is manifested here (cf. Mk 8:38; Abbot*, 4–6). The objection misses the point, however, which is that there is no epiphany of God’s glory and grace apart from that in Christ. The NT does not know a future hope of the epiphany of God (the Father). God brings about the epiphany of his Son rather than himself appearing along with him.

(i) Redemption and purification are the work of Yahweh in the OT (Exod 19:5; Deut 7:6; 14:2); in v. 14 these activities are transferred to Jesus and he is therefore appropriately called ‘God’ here (Lock, 145; Kittel, G., *TDNT* II, 248).

(j) Post-Nicene writers are said to interpret the phrase as applying to Christ.¹⁴⁷

But Harris notes that the evidence is uncertain and that in any case the major ancient versions distinguish two persons here.¹⁴⁸

(k) Finally, we must consider the theological arguments against this view, especially when the passage is set in the broader context of the theology of the PE as a whole. Here we find (i) the subordination of Christ to the Father (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 143), and (ii) a stress on the oneness of God. God has the initiative and Christ is only the helper (1 Tim 2:5; 1:17; 6:15f.; Klöpper 1904:83f; Windisch 1935:226). According to Windisch, God is called ‘great’ precisely to place him above Jesus.¹⁴⁹ The divinisation of Christ in the context of the epiphany idea is said to be impossible (Hasler 1977:200).

These counter-arguments are far from convincing. It can equally be affirmed that the Epistles demonstrate a strong functional equality, if not identity, between God [the Father] and Christ which makes the transfer of the title fully possible. It is difficult to see why the One in whom God is fully manifest should not thereby be entitled to the title of God.

Conclusion

The following points are decisive, and they establish that the third interpretation is the correct one:

(a) the probability that ‘God and Saviour’ must be treated as one phrase rather than being split in two in view of the absence of the article with ‘Saviour’ and the attestation of the phrase as a divine attribute;

(b) the improbability that Jesus Christ is in apposition to ‘glory’ or that two epiphanies are in mind;

(c) the background in the later NT writings and the AF in which the title of ‘God’ was beginning to be applied to Jesus.

14. ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν A somewhat loosely attached addition to the sentence develops the thought of Jesus as Saviour by describing his action as redeemer and purifier of a

people who are to be enthusiastic to do good works. It is thus broadly parallel with vv. 11f. in describing the saving action of God and its purpose in human life. Traditional language is used to refer to the redemptive action of Christ. The fact that the language is traditional does not make it any less meaningful. There is a strong contrast between the glory of the future epiphany of Christ and his self-giving in death (cf. Brox, 300f.). The effect of the whole addition is to strengthen the paraenesis by rooting it once again quite firmly in the past action of God in Christ. The saving effect of grace is described in more concrete terms.

The main (relative) clause is paralleled in Gal 1:4; 2:20; Mk 10:45; 1 Tim 2:6; cf. 1 Pet 1:13–19; 2:9f. for related material. An existing tradition is undoubtedly being used. There are four constant elements in the structure: (a) a verb ‘to give/hand over’; (b) ‘himself/his soul’; (c) a preposition ‘on behalf of/instead of’; (d) ‘me/us/many/all’. The closest parallel to the formula is found in 1 Tim 2:6, but there it is a much closer rendition of the saying of Jesus in Mk 10:45 in a more Hellenistic form with the Semitisms removed.

ὅς is used to add on what looks like a separate tradition which is appropriate as a motive and basis for Christian behaviour. δίδωμι¹⁵⁰ can be used of giving, dedicating oneself (2 Cor 8:5) or of giving oneself in death as a martyr (1 Macc 2:50; 6:44; cf. Thucydides 2:43:2). For Christ giving himself in death cf. Mk 10:45/Mt 20:28; Lk 22:19; Gal 1:4 (cf. Jn 6:51).¹⁵¹ The reflexive pron. ἑαυτόν¹⁵² is better Greek for the Semitic τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ of Mk 10:45, which reflects the absence of a reflexive pronoun in Hebrew and Aramaic. ὑπέρ*, ‘on behalf of, concerning’ (1 Tim 2:1, 2, 6**), is used in a series of statements about the death and self-giving of Jesus and his priestly activity on behalf of others.¹⁵³

The force of the preposition can range from doing something on behalf of others for their benefit (so here, Holtzmann, 491) or as their representative (Heb 6:20) to doing something in place of others, such as dying or bearing a penalty so that they do not need to do so, and so doing it for their benefit.¹⁵⁴ The preposition here is equivalent to ἀντί in Mk 10:45. Linked as it is here with redemption, it suggests that the person gives his life instead of those for whom he dies. It thus expresses representation and

solidarity (Spicq, 641f.). According to Harris a possible reason why Paul preferred ὑπέρ to ἀντί was that the former could simultaneously express representation and substitution. ἡμῶν expresses a natural shift to the pl. in view of the following first person.

ἵνα λυτρώσεται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας The stress in the verse lies on this purpose clause which expresses the effects of Christ’s self-giving. It has two balanced parts. On the one hand, Christ has redeemed his people from all evil. On the other hand, he has created a new people, i.e. a new Israel, who will do good works. Both of these actions of Christ are antitypical of the actions of Yahweh. At the Exodus he delivered the Israelites from slavery and made them his own people. Already in the OT the concept of redemption is spiritualised to refer to deliverance from sin. Thus Christ here has the same roles as Yahweh; the ‘high’ Christology of v. 13 is maintained. The Christian church is described as his ‘Israel’. To the negative deliverance from evil corresponds the positive zeal for doing good.

The first part of the purpose clause is negative in that it is concerned with setting people free from evil. λυτρώω** is ‘to set free’ — sometimes by payment of a ransom (Lk 24:21; 1 Pet 1:18***). The verb can be used of human action (Exod 13:13; Lev 25:25; 27:13) and of divine, expressing God’s deliverance of Israel from Egypt (Exod 6:6; Deut 7:8; 2 Sam 7:23) and his action generally in delivering his people from their enemies.¹⁵⁵ There is only one instance in the LXX of deliverance from sin (Ps 129 [MT 130]:8; but cf. Isa 44:22–24; *T. Jos.* 18:2) and two of deliverance of the individual from death (Hos 13:14; Eccles 51:2). God’s deliverance of his people may involve the exercise of his power (Exod 6:6; Neh 1:10), and in some cases the metaphor of ransom is used, but the idea that God has to pay anything to anybody as the price of setting his people free is rejected (Isa 45:13; 52:3).¹⁵⁶

The verb is used of the Lord’s action on the day of his future epiphany (2 Clement 17:4) and of Christ’s action in delivering his people (Barnabas 14:5f., 8) from death (Barnabas 19:2); Ignatius, *Philad.* 11:1 speaks of the redemption of persecutors of the church through the grace of Christ. Hermas uses it for rescue from a wild beast (*Vis.* 4:1:7) and of setting people free from their afflictions

(*Mand.* 8:10). The language here echoes Ps 129:8, but what is said there of God is here applied to Christ (cf. Wolfe 1990:48–54).

ἀνομία** is ‘lawlessness, iniquity’, the opposite of righteousness and synonymous with sin. The word is very frequent in the LXX (228 times) as a translation for **יָדָוּ** and other words. It can refer both to evil intentions and to evil deeds. The relationship with the concept of law is often weak. It is equated with sin in 1 Jn 3:4. Paul uses it rarely.¹⁵⁷ The use of the word here is based on Ps 129:8 LXX, but the word provides a link with Ezek 37:23 which has also influenced the next part of the verse (Haubeck*, 211). Holtzmann, 491, claims that in Paul salvation is from the power of the law, whereas here it is from the power of sin (as in 1 Pet 1:18). This assertion neglects Paul’s close linking between the power of sin and the power of the law. To be delivered from evil may be to be set free from its power or from its consequences. The context here of the parousia (and therefore of judgement) suggests that both ideas are included.

καὶ καθάρισι ἐαυτῶ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων

The second part of the purpose clause is positive in that it is concerned more with the creation of a new people characterised by good deeds. Admittedly, the verb shares the negative quality of λυτρόω, but it is given a positive character in its context. καθαρίζω** is ‘to make clean’, literally (Lk 11:39), cultically (Heb 9:22), and metaphorically of spiritual cleansing. The last of these categories can include both the action of God in forgiving sin and taking away its guilt,¹⁵⁸ and also the action of people in abstaining from evil deeds (2 Cor 7:1; Jas 4:8).¹⁵⁹ The language echoes Ezek 37:23, which is used here to fill out the thought taken from Ps 129:8 (Haubeck*). The thought of cleansing by the blood of Jesus may be implicit in view of the cultic background of the phraseology (cf. 1 Jn 1:7; Heb 9:14; 1 Pet 1:2; Lock, 146). Schlarb 1990:84f. suggests that the use of the language of ἀνομία and καθαρίζω may be related to false notions of purity held by the heretics. ἐαυτῶ corresponds to μοι in Ezek 37:23.

The reference of the phrase is disputed. Some find a reference to baptism (cf. 3:5; White, 196; Lock, 147; Spicq, 642); others think that the reference is to the sanctification of believers (Bernard, 174; Guthrie, 213). But much the most likely view is

that the writer is thinking simply of God’s total purpose in creating a new people for himself.

λαός** can be used of a crowd or of a nation, national group, or of a people as opposed to their rulers. Here it echoes OT language where Israel was ‘the people of Yahweh’, the nation which he had chosen to be the people over whom he would rule (Deut 7:6; Judg 5:11; 1 Sam 2:24). In the NT the members of the Christian church are increasingly seen as part of this people, and they take over to themselves this designation over against the Jewish people who are regarded as being no longer the people of God because they have rejected the Messiah, Jesus. Paul takes over the OT designation of the Jews as the people of God (Rom 10:21; 11:1, 2; 15:10), but he also applies the term to the church of Jews and Gentiles (Rom 9:25f., reapplying Hos 2:25 and 1:10; 2 Cor 6:16, reapplying Lev 26:16). Here also OT language is reapplied to the new people created by the redemptive action of Christ; the same point is made even more strongly in 1 Pet 2:9f. (cf. 1 Clement 64).¹⁶⁰

περιούσιος***, ‘chosen, special’, is a word found only rarely outside the LXX.¹⁶¹ It is related to the noun περιουσία, ‘surplus, superfluity, abundance’, and the verb περιουσιάζω, ‘to have more than enough, abound, be distinguished, eminent’. Hence the word here conveys the idea of ‘a costly possession, a choice treasure’ rather than simply ‘a people of possession’.¹⁶² In the LXX the phrase λαὸς περιούσιος translates **הַלְלוּ עַם** (Exod 19:5; cf. Deut 7:6; 14:2; 26:18; cf. Exod 23:22 [no Heb. equiv.]). The Hebrew term occurs also in Mal 3:17; Ps 135:4; Eccl 2:8; 1 Chr 29:3, and refers to private property that one has personally acquired (Wildberger, H., *THAT* II, 142–4). Cf. 1 Clement 64 and the use of the noun περιποίησις.¹⁶³ The concept is also linked with redemption in Eph 1:14. Spicq, 643, says the phrase expresses personal possession, choice, preference and privilege.

ζηλωτής** is ‘a zealous, enthusiastic person’. The noun is often followed by an indication of the sphere of the zeal, which may be a person or a thing.¹⁶⁴ It frequently expresses active devotion to God (Acts 22:3) and the law in Judaism.¹⁶⁵ The word can be used absolutely in this sense (4 Macc 18:12; 1 Esdr 8:69 v.l.) and came to refer to militant Jewish nationalists (Lk 6:15;

Acts 1:13). However, the language also has ‘a good Gk. ring, denoting the consistent and zealous orientation of action to a moral ideal’; it is thus expressive of the predominant Gk. usage for an ethical attitude.¹⁶⁶ It signifies ‘eager [to possess] spiritual gifts’ (1 Cor 14:12). The phrase ‘eager [to do] good’ (1 Pet 3:13***; cf. Philo, *Praem.* 11) is close to the usage here.¹⁶⁷ A vigorous, active attitude is indicated (cf. 1 Clement 45:1 where it is linked to φιλόνηκος).¹⁶⁸

EXCURSUS 8

Christology and the concept of ‘epiphany’

Brox, 161–6; Deichgräber 1967; Gundry, R. H., ‘The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in 1 Timothy 3, 16’ in Gasque, W. W., and Martin, R. P., *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970), 203–22; Hanson, 38–42; Klöpffer 1902; Läger 1996; Lau 1996; Löning, K., ‘Epiphanie der Menschenfreundlichkeit. Zur Rede von Gott im Kontext städtischer Öffentlichkeit nach den Pastoralbriefen’, in Lutz-Bachmann, M. (ed.), *Unddennoch ist von Gott zu reden. FS H. Vorgrimler* (Freiburg, 1994; not accessible to me), 107–24; Marshall 1988; 1994; Merkel, H., ‘Christologische Traditionen in den Pastoralbriefen’, unpublished paper given at the SNTS conference, Canterbury, 1983; Metzger, W., *Der Christushymnus 1. Timotheus 3, 16* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1979); Oberlinner 1980:192–213; [1996], 143–59; Roloff, 358–65; Schnackenburg 1970:355–60; Simonsen 1980; Spicq, 245–54; Stenger, W., *Der Christushymnus 1 Tim 3, 16* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1977); Stettler 1998; Towner 1989:51–6, 75–119; Trummer 1978:193–208; Wengst 1973; Wilson 1979:69–89; Versnel, H. S., ‘What did ancient man see when he saw a god?’, in van der Plas, D. (ed.), *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 42–55; Windisch 1935.

On ἐπιφάνεια

Bultmann, R., and Lührmann, D., *TDNT* IX, 7–10; Couser 1992:155–64; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 104; Gärtner, B., *NIDNTT* III, 317–20; Hasler 1977:193–209; Lührmann, 1971; McNamara, M., *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978); Mohrmann, C., ‘Epiphania’, *RSPT* 37 (1953), 644–70; Oberlinner 1980:192–213; Pax 1955; idem, *RAC* V, 832–909; Pfister, F., *PWSup* IV (1924), 277–323; Schlarb 1990:164–72; *TLNT* II, 65–8.

1. Modern Study of the Problem

(a) *The post-Pauline understanding.* The general consensus among critical scholars in the early part of the twentieth century was to regard the Christology of the PE as something of a declension from that of Paul, hardly an entity worthy of study for

its own sake. The PE were thought to have a deuteropauline Christology in that they picked up the Pauline concepts of preexistence and exaltation, added to them some Johannine insights, and expressed the result with the aid of new terminology drawn from the imperial cult and the syncretistic epiphany theology of the time.¹⁶⁹

(b) *The pre-Pauline hypothesis.* This consensus was sharply questioned by Windisch*. He argued that the concept of preexistence is not to be found in the Pastorals. Instead of it he detected, first, the presence of a *Son of man/Messianic* type of Christology which speaks of two stages of existence (2 Tim 2:8; 1 Tim 2:5 (cf. 1 Tim 5:21; 2 Tim 4:1); 1 Tim 6:11–16. Here Jesus is thoroughly subordinate to God. He is a man who is exalted and placed alongside God.

Second, side by side with these statements there are others in which something more like an *incarnation-Christology* is to be found. The texts in question are 1 Tim 1:15; 3:16 and Tit 2:13f. They speak of the ‘coming’ of Christ and his manifestation in the flesh, but there is no reference to pre-existence. The vocabulary of epiphany is used in this connection, but only in 2 Tim 1:9f. does Windisch find it used specifically of the historical appearing of Christ, and the emphasis there is on the resurrection rather than the incarnation. In fact the epiphany really takes place in the proclamation of the gospel. When we hear of the appearance of our great God in Tit 2:13 the reference, according to Windisch, is to God the Father and not to Christ. Thus it is only with considerable qualification that we can speak of an epiphany-Christology in the Pastorals.

It emerges, then, that Christ is never spoken of as divine, and the phrase Son of God is not used. When Jesus is called Saviour, this occurs in the context of epiphany-theology and here (and here only) we can observe a taking-over of Hellenistic language. Only in the use of *kyrios* do the Pastorals stand near Paul.

Windisch claimed that a similar Christology could be found elsewhere in the NT. In addition to the Synoptic Gospels, he found similar thinking in Acts and 1 Peter, and he also detected it behind the Apostles’ Creed. These writings do not develop wisdom, logos and incarnation christologies.

From all this Windisch concluded that the Christology of the Pastorals is basically *pre-Pauline* and draws little from Paul. It is a combination of some Pauline and synoptic/early Christian motifs, with a notable absence of some central Pauline christological concepts. The post-Pauline element lies in the use of the epiphany and saviour terminology. There is no indication that the author is developing his views over against a false, Gnostic Christology. He is *not a systematic theologian* but a purveyor of tradition. The Christology of the Pastorals thus forms an important part of the argument against Pauline authorship, since it represents a throwback to an earlier period.

This position was broadly accepted by subsequent writers who do not add a great deal to what he said.¹⁷⁰ Hanson, 38–42, holds that the author has no consistent Christology of his own but makes use of whatever comes to him in his sources. He does not go back behind Paul but simply picks up titles at random (like ‘saviour’, taken from the imperial cult). He is a binitarian and is in danger of becoming a ditheist. He has no doctrine of the cross.

