

# LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY



---

VOLUME 62 • NUMBER 4

DECEMBER 2022

---

**The Pastor's Breastplate:  
An Exegesis of First Timothy 3:1–7**

**Funeral Sermon for the  
Rev. Harry Kenneth Bartels**

**Until the End Comes the Gospel is  
Proclaimed in Our Broken World**

# LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY



VOLUME 62 • NUMBER 4  
DECEMBER 2022

*The journal of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary*

# LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY

---

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF..... Timothy A. Hartwig  
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS ..... Nicholas D. Proksch,  
Timothy R. Schmeling

---

The *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* (ISSN: 0360-9685) is edited by the faculty of  
Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary  
6 Browns Court  
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

The *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* is a continuation of the *Clergy Bulletin* (1941–1960). The purpose of the *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, as was the purpose of the *Clergy Bulletin*, is to provide a testimony of the theological position of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod and also to promote the academic growth of her clergy roster by providing scholarly articles, rooted in the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures and the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* is published in March and December with a combined June and September issue. Subscription rates are \$25.00 U.S. per year for domestic subscriptions (shipping is no longer available for international subscriptions).

All subscriptions and editorial correspondence should be sent to the following address:

Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary  
Attn: *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*  
6 Browns Ct  
Mankato MN 56001

Back issues of the *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* from the past two years are available at a cost of \$10.00 per issue. Back issues of the *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* and *Clergy Bulletin* prior to the past two years are available at <[www.blts.edu/lsq](http://www.blts.edu/lsq)>.

The *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* is abstracted in *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, PO Box 215, Myerstown, PA 17067 (E-mail: [rtaed@rtabstracts.org](mailto:rtaed@rtabstracts.org); Website: [www.rtabstracts.org](http://www.rtabstracts.org)).

Copyright ©2022 by Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary. Requests for permission to reproduce more than brief excerpts are to be directed to the Editor-in-Chief.



# Contents

---

LSQ Vol. 62, No. 4 (December 2022)

---

- The Pastor's Breastplate: An Exegesis of First Timothy 3:1–7 .....263  
*Phillip K. Lepak*
- Funeral Sermon for the Rev. Harry Kenneth Bartels .....359  
*Rob A. Lawson*
- Until the End Comes the Gospel is Proclaimed in Our  
Broken World.....367  
*Glenn R. Obenberger*



# Foreword

---

*LSQ* Vol. 62, No. 4 (December 2022)

---

**T**HE CHURCH IN AMERICA FINDS ITSELF WITH A credibility problem. The Bible is considered just myths that cannot be taken at face value. At best, it is a book of morals that are a good rule for life, but the events recorded in it cannot be trusted—especially, the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth! Should we be surprised that those called to represent Jesus and proclaim the truths record in the Holy Scriptures also suffer from a credibility problem? Pastors cannot control how culture views them. They can control their words and actions so that they remain above reproach. Pastor Phillip Lepak takes a deep look at what is often called “the qualifications for a pastor” as written by St. Paul in his first epistle to Timothy. Paul’s goal was that credibility of those in the public ministry would be preserved and the work that God carries on through them blessed.

Pastor Harry Bartels, a faithful pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, was called home to the eternal rest Christ has prepared for His saints on August 4, 2022. Harry served ELS congregations in Brownsburg, Indiana and Tacoma, Washington from 1989–2007. His passion for church music and hymnody was well used by Pastor Rob Lawson in Harry’s funeral sermon.

Pres. Glenn Obenberger had the privilege of preaching at Saude Evangelical Lutheran Church, Lawler, Iowa, for the rededication of its sanctuary. The building was constructed in 1904 and underwent significant redecoration in 1960. The 2022 project was an effort to

restore much of the original design of the sanctuary. In his sermon, Pres. Obenberger answers the question, “Why do believers make their houses of worship to be places of beauty and sacredness?”

—TAH

# The Pastor's Breastplate: An Exegesis of First Timothy 3:1–7

*Phillip K. Lepak  
Pastor, Hartland and Manchester Lutheran Churches  
Hartland and Manchester, Minnesota*

---

LSQ Vol. 62, No. 4 (December 2022)

---

**Editor's Note:** This paper was presented at the 2017 West Coast Pastoral Conference in Lakewood, Washington, on April 27, 2017.

---

“THESE ARE THE PRIESTLY ROBES, THE ROYAL adornment, the gems and precious stones of our Aarons.”<sup>1</sup> The limestone of Solomon's Quarry, though fine, was never truly suitable for the Temple of the Most High. Though it pleased Him to manifest Himself within its walls during His visitations, that rock was cast down three times and, indeed, all the elements will burn away as though by fire upon His return. Rather, His Christians are the Temple of His Spirit, builded together mysteriously—eternally living, spiritual stones. As the Temples that successively crowned Mt. Zion were pictures of the Holy Christian Church, so Luther saw in the priestly breastplate of finely twisted threads, gold, and precious stones a picture of a spiritual breastplate, adorned with the precious virtues of Christ covering the hearts of His servants. Explore the text with this picture in mind and consider with awe the call of God to serve before Him day and night in His Temple.

## Summary

The text of the first section of First Timothy, Chapter 3, is itself relatively straightforward. Even though the content is well established

---

<sup>1</sup> Quote or paraphrase of unknown origin, probably of Luther.



and the *variata* are few in number, the first variant—really a matter of discourse grouping—is significant. Verses 2 through 6 form a list, which, while somewhat structurally complicated, is rather straightforward semantically. Thus, the labor of the exegete of these passages is primarily one of word study and semantic domain analysis, rather than grammatical analysis. Several questions present themselves in the text and in the literature:

1. Does 1Ti 3:1a refer to 1Ti 3:1b and following or to the discourse at the end of Chapter 2? (1)
2. Does the office seek the man? If so, what is the meaning of ὀρέγεται with ἐπιθυμεῖ? (1)
3. Do ὀρέγεται and ἐπιθυμεῖ focus the sentence on the desire of the candidates, or does καλοῦ ἔργου focus it upon the weightiness of the calling (or some combination thereof)? (1)
4. What is the meaning of καλοῦ in its application to the anarthrous ἔργου? (1)
5. What is the force of δεῖ in verse 2? Does it mean that what follows is a necessary condition for permitting a candidate to enter the office, or does it mean that what follows must be the faithful aspiration of the candidate, or both? (2)
6. What is the meaning of ἐπίσκοπῆς relative to the many historically relevant terms of other ecclesiastically important languages and relative to their respective uses in doctrinal statements, officio? *Amt*, etc. (1f)
7. What distinctions, if any, should be made between ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, διάκονος, κ.τ.λ.? (1f)
8. Is ἀνεπίλημπτον the “one-word summary” of the list of qualities, etc.? (2)
9. By whom (Christians, world, peers, community, family, etc.) and in what manner is a pastor assailed? What constitutes an assailing of a pastor? (2)
10. What is the meaning of μίας γυναικὸς ἀνδρας? (2)
11. How ought the subtle meaning of κόσμιος be reflected in an English translation? (2)
12. Can the broadening of the translation of μὴ πάροινον to include other intoxicating substances be supported by the text? Is πάροινον indicative of a broad category of behavior? (3)
13. Does πλήκτην refer to spiritual, psychological, and/or physical striking? (3)
14. What does it mean for a child to be ἐν ὑποταγῇ? (4)

15. To whom does μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος, "with all dignity," refer? (4)
16. Does the argument regarding the orderly household refer to or build on Chapter 2? (4f)
17. How should νεόφυτον be understood? (6)
18. What does κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου, "the judgment of the devil/accuser," mean? How is the genitive to be understood?
19. Does τοῦ διαβόλου refer to the devil or to the accuser? (6)
20. What does παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου, "the condemnation of the devil/accuser," mean? How is the genitive to be understood? (7)

## Isagogical Treatment

Among modern scholars, a case has been made that the Pastoral Epistles were not written by Paul but, in fact, added in the second century. Historical and scriptural counter arguments abound, and the evidence provides insight into the early dissemination and authority of the letter. (Since the counter arguments are germane to the subject of the paper, they are presented below. Some of the influential modern arguments against Pauline authorship are provided in summary and citations only.)

### *Authorship and Canonicity*

#### *Ancient Testimony Supporting Pauline Authorship*

##### Introduction

Evidence for Pauline authorship of First Timothy is sprinkled throughout the writings of the apostolic fathers of the Early Church. At that time, a primary concern was canonicity, and authorship was a part of that consideration. That significant quotations can be found is evidence of the apostolic origin of Pauline authorship. The treatment below is by no means comprehensive but should suffice to introduce the topic and to provide direction in countering the arguments of the higher criticism of modern scholarship.

Clement of Rome (c. A.D. 35–c. 100; feast day Roman November 23, Orthodox November 25)

Clement of Rome's First Epistle to the Corinthians might allude to 1Ti 5:21: ...φανερὸν ποιησάτωσαν, τὴν ἀγάπην αὐτῶν μὴ κατὰ προσκλίσεις, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸν Θεὸν ὅσιως, ἴσῃν παρεχέτωσαν.— "... let them display their love, not by preferring one to another, but by showing equal

affection to all that piously fear God”<sup>2</sup>; with the coincidence of the *hapax legomenon*, πρόσκλησις: διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων, ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξῃς χωρὶς προκρίματος, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλησιν.—“In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of the elect angels I charge you to keep these rules without prejudging, doing nothing from partiality.”<sup>3</sup> This allusion is not conclusive.

Ignatius of Antioch (c. A.D. 30–c. 107; original feast day February 1, Roman October 17, Orthodox December 20)<sup>4</sup>

In the greeting of the *Epistle to the Philippians*, Ignatius of Antioch purportedly writes, Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, Ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ ἡ ἰεραμένη, ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Φιλίπποις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν.—“Ignatius, who is called Theophorus, to the Church of God which is at Philippi, which has obtained mercy in faith, and patience, and love unfeigned: Mercy and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, *‘who is the Saviour of all men, [es]pecially of them that believe.’*”<sup>5</sup> The italicized phrase is nearly identical to 1Ti 4:10b: εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ κοπιῶμεν καὶ ὀνειδιζόμεθα, ὅτι ἠλπικαμεν ἐπὶ θεῷ ζῶντι, ὃς ἐστὶν σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν.—“For to this end we toil and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God, *who is the Savior of all people, especially of those who believe.*” This quotation, however, is of dubious value, since the letter is considered spurious and is not “quoted or referred to by any ancient writer previous to the Sixth Century. The style, moreover, in which they are written, so different from that of the other Ignatian letters, and allusions which they contain to heresies and ecclesiastical arrangements of a much later date than that of their professed author, render it perfectly certain that they are not the authentic production of the illustrious bishop of Antioch.”<sup>6</sup>

“Of the seven Epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., iii. 36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer. It is plain that one or other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and scholars have for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing

<sup>2</sup> Clement of Rome, *Epistle to the Corinthians* [ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α'] (PG 1:256). Clement of Rome, First Epistle to the Corinthians (*ANF* 1:11). Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Ephesians* [ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ] (PG 5:59).

<sup>3</sup> 1Ti 5:21.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.christianiconography.info/ignatiusAntioch.html>.

<sup>5</sup> Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Philippians* [ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ] (PG 5:920). Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Philippians* (*ANF* 1:116)

<sup>6</sup> “Introductory Note to the Spurious Epistles of Ignatius” (*ANF* 1:105).

the genuine letters of Ignatius.<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of the argument, the Syriac manuscripts, discovered in 1845 by Cureton, are inconsequential.<sup>8</sup>

Ignatius' shorter *Epistle to the Ephesians* was widely considered to be genuine and mentioned by Eusebius of Cæsarea. The longer *Epistle*, however, is believed to contain later interpolations and expansions. In the longer *Epistle*, Οὐκοῦν οὐ λήσεται ὑμᾶς τι τῶν νοημάτων τοῦ διαβόλου, ἐάν, ὡς Παῦλος, τελείως εἰς Χριστὸν ἔχητε τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ ζωῆς καὶ τέλος.—“Wherefore none of the devices of the devil shall be hidden from you, if, like Paul, you perfectly possess that faith and love towards Christ which are the beginning and the end of life.”<sup>9</sup> In light of the clear connection of this sentence to St. Paul's teaching, compare the italicized words with 1Ti 1:14, ὑπερεπλέονασεν δὲ ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μετὰ πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.—“...and the grace of our Lord overflowed with *the faith and love that are in Christ Jesus*.” This allusion is immediately followed by an allusion to 1Ti 1:5 in the shorter version of the *Epistle*. Given the abruptness of the Greek in the shorter *Epistle* and the two-fold allusion, that shorter *Epistle* is likelier an epitome with additions rather than the longer *Epistle* an expansion with omissions. Whichever is the case, both indicate Pauline authorship for First Timothy.

Ignatius' *Epistle to the Magnesians* is likewise considered genuine and is also found in shorter and longer forms. Of note is a quotation found in Chapter 1 of the longer: ... ὅς ἐστι Σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα δὲ πιστῶν—“who is the Saviour of all men, but especially believers,” which is identical (up to the omission of the ephelcystic-ν) to 1Ti 4:10b: εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ κοπιῶμεν καὶ ὄνειδιζόμεθα, ὅτι ἠλπικαμεν ἐπὶ θεῷ ζῶντι, ὅς ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν.<sup>10</sup> This citation, however, does not appear in the shorter form of the *Epistle*, and is thus controverted; likewise the citation of 1Ti 4:12 in Chapter 3. A probable allusion in the shorter form of Chapter 7 to 1Ti 1:4 has in its place in the longer form the quotation, lending credence to the theory that the longer recension

<sup>7</sup> “Introductory Note to the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians” (*ANF* 1:45).

<sup>8</sup> “Introductory Note to the Syriac Version of the Ignatian Epistles” (*ANF* 1:97).

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius, *Church History* (*NPNF2* 1:166). Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Ephesians* [ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ] (*PG* 5:747). Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, (*ANF* 1:55).

<sup>10</sup> Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Magnesians* [ΠΡΟΣ ΜΑΓΝΗΣΙΟΥΣ], (*PG* 5:757). Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, (*ANF* 1:59). Ephelcystic means “drawn to.” The moveable-ν and ultimate-ν are comprehended under the term ephelcystic-ν.

of this letter is likely expanded with glosses. The quotation in Chapter 11 of the shorter *Epistle* of 1Ti 1:1 is too short and the phrase too common to make a strong case. The quotations and allusions to First Timothy in the *Epistle to the Trallians* are likewise unconvincing. The allusion to 1Ti 2:6 and quotation of 1Ti 6:1 in Chapter 8 are not duplicated in the shorter form. Similarly the quotation of 1Ti 2:4 in Chapter 3 of the *Epistle to the Philadelphians* appears only in the longer form. In the Chapter III of the *Epistle to Polycarp*, both recensions use the compound verb *έτεροδιδασκαλέω*: Οί δοκούντες άξιόπισοι είwai και έτεροδιδασκαλούντες, μή σε καταπλυσσέτωσαν. Στήθι έδραίος ώς άκμων τυπτόμενος. This verb is found only at 1Ti 1:3 and 1Ti 4:3, but again *ένας κούκος δε φέρνει την Άνοιξη*—“One cuckoo doesn’t bring the spring.”

Polycarp of Smyrna (A.D. 69–155; feast day February 23)

The authenticity of Polycarp’s *Epistle to the Philippians* “can on no fair grounds be questioned. It is abundantly established by external testimony, and is also supported by the internal evidence. Irenæus says (Adv. Hær., iii. 3): ‘There is extant an Epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians, most satisfactory, from which those that have a mind to do so may learn the character of his faith.’”<sup>11</sup> The *Epistle to the Philippians* was written during the mid-second century, near the end of Polycarp’s life and likely after the Ignatian corpus. At the beginning of Chapter 4, Polycarp quotes 1Ti 6:10 then 1Ti 6:7, Άρχή δε πάντων χαλεπών φιλαργυρία. Ειδότες ούν ότι ουδέν εισηνέγκαμεν εις τον κόσμον, άλλ’ ουδε έξενεγκείν τι έχομεν. ...—strong evidence that Paul’s epistle was known to this early martyr and pupil of the Apostle John.