A more positive view is offered by Merkel*, who claims that the christological texts which appear to incorporate traditional materials derive from sources which lie partly in a Greek-speaking Jewish-Christian church, and partly in Pauline Christianity. The texts have a certain unity in that they show no indication of pre-existence. Nevertheless, the author has taken over a large number of terms from Hellenistic religion and has used these to interpret the salvation event. The author has thus tried to use modern expressions to interpret the content of the old formulae; he is thus modern in expression, but conservative in content.

(c) *The theory of an ‘epiphany’ Christology.* Merkel is influenced by the work of Hasler, who appears to have been the first to see the key importance of ‘epiphany’ to the author’s Christology. He claims that the author lays aside salvation-historical or apocalyptic ways of thinking and offers a new presentation of Christology in the language and, more importantly, in the thought-forms of the Hellenistic world. Traditional statements are translated into this new set of categories which are associated with the concept of epiphany.

The starting point is the transcendence of God, who is described as the only and the invisible God, the great Creator. He

is the source of eternal life and his will is to bestow it on mankind. His gracious will to this end is manifested in Christ who will at a future time appear as the manifestation of the grace of God. He will bestow eternal life on those who, thanks to the grace already revealed in him, have persevered in the faith and in good works, and consequently qualify for it. The hope of salvation is not guaranteed, therefore, by belonging to the church or by being baptised but only by the Holy Spirit who enables believers to do good works that will please the judge. Thus the doctrine of Christ is swallowed up in the doctrine of God. Even the cross has no saving significance of its own but is simply the evidence of the saving will of God. Traditional phraseology loses its original meaning and is made to serve this new conception. The witness of the church now functions as the evidence of eternal life in the future. The practice of Christian virtues will provide the members of the church with integrity at the last judgement; in this way they can be said to be justified by grace. There is thus a unified development of a new Christology in the Pastorals.

Similarly, Oberlinner (1980; 1996) finds a unified christological conception in the Pastorals. He claims that the presentation differs from that of Paul in that the author no longer lives in expectation of the imminent parousia; he has a greater sense of solidarity with the world, and his concept of sin is expressed more in terms of opposition to sound teaching. Christology is embedded in statements about the salvation-event which takes place on three closely linked levels — salvation history, proclamation, and ‘surprise’ (*Betroffenheit*); the soteriological aspect is thus the point of emphasis. The fundamental framework is provided by the Hellenistic categories of Saviour and epiphany, so that the concepts drawn from other religious settings enable a ‘translation’ of Christology; into this framework are integrated traditional sayings as well as Pauline material, and the whole has an anti-Gnostic tendency. Oberlinner corrects the picture given by Hasler by insisting that the epiphany of Jesus Christ makes the present time the time of salvation.

Läger 1996 emphasises the contribution made by the author of the PE as a creative theologian although he is careful to present his material as though it were part of the tradition. Her general understanding of the actual Christology is similar to that of

Oberlinner, but she notes that the author's interest is more in soteriology. She rightly contests the suggestion that the Christology is particularly subordinationist. Her specific contribution is to argue that the author lays great emphasis on the place of Paul (as he understands him) in soteriology, so that Christology is almost replaced by 'Paulology' and one could say '*extra Paulum nostrum nulla salus*', since salvation is mediated exclusively through his message (see Tit 1:1 note).

2. *The Use of Tradition*

The general trend in recent studies to regard the author as a theologian in his own right is fully justified. His work shows signs of a definite literary structure, and he binds theology closely to ethical and ecclesiastical teaching. Although he makes use of traditional material, he gives it his own deliberate formulation.

An important part is played by texts which are based on synoptic traditions (1 Tim 1:15; cf. Lk 19:10; 1 Tim 2:6 and Tit 2:14; cf. Mk 10:45). These stress the coming of Christ in order to ransom people from sin. It is not surprising that these statements stand in the service of a concept of Christ as Saviour.

Side by side with these statements which are basically soteriological are others which deal more with the status of Christ. 2 Tim 2:8 expresses the resurrection of Jesus Christ and his Davidic descent and is related in some way to Rom 1:3f. It is generally held that the author is dependent on Rom at this point, but it is more likely in our opinion that he was using the same traditional material as is incorporated in Rom. The reference to Davidic descent is part of the case for Jesus' status as Messiah (and not simply his humanity); the other part of the case is his resurrection as (implicitly) an act of divine vindication.

Whether or not 1 Tim 3:16 is pre-formed tradition, it is highly enigmatic in its terse presentation. The opening line is clear enough as a depiction of the manifestation of Jesus in this world as a human being. The following lines can be understood as varying depictions of his divine vindication which is spelled out in terms of his being revealed to angels and proclaimed to the nations, his acceptance in this world (by believers) and in the heavenly world of glory (by God) (cf. Lau 1996:91–114).

Both passages are thus concerned with the status of Jesus as the One vindicated by God through resurrection. In both passages, however, the significance of Jesus as Saviour is present: it is brought out explicitly in 2 Tim 2:8 and it is implied in the references to proclamation and belief in 1 Tim 3:16.

A further important feature is the use of the 'in Christ' formula, always (except 2 Tim 3:12) with nouns. Its effect is to put a christological stamp on the gifts of life, grace and salvation (2 Tim 1:1, 9; 2:10) and on the qualities of faith and love to be found in believers (1 Tim 1:14; 3:13; 2 Tim 1:13; 3:1, 5). Thereby it is made clear that the saving power of the crucified and risen Saviour, Jesus Christ, continues to be operative in the present era of salvation.¹⁷¹

3. *Jesus as Saviour*

The move towards a less Jewish and a more Hellenistic manner of expression is already apparent in the formulation of the traditional material. The language is generally less Semitic in character. It is also more universal in its scope.

The two main indications that the author has expressed himself by using Hellenistic categories, namely the use of 'Saviour' and 'epiphany', were highlighted by Oberlinner 1980. The characterisation of Jesus as Saviour (2 Tim 1:10; Tit 1:4; 2:13; 3:6) must be seen in the light of three factors.

The first is that it is also used of God (1 Tim 1:1; 2:3; 4:10; Tit 1:3; 2:10; 3:4), and the initial description of him as Saviour in both 1 Tim and Tit sets the tone of both these letters. God is primarily a Saviour. Consequently, the concept of Jesus as Saviour is directly related to this dominant theme. Salvation is the work of God through Jesus.

The second is that the letters contain ten instances of other words from the same word-group. The total salvation vocabulary is found proportionately to a far greater extent than anywhere else in the NT and occupies a major place in the vocabulary of the PE alongside other theological and ethical terms. This vocabulary is used at strategic points in the thought of the letters, both in the opening salutations and also in extended doctrinal passages, so that it is appropriate to describe the author's theology as essentially a theology of salvation (Marshall 1996a). It is within

this context that the references to Christ as Saviour are to be understood.

The third factor is the background to the letters. The term 'Saviour' was especially applied to gods and rulers in the Hellenistic world, and the influence of this usage is often held to be decisive for the use in the PE (Brox, 232f.; cf. Oberlinner, 155). Oberlinner draws attention to the paucity of usage in earlier parts of the NT and the evidence of a Hellenistic vocabulary and concepts elsewhere in the PE. He is not unaware of the frequent use of Saviour as a description of God in the LXX. It is true that the term was not used of the Messiah in Judaism. It appears, therefore, that the use of 'Saviour' for the Messiah developed in view of the understanding of his saving function and in the light of the usage for God. At the same time there is the fact that the name 'Jesus' is related to the same root.¹⁷² Moreover, the attestation of the title for Jesus is earlier than the PE (Phil 3:20; other NT instances may also well be earlier: Lk 2:11; Jn 4:42; Acts 5:3, 1; 13:23; Eph 5:23; 1 Jn 4:14). It appears, therefore, that the PE pick up a designation that was already in use in the church for Christ, but the author does so in close association with his use of the title for God and with an eye to its popularity in the Hellenistic world. The fundamental force of the term is accordingly derived from its Jewish and Christian background.

It has been suggested that the underlying reason for the use of the salvation vocabulary in the PE lies in the significant place which the concept has in Gnosticism and that the PE maintain the Pauline understanding of salvation as redemption over against the Gnostic physical-ontological understanding.¹⁷³

4. The Concept of Epiphany

The noun ἐπιφάνεια means 'appearance, appearing' (2 Th 2:8; 1 Tim 6:14; 2 Tim 1:10; 4:1, 8***; 2 Clement 12:1; 17:4). The word was used of the appearance of something previously hidden (like dawn or an unexpected enemy; LSJ) and especially of the manifestation of gods and divine beings.¹⁷⁴ The term 'epiphany' has come to be used in English for this specialised sense. Lührmann, 1971 has shown that in Hellenistic literature ἐπιφάνεια is associated with some kind of help to human beings, e.g. on the battlefield, but has questioned whether there is

necessarily a visible manifestation when the concept appears in Hellenistic Judaism. Lau 1996:179–225, has re-examined the evidence for the 'visibility' of the manifestation and concluded that 'the line of demarcation between the ideas of visible appearance and helping intervention is often blurred' (223; cf. Versnel*). 2 Macc in particular offers several examples of visible appearances reminiscent of OT theophanies.

The language is characteristic of Hellenistic religion and the cult of rulers who were regarded as gods or divine beings 'manifest' on earth. But, although the terminology is Greek, the concept is found in the OT (ἐπιφάνεια occurs 12 times in the LXX) and Judaism. The noun ἐπιφάνεια can refer to greatness, majesty (2 Kdms 7:23); to splendour of appearance (Esth 5:1 [15:6]); to the 'appearances' of people sacrificing before God (Amos 5:22 as a result of error); to 'saving interventions of God for his people' involving miraculous signs and visions (2 Macc 2:21; 3:24; 5:4; 12:22; 14:15; 15:27 *v.l.*; 3 Macc 2:9; 5:8, 51).¹⁷⁵

The verb ἐπιφάνω is used frequently (25 times) in the Gk. Bible. In the active it means 'to show'; the phrase 'to manifest one's face' is frequent (Num 6:25; Ps 30:16; 66:1; 79:3, 7, 19; 118:135; Dan 9:17θ; 3 Macc 6:18) and indicates the showing of divine favour. The verb is also used intransitively with the sense 'to appear', of what was previously unseen (the heavenly bodies, Acts 27:20), or 'to shine' (2 Macc 12:9 *v.l.*; Ep Jer 60). In the pass. it means 'to show oneself, make an appearance' (Ezek 17:6). In this sense it is used of divine beings,¹⁷⁶ and expressed the manifestation of God at Bethel (Gen 35:70),¹⁷⁷ the Sinai theophany (Deut 33:2); God's helping intervention (Ps 117:27); and his future manifestation (Jer 36 [29].14; Zeph 2:11; cf. Ezek 39:28). It is used of miraculous interventions by God in the temple in 2 Macc 3:30 and in battle in 2 Macc 12:22; 14:15. When God is petitioned to manifest his mercy in 3 Macc 2:19, he does so by a miraculous intervention against Ptolemy in the temple (cf. also 3 Macc 6:4, 9:18, 39). Lk 1:79 describes how the light of God will shine upon those in darkness and the shadow of death.

The adjective ἐπιφανής (13 times in LXX) can mean 'glorious, terrible [in appearance]'.¹⁷⁸ In 2 Macc 15:34 and 3

Macc 5:35 it is used of God as the One who had manifested his supernatural power.

This evidence shows that the concept of God revealing himself both to save and to judge was known in the OT in the tradition of theophanies, and that it was taken over in the LXX. Josephus likewise refers to God's powerful interventions and manifestations, but this usage is absent from Philo.¹⁷⁹ In the secular world the accession of a ruler or his visit to a city could be described as an epiphany (cf. Deissmann 1927:370–4; *TDNT* IX, 9).

In some Jewish literature it is said that the Messiah will be 'revealed' (4 Ezra 7:28; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 29:3; 39:7; cf. Jn 1:31). The same concept is found in the Targums (Tg JI Gen 35:21; PT Exod 12:42; Tg Zech 3:8; 6:12; Tg Jer 30:21; similarly the Kingdom of God will be revealed). This evidence suggests to McNamara*, 246–52, that it is unnecessary to look to Hellenism for the origin of the concept here; although the terminology was familiar in Hellenism, the concept expressed was fully at home in Judaism.

In the NT the noun is used as the equivalent to *παρουσία* for the future coming of the Lord (Tit 2:13; 2 Tim 4:1, 8; 2 Th 2:8; 2 Clement 12:1; 17:4) (and also as a term for his first coming (2 Tim 1:10***)). But whereas the noun is used to refer to the appearance of Jesus Christ or his glory, the verb is used (Tit 2:11; 3:4) for the manifestation of the grace or love of God. The thought is that God's saving purpose is made manifest in that it is put into effect. The thought is broader than simply that of the appearance of Christ and appears to encompass the whole of the saving event including the actual salvation of individuals who experience new birth and justification. It thus becomes possible to speak of a manifestation of grace which trains people to live godly lives. The plan/execution scheme which is expressed in 2 Tim 1:9f. and Tit 1:2f. by the use of the synonym *φανερώω* is thus implicit in Tit 3:4. At the same time the execution is closely linked to the epiphany of Jesus Christ as saviour (2 Tim 1:10); the thought, however, is not confined to the actual historical event of the life of Jesus but encompasses the ongoing effects that are brought about by the gospel. In this sense there is one epiphany inaugurated by the coming of Jesus and continuing throughout the present and future time.¹⁸⁰ But when the writer uses the phrases 'until the

epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Tim 6:14; cf. 2 Tim 4:1, 8) and 'awaiting the epiphany' (Tit 2:13), he is clearly distinguishing a separate event which lies in the future and forms the temporal context for a godly life. To speak, therefore, of the *second* advent of Christ is fully justified (*pace* Oberlinner, 157 n. 48).

When the PE speak of the manifestation of Christ and do so in relation to 'the grace which was given to us in Christ before eternal ages' (2 Tim 1:9f.), the implication is certainly that Christ himself was pre-existent and then revealed in his historical manifestation in flesh. In the light of this passage it is legitimate to assume that the manifestation of a pre-existing being is also intended in 1 Tim 1:15; 3:16. Thus, although epiphany language is not the same as incarnation language, in both cases the pre-existence of Christ is presupposed.¹⁸¹ The real manhood or humanity of Christ is also a matter of some importance, crystallised in the deliberate use of *ἄνθρωπος* in 1 Tim 2:5. The intention here is probably to emphasise that Jesus is properly qualified to be a mediator by himself belonging to the human race rather than to make an anti-docetic point.

5. Conclusion

If Jesus Christ shares the designation 'Saviour' with God and is a pre-existent being now made manifest, the implication is that he is a 'divine' being. This is further confirmed by the way in which he is described as the 'Lord' who possesses the divine prerogative of judgement (2 Tim 4:8), and as being alongside God the source of spiritual blessings and the object of service; it is also significant that he can be the object of a doxology (2 Tim 4:18). In this context the interpretation of Tit 2:13 as an application of the title 'our great God' to Jesus Christ is justified.

It emerges that the christological statements in the PE stand fully in line with the traditions which the writer has inherited but employ a new framework which brings out the character of Jesus as the universal Saviour who manifests the saving plan of God in its historical realisation. The saving event comprises three elements, the redemptive death of Jesus, the proclamation of the gospel, and the personal acceptance of salvation by faith, but this structure is firmly attested throughout the NT and should not be regarded as an innovation in the PE. The language used would

have aroused echoes in the Hellenistic world, but the concepts used are thoroughly Jewish, Christian, and Pauline.

g. Recapitulation (2:15)

The verse functions to bring the reader back to the point after the doctrinal backing, and to prepare the way for the further instructions that he is to give. Spicq, 643, says that it is very emphatic with its series of three verbs (cf. 2 Tim 4:2). It underlines the importance of the teaching that Titus is to give and offers encouragement in the face of any opposition. The danger is that people will pay no heed to Titus' authority. Probably this was because of his youth, like Timothy. This is not explicitly stated, and Oberlinner, 140, insists that this is too narrow an interpretation at a time when it is more likely that the development of an orderly system of leadership was not universally accepted; but 2:7f. may well point in that direction (though see discussion there; see further Wolter 1988:189–91). Spicq, 644, suggests that the Cretans were especially defiant (cf. above 1:7, 10–13 notes). The comment is apt, since the next section deals again with subordination.

If the letter is inauthentic, the verse can be seen as really addressed to the church, emphasising the importance of the teaching and the need not to ignore or despise it (Brox, 302). For its function cf. 3:8 and 1 Tim 1:18–20.

TEXT

15. λάλει δίδασκε (A) is probably assimilation to 1 Tim 6:2; the variant is possibly due to Atticist objection to a verb which could simply mean 'to chatter' (Elliott, 188).

περιφρονεῖτω καταφρονεῖτω (P pc) is assimilation to 1 Tim 4:12 (Elliott, 189).