Muratorian Fragment (c. A.D. 170–180)

Specifically, lines 60–62 state (in a corrupted Latin, *et at titu una et ad tymotheu duas pro affecto et dilectione in honore tamen eclesiae catholice in ordinatione eclesiastice*—[Paul wrote ... ] “and one to Titus, and two to Timothy; and these are held sacred in the esteem of the Church catholic for the regulation of ecclesiastical discipline.”

Eusebius of Cæsarea (A.D. 263–339)

While Eusebius of Caesarea does not explicitly mention the First Letter of Paul to Timothy, he did write, Τοῦ δε Παύλου πρόδηλοι και σαφείς, αι δεκατέσσαρες.—“The fourteen [epistles] of Paul are well known and undisputed.” These are presumably Romans, First and Second

<sup>11</sup> “Introductory Note to the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians” (*ANF* 1:31).

Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second Thessalonians, First and Second Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews.<sup>12</sup> This presumption is reinforced by Eusebius' ordering of the books, where he places the 14 books after the Gospels and before the epistles of John: Καὶ δὴ τακτέον ἐν πρώτοις τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων τετρακτὸν οἷς ἔπεται ἢ τῶν Πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφή. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτην, τὰς Παύλου καταλεκτέον Ἐπιστολήν. Ἐπὶ τούτοις τακτέον, εἴγε φανείη, τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ ἧς τὰ δόξαντα κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκθησόμεθα. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένας.—“After this must be reckoned the Epistles of Paul; next in order the extant former Epistle of John, and likewise the Epistle of Peter must be recognized. After these must be put, if it really seems right, the Apocalypse of John, concerning which we shall give the different opinions at the proper time. These, then, [are to be placed] among the recognized books.”<sup>13</sup>

### *Ancient Testimony Opposing Pauline Authorship*

“Jerome, in his preface to Titus, notes that Basilides and other teachers, as well as Marcion, rejected the Pauline pastorals together with Hebrews, as savouring too much of the OT, although Tatian (c. A.D. 110–c. 180), ‘Encratitarum patriarches,’ made an exception in favour of Titus, and the Valentinians seem to have read the epistles to Timotheus.”<sup>14</sup> Although Tatian might not have been a hostile witness while Justin Martyr, his spiritual father, still lived, he certainly departed from the scriptural teachings afterward, and the others mentioned, Basilides and Marcion, were both *hæresiarchs*. Basilides was a gnostic (as were the Valentinians), while Marcion was known for discarding portions of the Scriptures that were not supportive of his peculiar and personal doctrine.

### *Medieval, Reformation Era, and Modern Scholarship*

#### Supporting Pauline Authorship

Before the Enlightenment Era, the Pauline authorship of First Timothy was widely accepted. A quick survey of Reformation Era literature, for example, shows no evidence of departure from that understanding. Albert Barnes notes that “Theodoret [Theodoret of Cyrrhus,

<sup>12</sup> Eusebius of (Pamphylia) Caesarea, *Church History* [ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ] (PG 20:217). Eusebius, *Church History*, (NPNF2 1:134).

<sup>13</sup> Eusebius of (Pamphylia) Caesarea, *Church History* [ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ] (PG 20:268). Eusebius, *Church History* (NPNF2 1:155).

<sup>14</sup> Moffatt, 420.

V], Benson [Christopher Benson, XVIII], Zachariae [Karl Eduard Zachariae von Lingenthal, XIX], Michaelis [Johann David Michaelis, XVIII], Schmidt [?], Koppe [John Benjamin Koppe, XVIII], Planck [Gottlieb Jakob Planck, XVIII], Grotius Lightfoot [XIX], Witsius [Herman Witsius, XIX], Lardner [Nathaniel Lardner, XVIII], Hug [Johann Leonhard Hug, XIX], Stuart [Moses Stuart XIX]" advocate for Pauline authorship and date the letter to A.D. 58 or 59, and that "Paley [William Paley, XVIII], Pearson [John Pearson, XVII], L'Enfant [Jacques L'enfant, XVII], LeClerc [Jean Leclerc, XVII], Cave [Guilielmo Cave, XVII], Mill [John Mill, XVII], Whitby [Daniel Whitby, XVII], Macknight [James Macknight, XVIII]" also advocate for Pauline authorship but date the letter to A.D. 64 or 65.<sup>15</sup>

### Opposing Pauline Authorship

The typical, modern argument against the Pauline authorship of First Timothy and, indeed, all the Pastoral Epistles, begins with the assumption of sources common to both the Apostolic Fathers and some later, supposed author or authors of the Pastoral Epistles; this argument ends in assigning the Pastoral Epistles to the category of pseudepigrapha.

Beginning in the Hegelian Era in Germany with Schleiermacher, the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles was denied or at least controverted. Harrison's comprehensive introduction, entitled *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, presents the three main lines of reasoning against Pauline authorship, below summarized:

1. The first argument is the number and proportion of the words in the Pastoral Epistles that are *hapax legomena*, many of which had become considerably more popular in the second century.
2. The second argument demonstrates that the choice of and use of particles in the Pastoral Epistles differs substantially from the other Pauline Epistles and are more consistent with second century use.
3. Finally, an argument is made on the basis of a very exacting reconstruction of Paul's timeline of activities.

On the basis of these arguments, First Timothy is labeled pseudepigraphical by many modern scholars.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Barnes, §2.

<sup>16</sup> I am unaware of any single, solid, comprehensive document countering Harrison point for point, though certainly there are clear, individual rebuttals for many of the points, since Harrison is primarily a compiler of the arguments of others. Creating such a document might be a useful, seminary-level isagogics thesis.



### Conclusions

The early evidence need not be treated by means of the invention of some supposedly self-consistent theory dependent on the presupposition of lost documents. Given that Polycarp served in Smyrna, one of the towns of Asia Minor most likely to have early possession of Paul's letters, and that Polycarp was a native, first-century, educated Koine Greek speaker, entrusted with the deposit of faith by the Apostle John himself, it seems logical to assume that he would not have quoted a pseudepigraphical letter in such a way as to contribute to its authority, nor would the Pastoral Epistles likely have remained together canonical. The evidence is straightforward enough: Paul is the author of First Timothy, and the Christian Church has accepted the Epistle as canonical from its earliest days.

### Occasion and Recipient(s)

Paul's intended recipient was clearly Timothy: Τιμοθέω γνησίω τέκνω ἐν πίστει (1Ti 1:2). Paul also writes at the end of the epistle, ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, ἣν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστόχησαν. Ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν (1Ti 6:20ff). The use of the vocative adds a very personal touch, and yet the final phrase uses the plural, second-person pronoun, broadening the intended audience to those whom Timothy was serving. Παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε. μηδεὶς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω, ἀλλὰ τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν ἀναστροφῇ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πίστει, ἐν ἀγνείᾳ. ἕως ἔρχομαι πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ (1Ti 4:11–13). The repeated use of the singular, second-person pronouns indicate that Paul is directly addressing Timothy, who in turn will teach according to Paul's instruction—thus the final plural pronoun.

Between A.D. 64 and 65, Timothy was in Ephesus, and Paul had charged him with opposing "certain persons" who were, at the very least, attracted to false Judaizing doctrine: Καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε προσμεῖναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, ἵνα παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (1Ti 1:3), and to fight specifically Hymenaeus and Alexander who blasphemed the truth: ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν.<sup>17</sup> 1Ti 4:11–16 clearly indicates that Timothy was a younger, new pastor. In Chapter 3, Paul explains to Timothy his motivation for writing, Ταῦτά σοι γράφω, ἐλπίζων ἔλθειν πρὸς

<sup>17</sup> 1Ti 1:20.