EXEGESIS

15. Ταῦτα λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς ταῦτα refers backwards to the preceding instructions.¹⁸²

The doctrine is meant to lead to the moral effort previously described. Three verbs describe the desired action. λαλέω (2:1 note) is the weakest of them; here it must mean 'instruct'. It forms an *inclusio* with 2:1 and this suggests that the reference in the phrase is to the whole of 2:2–14. For παρακάλει see 1:9; 2:6, and for ἐλέγχω see 1:9, 13 and notes (cf. 2 Tim 4:2); the latter has the

force (a) 'to refute those who disagree/disobey'. If so, there is a slight shift in construction; ταῦτα no longer functions as direct object, but is taken as acc. of respect or quietly forgotten. Another possibility is that the verb here means 'to expose, set forth, declare' (so BA); since, however, the parallels refer to the exposing of what is evil, this possibility is not likely. μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς (cf. 1:3) is lit. 'with every kind of command' (Spicq, 644. cf. 1 Cor 7:6). But here the thought is of 'authority', i.e. 'with full authority, with all impressiveness' (BA); ὡς ἐπιτάσσω (Barrett, 139). The reference is to 'the impress of the pastoral word' (Delling, G., *TDNT* VIII, 37). The authority is doubtless to be understood as divine (Knight, 329), but the fact that the word is used elsewhere for divine commands is hardly the basis for taking it in this way here (*pace* Guthrie, 214). Titus's authority to teach and correct the congregation, which is an extension of the apostle's, is established, by way of transference or participation, in 1:1–5. Moreover, all commands to him (1:5, 13; 2:1) grow out of 1:1–4.¹⁸³

μηδεῖς σου περιφρονεῖτω The command is similar to 1 Tim 4:12 but with different wording (μηδεῖς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω). Cf. 1 Cor 16:11 (μη τις οὖν αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ), which has been thought to be echoed here, Holtzmann, 493). The third person command is a grammatical curiosity. In 1 Cor 16:11 it is indirectly addressing any of the readers of the letter to whom it applies. Here, although the letter is ostensibly addressed to Titus himself, it may have this force; commentators since Calvin have insisted that this statement is really addressed to the congregation. But the primary force of it is surely an appeal to Titus himself = 'Don't let anybody despise you'; or 'Don't be put off if anybody despises you'. Kelly, 103, and Fee, 106f., suggest it has both forces. σου is here gen. after the verb, but in 1 Tim 4:12 it may be dependent on the noun ('youth'). περιφρονέω*** is 'to disregard, despise' (with gen.; cf. 4 Macc 6:9; 7:16; 14:1); the verb suggests insolence and lack of respect for authority (Spicq, 644; *TLNT* III, 103f.).

**IIB. TEACHING FOR THE CHURCH — HOW BELIEVERS
ARE TO LIVE IN SOCIETY (3:1–11)**

This second teaching section consists of three parts; 3:1–2, 3–7, 8–11.¹ An opening set of instructions that culminates in the need for believers to show a gracious attitude to all people is followed by a justification for such conduct in the form of a reminder of how God acted graciously in their lives to save them and give them the gift of the Holy Spirit. With the aid of this theological backing Titus is to encourage good works and to avoid profitless arguments; people who persist in the latter are to be disciplined.

a. General Social Teaching Addressed to All (3:1–2)

Strobel, A., 'Zum Verständnis von Rom. 13', *ZNW* 47 (1956), 67–93.

The section opens with a collection of commands concerned especially with the relations of believers to outsiders. It deals specifically with subjection to the civil authorities, positive good works, avoiding contention with other people, and showing gentleness and courtesy to people in general. Similar teaching on the believers' relation to society is found in 1 Tim 2:1–2; Rom 13:1–7; 1 Pet 2:13–3:17. The passage is analogous to Rom 12:17–13:7, but there is more stress here on meekness and gentleness (Spicq, 645). The qualities required here stand in contrast to the life style of the writer's opponents (Fee, 201).

Unlike the instructions in 2:1–10 which were addressed to different categories of people, the present instructions are to be transmitted to all the members of the church. This fact may be sufficient in itself to explain why the writer makes a fresh start at this point instead of incorporating this teaching in the preceding unit. It may also be the case that the two units are based on separate sets of material that were used in oral instruction in the church.

Underlying the instruction is the realisation by believers that they now form a separate group in society (Spicq, 645). They must take a positive attitude to society as good citizens, both by doing good and by avoiding strife. Their outgoing attitude of patient gentleness to everybody is backed up by the example of God's own patience to them; the unspoken implication would

seem to be that this attitude may lead to the conversion of unbelievers, which, if correct, would move the thrust of the text beyond the level of *christliche Bürgerlichkeit*.²

Why is this instruction needed here? Rom 13 and 1 Pet 2 show that it was part of Christian moral teaching. According to Lips 1994:267, the combination of this instruction with 2:1–10 links it to the line of development of the household code represented in 1 Pet 2–3 (see note on 2:1). There may, then, be nothing more behind it than the need to emphasise obedience to the State in a context where disobedience was commonplace, much as Christians today may need to be reminded to be law-abiding (cf. Hasler, 95). However, as with 2:1–10, the teaching may have been called forth by a tendency towards insubordinate behaviour somehow associated with the influence of the errorists. Some commentators link the instruction with the alleged reputation of the Cretans as being especially rebellious (Lock, 151; Spicq, 646). Were the many Jews there '*assidue tumultantes*' as at Rome? Quinn, 183–5, develops the hypothesis that the teaching here, which does not verbally echo Paul, is of Jewish-Christian origin and may have developed in such circles in Rome. However, the fact that Crete was said to be particularly factious may be irrelevant, unless this explains the lack of mention of this motif in 1 Tim.

TEXT

1. ἀρχαίς Add *καί* (D² 078 TR lat sy; UBS mg.; Kilpatrick). Elliott, 211f. argues that scribes reduced the instances of *καί* linking two separate ideas (cf. 1 Tim 2:5, 7; 6:11), whereas it is necessary to the sense (cf. Lock, xxxviii. 152). Metzger, 655, notes that it is omitted by the best Alexandrian and Western MSS. There are also no connections between the immediately following infinitives, which shows that the author is in fact writing very concisely (cf. BD § 460^{1*}; Parry, 82, suggests that in each case the second word has the effect of qualifying the first). Addition of *καί* by copyists who wished to avoid asyndeton is more likely. Quinn, 178f., holds that the addition was intended to harmonise with Eph 3:10; Col 2:15 where the reference is to angelic powers. Hasler, 95, raises the possibility that the cause of the problem is the addition of *ἐξουσίαις* as an explanatory gloss (similarly, Quinn, 183f.).

πειθαρχεῖν Praem. *καί* (F G); or add after verb (A). The variants should be rejected, since the infinitives are asyndetic in the rest of sentence (Elliott, 212).

ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδῆν τά (?) (Σ*); The variant should be rejected as it is assimilation to Heb 6:11 (Elliott, 189f.). The article may be a remnant of πραΰτη-τα and thus a sign of error.

πραΰτητα πραότητα (Σ^c Ψ D F G 326 88 1908 69 256). Elliott, 100: the text is a late form of Attic πραότης, found in LXX; the variant is probably Atticistic and therefore secondary.

EXEGESIS

1–2. Ὑπομίμησκει αὐτούς Titus is to remind his congregations of the teaching they already know which needs repetition, αὐτούς must refer in context to all the members of the church (cf. 2:15).³ The implication is that previous oral teaching had been given. At the same time, the verb⁴ functions as a means of formal transition to fresh teaching. For the indirect mode of issuing instructions to the congregation see 2:1–10.

Seven requirements are listed in asyndeton. Cf. Rom 8:35b; 2 Cor 7:11; Heb 11:32; 12:18 for piling up of words like this, with/without connectives. There are five infinitives followed by an adjective (sc. εἶναι) and a participial phrase which forms the climax of the list. These can be analysed in terms of content, however, as expressing four basic requirements arranged in two pairs: subjection to authorities and readiness for good works; non-aggression and showing patience to everybody.

(a) Subjection to Authorities

ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, πειθαρχεῖν The two nouns together are meant to cover all possibilities, and are probably not to be sharply distinguished.⁵ It seems that the combination was something of a cliché (e.g. Lk 12:11; 20:20). Governmental officials, whether imperial, national or local, are in mind. Although Paul generally uses the two terms with reference to angelic powers, he uses the latter of rulers and magistrates in Rom 13:1–3 (cf. ἄρχων).⁶

ὑποτάσσεσθαι is used of subjection to political powers, as in Rom 13:1, 5; 1 Pet 2:13; cf. 1 Chr 29:24. It connotes recognition of their authority; this is then developed in terms of obedience. According to G. Dellings, ‘the primary point is recognition of the existing relation of superordination’ (*TDNT* VIII, 44); similarly, Barrett, 139, thinks of recognition of authority without being servile. The pattern is common: see Prov 24:21; 3 Macc 3:3; and

cf. the example of Jesus’ obedience to the established order (Lk 2:51; Jn 19:11; Spicq, 646). There is an implicit contrast with the attitude which is ἀνυπότακτος (Tit 1:6, 10; 1 Tim 1:9).

The second verb reinforces the point by indicating obedience as the normal pattern. It expresses what being subject means in practice (Holtzmann, 493).⁷ Presumably, the concrete application implicit in the use of the verb would correspond to Rom 13:6, where the paying of taxes is introduced as one practical expression of subordination to the State.

(b) Readiness for Good Works

πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐτοίμους εἶναι Believers are to fulfil the role of good citizens in the context of the preceding instruction about obedience to the authorities,⁸ but the thought need not be confined to this (Fee, 201; Knight, 333; Brox, 303, says that there is no link). Cf. 1 Clement 2:7 for the same phrase in a general church context. Trummer suggests that the admonition to Christians to respect the social and political structures becomes most radical in the PE (1978:144), but this view is based on the assumption that the PE are written at a time when the church had already experienced severe persecution at the hands of the State, a situation which the letters themselves do not readily verify.

The presence of this requirement to be ready to ‘do good (or ‘good works’)⁹ in the context of teaching about the church’s responsibility to the State reflects a traditional format. Rom 13:3 has οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶν φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ ... τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἕξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς. 1 Pet 2:14f. has εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι’ αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθοποιῶντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν. A statement describing the ruler’s responsibility to dispense justice is lacking (though probably assumed) in Titus. The station code is reminiscent of the Hellenistic-Jewish ethos of the State¹⁰ and charges the Christian to exhibit exemplary behaviour within it (cf. Trummer 1978:143f.). The charge may have been given a shape more suitable to the interests of the PE (πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον; cf. 1:16 note).

The reference is to ‘good works’, not ‘any honourable form of work’ (REB; Hanson, 189), and the phrase hardly implies a

limitation — do only what is good (Holtzmann, 493; *pace* Spicq, 647). Rather, according to the meaning of the term in the PE, ‘readiness to do “good works” ’ is a call to live in such a way that the fruit of the new life in Christ is manifested in tangible ways in this mundane context (see **Excursus 6**; Schlarb, 1990:349 n. 139).

(c) *Non-Aggression*

μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, ἀμάχους εἶναι, ἐπεικεῖς Three phrases sum up the way in which believers are to avoid causing offence to non-believers¹¹ but rather to commend their faith by their demeanour.

μηδεῖς is fairly general in view of the following ‘all men’ (Holtzmann, 493), although the reference may be more specifically to slander of the civil authorities (Spicq, 647). βλασφημεῖν¹² can be used of slander or speaking ill on a secular level (cf. Rom 3:8; 14:16; 1 Cor 10:30). However, in all these cases it is speaking ill of Christians which is meant and therefore the sense of ‘blaspheme’ may be present. Beyer, *TDNT* I, 624, holds that even here ‘the predominantly religious connotation is present’. If the reference is to the secular authorities, who are ultimately appointed by God, this may be the case, but it is rather pushing the term. For the danger of Christians committing this sin see also 1 Tim 6:4, where it is one of the results of disputes in the church, and 2 Tim 3:2, where it is characteristic of nominal believers (v. 5) in the last days. Jews were forbidden to blaspheme the gods of other peoples (Josephus, *Ap.* 2:237 with Thackeray’s note).

ἄμαχος continues the injunction with the broad sense of being ‘peacable’, i.e. ‘not quarrelsome’.¹³ It takes up a motif present throughout the PE. In 1 Tim 3:3*** it is to be a characteristic of the overseer. Cf. the use of μάχη and μάχομαι in 2 Tim 2:23f. and Tit 3:9, where Timothy and Titus are warned against quarrelsomeness; see further Jas 4:1–2 and note the positive commendation of peacableness in Mt 5:9; Rom 12:18; *et al.*

More positively, the believers are to be ἐπεικεῖς, ‘yielding, gentle, kind’, i.e. being reasonable, ‘conciliatory’. Spicq claims that the word refers to the clemency that should be associated with justice, expressed in moderation and reasonableness.¹⁴ According to Preisker, the word here has less of a Christian or septuagintal

accent: ‘the literary character of the list, and the schematism of the concepts borrowed from Hellenism, suggest that here, as often enough later, ἐπεικεῖς bears the general sense of “meek” customary from Attic times.’ Preisker argues that elsewhere Christians show this quality in virtue of their heavenly calling and that it is ‘an expression of royal or heavenly majesty’; this is true even in 1 Tim 3:3 where it refers to the overseer as a figure of authority ‘with eschatological assurance and in virtue of eschatological possession’. This differentiation lacks any real basis; the close similarity of 1 Tim 3:3 and Tit 3:2 makes it very unlikely that the word is used in different senses in the two passages. The ‘eschatological’ basis for Christian character is, of course, present in 3:3–6, even more so than in 1 Tim 3. The attitude is to be contrasted with that of the author’s opponents (e.g. 3:9; 1 Tim 6:3–5; 2 Tim 2:22–26).

(d) *Showing Patience to Everybody*

πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους After a series of three ‘passive’ qualities the list climaxes in a requirement to take the initiative (Spicq, 647) in demonstrating¹⁵ all manner of¹⁶ good to people in general.¹⁷ The implication is that the rule is unalterable in all circumstances. The quality of ‘gentleness’ or ‘meekness’¹⁸ is seen in Christ himself (e.g. 2 Cor 10:1; cf. Mt 11:29; 21:5; cf. Spicq, 642f.) and commended by him (Mt 5:5, πραῦς). The thought is not so much of sweetness as of patience, and is depicted in terms of non-retaliation in Rom 12:14; 1 Pet 3:9. Christians are not to attack their opponents. Gentleness is to characterise relationships within the church, especially in disciplinary situations (1 Cor 4:21; Gal 6:1; 2 Tim 2:25); according to Judge it is ‘an attribute of those with authority’. It occurs frequently in catalogues of virtues (Gal 5:23; Eph 4:2; Col 3:12; 1 Pet 3:15***) and is to be shown especially to non-Christians (1 Pet 3:15).

The Christian behaviour here described is outward looking; cf. 3:8b, where ταῦτά (*sc.* the teaching in 3:1–8a) ἐστὶν καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). Brox, 304f., links this universal scope of Christian courtesy with the thought of God’s universal love in vv. 3f.

b. The Doctrinal Motivation for Such Conduct (3:3–7)

Beasley-Murray 1962:209–16; Burnett, F. W., ‘Philo on Immortality: A Thematic Study of Philo’s Concept of *παλιγγενεσία*’, *CBQ* 46 (1984), 447–70; Couser 1992:165–76; Dey, J., ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ (*NTA* 17:5. Münster, Aschendorff, 1937); Dunn 1970:165–9; Fee 1994:777–84; Flemington, W. F., *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (London: SPCK, 1948), 101–5; Friedrich, J., Pöhlmann, W., and Stuhlmacher, P. (eds.), *Rechtfertigung. FS für E. Käsemann* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1976); Hartman, L., *Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus. Die Taufe in den neutestamentlichen Schriften* (SBS 148. Stuttgart: Katholisches, 1992), 106–11; Holman, C. L., ‘Titus 3:5–6: A Window on Worldwide Pentecost’, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 (1996), 53–62; Käsemann, E., ‘Titus 3:4–7’, in Käsemann 1960:298–302; Keuck, W., ‘Sein Erbarmen. Zum Titusbrief (3:4f.)’, *BibLeb* 3 (1962), 279–84; Le Déaut, R., ‘Φιλανθρωπία dans la littérature grecque jusq’ au NT’, *Mélanges E. Tisseront, I* (Civitas Vaticana, 1964), 255–94; Löning, K., ‘“Gerechtfertigt durch seine Gnade” (Tit 3:7). Zum Problem der Paulusrezeption in der Soteriologie der Pastoralbriefe’, in Söding, T. (ed.) *Der lebendige Gott. Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift für Wilhelm Thüsing zum 75. Geburtstag* (Münster: Aschendorf, 1996), 241–57; Luz, U., ‘Rechtfertigung bei den Paulusschülern’, in Friedrich*, 365–83; Mott 1978:22–48; Mounce, W. D., ‘The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth’ (Diss. Aberdeen, 1981); Norbie, D. L., ‘The washing of regeneration’, *EvQ* 34 (1962), 36–8; Quesnel, M., *Baptisés dans l’Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1985); Schnackenburg, R., *Baptism in the Thought of Paul* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964); Spicq, C., ‘La philanthropie hellénistique, vertu divine et royale. A propos de Tit 3, 4’, *ST* 12 (1958), 169–91; Trummer 1978:173–93.

After this surprisingly short paraenetic section comes a further theological grounding that provides the basis for it.