σὲ ἐν τάχει, ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῆς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. . . .<sup>18</sup>

No doubt Timothy passed along the teachings that he had received from Paul, and the epistle began to be spread from that congregation throughout Christendom. Smyrna would have been one of the first places that the epistle would have reached from Ephesus (near Selçuk), since Smyrna (modern İzmir) is only 50 miles to the north of Ephesus across the Izmir Peninsula and was similarly a great port of Asia Minor. From western Asia Minor, one would anticipate, based on the trade patterns, the spread of the Epistle to Rome, eastern Asia Minor, then to Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, and later to Gaul, North Africa, and farther. This appears to be the manner in which First Timothy spread through Christendom, based on its appearance in extant copies and the patristic literature, although, admittedly, this conjecture is only weakly supported by a paucity of data.

## Textual Criticism

### *Manuscript Analysis*

The Codex Sinaiticus generally provides casual scholars the most accessible and excellent ancient manuscript.<sup>19</sup> High-resolution digital photographs of the entire document are freely available online and accompanied with a suite of tools that make the manuscript considerably more accessible. Recently the British Library has made several hundred manuscripts available in like manner, most notably Codex Alexandrinus. These other digitized manuscripts, however, are not accompanied by the tools available for the online study of Sinaiticus.

<sup>18</sup> 1Ti 3:14–15.

<sup>19</sup> Though it was dismantled and its folios separated for profit, the Codex was pandectic until sometime after 1761, when it was seen intact by Vitaliano Donati, who wrote, *In questo monastero ritrovai una quantità grandissima di codici membranacei . . . ve ne sono alcuni che mi sembravano anteriori al settimo secolo, ed in ispecie una Bibbia in membrane bellissime, assai grandi, sottili, e quadre, scritta in carattere rotondo e bellissimo; conservano poi in chiesa un Evangelistario greco in carattere d'oro rotondo, che dovrebbe pur essere assai antico.*—"In this monastery I found a great number of parchment codices . . . there are some which seemed to be written before the seventh century, and especially a Bible (made) of beautiful vellum, very large, thin and square parchments, written in round and very beautiful letters; moreover there are also in the church a Greek Evangelistarium in gold and round letters, it should be very old." See Donati, Vitaliano qtd. in *Atti della R. Accademia della Scienze di Torino*, Torino: Stamperia Reale, 1872. 482. Note that this citation considerably predates the most commonly cited source. Regardless, the original diary still exists but has yet to be published.

From the manuscript's *scriptio continua*, the modern presentation can most easily be produced as follows:

1. The lines from the manuscript are copied into a word processing program line by line. (L denotes line number in the heading of the first column of table below.)
2. Spaces are introduced in the appropriate places. This is most easily accomplished by oral reading of the syllables. A number of observations help speed the work:
  - a. Native Greek words will end with a vowel (or diphthong), -ς, -ρ or -ν. In the first cell below, the sigmas are noted. In this case, the task is complicated by Sinaiticus' lack of differentiation between the sigma and final sigma in its face. Not all of the sigmas prove significant, but most do.
  - b. If the text contains foreign words, the scribe typically would note the word division calligraphically in the script.
  - c. There are very few valid triphthongs across the corpus, since such are often subject to contraction. Thus three consecutive vowels are marked for inspection. Typically a division of words will be found at such points in the manuscript.
  - d. Common nouns, verbs, and conjunctions are sought and divisions made accordingly.
  - e. Common declension and conjugation endings are the next focal point.
  - f. Finally, some divisions must be made by examination of the possibilities on the basis of context.
3. If the original is an uncial manuscript, the presentation should be converted to a minuscule face. Depending on the eye of the reader and the tools available, it is sometimes advantageous to perform this step before attempting to divide the words with spaces.
4. There are examples of verses where the words can be divided in two ways, e.g., Rom 7:14. When such is the case, it is helpful to examine the calligraphy closely, since the scribes were sometimes aware of this issue; those who were often left clues about their understanding of the text in marks or spacing meant to resolve the ambiguity. "Scribes would sometimes use a mark shaped like a grave accent ... or like a smooth breathing mark."<sup>20</sup> In such cases, it is also important to compare these clues across many manuscripts.
5. If the original does not have the polytonic diacritical marks, the minuscule presentation should be written in the modern

---

<sup>20</sup> Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 31.

presentation with the accents, breathing marks, iota subscripts, etc.<sup>21</sup> Note that in the case of Sinaiticus, the diaeresis is applied in the original, but in a way that is inconsistent with the later convention. Here the diaeresis often marks some juncture in the text that the scribe desires the reader to note in the interest of making the text more readable, for example, where a line division must occur, as in column 1, lines 42–43 with ῖ-νᾱ.

6. In the uncials, scribes often superposed ultimate-*vs* “as a horizontal stroke above the preceding letter,” especially at the end of a line.<sup>22</sup> The ephelcystic-*vs* are applied according to the current convention, which may differ significantly from any given scribe’s convention.
7. Obviously, punctuation is not inherent in the text and is thus a matter of imposition on the basis of exegetical concerns.
8. Estienne’s verse divisions are applied with the variations introduced subsequent to the Textus Receptus. (V denotes the verse number in the heading of the fifth column of table below.)
9. Finally, any modifications of the text that are to be introduced from the critical study of the corpus are applied.

---

<sup>21</sup> “According to tradition, it was Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257–180 B.C.), successor to Eratosthenes as head of the Alexandrian Library, who devised the several accent and breathing marks in order to help increasing numbers of foreigners learn how to pronounce Greek. He used the acute mark, called ὄξύς (‘sharp, acute’), to denote a rise in pitch, and the grave mark, called βαρύς (‘heavy, grave’), to denote a fall in pitch. The circumflex denoted a rise followed by a fall in pitch.

“The change from a tonal to a stress accent in Greek cannot be precisely dated. It seems clear that it had taken place by the latter part of the second century A.D., when Clement of Alexandria composed hymns in meters based on stress accentuation. ...

“The rough ( ) and the smooth ( ) breathing marks (πνεύματα) at first represented the left and the right half of the letter H, which in the Old Attic alphabet indicated aspiration ... (eventually in the eleventh century) these forms became the rounded [abbreviated strokes] familiar to us today.” (Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 12).

<sup>22</sup> Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 29.

	Line From Manuscript	With Spacing	Minuscule	V	Modern Presentation
16	ΠΙΣΤΟΣΟΛΟΓΟΣΕΠΙΤ	ΠΙΣΤΟΣ Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΙ ΤΙΣ	πιστος ο λογος ει τις	1	πιστός ο λόγος· Εἴ
17	ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΗΣΟΡΕΓΕ	ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΗΣ ΟΡΕΓΕ	επισκοπης ορεγε		.... τις
18	ΤΑΙΚΑΛΟΥΕΡΓΟΥΕΠΙ	ΤΑΙ ΚΑΛΟΥ ΕΡΓΟΥ ΕΠΙ	ται καλου εργου επι		.... επισκοπης ὀρέγε- · ... ται καλου ἔργου ἐπιθυμει.
19	ΘΥΜΕΙΔΙΟΥΝΤΟΝ	ΘΥΜΕΙ ΔΙ ΟΥΝ ΤΟΝ	θυμει δι ουν τον	2	θυμει. δεῖ οὖν τὸν
20	ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΝΑΝΕ	ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΝ ΑΝΕ	επισκοπον ανε		.... ἐπίσκοπον ἀνε-
21	ΠΛΗΜΠΤΟΝΕΙ	ΠΛΗΜΠΤΟΝ ΕΙ	πλημπτον ει		.... πλημπτον εἴ-
22	ΝΑΙΜΙΑΣΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ	ΝΑΙ ΜΙΑΣ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ	ναι μιας γυναικος		.... ναι, μίς γυναικός
23	ΑΝΔΡΑΝΗΦΑΛΙΟ	ΑΝΔΡΑ ΝΗΦΑΛΙΟ	ανδρα νηφαλιον		.... ἄνδρα, νηφάλιον
24	ΣΩΦΡΟΝΑΚΟΣΜΙ	ΣΩΦΡΟΝΑ ΚΟΣΜΙ	σωφρονα · κοσμι		.... σώφρονα κόσμι-
25	ΟΝΦΙΛΟΕΕΝΟΝ	ΟΝ ΦΙΛΟΕΕΝΟΝ	ον · φιλοξενον		.... ον φιλοξενον .... διδακτικόν,
26	ΔΙΔΑΚΤΙΚΟΝΜΗ	ΔΙΔΑΚΤΙΚΟΝ ΜΗ	διδακτικον · μη	3	διδακτικόν, μὴ
27	ΠΑΡΟΙΝΟΝΜΗ	ΠΑΡΟΙΝΟΝ ΜΗ	παροινον · μη		.... παροινον μὴ
28	ΠΛΗΚΤΗΝΑΛΛΑ	ΠΛΗΚΤΗΝ ΑΛΛΑ	πληκτην · αλλα		.... πλήκτην, ἀλλά
29	ΕΠΕΙΚΗΜΑΧΟ	ΕΠΕΙΚΗ ΑΜΑΧΟ	επεικειν αμαχον		.... ἐπεικειν ἄμαχον .... ἀφιλάργυρον,

	Line From Manuscript	With Spacing	Minuscule	V	Modern Presentation
30	ΑΦΙΛΑΓΓΥΡΟΝΤΟΥ	ΑΦΙΛΑΓΓΥΡΟΝ ΤΟΥ	αφιλαργυρον του	4	ἀφιλάργυρον, τοῦ
31	ΪΔΙΟΥΟΙΚΟΥΚΑ	ΪΔΙΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΥ ΚΑ	ιδιου οικου κα		...ιδίου οίκου κα-
32	ΛΩΣΠΡΟΪΣΤΑΝΟ	ΛΩΣ ΠΡΟΪΣΤΑΝΟ	λωσ προϊστανο		...λως προϊστανό-
33	ΜΕΝΟΝΤΕΚΝΑ Ε	ΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΕΚΝΑ Ε	μενον · τεκνα ε		...μενον, τέκνα ἔ-
34	ΧΟΝΤΑΕΝΥΠΟΤΑ	ΧΟΝΤΑ ΕΝ ΥΠΟΤΑ	χοντα εν υποτα		...χοντα ἐν ὑποτα-
35	ΓΗΜΕΤΑΠΙΛΑΧΗCΕ	ΓΗ ΜΕΤΑ ΠΙΛΑΧΗ CΕ	γη μετα παχης σε		...γη, μετὰ πάσης σε-
36	ΜΝΟΤΗΤΟC	ΜΝΟΤΗΤΟC	μνοτητα		...μνότητος
37	ΕΙΔΕΤΙCΤΟΥΪΔΙΟΥ	ΕΙ ΔΕ ΤΙC ΤΟΥ ΪΔΙΟΥ	ει δε τις του ιδιου	5	(εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου
38	ΟΙΚΟΥΠΡΟCΤΗΝΑΙ	ΟΙΚΟΥ ΠΡΟCΤΗΝΑΙ	οικου προcτηναι		...οίκου προcτηναι
39	ΟΥΚΟΙΔΕΝΠΩCΕΚ	ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔΕΝ ΠΩC ΕΚ	ουκ οιδεν πως εκ		...ουκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκ-
40	ΚΛΗCΙΑCΘΥΕΠΙ	ΚΛΗCΙΑC ΘΥ ΕΠΙ	κλησιας θυ επι		...κλησίας θεοῦ ἐπι-
41	ΜΕΛΗCΕΤΑΙ	ΜΕΛΗCΕΤΑΙ	μεληcεται		...μελήcεται;)
42	ΜΗΝΕΟΦΥΤΟΝΪ	ΜΗ ΝΕΟΦΥΤΟΝ Ϊ	μη νεοφυτον ι	6	μὴ νεόφυτον, ἴ-
43	ΝΑΜΗΤΥΦΩΘΕΙC	ΝΑ ΜΗ ΤΥΦΩΘΕΙC	να μη τυφωθεις		...να μὴ τυφωθεις
44	ΕΙCΚΡΙΜΑΕΜΠΕCΗ	ΕΙC ΚΡΙΜΑ ΕΜΠΕCΗ	εις κριμα εμπεcη		...εις κριμα ἔμπεση
45	ΤΟΥΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΥ	ΤΟΥ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΥ	του διαβολου		...του διαβόλου.

	Line From Manuscript	With Spacing	Minuscule	V	Modern Presentation
46	ΔΕΙΔΕΚΑΙΜΑΡΤΥΡΙ	ΔΕΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙ	δει δε και μαρτυρι	7	δει δε και μαρτυρι-
47	ΑΝΚΑΛΗΝΕΧΙΝΑ	ΑΝ ΚΑΛΗΝ ΕΧΙΝ Α	αν καλην εχιν α		....αν καλην εχεν α-
48	ΠΟΤΩΝΕΞΩΘΕΝ	ΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΕΞΩΘΕΝ	πο των εξωθεν		....πο των εξωθεν,
1	ΣΕΜΝΟΥΣ	ΣΕΜΝΟΥΣ	σεμνους		....σεμνους [σεμνότητος]
2	ἸΝΑΜΗΕΙΟΝΙΔΙ	ἸΝΑ ΜΗ ΕΙΣ ΟΝΙΔΙ	ινα μη εις ονιδι		....ινα μη εις ονειδι
3	ΣΜΟΝΕΜΠΕΧΚΑΙ	ΣΜΟΝ ΕΜΠΕΧ ΚΑΙ	σμον εμπεχη και		....σμον εμπεστη και
4	ΠΑΥΙΔΑΤΟΥΔΙΑΒΟ	ΠΑΥΙΔΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΙΑΒΟ	παυιδα του διαβο		....παυιδα του διαβό-
5	ΛΟΥ	ΛΟΥ	λου .		....λου.

## Textual Variants

### *Across All Manuscripts*

The Nestle-Aland 24 critical apparatus summarizes textual variants present in a significant number of manuscripts across the corpus.

3:1 Γανθρωπινος *D\**, *b*, *m*; *Ambst Spec*

Codex Claromonatanus (Latin), Codex Budapestiensis (Latin), Codex Speculum (Latin), and Codex Monza (Latin), as well as Ambrosiaster, a number of Vulgate manuscripts, Augustine and Speculum (also known as Pseudo-Augustine) substitute ἀνθρώπινος for πίστος, which is found in most of the other extant manuscripts. This variant, together with the calligraphic placement of 1Ti 3:1a offers interesting insight into the early struggle to ascertain whether 1Ti 3:1a pertains to the content at the end of the second chapter or to the content of the first part of the third chapter.

3:3 Τ (*Tit 1,7*) μη αισχροκερδη 326, 365, 614, 630, 2495 *pm*

This variant is clearly an insertion borrowed from the very similar text found at Tit 1:7. The semantic similarity of ἀισχροκερδής to ἀφιλάγυρον, together with the variant's appearance in such a small number of late minuscules (XII–XV) conclusively weigh against the insertion. The meaning would be very similar, with ἀισχροκερδής tending toward greed and ἀφιλάγυρον toward avarice (more negative connotation).

3:7 Ταυτον *D, M* | *txt* ⚭, *A, F, H, I, Ψ, 33, 81, 326, 1739\**, 1881 *pc* (*G: h.t.*)

The insertion of αὐτον as subject of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI) construction is supported by Claromontanus and the majority text (the Byzantine family of manuscripts), but the overwhelming testimony of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Augiensis, Coislinianus, Freerianus, Athous Lavrensis, and a number of minuscules (earlier and later) easily lays the matter to rest.

### *Between the Critical Text and Sinaiticus*

3:2 δι vs. δεῖ

This variant results from an elective shortening of the hiatus with οὖν.

3:4 προῖστανόμενον vs. προῖστάμενον

Sinaiticus is quite possibly the origin of this variant, which appears only in later manuscripts. The μι-verbs of Greek are very old. Already by the time of the Septuagint, ἴστημι is being replaced by ἰστώνω, especially in prepositional prefix compounds, for example, καθιστώνω at Isa 2:29 and ἐξιστώνω at 3Ma 1:25. It is possible that this morphological creep prevented the scribe from detecting his insertion during the copying process.