Holtzmann, 494, expresses a possible connection between this passage and what precedes: ‘since we once were what they still are, but were delivered through the kindness of God, so we ought to show kindness to those whom we once resembled’ (cf. Löning*, 247). Brox, 305, and Knight, 335, go further in suggesting that the writer is motivating the readers to show kindness to people who are difficult to live with and to treat them with kindness; but this is perhaps to press the passage too strongly. If this connection of thought is present, it is soon swallowed up in the development of the more basic contrast between what the readers were and what they now are, or, rather, between their sinfulness (like the rest of humankind) and the saving kindness of God, as in Rom 5, 6, 8. The main point is accordingly that the readers are now able to live differently from

previously and therefore ought to do so (cf. Barrett, 140). But this point does not emerge fully until the writer offers his comment on the ‘trustworthy saying’ in v. 8.

The dominant thought is that God has saved the readers who were once enslaved by sin; he has transformed them by the power of the Holy Spirit so that they are now in effect delivered from slavery to sin and empowered to live a new life. The passage thus functions rather differently from the corresponding doctrinal passage in 2:11–14. Whereas in ch. 2 the function of the passage was more to explain that the purpose of God’s act of redemption was to create a people who would do good works, here the function is more to explain how the readers are capable of doing good works in that they have been saved by God. If the thought in ch. 2 was more salvation-historical in that it described God’s saving intervention in the world and its purpose, here the thought is expressed more in terms of the individual experience of conversion and salvation through which people are enabled to live a new life. Nevertheless, the contrast between the two passages should not be over-pressed. The thought of individual redemption is integral to the earlier passage, and the conversion of individuals is seen as part of the total saving action of God in the later passage.

The statement is shaped in the form of a contrast between what the readers once were before their conversion and the saving action of God in Christ. For the use of such schemes contrasting the previous state of believers with their conversion or with the manifestation of Christ see Rom 6:17f.; 7:5f.; 1 Cor 6:9–11; Gal 4:8–10; Eph 2:1–10, 11–22; 4:17f.; Col 1:21f.; 3:7f.; 1 Pet 1:14–21; 2 Clement 1:6–8 (cf. Tachau 1972). The description of the readers’ old life is expressed in the form of a vice list which shows that once they too were living in a pagan manner very differently from the pattern that has just been put before them.

The list of characteristics here is a stereotyped one that is generally true of non-believers as a group but does not appear to fit, for example, Paul’s pre-conversion life too well (cf. Holtzmann, 494; Quinn, 200f.).¹⁹ This disparity may be due to assimilation to the first-person format of vv. 4–7, if it be the case that traditional material is being cited there (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 147). At the same time, the use of the first person

acts as a rhetorical means of persuasion by developing the relationship between the writer and the readers (Quinn, 201). The pre-Christian situation is painted in similar colours to heresy in the church (Brox, 305; Oberlinner, 167). Cf. 2 Tim 3:13.

The passage then describes the way in which God saved them by grace and renewed them by the Spirit so that they should be justified and so become heirs of eternal life. This section is generally regarded as a ‘hymn’, with a ‘reference’ in v. 8. But the extent of the traditional material is debated:

(a) The debt to tradition is interpreted most generously by those who see all of vv. 3–7 as pre-formed soteriological material with Pauline interpretative glosses in prose by the author.²⁰

(b). Most scholars exclude v. 3 and restrict the traditional elements to vv. 4–7.

(c) Others restrict the traditional material to some or all of vv. 5–7. Thus Lock, 155, favours possibly only v. 5 with 6–7 as expansion by the author. By contrast Easton, 99f., 102, identifies vv. 5b–7 as the section centred on baptism; he argues that the theological language in 5a would be out of place in a hymn. Even more restricted is the limitation of tradition to vv. 5b–6 by Kelly, 254, who argues that vv. 3–4 should be excluded as too much in the idiom of the PE; 5a and 7 have ‘a strongly Pauline tang’.

In view of the way in which the author has framed the material in his own style it may be unwise to be too precise. In any case, vv. 4–7 consist of one sentence which (although some of the relationships are uncertain) can be laid out as follows:

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| (1) ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη | Time |
| τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ | |
| (2) οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ | Basis |
| ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς | |
| ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος | |
| (3) ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς | Main Action |
| (4) διὰ λουτροῦ | Means |
| παλιγγενεσίας | |
| καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου | |
| οὐ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς πλουσίως | |
| διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν | |

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| (5) ἵνα | Purpose/Result |
| δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι | |
| κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν | |
| κατ’ ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου | |

We should be wary of describing the passage as a ‘hymn’, since poetic elements are entirely lacking (Fee, 203). It is clear that material from traditional schemata is being used, but we may ask whether the writer has so adapted it to his own purposes here that the task of identifying a traditional basis will be fruitless.

Similar ideas are found in 1 Cor 6:9–11; Col 3:7f.; Eph 2:4–9;²¹ 4:17–24; 1 Pet 1:3–5, 14–21 (Merkel, 101). The language is largely traditional, but the use of ‘kindness and love’ instead of ‘grace’ (2:11) suggests a picking up of a familiar Hellenistic pairing, and the word ‘rebirth’ is also unusual. Boismard held that the passage is a ‘re-reading’ of the more primitive baptismal hymn cited in 1 Pet 1:3–5, but this is highly speculative and has not been widely accepted.²² Mounce*, 214–45, holds that there is insufficient evidence to show that the two passages reflect a common source. There is a closer parallel with Gal 4:3–7, although the content of this passage is developed rather differently (Lohfink 1988:174–7).

The statement is entirely concerned with soteriology. It describes what has happened in the new era which dawned with the revelation of God’s kindness and love. These words give a strong contrast with the vices in 3:2 (Spicq, 651) and may have been deliberately chosen to give parallels to desired Christian virtues (Brox, 306). The reference is to the saving act of God as a whole, and not simply to the Christian message. God’s saving action towards Christians was not the result of righteous deeds done by them as a ground for his rescuing them but was rather in accordance with his unmerited mercy. The ‘means’ of salvation was the washing away of sin associated with a new beginning and a spiritual renewal brought about by the Holy Spirit. And the gift of the Spirit in rich measure was God’s gift through Christ. God’s ultimate purpose was that his people who have been justified by his grace should become heirs, living in hope of their share in eternal life. Nothing is said for the moment about the ethical implications of this statement, and this may be an indication that

the writer is using traditional material that was originally used more to stress the concept of *sola gratia* and to depict in glowing terms the blessings that believers enjoy through God's gracious act of salvation. The statement is almost trinitarian (cf. Spicq, 655; Fee 1994, ch. 11; *contra* Hanson, 192).

TEXT

3. ἀνόητοι Add καί (D a b t vg^{mss} sy^p Lcf). The addition is secondary since the author can and does write unconnected lists (1 Tim 1:7; Elliott, 212).

5. ἄ ὤν (C² D² Ψ 1881 TR) is an Atticistic alteration (cf. 1 Tim 4:3. 6; Elliott, 63).

αὐτοῦ ἔλεος Inverted order (D* E F G); Elliott, 191, claims that this is more Semitic (Lk 1:50, 58; cf 1 Tim 5:25). He notes that αὐτοῦ never separates article and noun elsewhere in PE (cf. 1 Tim 5:18; 2 Tim 1:8; 2:19; 4:1, 8, 18; Tit 1:3).

πνεύματος ἁγίου Praem. διά (D* F G b vg^{mss} Lcf). Elliott, 191, argues that the preposition is possibly original and was omitted for stylistic reasons because of frequency of word in vv. 5–6. Alternatively, and more probably, the word could have been inserted par. 3:6b or is epexegetical to clarify whether 'of the Spirit' is subjective or objective.

6. οὗ ὅ (D* 1739 326). According to Elliott, 191, the PE avoid attraction of relative, and the text is Atticistic correction. See 1 Tim 4:4 note.

7. γενηθῶμεν γενώμεθα (K² D² Ψ TR). Although Elliott, 192, argues that scribes disliked the aorist middle and so altered it, he appears to adopt the aor. pass. (233).

κατ' κατά (D*); Elliott, 120, accepts the variant, as at 2 Tim 1:9, but the MS evidence is weak.

EXEGESIS

3. Ἦμεν γὰρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς For this use of the first person plural of believers in general cf. 3:5*, Gal 4:3; Eph 2:3 (cf. 2nd plural in Col 3:7). The first person sing. is used of Paul in 1 Tim 1:13–16 in a similar once/now description, but there the reference is to him personally. γὰρ introduces doctrinal motivation, as before. ποτε is used of believers' non-Christian past in Rom 7:9; 11:30; Gal 1:13, 23a, 23b; Eph 2:2, 3, 11; 5:8; Col 1:21; 3:7; Philem 11; 1 Pet 2:10 (3:20). This is a remarkably frequent and consistent usage, amounting to 14 out of 29 occurrences of the word in the NT. Here it probably functions with ὅτε δέ of v. 4 to form the transition formula 'formerly ... but now' (more typically ποτε ... νῦν[ι], Rom 6:20–22; 11:30–32; Gal 1:23; 4:8–9; Eph

2:1–22; 5:8; Col 1:21–22; 3:7–8; Philem 11; 1 Pet 2:10; but also with variations, Rom 5:8–9; 7:5; Gal 1:13; 1 Pet 2:25; cf. Tachau 1972:79–95). καὶ draws the analogy with those who are still not Christians. In this way their need of the gospel is implicitly underlined (cf. Oberlinner, 166f.).

Seven vices are listed here (corresponding to the seven virtues in 3:1f., according to Spicq, 649).²³ The first three belong together and have to do with human ignorance, folly and religious disobedience; the resultant state is one of bondage to human desires; the remaining three vices have to do with antisocial sins.

(a) Wandering in Ignorance

ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, πλανώμενοι The first three characteristics belong together as a description of people ignorant of God, disobedient and deluded. Although ἀνόητος²⁴ can be used of people who are merely uneducated and simple (Rom 1:14), it generally refers in the NT to those who are insensible and obtuse, especially to spiritual values. They lack the knowledge that brings salvation. Hence it is not clear whether the thought is simply of ignorance or of deliberate obtuseness. For the thought see Eph 4:17f.; Rom 1:21–32. The disobedience — echoing 1:16 (cf. note) — is clearly towards God or his agents. The list of vices does not stand in direct correspondence with the virtues in 3:1f., but a contrast with obedience to the authorities is likely. As a result of these two qualities they are easily deceived.

πλανᾶω²⁵ is used literally of leading people astray, namely from the right path, and hence refers to people who wander about and are lost. It also contains the element of deceiving people so that they are deluded. Quinn, 202–4, wants to link the motif here to the false prophecy current in first-century Palestine and reflected in Mt 24:10–12, 23f. (cf. Rev. 2:20), but a more general reference to the delusions of paganism is likely, with perhaps a passing glance at the heresy which seems to produce a 'spirituality' marked by pagan characteristics. Such delusion may be both doctrinal and ethical. It is particularly associated with the last days when evil powers delude people in general and attempt to captivate believers. The force here may be that the unbelievers were deceived or that they were 'lost' and directionless.

(b) Slaves to Pleasure

δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις Human beings prior to conversion are regarded as being held captive²⁶ by all kinds of²⁷ powers such as sin, lawlessness, uncleanness, false gods, the elements of this world, and even the law. Cf. Rom 6:16–21; 2 Pet 2:19. (It is possible for Christians to fall back into this situation.) The idea of slavery to evil was commonplace in the Graeco-Roman world (Menander, Koerte 568/541K, cited by Quinn, 204) and in Judaism (*T. Jud.* 18:6; *T. Jos.* 7:8; 4 Macc 3:2; 13:2). According to Spicq, 650, the Stoics regarded slavery to the passions²⁸ and pleasures²⁹ as the worst of all. It stands in strong contrast to loving God (2 Tim 3:4). Hort 1909:88 distinguished between ἐπιθυμία as ‘desire’ and ἡδονή as ‘indulgence of desire, indulged desire’. But the line between the longing for pleasure and the actual enjoyment of it is a thin one.

(c) *Anti-Social Behaviour*

ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες, στυγητοί, μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους The three remaining characteristics may probably be seen as the outworking of the anti-religious, selfish attitudes just described. A way of life³⁰ is described with its evil qualities. κακία is an evil of the mind, contrasted with πονηρία as its manifestation (Ellicott, 191).³¹ Linked with φθόνος,³² it is ‘a force which destroys fellowship’ (Grundmann, W., *TDNT* III, 484). Envy itself leads to hatred³³ of those who have what we desire, and is not surprisingly linked on occasion with ἔρις (Rom 1:29; Phil 1:15). Malicious and envious people are odious;³⁴ they cause other people to react with hatred, and they respond in kind. Community and society collapse.

The statement in verses 4–7 falls into five parts:

(a) **4. ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ** A loose contrast is drawn (δέ) between the sinful past state of the readers (ποτε) and the new era of salvation which ensued (ὅτε³⁵) with the revelation of the kindness of God (cf. Eph 2:4). The temporal clause describes the event which inaugurated the saving activity of God. Although the ethical imperative to live the life that the event has made possible is less direct than in 2:11f. (with its ἵνα ... ζήσωμεν), the connection of vv. 3–7 with v. 2 suggests that the implication is present.

Hasler, 96, holds that the clause refers merely to the revelation³⁶ in the preaching and not to the historical salvation-event in Christ. See, however, Knight, 338–40, who rightly argues that this statement must be understood in the light of 2 Tim 1:9f., and concludes that the phrase encompasses both the historical appearing of Christ and his manifestation to the readers in their personal experience (cf. Towner 1989:66–71, 112f.; Oberlinner, 170).

Two nouns express the grace shown by God. χρηστότης is used of the ‘kindness, goodness, generosity’ of God (Rom 2:4; 11:22a, 22b, 22c; especially Eph 2:7; cf. adj. Lk 6:35; 1 Pet 2:3) and of people (Rom 3:12; 2 Cor 6:6; Gal 5:22; Col 3:12***),³⁷ φιλανθρωπία, ‘love for mankind’, occurs here only in the NT in this sense (also ‘hospitality’, Acts 28:2***).³⁸ It refers to a virtue found in the gods, but also in rulers in relation to their subjects (e.g. 2 Macc 14:9). Lock, 153, notes passages where it was linked with ransoming captives. It was highly regarded in later Stoicism.³⁹ It was seen as a divine virtue that ought to be practised by human beings, especially rulers (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 144 n. 23; cf. φιλανθρώπως, Acts 27:3, of the kindness of a centurion towards Paul. According to Spicq, 651f., it corresponds to *humanitas* (‘kindness’) and was defined by the Stoics as ‘a friendly disposition in human intercourse’. This use is found in the LXX (3 Macc 3:15, 20; 2 Macc 9:27; 14:9; 4 Macc 5:12; cf. *Ep. Arist.* 208); it is a quality of the righteous generally (Wis 12:19), and wisdom itself shows it (φιλανθρώπος, Wis 1:6; 7:23). Josephus, *Ant.* 1:24 uses it of God. Philo, *Virt.* 51–174 discusses it at length. Justin, *Apol.* I. 10 links it with sobriety and righteousness as divine attributes to be shown by believers. The word is rarely used in the NT, but the usage recurs in Justin, *Dial.* 47:5; Diognetus 9:2.⁴⁰

The precise background of the language as it is used here is uncertain. Luck states that ‘the phraseology is influenced by the worship of manifested gods as seen especially in emperor worship’ (*TDNT* IX, 111). Kelly, 251, holds that the writer is deliberately using the language of the imperial cult so as to bring out the claims of Christianity more powerfully (cf. Wendland 1904:335–53). Quinn, 213–15, thinks that here we have a Jewish-Christian response to the common attacks on Jews as being

misanthropic, drawing attention to Philo's designation of God as loving humanity. But the imperial cult background seems more compelling.

There is also the question whether the description has an implicit paraenetic function. Luck (*TDNT* IX 111, n. 37) states that the text is not thinking of a virtue shown by God which is to be imitated by believers. This is rightly disputed by Brox, 306, who further argues that it should not be seen especially as a virtue of rulers towards their underlings. The contrast with the description of the readers before their conversion in v. 3 suggests that one of the implicit purposes of God in the eschatological 'appearance' of his 'kindness' is to equip his people to do the same. Scott's view (174) that it is the natural sympathy which man bears to his fellow men is too weak in this context. Rather, the effect of vv. 5f. is to define the nature of God's kindness by the way in which he acted to save us.