3:7 σέμνους vs. σεμνότητος

Σέμνους, the masculine, plural accusative of the adjective σεμνός, instead of σεμνότητος, the feminine, singular genitive of the noun σεμνότης, is almost certainly an assimilation substitution from v. 8. Μέτα πάσης σέμνους is exceedingly awkward, since πᾶς could not be in attributive position but would have to be substantival, i.e., “with all,” while σέμνους would have to mean “the serious ones” and would be a direct object or an accusative for a nominative. It would not match in gender with τέκνα. Even with the flexibility of the Greek word order and prepositions, the sentence would make little sense with the variant.

### *Grouping and Versification*

The verse numbers are not normally a matter for textual criticism, since the verse numbers were imposed, but early scribes often left clear signs in the calligraphy, grouping discourse in the visual structure of the text.

Sinaiticus places πίστος ὁ λόγος at the beginning of Chapter 3, clearly grouping the phrase with the text that follows. Indeed, among those extant manuscripts with the majority reading, most exhibit the same grouping.

An analysis of the calligraphic composition of the manuscripts sheds some light on the proper placement of the verse division and, consequently, the ἀνθρώπινος variant in the (first corrector's) Codex Claromontanus text (D\*<sup>23</sup>).<sup>23</sup> Claromontanus clearly situates ἀνθρώπινος ὁ λόγος at the end of the preceding chapter, with the third chapter beginning at the initial capital.

<sup>23</sup> Codex Claromontanus and Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis are often both labeled D, leading to much confusion. Codex Bezae contains only the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.



## Exegetical Method

Having established the text with some certainty, the focus now falls upon the process that reflects into the destination language the individual words, structure, and meaning of the text in the original language. It has been said that the typical exegetical method for a Koine Greek text boils down to

1. looking up words in a high-quality dictionary, looking especially for the “root” meaning of each word, since working with the root meaning affords the necessary latitude during the translation process, and
2. classifying
  - a. each genitive,
  - b. each participle,
  - c. each instance of verb tense, and
  - d. conditional constructions.

Typically the goal is to obtain self-consistent translation rationale. Such an approach is mightily influenced *a priori* by doctrinal stance, historical understanding, and all manner of cultural biases.

While purely *de novo* exegesis is a pipe dream, it is advisable to extract as much information as possible from the text, the Bible and the extrabiblical corpus before attempting to apply any normalizing translation technique.

Five prime examples where the typical method fails present themselves:

1. Root word extrapolation—Words are fluid in every living language. Words stemming from an ancient root can spread out from the origin of meaning over time until the root is no longer important in discerning the meaning at the time of use. A word once detached from its root in idiomatic usage can be intentionally reattached by an author for the purpose of re-emphasizing and amplifying the original meaning. Words can become constituent within an idiom and thus, to some extent, removed from the root word. These describe the phenomenon of root word expansion. Such expansion rarely, if ever, matches with a subsequent extrapolation of the root word on the basis of historical philological evidence, because the historical uses and the countless small deviations of those uses move the meaning about through time. It is particularly important to observe this fact in Koine Greek, wherein Doric, Aeolic, and Ionic roots compete, and the many foreign languages and cultures of the

Alexandrian expansion mix in ideas, words, and figures of speech freely and often.

2. Verbal aspect—Verb tense is not the sole consideration in understanding the function of the verb in a Koine Greek sentence. An author may, for example, chose to bring a past situation to the fore, to place the reader in the moment. This is accomplished by a change of tense that does not follow from the actual timing or duration of events.
3. Semantic domain analysis—A dictionary, however detailed, cannot serve to exclude the meanings the author chose not to use when he chose a particular word, construction, or idiom. Often what is not said can be just as important as what was said, particularly when making theological distinctions. Both the canon and extrabiblical corpus provide the list of alternatives.
4. Figure of speech recognition—Obviously, blindly translating a series of words that form a figure of speech leads to an improper translation. Sometimes such translations are self-evidently ludicrous but others not so easily detected. The extrabiblical corpus serves as the backdrop for the Bible and is thus useful for understanding the so called Γοργίεια σχήματα—Gorgian forms, i.e., Koine Greek figures of speech.<sup>24</sup>
5. Temporo-cultural recognition—Dictionaries present a diachronic picture of each word. Most grammars present a diachronic picture of a language. Proper translation requires a synchronic understanding of words, structure, idioms, etc. Study of the canon and extrabiblical corpus contemporary to the time of writing is thus practically necessary.

## Parsing and Morphology

With the modern presentation of the text confidently in hand, the parsing and morphology of each word may now be determined. For the purposes of the parsing, a five-case system is employed; the eight-case classification is provided in braces.<sup>25</sup> (Most of the parsing distinctions are of little help in the exegetical treatment of the text, but are useful for

<sup>24</sup> The sophist, Gorgias, is credited with the initial categorization of figures of speech. [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%A1%CE%B7%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AC\\_%CF%83%CF%87%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B1](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%A1%CE%B7%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AC_%CF%83%CF%87%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B1) and *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, 351.

<sup>25</sup> Wallace and most other Koine grammarians argue for the utility of a five-case system. I prefer greatly to work with a five-case system, because the eight-case system mixes semantic distinctions with grammatical by distinguishing functions of the

jogging our memory of the Greek we once learned. The classification of verb usages is partially a matter of semantics and partially a matter of discourse analysis and will be examined in those sections below. The morphological classification follows Crosby and Schaefer's classical Greek schema.)

### Verse 1

- πιστός—(ο-declension three-ending adjective πιστός, -ή, -όν; masculine, singular, nominative)
- ὁ λόγος—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, singular, nominative) (first declension, ο-stem noun λόγος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, nominative) (full-stop punctuation)<sup>26</sup>
- εἰ—(proclitic subordinating conditional conjunction, εἰ) The acute is retrograde from the subsequent enclitic.<sup>27</sup>
- τις—(enclitic indefinite pronoun τις, τι; conventional masculine, singular, nominative)<sup>4</sup>
- ἐπισκοπῆς—(first declension, α-stem noun ἐπισκοπή, -ῆς, ἡ; feminine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})
- ὀρέγεται,—(regular verb ὀρέγω; third person singular, present, middle, indicative) (minor break punctuation)
- καλοῦ—(ο-declension three-ending adjective καλός, -ή, -όν; neuter, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})
- ἔργου—(second declension, ο-stem noun ἔργον, -ου, τό; neuter, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})
- ἐπιθυμεῖ.—(regular ε-contract verb ἐπιθυμέω; third person singular, present, active, indicative) (major break punctuation)<sup>28</sup>

(five-case) genitive case. Additionally, it seems best to steer clear of the notion that so much of exegesis boils down to distinguishing genitives, participles, and verb tenses.

<sup>26</sup> Strictly speaking, punctuation is outside of morphological analysis; it is imposed on the text.

<sup>27</sup> Strictly speaking, this is a conclusion outside of the morphological analysis. When used as an interrogative, τις is orthotone. The enclitic τις follows the monosyllabic proclitic εἰ. In such cases, the monosyllabic proclitic receives the acute accent (upon its only syllable).

<sup>28</sup> "The high point (στίγμα τέλεια) is the strongest, equivalent to a full stop; the point on the line (ὑποστίγμα) and the point in the middle position (στίγμα μέση) were used with different values by different scribes. The middle point eventually disappeared, and about the ninth century the comma was introduced" (Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 32).

## Verse 2

- δεῖ—(irregular ε-contract verb δέω; third person singular, present, active, indicative)
- οὖν—(post-positive inferential coordinating conjunction οὖν)
- τὸν ἐπίσκοπον—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, singular, accusative) (first declension, ο-stem noun ἐπίσκοπος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, accusative)
- ἀνεπίλημπτον—(ο-declension compound two-ending adjective ἀνεπίλημπτος, -ον [composed of λαμβάνω with α-privative and ἐπί]; masculine, singular, accusative)
- εἶναι,—(irregular copula εἶμι; present infinitive) (minor break punctuation)
- μιᾶς—(cardinal number εἶς, μιᾶ, ἕν; feminine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive})
- γυναικός—(third declension, monosyllabic κ-stem noun γυνή, -αικός, ἡ; feminine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive})
- ἀνδρα,—(third declension, syncopated liquid stem noun ἀνήρ, ἀνδρας, ὁ; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- νηφάλιον,—(ο-declension three-ending adjective νηφάλιος, -ία, -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- σώφρονα,—(consonant declension two-ending adjective σώφρων [gen. -ονος], -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- κόσμιον,—(ο-declension three-ending adjective κόσμιος, [-ία], -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- φιλόξενον,—(ο-declension two-ending adjective φιλόξενος, -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- διδακτικόν,—(ο-declension three-ending adjective διδακτικός, -ή, -όν; masculine, singular, nominative) (minor break punctuation)

## Verse 3

- μὴ—(negative particle μὴ)
- πάροινον,—(first declension, ο-stem noun πάροινος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation or ο-declension two-ending adjective πάροινος, -ον; masculine, singular, accusative)
- μὴ—(negative particle μὴ)
- πλήκτην,—(first declension, α-stem noun πλήκτης, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- ἀλλὰ—(adversative coordinating conjunction ἀλλὰ)

- ἐπιεικῆ, —(consonant declension two-ending adjective ἐπιεικής, -ες; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- ἄμαχον, —(ο-declension two-ending adjective ἄμαχος, -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- ἀφιλάργυρον, —(ο-declension two-ending adjective ἀφιλάργυρος, -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)

#### Verse 4

- τοῦ οἴκου—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive}) (second declension, ο-stem noun οἶκος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, genitive)
- ἰδίου—(ο-declension three-ending adjective ἴδιος, [-ία], -ον; masculine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})
- καλῶς—(positive adverb καλῶς, κάλλιον, κάλλιστα)
- προῖστάμενον, —(regular μι-verb προΐστημι [composed of ἵστημι with πρός]; present, middle, participle, masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- τέκνα—(second declension, ο-stem noun τέκνον, -ου, τό; neuter, plural, accusative)
- ἔχοντα—(irregular ω-verb ἔχω; present, active, participle, masculine, singular, accusative)
- ἐν—(proclitic preposition ἐν with dative)
- ὑποταγῇ—(first declension, α-stem noun ὑποταγή, -ῆς, ἡ [composed of ὑπο with τάσσω]; feminine, singular, dative)
- μετὰ—(preposition μετὰ with genitive)
- πάσης—(irregular three-ending adjective πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν; feminine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive})
- σεμνότητος—(third declension, τ-mute stem noun σεμνότης, -τητος, ῆ; feminine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive}) (partial break punctuation)

#### Verse 5

- εἰ—(proclitic subordinating conditional conjunction, εἰ)
- δέ—(post-positive demarcating/coordinating conjunction particle)
- τις—(enclitic indefinite pronoun τις, τι; conventional masculine, singular, nominative)
- τοῦ οἴκου—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive}) (second declension, ο-stem noun οἶκος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})

- ἰδίου—(ο-declension three-ending adjective ἴδιος, [-ία], -ον; masculine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})
- προστῆναι—(regular μι-verb προΐστημι [composed of ἵστημι with πρός]; aorist, active, infinitive)
- οὐκ—(proclitic negative particle οὐκ)
- οἶδεν,—(irregular verb οἶδα; third person, singular, perfect, active, indicative ) (minor break punctuation)
- πῶς—(interrogative particle)
- ἐκκλησίας—(first declension, α-stem noun ἐκκλησία, -ας, ἡ [composed of ἐκ with καλέω]; feminine, singular, genitive {attendant genitive})
- θεοῦ—(second declension, ο-stem noun θεός, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive})
- ἐπιμελήσεται;—(regular ε-contract verb ἐπιμελέομαι [composed from μέλος and ἐπί]; third person, future, middle deponent, indicative) (interrogation mark punctuation)<sup>29</sup>

#### Verse 6

- μὴ—(negative particle μὴ)
- νεόφυτον,—(ο-declension two-ending adjective νεόφυτος, -ον; masculine, singular, accusative) (minor break punctuation)
- ἵνα—(subordinating conjunction ἵνα)
- μὴ—(negative particle μὴ)
- τυφωθείς—(ο-contract verb τυφώω; passive, participle, masculine, singular, nominative)
- εἰς—(proclitic preposition εἰς with accusative)
- κρίμα—(third declension, τ-mute stem noun κρίμα, -ατος, τό; neuter, singular, accusative)
- ἐμπέση—(regular ω-verb ἐμπίπτω [composed from πίπτω and ἐν]; third person, singular, second aorist, active, subjunctive)
- τοῦ διαβόλου.—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive}) (second declension, ο-stem noun διάβολος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive}) (major break punctuation)

#### Verse 7

- δεῖ—(irregular ε-contract verb δέω; third person singular, present, active, indicative)
- δὲ—(post-positive demarcating/coordinating conjunction particle)

<sup>29</sup> “The interrogation mark (;) first appears about the eighth or ninth century” (Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 32).

- καί—(copulative coordinating conjunction particle)
- μαρτυρίαν—(first declension, α-stem noun μαρτυρία, -ας, ή; feminine, singular, accusative)
- καλήν—(ο-declension three-ending adjective καλός, -ή, -όν; feminine, singular, accusative)
- ἔχειν—(irregular ω-verb ἔχω; present, active, infinitive)
- ἀπό—(preposition ἀπό with genitive)
- τῶν ἕξωθεν—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, plural, genitive {adjectival genitive}) (substantival adverb) (minor break punctuation)
- ἵνα—(subordinating conjunction ἵνα)
- μή—(negative particle μή)
- εἰς—(proclitic preposition εἰς with accusative)
- ὀνειδισμὸν—(second declension, ο-stem ὀνειδισμός, -οῦ, ὁ; masculine, singular, accusative)
- ἐμπέση—(regular ω-verb ἐμπίπτω [composed from πίπτω and ἐν]; third person, singular, second aorist, active, subjunctive)
- καί—(copulative coordinating conjunction particle)
- παγίδα—(third declension, τ-mute stem noun παγίς, -ίδος, ή; feminine, singular, accusative)
- τοῦ διαβόλου.—(definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό; masculine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive}) (second declension, ο-stem noun διάβολος, -ου, ὁ; masculine, singular, genitive {adjectival genitive}) (major break punctuation)

## Grammatical and Structural Analysis

The grammatical, structural analysis examines the structure that is evident within the verse. Insofar as it is possible, separating grammatical, structural concerns from the semantics is useful for organizing the effort to determine the meaning. The examination of structures larger than sentences is found in the section below entitled “Discourse Analysis”.

*Verse 1* — πιστὸς ὁ λόγος· εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ.

- πιστὸς ὁ λόγος· is an equative, simplex sentence.<sup>30</sup> The copula (ἐστίν) is implied.<sup>31</sup> The adjective-article-noun ordering indicates that πιστὸς is in first predicate position.<sup>32</sup> The sentence necessarily expresses

<sup>30</sup> Wallace, 39.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 307.

- a subset proposition, i.e., is nonconvertible.<sup>33</sup> This construction is relatively common.<sup>34</sup> The phrase may be a marker of gnomic aspect.
- Wallace and most modern translators hold that the article is kataphoric, pointing ahead to the immediately following conditional that defines ὁ λόγος.<sup>35</sup> Chrysostom (A.D. 349–407), whose mother tongue was Koine Greek, considered the construction to be anaphoric, with ὁ λόγος finding its antecedent in the last verse of Chapter 2.<sup>36</sup> Erasmus noted that Eugenius Vulgarius (c. A.D. 887–928) concluded likewise. Erasmus grouped the phrase typographically with Chapter 3 in his 1516 first edition of the *Textus Receptus* with the note: *Chrysostomus & Vulgarius referunt ad superiora, quae Paulus voluerit in dubitata esse, dixit mulierem seruari gignendis & recte instituendis liberis. . .*—“Chrysostom and Vulgarius refer [the phrase] to the preceding.”<sup>37</sup> Structural analysis alone does not suffice to resolve this point, since it is a matter of discourse grouping.
  - The conditional structure εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ is first class, characterized by the formula “εἴ + indicative / any mood, any tense,” where the slash divides protasis from apodosis. First-class conditionals are assumed true for the argument’s sake, that is, “the point of the argument is based on the assumption of reality.”<sup>38</sup> This construction is very common.<sup>39</sup>
  - Τίς is substantival, functioning as a true pronoun. Τίς is the indefinite S, “introducing a member of a class without further identification.”<sup>40</sup>
  - Ὁρέγω is a verb of mental action or, more narrowly, of emotion. “The intensive force of this middle is partially seen in verbs of mental action.”<sup>41</sup> Robertson regards verbs of this class as deponent, despite the fact that ὀρέγω was still in use in the active voice. As Wallace

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>34</sup> See Mat 5:9; Mat 7:13; Mar 6:35; Mar 9:50; Luk 10:7; Joh 3:19; Act 7:39; Rom 7:13; 2Co 1:18; Tit 3:8; Heb 6:10; 1Pe 2:3; 1Jo 3:10 and Rev 5:12. The other instances of πιστὸς ὁ λόγος in Paul’s writings include 1Ti 1:15; 1Ti 4:9; 2Ti 2:11; Tit 3:8 but are inconsequential to the identification of the structure of 1Ti 3:1.