(b) 5. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος There is a lengthy qualification before we reach the main verb ἔσωσεν in order to introduce as emphatically as possible the works/mercy contrast (for which cf. 2 Tim 1:9).⁴¹ The intention is to rule out decisively the thought that people can be saved on the basis of (ἐξ) any kind of human works.⁴² The phrase ἐξ ἔργων is Pauline (Rom 3:20; 28, 4:6; Rom 9:12; 11:6; Gal 2:16a, 16b, 16c; Eph 2:9) and is often clarified by the addition of νόμου. The verb ποιέω is likewise used to express doing what God requires (Rom 2:14; 10:5; Gal 3:10, 12; 5:3).⁴³

But here the thought is widened out to exclude any kind of actions done 'in⁴⁴ righteousness'. Righteousness⁴⁵ is the quality required by God in human action and represents conformity to his norms, doing what the law requires. Hence it can refer to the general quality of life shown by people who act in this way or to the verdict which is passed upon them. It thus means conduct in accordance with God's requirements or laws. Cf. Acts 10:35; 13:10; 24:25; Phil 1:11; 1 Clement 5:7. The process of justification (cf. 3:7, δικαίω) is the recognition by God of people as righteous, regardless of their past actions, on the basis of the work of Christ; it is the conferring of a status which must then be demonstrated in practice in righteous living (cf. adv. δικάως,

2:12). The verb ποιέω is not used elsewhere with 'works' as its object. The phrase is added here to give the required contrast between 'what we (ἡμεῖς, emphatic) did' and 'what by his (αὐτοῦ emphatic⁴⁶) mercy God did'.⁴⁷ ἔλεος is used by Paul of God showing favour to people who do not deserve it (Rom 9:23; 11:31; 15:9; Gal 6:6; Eph 2:4); for the OT background see Exod 34:6–7; Ps 85:15 LXX. In the present context it is equivalent to χάρις elsewhere and it sums up the reference to χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία earlier in the sentence.⁴⁸

The thought is paralleled in 1QM 11:3f.: 'You have also saved us many times by the hand of our kings because of your mercy and not according to our works by which we have done evil nor [according to] our sinful deeds', which in turn reflects Ezek 20:44: 'when I deal with you for my name's sake, not according to your evil ways, or corrupt deeds' (Spicq, 652).

The point of the contrast here is uncertain.

(a) The thought is Pauline, contrasting God's mercy with works done in obedience to the law and required of Gentiles in order that they may be saved. The echoes of Pauline language make this the most obvious interpretation (cf. Brox, 306f.).

(b) More probably, however, there is a widening out of Pauline thinking in the direction of opposing moral effort generally as a means of salvation (Scott, 174f.) However, this emphasis is already present in Paul (Rom 9:11f.; Eph 2:9; Kelly, 251). Trummer argues that the author has made Pauline teaching more radical: not just the value of works generally but even of 'works done in righteousness' is nullified (1978:187).⁴⁹

(c) Rather than a generalisation of Pauline thinking, some scholars see here rather a misunderstanding of Paul (Hasler, 96; cf. Schlarb 1990:189; discussion in Löning*, 247–50), but it is hard to discover just how they think Paul has been misunderstood.

(d) Klöpper 1904:59 states that there is no polemic against Jewish works in the PE, and therefore the reference can only be to 'such ethical activities which were so valued from the darkness of Gnosticising circles (which prided themselves on possessing the light-kernels and consequently considered themselves to be excellent over against the psychic and hylic elements) that they

regarded themselves in a special way as worthy of obtaining salvation’.

In Rom 9:30f. Paul comments on Gentiles who did not seek righteousness but gained it by faith; he is drawing a contrast between their past life of sin and ignorance and their new status as believers; however, the Jews who followed the ‘law of righteousness’ did not attain to it. Here in Tit the deeds are those done in observance of the righteousness required by the law (the phrase ‘denotes the human attainment envisaged in Phil. 3:6, 9’. Schrenk, G., *TDNT* II, 202). Barrett suggests that Paul would have added τοῦ νόμου (cf. Wilson 1979:25; but Rom 9:12; Eph 2:9 might challenge the suggestion).

Two possibilities arise: (a) The author is thinking of Gentiles who were not saved by righteous deeds before their conversion because they had not in fact performed any (Parry, 83); or (b) he may be thinking of people (both Gentiles and Jews) who tried to do righteous deeds but who were saved by God not because of these deeds but by his mercy, because these deeds were irrelevant and could not win salvation (Käsemann*, 300). In either case, to the degree that this portion of the statement intends to inform the ethical response of believers (3:2), the emphasis is most likely to be generally one of mercy in dealings with others (cf. Knight, 340).

(c) ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου The main clause describes how God effected salvation.⁵⁰ The reference is to personal experience of salvation⁵¹ rather than to God’s action at the cross.⁵²

The use of the aorist ἔσωσεν, as in Eph 2:8, may be thought to form a sharp contrast with Paul’s use of the future tense to express ‘the definitive final deliverance of believers’,⁵³ but salvation is in some sense a past and present experience in Paul (Rom 8:24). What is unusual is the description of the means. To be sure, the three concepts of regeneration, renewal and the Spirit that are associated here with baptism are familiar elsewhere in the NT.⁵⁴ It is the terminology and the way in which the concepts are linked which cause problems.

The syntax of the διὰ phrase⁵⁵ is debatable in two respects:

The first problem is the relation of the following two nouns in the gen. to λουτροῦ.

(a) They may both be dependent upon it (‘Through a washing of rebirth and of renewal’).⁵⁶

(b) λουτροῦ and ἀνακαινώσεως may stand in parallel (‘Through a washing of rebirth and [through] renewal’).⁵⁷

The second problem is the construction of πνεύματος ἁγίου. Here there are three possibilities:

(i) with ἀνακαίνωσις (only) as subj. gen., of ‘renewal associated with⁵⁸ the Holy Spirit’ (cf. 2 Th 2:13).⁵⁹

(ii) with both παλιγγενεσία and ἀνακαίνωσις. (In this case construction (a) is required.);⁶⁰

(iii) with λουτροῦ.⁶¹

Combining these possibilities we have four possible interpretations of the whole phrase:

(1) (a) + (i) Through a washing of rebirth and of renewal which is associated with the Holy Spirit.

(2) (a) + (ii) Through a washing of rebirth and of renewal which are associated with the Holy Spirit.

(3) (a) + (iii) Through a washing associated with the Holy Spirit which brings rebirth and renewal.

(4) (b) + (i) Through a washing of rebirth and through a renewal associated with the Holy Spirit.⁶²

A decision between these fine distinctions is difficult, and it is very doubtful if there is any major difference in understanding whichever set of possibilities we adopt. We can assume without further ado that the author would have agreed that the Holy Spirit was associated with the whole process. Syntactically, the simplest understanding of the expression is (1). (3) is not an obvious rendering of the Greek. The difficulties with (4) are the lack of a second διὰ and the fact that the two dependent genitives (παλιγγενεσίας, πνεύματος ἁγίου) have different functions. Construction (2) is also awkward.

λουτρόν, ‘washing’,⁶³ has been taken in three ways. (a) We can safely put aside the novel view of Hanson, 190f., that it refers to ‘some sort of archetypal baptism. ... Christ is regarded as having undergone an archetypal baptism on behalf of all Christians in the waters of death.’ He appeals to Eph 5:25–27 as a

parallel. But the passage contains no hint of such an intent (cf. 1 Tim 6:13); the author's thought here is of the individual application of salvation. (b) The majority of commentators assume that it refers primarily to baptism (cf. 1 Cor 6:11).⁶⁴ (c) But it may also be used metaphorically for spiritual cleansing (Simpson, 115; Towner 1989:116f.; Fee; 1994:780f.; Mounce*, 195–202). Dunn 1970:168f. claims: 'of water-baptism as such there is here no mention'. The reference is to the 'washing of regeneration and renewal which the Spirit effects'.⁶⁵ The case for a metaphorical use would be strengthened if πνεύματος ἁγίου is syntactically linked to λουτροῦ (Towner). Even if this view of the syntax is not accepted, it still remains the case that a reference to an outward rite as the means of salvation is very unlikely in a context which is replete with references to divine action. Even if a reference to water-baptism is primary, the washing is at least symbolical of an inward process (see Holtzmann, 496f.). But it is more likely that the term refers primarily to that spiritual cleansing which is outwardly symbolised in baptism with water. 'Washing' implies the forgiveness and removal of the sins described in v. 3. Such a removal of sin is part of the new creation in which the saved individual already participates, and is associated with a renewal.

The washing is associated with regeneration and renewal effected by the Spirit. The precise significance of the connection expressed by the use of the gen. is debatable. The phrase has been taken to mean either (i) a washing that *conveys* new birth, in the sense of new life and moral renewal, or (ii) a washing characterised by new life and renewal (Fee 1994:782). However, it is hard to see how washing can convey new birth, and therefore the second possibility is to be preferred. It is, then, rather the new birth that leads to cleansing. In any case, whether we link πνεύματος ἁγίου directly with λουτροῦ or, more probably, indirectly through ἀνακαινώσεως, the washing is the work of the Spirit. The process is then equivalent to baptism in the Spirit.

The concept of 'regeneration' (παλιγγενεσία) is the most difficult in the passage.⁶⁶ It was a term in use in everyday language to refer to any kind of rebirth, regeneration or re-creation.⁶⁷ It can signify both a return to a former existence and renewal to a higher existence. It is used of life after death.⁶⁸ The

concept was used by the Pythagoreans (Plutarch, *Mor.* 379F, 998C), and was developed in Stoicism to signify the renewal of the world after the conflagration.⁶⁹ It was also used in the Dionysiac mysteries and Osiric mysteries.⁷⁰ Here it refers to the renewal of individuals (cf. Heraclitus, *Ep.* 4:4). Similarly, it is used of the renewal of a race (*CH* 3:3); and of renewal into a higher form of existence by means of an incantation (*CH* 13:1, 3 *et al.*; cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 998C for transmigration of souls). In the one other NT reference it expresses the renewal of the world in the time of Messiah (Mt 19:28; for the thought cf. Acts 3:21; 2 Pet 3:13; Rev 21:1).

The origin of the usage here is disputed.

(a) Derivation of the concept from the Mysteries is defended by Dibelius–Conzelmann, 148–50. They cite Philo. *Cher.* 114, and Apuleius, *Met.* 11:21 (*quodam modo renatos*); *CIL* VI, 510, 17ff., (*in aeternum renatus*); Mithras liturgy (Berger-Colpe, § 563); *CH* 13:3. However, they note that there are significant differences between the 'ecstasy "for a brief time"' and the 'new and lasting life in the spirit' which is available to all believers.

(b) Büchsel disputes that the usage rests on the Mysteries, since first-century usage cannot be demonstrated (cf. Mounce*, 62–120; Trummer, P., *EDNT* III, 8–9), but argues that behind it lies the Jewish form of the Stoic concept of renewal of the world (cf. Mt 19:28). One might then argue that baptism anticipates the renewal of the world and initiates the believer into the new age.

(c) More recent scholarship has stressed that the word and concept are widely used in the ancient world for 'renewal' in all kinds of areas (Mounce*, 17–61). Brox, 307f., argues that the general use of the term in ordinary speech is found here.

(d) But it is more probable that the term reflects the concept of new birth which is already associated with baptism and conversion (cf. Oberlinner, 174; *pace* Mounce*, 192f., who thinks that the reference is to the cleansing aspect of conversion). Note, however, that etymologically the term is connected with γίνομαι and γένεσις, not with γεννάω.

The use of an unusual term raises the question whether there is any special significance in the choice of it.

(a) The use of a term that is elsewhere (Mt 19:28) cosmic and eschatological in scope may indicate that the reference is to 'the

incorporation of the individual into the work of kindness and generosity which God is doing in the last days' (Barrett, 142).

(b) The allusion to the Pentecost experience in ἐκχέω (see v. 6 note) may suggest that the term refers not so much to the experience of the individual as to the "rebirth" of the Messianic community which was inaugurated at Pentecost' (Flemington*, 104, following Thornton, L. S., *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* [London: Dacre, 1941], 190f.).

(c) However, it is not necessary to regard these individual and corporate understandings as alternatives. The reference is to the Pentecost event as fulfilled in the lives of the readers: 'the counterpart in the individual's experience of the sending of the Spirit at Pentecost' (Beasley-Murray 1962:211).

(d) Quinn, 195f., 220f., goes a stage further in nothing that the word was sometimes used of bodily resurrection: baptism brings believers 'into the mystery of the death and resurrection of Jesus and sets them on a course that culminates at last in the bodily resurrection of all human beings, with its accompanying judgment'. In any case, the connection of thoughts in Rom 6 (cf. Phil 3:10) would seem to suggest that the promise of bodily resurrection would have been closely related to the present experience of rebirth.

The word ἀνακαίνωσις⁷¹ can refer to renewal as an event or as a process. It can be taken as passive (the renewal of the mind, Rom 12:2) or as active, with the genitive of the object which is renewed or of the subject which effects the renewal (cf. Holtzmann, 497). Easton, 100, comments that the thought is of a new creation (2 Cor 5:17), not of the renewal of former abilities. For the thought cf. Rom 6:4 with its link of baptism and newness of life and Eph 4:23.

The concept of renewal is closely related to regeneration. Nevertheless, some scholars have argued that two distinct acts are meant. A distinction between baptism and confirmation is made by some scholars (cf. Quesnel*, 171–4), or between conversion and a subsequent baptism in the Spirit by scholars in the Pentecostal/charismatic tradition. However, the two terms are nearly synonymous (Spicq, 653), and it is significant that only one preposition is used.⁷² It is most likely, then, that the two phrases describe one and the same event from different angles. Knight,

343f., holds that the one event is seen 'from two different perspectives': cleansing seen as a new beginning or transformation and renewal brought about by the Holy Spirit. The nouns are arranged chiastically with the results in the centre.⁷³ Cleansing and renewal are distinguished in other passages (Ezek 36:25–27; 1 Cor 6:11). This view assumes that λουτροῦ and ἀνακαίνωσεως stand in parallel, which we have already seen reason to doubt.

Spiritual renewal always has moral effects. It is difficult, therefore, to understand the way in which E. Schweizer, *TDNT* VI, 445, comments that the formula cited here associates the Spirit⁷⁴ with new birth but that 'the author himself, however, seems to have understood this ethically'; there is no tension present.

Consequently, through the allusion to washing (in which is a reference to baptism and the work of the Spirit depicted in the rite), v. 5b depicts the Holy Spirit as the source of the 'washing' which results in a transformation characterised here from the dual perspective of 'regeneration' and 'renewal'. The genitive is one of author or cause (Spicq, 654). The single preposition and the conceptual closeness of 'regeneration' and 'renewal' suggest unity. The one event of salvation is viewed specifically from the standpoint of the work of the Holy Spirit. While the rite of water baptism may not be far from mind (as a symbolic expression depicting the work of the Spirit), it is that which it signifies – the individual's experience of the Spirit – that is the primary focal point, and this is probably linked with the paradigmatic experience of the church at Pentecost (v. 6, ἐκχέω). Nevertheless, while the rite of baptism might celebrate, illustrate or commemorate the work of the Spirit and therefore be immediately called to mind or alluded to by such a statement (here and throughout the NT; cf. Kelly, 252), this is not a proof-text for baptismal regeneration or sacramental salvation (*contra* Schlarb 1990:189).

Although the doctrine of the Spirit is not prominent in the PE, here the association of the Spirit with salvation, baptism (as spiritual cleansing) and regeneration (Jn 3:5) is thoroughly traditional. Elsewhere in the PE the Spirit is associated with prophecy (1 Tim 4:1a) and with the endowing of the believer with

power, love and sobriety (2 Tim 1:7). It is the source of the spiritual gifts (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6) which are associated with the laying of hands on Timothy (Haykin 1985).

(d) **6. οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν** The fourth element is a development of the reference to the Spirit⁷⁵ which emphasises both the fulness of God's provision for his people and the fact that it is given through Jesus Christ. ἐξέχεεν in itself suggests profusion,⁷⁶ but even so is strengthened by πλουσίως.⁷⁷ The verb is used of the Spirit in Zech 12:10; Acts 2:17, 18 (= Joel 3:1, 2), 33; 10:45; 1 Clement 46:6; Barnabas 1:3 (cf. 1 Clement 6:2, ἔκχυσις); cf. Rom 5:5. The verbal link thus provided with Acts 2 suggest an allusion to the Pentecost event of the Spirit's outpouring upon God's people.⁷⁸ For the bestowing of the Spirit from above see Isa 44:3f; Ezek 36:26f.; 39:29 (MT). The clause comes to a climax with the full reference to Jesus Christ our Saviour⁷⁹ as the giver of the Spirit (Acts 2:33).⁸⁰

(e) **7. ἵνα δικαιοθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου** Now comes the ultimate purpose, and, in effect, the result of God's act.⁸¹ It is theological, not ethical!

The aorist participle δικαιοθέντες⁸² is coincident in time with the main verb 'become heirs'. 'The saving purpose of God, which is that we might be justified and become heirs, is effected by baptism in the Spirit' (Dunn 1970:167; cf. Fee 1994, ch. 11). The relationship of the participle to what precedes is uncertain:

(a) Justification is coincident with the gift of the Spirit or baptism.

(b) Justification is the presupposition for receiving the Spirit (Holtzmann, 499).

(c) Justification is the intended result of receiving the Spirit.

It is most probable that the participle sums up the previous statements. Justification is unlikely to be seen as the result of baptism; the participle is coincident with ἔσωσεν. In 1 Cor 6:11 justification and being washed are simultaneous. That justification is a past event in the life of believers is clear from Rom 5:1, 9; 8:30. Here the various events cannot be placed in a chronological series (Brox, 309).

Grace (1:3 note) is expressed, as in Rom 3:24, in God's act in Christ.⁸³ The understanding of justification is regarded as different from that of Paul by numerous scholars (cf. Oberlinner, 177f.). The possibility that grace is seen as a gift to enable us to live righteously rather than as acquittal is raised by Klöpffer 1904:66f.; cf. 'given potentialities to achieve righteousness' (Easton, 100). Dibelius–Conzelmann, 150, ask whether 'the act of justification itself is actually meant, or rather a life which is righteous by virtue of grace (as substantiation for the latter alternative see above on Tit 2:11–14)'. Similarly, in a manner which Hanson, 191, characterises as seeing the passage as 'a parody of Paul's doctrine', Houlden, 154, suggests the possible meaning 'so that having been made morally upright by his grace'; Similarly, the force is not forensic, but circumstantial, says Hasler, 97. These opinions have no visible support in the text and are rightly rejected by Schrenk, G., *TDNT* II, 217 n. 22.; Barrett, 143.

Some commentators claim that the non-mention of faith, except in 3:8, is significant (see Klöpffer 1904:86–8). But there is no suggestion that it is excluded (so rightly Merkel, 103), much less that its absence indicates that baptism had acquired saving powers and is on the way to being considered as magical (*contra* Scott, 176f.; Schlarb, 1990:189). A number of similarly oriented passages in the Pauline corpus (in which the importance of faith would be assumed) omit an explicit reference to faith (e.g. Rom 6:1–11; 1 Cor 6:11; 12:13; 2 Cor 1:21f.; cf. Beasley-Murray 1972:213).

The consequence of being saved and justified is that believers become⁸⁴ heirs of God's promises,⁸⁵ cf. Gal 3:11–29 for the same link of justification and inheritance. The heir has a right to future possession and is already in a sense a partaker of it. For the relationship between inheritance and the Spirit see Rom 8:15–17; 1 Cor 6:9–11; Gal 3:14, 18; 4:6f.; Eph 1:13f. The thought of sonship is implied (Brox, 310; Spicq, 655).

In the slightly unusual phrase κατ' ἐλπίδα⁸⁶ the preposition modifies γενηθῶμεν thus providing the standard or pattern for the granting of heirship; in principle the inheritance and eternal life are equivalent; but here the promise/hope element provides the framework for understanding accession to the status of heir. The phrase is variously interpreted to mean that the readers are:

(a) ‘heirs in accordance with the hope of eternal life’ (Brox, 303);

(b) ‘heirs of eternal life in accordance with hope’ (Holtzmann, 499);

(c) ‘heirs, as we hope for eternal life’ (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 150: ‘the text does not say “heirs of eternal life” ’);

(d) ‘heirs of the life for which we hope’ (Klöpffer 1904:70f.; Jeremias, 74; Dey*, 135).

There is not much difference between these views, and the first is probably the best. Tit 1:2 suggests that ἐλπὶς ζωῆς αἰωνίου had already become a formula which is here joined loosely to κληρονόμοι with the preposition κατά. Hence the phrase ζωῆς αἰωνίου is dependent on ἐλπίδα (Brox, 309f.) rather than κληρονόμοι (Holtzmann, 499). The inheritance and the hope of eternal life are clearly related, and eternal life is undoubtedly assumed to be an important part of the content of the inheritance (and does not need to be expressed; Brox, 310). The present phrase, however, expresses a slightly different aspect of the relationship of the two things, with κατά ... explaining the promise-pattern that guides the gracious ‘justification-to-heirs’ transaction.

According to Spicq, 656, the eternal life is not fully realised, as some heretics hold (cf. 2 Tim 2:18), but is nevertheless certain. However, there is no hint in this letter that this particular heresy is being combatted, and there is nothing to suggest a polemical intent here.⁸⁷

c. Recapitulation; How to Deal with the Recalcitrant (3:8–11)

Colson, F. H., ‘“Myths and Genealogies” – A note on the polemic of the Pastoral Epistles’, *JTS* 19 (1918), 265–71; Deer, D. S., ‘Still more about the imperatival *hina*’, *BT* 148 (1979), 148; Kittel 1921; Sandmel, S., ‘Myths, Genealogies and Jewish Myths and the Writing of the Gospels’, *HUCA* 27 (1956), 201–11.

After the doctrinal backing for the ethical instructions which Titus is to give to the churches, the author returns to giving instructions to him, insisting, first, on the need to pass on the teaching to the church so that the believers will practise the good works commended in 3:1f., and, second, on the avoidance of futile

arguments and the disciplining of those who persist in them. Thus the motif of heresy, which was very much in the background in 2:1–3:7, now returns to the foreground. The strong language used to condemn the opponents in ch. 1 is matched by the vigorous stress on the need for action to deal with them. Yet it should be noted that the writer’s emphasis in this brief section is rather on the positive need to engage in doing good rather than in time-wasting disputes, and the directions regarding factious people are, if not an after-thought, at least secondary in importance to the thought of doing what is worthy and profitable.

TEXT

8. καλά Praem. τά (D² Ψ TR); Elliott, 193, rejects the article, stating that the adjs. must be in apposition to ταῦτα.

θεῶ Praem. τῶ (Kilpatrick).

9. γενεαλογία: λογομαχίας (P61 F G g) is assimilation to 1 Tim 6:4, Elliott, 193.

ἔρεις ἔριν (ℵ* D F G Ψ pc Ambst; WH). Elliott, 92, argues that the original sing. was assimilated by a scribe to the surrounding plurals; the intermediate reading ἔριδας (241, 462; cf. 1 Cor 1:11 for this Hellenistic pl.) was then corrected by Atticist scribes to the Cl. pl. See further 1 Tim 6:4 note. But Metzger, 586, argues that, although a change of sing. to plural is more likely, there is strong external evidence for the plural, which is also required by the sense.

10. καὶ δευτέραν νοουθεσίαν νοουθεσίαν καὶ δευτέραν (D [D* δύο] Ψ 1505 1881 pc sy^h); νοουθεσίαν (1739 b vg^{ms} Ir^{lat} Tert Cyp Ambst); νοουθεσίαν ἢ δευτ. (F G). Elliott, 194, states that 1739 is prone to omissions (1 Tim 4:12; 5:19; 6:11), and argues for retention of the text.

EXEGESIS

8a. Πιστός ὁ λόγος The first part of the verse is generally taken to be a validation of the preceding doctrinal statement and the accompanying ethical instructions. These are meant to serve as a basis for the renewed exhortation to good works and the avoidance of futile discussions and speculations which follows. The phrase thus functions as a bridge between the two parts of the section.

πιστός (1:6) is used frequently of speech; see especially Rev 21:5; 22:6. λόγος (1:3) can refer to a saying, whether oral (e.g. Jn 4:37) or written (Rom 13:9; 1 Cor 15:54), dependent on the context.

EXCURSUS 9

The trustworthy sayings

Bover, J. M., 'Fidelis Sermo' [in Spanish], *Biblica* 19 (1938), 74–9; Brox, 112–14; Campbell, R. A., 'Identifying the Faithful Sayings in the Pastoral Epistles', *JSTNT* 54 (June 1994), 73–86; Dibelius–Conzelmann, 28f.; Grant, R. M., 'Early Christianity and Greek Comic Poetry', *CP* 60 (1965), 161; Hanson, 63f.; Knight 1968; Moule, C. F. D., *The Birth of the New Testament* (London, Black, 1981³), 283f.; Nauck 1950:45–52; North 1995; Oberlinner, 181f.; Oldfather, W. A., and Daly, L. W., 'A Quotation from Menander in the Pastoral Epistles?' *Classical Philology* 38 (1943), 202–4; Quinn, 230–2; Roloff, 88–90; Schlarb 1990:206–14; Spicq, 277 n. 2; *TLNT* I, 176f.; Swete, H. B., 'The Faithful Sayings', *JTS* 18 (1917), 1–7; Young 1994:56–9.

The phrase πιστὸς ὁ λόγος is found altogether five times in the PE (1 Tim 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11; Tit 3:8). A longer form with καὶ πάσης ἀποδόχης ἄξιός is found in 1 Tim 1:15 (see note there); 4:9. In 1 Tim 1:15 and 3:1 there is a textual variant with ἀνθρώπινος replacing πιστός. The repetition of the phrase indicates that it has become a stereotyped formula. It is peculiar to this author and is used by him to emphasise the truth of the statement which it accompanies. The expanded form is not significantly different in force. The addition simply reinforces the basic saying (Roloff, 89) and indicates that the saying is 'worthy of the fullest, most whole-hearted acceptance'; it is 'used when the response is not evident within the saying' itself (Knight 1968:29, 144).

1. *The Origin of the Phrase*

The same wording is found in Dionysius Halicarnassensis 3:23:17; 9:19:3; Dio Chrysostom 45:3 (cited in Knight, 1968, 5); *et al.*, where it is a perfectly natural part of a sentence affirming that a particular saying is credible.⁸⁸ The addition 'and worthy of fullest acceptance' uses a current Greek phrase (1 Tim 1:15 note).

There is also a possible usage behind Terence, *Adelphi*, 954 (*et dictum est vere et re ipsa fieri oportet*) if this phrase is translated back into Greek; this is a legitimate procedure since Terence's play was based on Menander (Oldfather and Daly*; cf. *TLNT* I, 177 n. 7: see Grant*).

A Jewish parallel has been seen in 1Q27 1:8, 'This word is certain to come to pass and this oracle is truth' (see Nauck 1950:50). However, the addition 'to come to pass' reduces the force of the parallel (cf. Hanson, 63).

Despite Quinn's synthesis of this material (Quinn, 230–2), the evidence is insufficient to show that the author was taking over an existing 'formula' from the Hellenistic world, perhaps one already appropriated by Hellenistic Judaism. As a formula, it appears for the first time in the PE. The most that can be said is that the author is using language that reflects turns of phrase current in Hellenistic Greek.

The view of Theodore of Mopsuestia (II, 97 Swete) that there is a similarity between the phrase and the 'Amen, I say' formula in the Gospels is hardly a basis for a theory about the origin of the phrase (Knight 1968:12f.; *pace* Schlatter, 61, and [cautiously] Quinn, 230f.).

The adjective is also applied to God, especially in the phrase πιστὸς ὁ θεός (e.g. 1 Cor 1:9; 10:13; 2 Cor 1:18; cf. 1 Th 5:24; 2 Th 3:3; Heb 10:23); Fee, 52, thinks that this usage may be the source of the language here. This hypothesis is over-simple. It is better to note with Knight that the words which are 'faithful and true' in Rev 21:5; 22:6 are the words of God. Further, in Tit 1:9 the overseer holds fast to the faithful word which is 'according to the teaching', and in 1 Tim 1:12 Paul is regarded as faithful in the service of the Lord. It would therefore appear that the sayings are faithful and reliable in that they are part of the teaching sanctioned by God himself.

2. *The Reference of the Formula*

There should be no dispute that the reference is forwards in 1 Tim 1:15 and 2 Tim 2:11, and that it is backwards in Tit 3:8. These examples show that the formula can be used both ways, and there is legitimate room for dispute over 1 Tim 3:1; 4:9. Campbell* argues for a forward reference in each case, but his argument that 1 Tim 3:16 is the saying to which reference is made in 3:1 is unconvincing. It has been suggested that in each case the reference is to a text that has to do with salvation (Lock, 33; Nauck 1950; Campbell*; Young 1994:56f.; Wagener 1994:71), but this result can be achieved only by some dubious

identifications of the sayings. The actual extent of the sayings is disputed in several cases.

3. *The Significance of the Formula*

The question arises whether this is basically a formula (a) for introducing or concluding a citation and indicating that the words are a citation or (b) primarily for confirming the truth of what is said.

There is now general agreement that the stress lies on (b). Dibelius–Conzelmann, 28f., 150, claim that the contents of the clauses referred to tend to go beyond the needs of the context, and therefore it is likely that the author is quoting, although not all quotations in the letters are accompanied by this formula. Nevertheless, this does not show that the formula is strictly a ‘quotation’-formula (cf. Lips 1979:40, n. 43) and it is better to see it as an affirmation of a statement that is the basis for application and exhortation (cf. Donelson 1986:150f.; Oberlinner, 181f.).⁸⁹ Roloff, 89, claims that a citation formula cannot follow a citation. Similarly, Trummer, 204, describes it as ‘a formula of asseveration’ (cf. Lips 1979:40, n. 43; Merkel, 105; Hanson, 64). Knight 1968:19f. argues that both senses are present in what he calls a ‘quotation-commendation’ formula, but with the stress on the latter. The formula emphasises the truth of what is said. It introduces a solemn note into the context, and it serves to underline the importance of the statement. An antiheretical stress may be present (cf. Schlarb 1990:214).

But does the formula relate to the truth of *traditional* teaching? For Brox* the reference is to traditional teaching about salvation and its realisation in the church. The author has in effect access to a reservoir of traditional teaching, and Brox sees significance in the way that ‘official validation’ is given to the formal character of the material as trustworthy tradition. Similarly, according to Spicq (277, n. 2) the formula refers to an article of faith or liturgical statement that is universally accepted; it stresses the importance of the statement and the need to adhere to it. Hanson, 63, questions whether this can apply to 1 Tim 3:1, and speaks vaguely of ‘credal, cultic and church-order material’. His insights are developed by Roloff, 90, who states that the formula is used of different types of assertions – kerygmatic,

hymnic and worshipping, and church ordering – and that it is used only when the statements allow for application; not all traditional material is accompanied by the formula. It is found only when thematic shifts are taking place or new ideas being introduced.

However, while it may be granted that the material is ultimately based on tradition, in general it has been given its formulation by the author himself, and therefore it can hardly be regarded as a *citation* of tradition. Consequently, Hanson’s claim that its function is to link disparate materials into the author’s composition is not justified. Rather, the formula has a definite purpose in commending teaching that the author wishes to emphasise. Its use is flexible, referring to teaching that is usually based on tradition and is related to salvation and to the consequent practical behaviour.

In the present case, Scott, 177f., and Campbell 1994:78f. appear to be alone in arguing for a reference forwards; but the following *καί* prevents this. Likewise, Hanson, 193, is alone in claiming that the formula need not be tied down in its application; for him it is simply a means of transition from one part of the author’s source material to another. The view of most scholars is that here it refers backwards.⁹⁰ Barrett, 144, however, notes the difficulties that accompany this interpretation.

Likewise, the extent of the ‘saying’ is a matter of dispute (See Knight, 347–9; more fully in Knight 1968:81–6). For many commentators a decision is related to the question of how far there is quoted tradition in 3:3–7 (see above). Most scholars opt for vv. 4–7; others prefer 3–7 (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 147; Ellis 1987:247; Schlarb 1990:213; Oberlinner, 181f.); 5b–7 (Easton, 99); 5b–6 (Kelly, 254). Knight argues that the other faithful sayings are single sentences.

According to Brox, 311, the effect here is to give formal validation of church teaching by the ostensible author to Titus and then through him as the official church teacher to the congregations (similarly, Oberlinner, 182). In Merkel’s opinion, the formula underlines the significance of the preceding passage, while also forming the transition to the authoritative instruction ‘to testify solemnly to this kerygma’: ‘only this form of the proclamation leads to “good works”, i.e. to a Christian manner of

life, which demonstrates goodness to fellow-men in a godless world and thereby extends the kindness of God' (105).

8b. καὶ περὶ τούτων βούλομαί σε διαβεβαιούσθαι, ἵνα φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων προϊστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ
The first part of the instructions to Titus follows naturally. In view of the significance of all that has just been said in 3:1–7, the author now reiterates his strong desire, tantamount to a command, that Titus will stress these things positively in the church with the aim that believers will express their faith by concentrating their minds on zealously doing good (rather than wasting time in useless 'theological' discussions); thus the believers are to demonstrate that they do not belong with the opponents (Oberlinner, 183). The point is that the believers are not simply to be obedient to ethical commands but must develop a personal concern that arises out of their faith (Brox, 311). Such activities are good and profitable for everybody, a comment which recalls the goal of living in a way that influences all people laid down in 3:2.

The shift from the singular 'saying' to the plural περὶ τούτων probably indicates that more than simply the 'saying' is in mind. The reference is rather to what is contained in it. The scope may be limited to the teaching in 3:3–7.⁹¹ More probably it includes all that is included in the previous section of the letter,⁹² since the concern is with good deeds and not just with doctrine. Cf. the similar usage in 2:15 (and note). βούλομαι, 'to wish, will', can have the weaker sense 'to wish, desire' (1 Tim 6:9) but is also used with acc. and inf. to express a strong command (1 Tim 2:8; 5:14 **).⁹³ In 1 Tim 2:8; 5:14 the verb is used to introduce apostolic commands directed to the church, but here the command is characteristically addressed to Titus himself who is to pass on the author's teaching to the church. διαβεβαιούσθαι is 'to give assurance, testify', hence 'to speak confidently, to insist'; it is used of the activity of false teachers in 1 Tim 1:7***.⁹⁴

ἵνα introduces purpose, rather than indirect command.⁹⁵ φροντίζω*** is 'to think of, be intent on'; it encompasses both intention and execution (Spicq, 656).⁹⁶ προϊστημι, used only intransitively in the NT, has a wide variety of meanings, but here it will mean either 'to devote oneself to' or 'to exercise [sc. a

profession]'.⁹⁷ For καλὰ ἔργα see **Excursus 6**; 2:7 note. The phrase has its usual meaning throughout the PE of 'good deeds' (cf. Knight, 351). Hanson, 194, regards this as quite banal, and suggests that in the present context one may think of acts of social welfare, but this is an unjustified narrowing down. The older rendering 'honourable occupations' (RSV mg; NEB) arises in the context from the use of the governing verb, but it rather narrows down the meaning (Fee, 209). The term describes acts of service (demonstrating God's kindness) resulting from faith throughout the PE.

οἱ πεπιστευκότες are 'those who have come to belief'. The use of the perfect of Christian believers is quite common.⁹⁸ When used with the dat., the verb generally signifies 'to give credence to',⁹⁹ but it is also used of the full act of religious faith in God or Christ.¹⁰⁰ Clearly *Christian* faith in God is meant here, as in Acts 16:34. It is the God whose grace has been portrayed in the preceding verses.

ταῦτά ἐστιν καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις The reference of this comment is not clear.

(a) Some take the plural pronoun ταῦτα to refer to the 'good works' just mentioned (NEB text; Fee, 207f.). The problem is that if the pronoun refers to the good works, then tautology results—unless the phrase καλὰ ἔργα was so stereotyped that the repetition of καλός with a stronger meaning was acceptable.

(b) It may pick up περὶ τούτων, the things about which Titus is to give instruction (Parry, 84; Spicq, 657; cf. Brox, 311).

(c) Others refer it to the activities commended and expressed by either διαβεβαιούσθαι or φροντίζωσιν, i.e. the activities of teaching or taking thought which lead to good works (Holtzmann, 501; hence the translation 'these precepts are good in themselves and also useful to society' [REB]; Barrett, 144f.).

(d) Another proposal is that it may refer both to the teaching and to the 'good deeds', i.e. the content of 3:1–7.¹⁰¹ But this is a very artificial combination and quite unlikely; more correctly the thought is of both the specific teachings and exhortations which Titus is to give, as described in 3:1–7.

The determining factor is the contrast to the foolish disputations in v. 9 (Knight wrongly regards v. 9 as referring to

both teachings and deeds). The problems of understanding may arise from the fact that the act and the content of teaching cannot be separated: it is the activity of sound teaching which is being commended.

Such teaching is 'good', in that it gives rise to good deeds. It is also *ὠφέλιμος*, 'useful, beneficial, advantageous', i.e. profitable spiritually; a contrast with 3:9 is intended.¹⁰² Cf. 1 Clem 56:2; 62:1.

τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (1:14 note; cf 1 Tim 6:9; 2 Tim 3:2) must refer to people in general (cf. 3:2), but commentators have attempted to be more precise and suggest that any of the following may be specially meant: (a) the people who do the good deeds; (b) the people to whom they are done or who witness them;¹⁰³ (c) generally of the church, in contrast to what follows which is bad for the church. The preceding reference to believers (οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ) suggests that this reference is at least not limited to the church; however, neither is it automatically limited to unbelievers, since believers can do 'good deeds' for other believers.¹⁰⁴

9. μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς περιίστασο· εἰσὶν γὰρ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι If v. 8 was concerned primarily with what Titus was to teach the church, vv. 9–11 describe how he himself is to act with regard to his opponents. He is to avoid both disputes and disputatious people. On the one hand, he is to avoid entering into their disputes, for these will lead nowhere and (by contrast with engaging in sound teaching and exhortation) are profitless. It is usually said that this means that debate with the opponents is forbidden, but Wolter 1988:137f., holds that the point is rather to maintain a sharp contrast between the behaviour of the church leaders and the foolish disputations characteristic of the opponents (cf. Thiessen 1995:322). On the other hand, if there is anybody who is *ἀρετικός*, he is to take disciplinary measures, which are justified because such people are self-evidently sinning.

For the content of this section cf. 1:10–16, with which it perhaps forms a chiasmus.¹⁰⁵ There are significant parallels with 2 Tim 2:23–26, which has much the same structure:

Titus 3:9–11

2 Timothy 2:23–26

⁹ μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις ... περίστασο· εἰσὶν ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι.	γὰρ	²³ τὰς δὲ μωρὰς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ζητήσεις παραιτοῦ εἰδῶς ὅτι
---	-----	---

¹⁰ ἀίρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νοουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, ¹¹ εἰδῶς ὅτι ...		γεννώσιν μάχας· ... ²⁵ ἐν πρᾶτῃτι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, ... μήποτε ...
---	--	---

In each case there is a stress on positive teaching (3:8; 2 Tim 2:24) followed by a warning against useless debates and a command to discipline those who persist in opposition.

Four phrases describe what is to be avoided, and the language used (*μωρός*, *ζήτησις*, *γενεαλογία*, *ἔρις*, *μάχη*, *νομικός*, *ἀνωφελής*, *μάταιος*) belongs to the author's polemic, though it is not a disguise for an imaginary opponent.¹⁰⁶ Holtzmann, 501, interprets the first two phrases as causes of strife and the latter two as actual quarrels, but *ζητήσεις* are probably disputes. The disputes are 'pointless', rather than 'half-witted', but they are pointless precisely because they are inane. They do not contribute to godliness (Cf. the comment of Calvin: they are foolish *non quod primo aspectu tales appareant (quin saepe inani sapientiae ostentatione fallunt), sed quia nihil ad pietatem conducunt*, cited by Bertram, G., *TDNT* IV, 844). They are concerned in part at least with 'genealogies', idle speculations based on the genealogies and possibly other early material in Genesis. This understanding of them as basically Jewish and arising out of the Torah is confirmed by the reference to 'legal disputes' which is also best understood in terms of Judaism; it is hard to see what other kind of law might be meant. Titus is personally to avoid involvement in such disputes and the discord which they engender

in the church. They achieve nothing positive, by contrast with the activities commended in v. 8, and they lead to no solid conclusions.

ζήτησις, ‘enquiry, dispute’, was used in Classical Greek for searching and enquiring, and hence for philosophical enquiries (so also in Philo; the word is not found in LXX). Greeven comments that it was not used for ‘clash of opinions’ or ‘disputation’ in pre-Christian Greek. Holtzmann, 501, apparently adopts ‘matters of dispute’ in view of the link with γενεαλογία, but the word appears to signify the action of discussing rather than the subject-matter. With μωρός it refers to mere bandying about of words rather than serious investigation.¹⁰⁷ μωρός means ‘foolish, stupid’ in 2 Tim 2:23** it also describes ζητήσεις, and hence it probably applies only to that word here (Knight, 353; *pace* Spicq, 686). In the wisdom literature and in Philo folly is not only intellectual but also religious.¹⁰⁸

γενεαλογία (cf. 1:14 note), ‘genealogy’, ‘the tracing of a genealogy’ (1 Tim 1:4***) is Cl.¹⁰⁹ The link with myths is traditional, being found in Plato, *Tim.* 22A; Polybius 9:2:1, with reference to stories of early times. The usual reference is to human family trees. According to Hort 1894:135–7, the term was used for the tales attached to the births of rulers and heroes and associated with their genealogies. Genealogies occupied an important place in Judaism, both in early history and in the family trees of living individuals; e.g. a priest’s position depended on his having an appropriate genealogy that could be traced back. The word is not found in the LXX (but cf. γενεαλογεῖσθαι, 1 Chr 5:1), but Philo can refer to the parts of Genesis dealing with people (as opposed to the creation of the world) as τὸ γενεαλογικόν (*Mos.* 2:47), reflecting the use of βίβλος γενέσεως (Gen 5:1).¹¹⁰ The reference here is disputed:

(a) Jewish speculations based on the genealogies and similar matter in the Scriptures, such as *Jub.*; 1QGenApoc; Ps-Philo.¹¹¹

(b) Gnostic speculations, whether interpretations of scriptural genealogies or about the aeons and their relationships.¹¹² However, there is no first-century evidence for such material and indeed no evidence that the term ‘genealogies’ was used for Gnostic systems of aeons or that the Gnostics equated names from

biblical genealogies with those of aeons.¹¹³ Further, there is no trace of speculation about the aeons in the PE, and the terminology points more clearly in a Jewish direction. The use of this term thus links the Cretan problems in some way with the Jewish teaching opposed in 1 Tim.

The two remaining items are quite general terms for strife¹¹⁴ and quarrelling.¹¹⁵ Such behaviour is characteristic of non-Christian society and makes the church no better than the society which it is seeking to change. The motif recurs in 1 Tim 6:4 (λογομαχία) and in the pattern for the church leaders in 1 Tim 3:2 (ἄμαχος). In 2 Tim 2:23 strife is the result of the foolish disputes condemned here.

The quarrelling here is concerned with the law. νομικός ‘pertaining to the law (cf. 1 Tim 1:7) is found here only in the NT in this sense.¹¹⁶ In Tit 3:13 and elsewhere in NT it means ‘[a person] knowing the law’, hence ‘lawyer’. Only the Jewish law is in mind; other systems of law are unlikely to have had theological significance for early Christians. But what kind of questions were arising? Gutbrod offers the two possibilities: (a) ‘the validity of the Law as a norm of life for Christians’ (cf. 1:10; 1 Tim 1:8f.); (b) ‘theories which are to be proved from Scripture’, and favours the latter. Another possibility is rules for asceticism (cf. Dibelius–Conzelmann, 151).

The mid. voice of περιίστημι has the sense ‘to go around so as to avoid, avoid, shun’ (2 Tim 2:16***).¹¹⁷ The thought here appears to be of personally avoiding involvement in such disputes, but elsewhere it is of suppressing them in the church (1:11f.). Perhaps both ideas are present.

The reason¹¹⁸ for avoiding such discussions is because of their harmful effects and uselessness. ἀνωφελής can mean both ‘useless’ (Heb 7:18***) and ‘harmful’.¹¹⁹ The word creates a deliberate contrast with v. 8. μάταιος is ‘vain, idle, empty, fruitless’ ‘without result’ (Holtzmann, 501) (Acts 14:15; 1 Cor 3:20 [LXX] 15:7; Jas 1:26; 1 Pet 1:18***).¹²⁰ The concept is also applied to speech in 1:10 (ματαιολόγος) and 1 Tim 1:6 (ματαιολογία).

10. αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ The problem of tackling opponents is discussed more

fully in 2 Tim 2:23–26 (cf. Brox, 312). The αἰρετικός*** is a person who holds sectarian opinions and promotes them in the church, thereby causing dissension in the congregation.¹²¹ The reference is to the kind of person described in Rom 16:17. Cf. Holtzmann, 502: ‘Within Christianity a heresy is, as the etymology indicates, a form of thinking according to an egotistical choice and inclination, associated with a tendency to separation and party spirit.’ Thus the elements of holding doctrines at variance from those of the congregation and of causing divisions over them are both present (Lock, 157).

Every effort is to be made to encourage such people to abandon the assertion of their views. Three stages are envisaged. The first and second consist in a formal warning. νουθεσία is ‘admonition, instruction, warning’ (1 Cor 10:11; Eph 6:4***).¹²² The corresponding verb is used by Paul of the admonition given by members of the church to one another and also by its leaders.¹²³ The word can be used of verbal criticism and physical punishment, Holtzmann, 502. Here, however, it is ‘the attempt to make the heretic aware of the falsity of his position, a pastoral attempt to reclaim rather than a disciplinary measure’ (Behm, J., *TDNT* IV, 1022; cf. Jeremias, 76; *pace* Hasler, 98, who thinks that pastoral care is absent). The procedure in Mt 18:15f. is in mind. This gave the person ample opportunity for restoration to the congregation. More than one opportunity was to be given.¹²⁴ But if repeated persuasion failed, the church leader must take strong action to silence the offender, presumably by some form of exclusion from the congregation (Oberlinner, 188). The force of παραιτοῦμαι is debatable. It means ‘to reject, repudiate, decline’, hence (with acc. of person; Josephus, *Ant.* 7:167) ‘to reject, refuse somebody’ (1 Tim 5:11; Heb 12:25a, 25b); here perhaps it has the stronger force ‘to dismiss, drive out’.¹²⁵ It also means (with acc. of thing) ‘to reject, avoid’ (1 Tim 4:7; 2 Tim 2:23; Acts 25:11***; Diognetus 4:2; 6:10).¹²⁶

Action here is apparently taken by the leader; contrast the congregational action in 1 Cor 5 (Hanson, 195). According to Spicq, 687, it is not as extreme as excommunication but is rather the refusal of fellowship, and the verb has the sense of keeping one’s distance from the offender. Fee, 212, notes the parallel in thought at the end of Romans (Rom 16:17, ἐκκλίνω).

Rabbinic procedures at this time are not altogether clear. Later practice involved the imposition of a ban (*nidduy, shammata*) for a period of 30 days. If this failed to induce penitence, it was followed by a further, similar period. And if this in turn failed to be effective, the more severe *herem* was imposed. However, this practice is not attested for the first century, when the *nidduy* was imposed for an unlimited period of at least 30 days on religious leaders rather than ordinary people. A better parallel is to be found at Qumran where dissidents might be temporarily or permanently excluded from the community.¹²⁷ The general principle of two warnings followed by a penalty does not seem to be paralleled except in Mt 18:15–17.

It would seem, then, that the procedure here may depend on the tradition of Jesus’ teaching. The question must also be raised whether it represents a milder approach than that in 1 Tim 1:20, but it is best to assume that that passage represents the last stage in the process with recalcitrant opponents. The spirit here is that of 2 Tim 2:24–26.

11. εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ ἀμαρτάνει ὧν αὐτοκατάκριτος Justification¹²⁸ for the severe action lies in the fact that the opponent¹²⁹ has proved to be recalcitrant. He is impervious to persuasion and is following a course that can only be described as sinful. The perf. ἐξέστραπται indicates a continuing, permanent state of perversion.¹³⁰ The culprit, therefore, persists in sinning. Spicq, 688, holds that ἀμαρτάνω (1 Tim 5:20**) here has its original sense ‘to miss the mark, deceive oneself’, hence ‘commit a folly’.¹³¹ In any case the force is ‘and is [deliberately] sinning’. His sin is now witting and deliberate (cf. Lk 19:22; Jn 3:18; 8:9–11). The implication may be that he has been warned about his conduct.¹³² He is without excuse and self-condemned, and therefore is to be disciplined.¹³³

Parry, 85, notes that the sin is not the holding of false views but rather the breaking up of the congregation. When Brox, 312, suggests that the underlying message is in effect ‘don’t waste time on such people’, this is true only when every reasonable effort to persuade the offender has failed. On the problem of the limits of pastoral care see further Oberlinner, 190–3.

PERSONAL INSTRUCTIONS (3:12–14)

The letter concludes with material of a more personal and occasional character. It is explained by advocates of pseudonymity as an attempt to demonstrate that Paul was concerned also for the ‘third generation’ of leadership, i.e. the period after Titus had completed his duties. The reference to Nicopolis is an indication that the scope of the letter is wider than simply Crete, and the mixture of names of known companions of Paul and fresh persons indicates the combination of continuity with the past and the appointment of new leaders (Oberlinner, 193–202). This seems very artificial.

There is the usual abrupt transition from the preceding ‘body’ material. The structure follows the typical pattern of a Pauline letter (Merkel, 106) with elements that can be broadly categorised as follows:

12–13	Travel plans	1 Cor 16:10–12	Rom 15:22–33
14	Personal instructions	1 Cor 16:13–18	Rom 16:17–20
	Recommendations	1 Cor 16:15–16	Rom 16:1–2
15a	Greetings	1 Cor 16:19–22	Rom 16:3–16, 21–23
15b	Grace	1 Cor 16:23–24	Rom 16:20

The structure is clearly flexible. It is also found in Heb 13:17–25, and therefore nothing about authorship can be deduced from it.

TEXT

13. Ἀπολλῶν The spelling varies: Ἀπολλῶν (Σ Href.* C*); Ἀπολλῶνα (F G); Ἀπολλῶ (the Attic form; C D* TR). Elliott, 195f., is undecided.

λείπη λίπη (Σ D* Ψ 1505 pc; T WH mg). Elliott, 196, prefers the aorist; cf. 1:5 note; 2 Tim 4:10 note.

14. ὧσιν ἄκαρποι Inverted order (F G Hier); Elliott, 196, accepts the variant on the basis that the PE have the order ἴνα—adj.—εἶναι in 1:9; 1 Tim 4:15; 5:7. But the external evidence is weak.

EXEGESIS

12. Ὅταν πέμψω Ἄρτεμῶν πρὸς σὲ ἢ Τύχικον, σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με εἰς Νικόπολιν, ἐκεῖ γὰρ κέκρικα παραχειμάσαι
The first of two personal instructions given to Titus concerns his own movements. Paul will send to him one of his colleagues, and at this juncture Titus is to travel to the same destination as Paul where the latter (and presumably Titus also) will spend the winter season when travel tended to be avoided.

ὅταν, ‘when, whenever’ (1 Tim 5:11**), is used of an action that is conditional and possibly repeatable in the indefinite future; it does not necessarily imply uncertainty.¹ πέμπω**² is frequently used of Paul sending colleagues.³ Ἄρτεμῶν*** is a shortened form of Ἄρτεμίδορος (BD § 125¹), ‘gift of Artemis’.⁴ Like Artemas, Τύχικος is also a Greek name (‘Fortunate’).⁵ It doubtless refers to Paul’s colleague who accompanied Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem, and was sent with Col and Eph (Acts 20:4; Eph 6:21; Col 4:7***). The listing of the two alternative possibilities (ἢ, 1:6) implies uncertainty in plans and sounds genuine – Paul had not yet made up his mind what to do (Kelly, 257). If a historical scenario lies behind the verse, then, since according to 2 Tim 4:12*** he was to be sent from Paul in his imprisonment in Rome to Ephesus to relieve Timothy, presumably it was in fact Artemas who was sent to replace Titus in Crete so that there would be a continuity in leadership there (Spicq, 689f.).

Once his replacement had arrived, Titus was to join up with Paul. The whole phrase σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με is paralleled in 2 Tim 4:9 (cf. 4:21). σπουδάζω can mean ‘to hasten, hurry’ (REB; 2 Tim 4:9, 21**); Ignatius, *Eph.* 1:2; *Mart. Poly.* 13:2) or ‘to be zealous, eager’ as a morally praiseworthy form of conduct (Gal 2:10; *et al.*). Clearly the former meaning (which is dominant in LXX usage; cf. Jdt 13:12) is required here (*pace* BA), but perhaps the command is ‘to be taken with a pinch of salt’ as ‘epistolary style’ (Spicq, 690; cf. Jude 3).⁶

There were at least nine known towns called Νικόπολις*** (‘Victory town’; Spicq, 690). It is generally agreed that the reference here is to Actia Nicopolis which was the major city in Epirus, a Roman *colonia* founded in 31 BC by Augustus after the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at the battle of Actium; Herod the Great contributed to the building costs.⁷ Epictetus had a school

here (c. AD 90), had Arrian as a pupil and seems to have known a Christian community whom he refers to as ‘Galileans’ (Epictetus 4:7:6; Aulus Gellius 15:11). This identification fits in with 2 Tim 4:10 where Titus is in Dalmatia. In Rom 15:19 Paul states that he had preached the gospel as far [west] as Illyricum. Other possible locations are discussed and dismissed by Dibelius–Conzelmann, 152f.

The reason for the choice of meeting place lies in Paul’s travel plans. The use of ἐκεῖ, ‘there’ (Rom 9:26 LXX; 15:24 in travel information), clearly implies that Paul had not yet arrived there (Holtzmann, 503). κρίνω is here ‘to decide’, and the perfect expresses ‘a settled decision’ (Knight, 357).⁸ παραχειμάζω, ‘to spend the winter’, can be used of ships staying in port over the winter season (Acts 27:12; 28:11; 1 Cor 16:6***; noun, Acts 27:12), but equally of people. A date of writing in the autumn or late summer is indicated.

The uncertainty as to which of Paul’s colleagues will actually come is admitted to be surprising by commentators like Hasler, 99, who think that the details are fictitious (cf. Trummer 1978:132–7; Donelson 1986:23f., 56, 58). Defenders of the authenticity of at least the personal notes hold that the motif is unlikely to have been invented.

The reason for the haste (cf. also v. 13) is not clear. The similar instruction in 2 Tim 4:9, 21 is motivated by the onset of winter and the imminence of Paul’s trial. Commentators have asked whether it is consistent with the duties in 1:5f. (Hasler, 98; Merkel, 106; see above on 1:5) and with the fact that Paul is not yet at Nicopolis (Holtzmann, 503; Spicq, 690). Certainly the onset of winter is also implied here, which would be a reason for not delaying to travel. Ancient travellers did not travel in the winter, even in the Mediterranean.

Why was Paul going to Nicopolis? It is probable that he settled in major cities during the winters for an extended period of evangelism and church development. If the letter belongs to the last period in his life, he may have had his sights on Spain, in which case Nicopolis would have been a convenient location for missionary activity before leaving the Aegean area and travelling further west. But this must be speculative.

So the real problem is why Titus’s presence is needed with Paul and why he is no longer needed in Crete. No reason is given why Titus should join Paul, nor is the period mentioned. It is not explicitly stated that he was to be replaced (permanently?) by one of the two people mentioned here (*pace* Hasler, 99), although this is a reasonable interpretation. We do not know how long it would take to appoint elders in the churches, but it may well have been possible in the time still at Titus’s disposal. The ongoing instructions are more of a problem. Oberlinner, 194f., solves the problems by claiming that the intent is simply to indicate the widening of Titus’s sphere of influence.

What does stand out is the fact that Paul is decisively in charge and can issue instructions to his colleagues. This picture agrees with that in the acknowledged letters where colleagues bustle to and fro at his direction.

13. Ζηναῖν τὸν νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶν σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον, ἵνα μηδὲν αὐτοῖς λείπη The second personal instruction to Titus is about the arrival of two further members of Paul’s missionary group, probably travelling together, who are to be given whatever resources they need for the continuation of their travels. It may be implied that they are Christian workers who trust the Lord (and hence his servants) to provide for their needs. For Oberlinner, 196, the author’s purpose is to portray Paul as being concerned for the third-generation situation.

Ζηναῖς*** is yet another Greek name reflecting pagan religion; it is a contraction for Ζηνοδωρός, ‘gift of Zeus’. This is the only mention of Zenas in the NT, but the attached adjective has suggested that another person of the same name was known in the church (Spicq, 691); this is an unnecessary supposition, since Paul does the same thing in Rom 16:23; Col 4:14. νομικός (3:9) is here a noun, ‘lawyer’. This sense of the term is well-attested in Hellenistic sources (4 Macc 5:4; cf. BA; Spicq, 691) and is common in Lk for Jewish experts in the law (Lk 7:30; cf. Mt 22:35). The word in itself does not indicate what kind of law is meant, whether Jewish, Greek or Roman law, but a Jewish lawyer is unlikely with such a pagan name (*pace* Lock). Some think that the mention of the detail has some connection with Paul’s own trials, but nothing in the context supports this.⁹

Ἀπολλῶς is a common Greek name,¹⁰ found for a colleague of Paul in Acts 18:24; 1 Cor 1:12; *et al.* The same person is probably meant throughout.¹¹

σπουδαίως has two nuances, corresponding to those of the verb (3:12 note), either ‘with haste’ (in the comparative form, Phil 2:28), or ‘with diligence, zeal’ (Lk 7:4; 2 Tim 1:17***). Here the latter force is more likely.¹² προπέμπω can mean ‘to accompany, escort’ (Acts 20:38; 21:5); Holtzmann, 503f., holds that this is also the meaning in all the remaining NT references except here and 3 Jn, but in fact it is more likely to mean ‘to help on one’s journey’ (by providing food, money, companions, etc.).¹³ The reference here is certainly to material provision in view of the next clause (Dibelius–Conzelmann, 152).¹⁴ But there appears to be a contrast between what Titus himself is to do and what the members of the congregation are to do (v. 14)

The question arises whether these two missionaries are the bearers of the letter.¹⁵ The principle of sending missionaries in pairs would then have been followed. If the information is fictitious, it was created to give concrete evidence of what is demanded in v. 14 and introduce the paraenesis there (Brox, 313); however, the fit between the duties in vv. 13 and 14 is not all that close. Merkel, 107, thinks it odd that two bearers of the letter, one of them a lawyer to boot, were necessary and holds that they were simply travelling evangelists; but nothing suggests that carrying a letter was their only reason for travel, and they were in fact going on elsewhere.

14. μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι καλῶν ἔργων προϊστασθαι εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας, ἵνα μὴ ὤσιν ἄκαρποι After the personal instructions comes a further implicit command to Titus regarding the instruction which he is to give the church in doing good and living fruitful lives. Although Brox, 314, notes that the instruction to do good works is rather stereotyped, in fact there may well be a fresh nuance here.

οἱ ἡμέτεροι (cf. 2 Tim 4:15**) is ‘our people’, i.e. in this context [Cretan] Christians (cf. Lips 1979:157). This usage to refer to one’s own group is common parlance¹⁶ and need not include any particular stress on the exclusion of other people such

as heretics and non-Christians (*pace* Brox, 314), although a delimited group is in mind (Spicq, 692f., with further examples).¹⁷

μανθάνω can be used of learning by receiving instruction, in this case Christian instruction in the church given by a teacher.¹⁸ Here, however, the force is more ‘to learn through practice’ and hence ‘to begin to do something’ rather than ‘to receive instruction how to’ (Heb 5:8; 1 Tim 5:4, 13**; Ignatius, *Mag.* 10:1; *Rom.* 4:3). Hence the remark of Rengstorf that ‘members of his churches will always be fruitful in piety if they will accept and learn from the Gospel as the new Law’ (*TDNT* IV, 410) is wide of the mark.¹⁹

The phrase καλῶν ἔργων προϊστασθαι repeats 3:8. The injunction is now applied specifically (cf. Lips 1979:179 n. 72) and may have a fresh nuance, depending on how the next phrase is understood. Lock, 156, thinks that ‘to practise honourable occupations’ may again be the sense here (but see note above).

χρεῖα is ‘need, necessity’, hence ‘something that is lacking, necessary’. In the plural it can refer to the things needed for daily life (food, clothes and the like).²⁰ ἀνάγκαιος** is ‘necessary’;²¹ hence it is used of ‘close’ friends (Acts 10:24), and here of ‘pressing needs’. The addition of the adjective to χρεῖαι seems strictly unnecessary, but the combination was evidently a stock phrase.²² Nevertheless, its force is disputed:

(a) ‘To obtain²³ the things necessary for life’ (sc. for themselves so as not to be a burden on others.²⁴ However, this interpretation depends on taking the previous part of the verse as a reference to engaging in honourable professions (and thereby earning wages); but we have already seen that this interpretation is unlikely in v. 8, and there is nothing else in the letter to suggest that this was a problem.

(b) ‘So as to help cases of urgent need’;²⁵ specifically ‘to help the needs of Christian travellers’ (Holtz, 237; Hasler, 98), or more broadly ‘in order to facilitate the Christian mission’ (Barrett, 148). Cf. Rom 12:13; Eph 4:28.

(c) ‘To help with problems in the community at large’. Spicq, 693f., notes that the language is unusual in the New Testament and suggests that Christians are here being summoned to generosity in dealing with disasters affecting the community at

large, such as epidemics and famine, which were dealt with in the ancient world through the gifts of public-spirited citizens (similarly, Hanson, 196f.).²⁶

There would seem to be some special reason for emphasising this point at the end of the letter. This makes view (c) attractive, although it does seem a big jump from caring for Christian missionaries to setting up disaster aid funds. View (b) certainly fits the context best. In any case, such action will ensure that Christians live useful lives.²⁷

A closing instruction of this kind is found elsewhere in Paul.²⁸ It repeats and sums up a main point of the letter (3:8; cf. 1:16; 2:7, 14; 3:1; Spicq, 689; Fee, 215). The letter thus ends with a stress on fruitful Christian living, expressed in deeds that benefit others, rather than wasting time in fruitless speculations. The faith of believers must be translated into action that is beneficial to others. Their purpose must be evangelistic in contrast to the heretics who are set on personal gain (1 Tim 6:5, Spicq, 694). Lock, 159, cites the taunt of the Romans that Christians were *'infructuosi in negotiis'* (Tertullian, *Apol.* 42:1).

CLOSING GREETING (3:15)

Weima, J. A. D., *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (Sheffield: JSNT Press, 1994; but he more or less neglects the PE).

TEXT

15. ἀπάσαι ἀπάσαθε (A b); not discussed by Elliott. Possibly assimilation to plural in v. 15b.

ἡ χάρις add τοῦ θεοῦ (F G 629 vg^{mss}); τοῦ κυρίου (D b vg^{mss}). These are natural additions to a brief benediction by scribes.

μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου (33); add καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου (81). Both are attempts to assimilate to 2 Tim (Elliott, 197), and the latter is a good example of conflation.

Add at end ἀμήν: (ℵ² D¹ F G H Ψ 0278 TR lat sy bo). Rejected by Elliott. 104; Metzger, 586f. Cf. 1 Tim 6:16.

EXEGESIS

15a. Ἀσπάζονται σε οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες. ἄψασαι τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει The letter closes in a conventional but nonetheless meaningful way with greetings from the writer and

his immediate companions to Titus, a request to pass on greetings to the Christian community, and an actual greeting in the form of an implicit prayer for God's grace to be with them all. Oberlinner, 200, deduces that contacts between the churches are mediated through the leaders, but this impression arises simply because this letter is from one church leader to another.

In v. 15a ἀσπάζομαι is 'to express good wishes to, greet' (2 Tim 4:19, 21), but in v. 15b** it has the sense 'to convey one person's greetings to a third party'.¹ Although it is common at the ends of letters (cf. BA for examples), Windisch notes that the epistolary use is not unknown in the pre-Christian period but is certainly rare, and follows O. Roller in suggesting that Paul was the first to see great significance in it.² Greetings from the writer's companions are a normal feature in NT letters.³ Here the senders of the greetings are οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες, i.e. the writer's companions; the more common terms 'saints' or 'brothers' are not used, but similar, rather vague phrases are found in Paul.⁴

The vagueness of the reference to Paul's companions may imply either that none of the writer's companions was known to the recipient or that he knew their names so well that there was no need to list them. One possibility is that the writer was on a journey with a few companions, none of them known to Titus (cf. the vagueness in Acts 20:34; Spicq, 694).

Titus is called to pass on greetings to Paul's friends and acquaintances who are with him. The phrase οἱ φιλοῦντες ἡμᾶς is attested in secular literature,⁵ but it is Christianised by the following words. With the exception of the (traditional?) formula in 1 Cor 16:22 φιλέω** is not found in the Pauline corpus, nor are there references to fellow-Christians as φίλοι (as in 3 Jn 15).⁶ Paul, however, does use ἀγαπητός of his friends and congregations (cf. 2 Tim 1:2). The switch from the singular 'me' to the plural 'us' is presumably to take account of the broad group of Paul and his colleagues mentioned in the immediate context.

Most scholars take the qualification ἐν πίστει to mean 'in the faith', so as to qualify 'those who love us' as Christians (cf. 1 Tim 1:2).⁷ Another possibility is that it means 'faithfully'.⁸ Either way the phrase refers to 'believers' or 'true believers'; Barrett, 148,

finds the double sense that the readers are Christians and that they can be trusted.

This description of the wider circle around Titus may carry a note of exclusion directed against heretics. But this may be to press the force of ἐν πίστει too far, and it may simply be a way of characterising the people greeted as those who have a loving relationship to Paul within the community constituted by faith. If there is an exclusion in the phrase, it lies in ‘those who love us’, since it may be assumed that Titus’s opponents were also opposed to Paul. To suggest that Titus is to make an appraisal of his congregation to decide who is to be greeted (Knight, 359f.) exaggerates the point, especially in view of the inclusiveness of the next phrase.

15b. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν This form of wording of the closing benediction (but without πάντων) is also found in 1 Tim 6:21; 2 Tim 4:22. The use of πάντων shows that it is a real plural referring to the church, corresponding to the ‘all’ in v. 15a. The phrase is probably a wish, and we should supply some such word as εἴη or πληθυνθείη. To ask for grace to be with people (μετὰ is common at the end of letters to express the presence of God/grace/love with believers; cf. BA) is to pray to God that he will act graciously towards them. The benedictions in the other Pauline letters (except Eph 6:24; Col 4:18) regularly include a reference to Christ as the source of grace. Hasler, 100f., thinks that this one is thus very formal; but the use of the same form in Col 4:18 and Heb 13:25 rather weakens the evidence for his assertion (cf. Oberlinner, 201, who suggests that χάρις itself signifies the totality of salvation).

Notes

- Berger
 Berger, K., ‘Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament’, ANRW II:25:2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984a), 1031–432.
 Berger, K., Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984b).
 ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
 Hegermann Hegermann, H., ‘Der geschichtliche Ort der Pastoralbriefe’, in Rogge, J., and Schille, G., (eds.) Theologische Versuche 2 (Berlin, 1970), 47–63.
 BJRL Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester
 Prior Prior, M., Paul the Letter Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy (JSNTSup 23. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).
 Roloff
 Roloff, J., Der Erste Brief an Timotheus (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Zürich/ Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1988).
 Roloff, J., Apostolat - Verkündigung - Kirche (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965), 236–71.
 Roloff, J., ‘Pfeiler und Fundament der Wahrheit’, in Grässer, E., and Merk, O. (eds.), Glaube und Eschatologie (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985), 229–47.
 Roloff, J., ‘Der Kampf gegen die Irrlehrer. Wie geht man miteinander um?’, BK 46 (1991 a), 114–20.
 Roloff, J., ‘Der Weg Jesu als Lebensnorm (2 Tim 2, 8–13). Ein Beitrag zur Christologie der Pastoralbriefe’, in Breytenbach, C., and Paulsen, H. (eds.), Anfänge der Christologie (=Fs. F. Hahn) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991b), 155–67.
 Schnider Schnider, F., and Stenger, W., Studien zum neutestamentlichen Briefformular (NTTS 11. Leiden: Brill, 1987).
 Stenger Stenger, W., ‘Timotheus und Titus als literarische Gestalten’, Kairos 16 (1974), 252–67.
 Wolter
 Wolter, M., ‘Verborgene Weisheit und Heil für die Heiden. Zur Traditionsgeschichte und Intention des “Revelations-schemas”’, ZTK 84 (1987), 297–319.
 Wolter, M., Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition (FRLANT 146. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988).
 Zmijewski Zmijewski, J., ‘Die Pastoralbriefe als pseudepigraphische Schriften: Beschreibung, Erklärung, Bewertung’, SNT (SU) 4 (1979), 97–118.
 1 Cf. the excursus on the theology of apostleship in Spicq, 595–9.
 2 On the assumption of authenticity Dormer, 118, holds that Titus needed especial affirmation of his position in view of his delicate task.
 Holtzmann Holtzmann, H. J., Die Pastoralbriefe, Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1880).