<sup>35</sup> Wallace, 220.

<sup>36</sup> Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (PG 62:547); Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (*NPNF1* 13:437).

<sup>37</sup> Huther, 115; Erasmus, 566.

<sup>38</sup> Wallace, 690, 692.

<sup>39</sup> Wallace 450ff; Robertson, 915ff.

<sup>40</sup> Wallace, 347; Joh 3:3; Act 4:35; Rom 5:7; Phl 18; Heb 2:9; Jam 1:5; 1Pe 4:11; 2Jo 10; Rev 3:20; and 1Ti 1:9 and 1:18.

<sup>41</sup> Robertson, 812.



notes, there is no clear-cut definition of deponent and, more importantly, provides a useful contemplation of the middle deponent idea. “The issue is compounded with many middles that have a lexeme that is intrinsically reflexive: Are these true middles in which the inflection emulates what is already resident in the stem, or are they deponent (in which case the stem needs to be examined apart from the inflection)?”<sup>42</sup>

- Verbs of mental action, as a rule, take an object in the genitive case, a so-called genitive of thing desired, as is here the case with *ὀρέγεται* and *ἐπισκοπῆς* and *ἐπιθυμεί* and *ἔργου*.<sup>43</sup>
- *Ἐπιθυμέω* is also a verb of mental action, and likewise takes an object in the genitive, in this case *καλοῦ ἔργου*. The object is grammatically simple (but semantically complicated): *καλοῦ* is an adjective in attributive position to the anarthrous *ἔργου*.

Verse 2 — *δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, φιλόξενον, διδακτικόν,*

- The post-positive inferential particle guides the semantic interpretation of what follows, but does not affect the structure or grammar.
- *Δεῖ* is a verb of expressing obligation and is impersonal, and as such, requires the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI) construction.<sup>44</sup> The accompanying infinitive *εἶναι* serves as S of *δεῖ*.<sup>45</sup>
- Within the AcI construction, *εἶναι* serves as copula in the nonconvertible, subset proposition. *Τὸν ἐπίσκοπον* is S, while *ἀνεπίλημπτον* is PJ in the second predicate position, with emphasis shared equally between the subject and predicate.<sup>46</sup>
- With the exception of *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*, a list of adjectives follows in the verse, each in the same case as *ἀνεπίλημπτον*, i.e., accusative. This form is clearly that of a list, with the sense of *τὸν ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι* repeated. The phrase *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* is clearly a nonconvertible subset proposition, which is adjectival in function and interposed between *ἀνεπίλημπτον* and *νηφάλιον*. It is therefore unlikely that the adjectives following *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* are predicate modifiers of *ἄνδρα*.

<sup>42</sup> Wallace, 430.

<sup>43</sup> Robertson, 508. Act 20:33; Exo 20:17 (LXX); 1Th 2:8; Col 3:13; 1Ti 4:14; Heb 12:5; Luk 10:34; 1Co 9:9; 1Ti 5:8; Tit 3:8; Mat 6:34; Rom 8:32.

<sup>44</sup> Wallace, 756.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 600.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 308.

- The adjectival phrase *μᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* and the list of adjectives might be semantically expegetical to *ἀνεπιλημpton*.<sup>47</sup> There is, however, no grammatical justification for this hypothesis, since it would make the list parenthetical instead of a regular structural continuation.

Verse 3—*μὴ πάροιον, μὴ πλήκτην, ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικῆ, ἄμαχον, ἀφιλάργυρον,*

- The list begun in verse 2 is here continued with four negated adjectival phrases. *Μὴ* applies to the *εἶναι* repeatedly inferred with each.
- Many diagramming schemes attach the negation of *μὴ* to the verb. Here, *δεῖ εἶναι μὴ ...*—“It is necessary to not be. ...” If such a scheme were followed, the *εἶναι* must be inferred for the negated adjectives such that *δεῖ* then has a list of instances of *εἶναι* attached, and this structure, in turn, becomes even more deeply complex when the necessities of verses 6 and 7 create a list of necessities with explicit and inferred instances of *δεῖ*. In the interests of simplifying the diagram and more clearly reflecting the structure, the *μὴ* will be considered to act on the adjectives in these instances.<sup>48</sup>
- The first adjectival is *πάροιον*, continuing the list of accusative predicate adjectives agreeing with *τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*.
- The second adjectival, however, is a predicate accusative noun (because of the Acl construction). Again, the *εἶναι* serves as copula in the nonconvertible, subset proposition.
- Because the contrastive coordinating conjunction *ἀλλὰ* followed by *ἐπιεικῆ* is not a negated adjectival phrase and is in an established, continuing series of such negated adjectival phrases, *ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικῆ* is to be considered a parenthetical insertion. *Ἄλλα* introduces a strong contrast. *Ἐπιεικῆ* is to be contrast for *πλήκτην* and limits its semantic scope.
- The first two elements of the list in this verse are negated with the prepended *μὴ*; then two negated by means of the  $\alpha$ -privative followed by *μὴ νεόφυτον* in Verse 6.

<sup>47</sup> Valleskey, 3.

<sup>48</sup> A diagram set entitled, “A Greek Exegetical Library Edition,” by William Ramey is quite popular among Greek New Testament students, but less popular among those who teach Greek. The method employed is far too mechanistic, resulting in diagrams, that while complete, are sometimes overly complicated primarily because of unnecessary verb inferences, reluctance to recognize clear anacolutha and parentheses, etc. In my opinion, such diagrams actually obfuscate the structure in these instances.

Verse 4—τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος·

- Verse 4 constitutes a single extended, adjectival, participular phrase that circumlocutes a concept for which there is no exacting vocable or idiom. Προϊστάμενον agrees in case with the other elements of the list and is limited by the enumerated condition. Προΐστημι is a verb of subordinating, requiring its object in the genitive case. The subject referent is τὸν ἐπίσκοπον.
- Τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου is the subordinated object of προϊστάμενον. Ἰδίου is a simple adjective; for all intents and purposes, ἰδίου is synonymous here with ἑαυτοῦ.<sup>49</sup>
- The adverb καλῶς modifies προϊστάμενον.
- The adjectival participular phrase τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος could either be exegetical to τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον or modifying τὸν ἐπίσκοπον. The AcI construction with a direct object is generally circumlocuted or avoided when the subject and object agree in number, but in this instance, the object τέκνα is plural. The referent, therefore, cannot be determined on purely structural considerations.
- Ὑποταγῇ is a noun of state; ἐν indicates existence within and circumscribed by the sphere of the state.<sup>50</sup>
- Μετὰ with the genitive πάσης σεμνότητος indicates here an accompanying condition to ἐν ὑποταγῇ.

Verse 5—(εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται;)

- Here δέ is transitional, introducing with a contrastive (by virtue of οὐκ) argument about τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον in the preceding verse.<sup>51</sup>
- The replication of the τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον forces the protasis to be exactly parallel to verse 4a and thus not a part of the argument presented from the flow of the text between verses 2 and 6. The sentence that spans verses 2 to 6 is broken by the interjection of verse 5; thus verse 5 is an anacoluthon. “The participle in particular,” here προϊστάμενον, “is a very common occasion for

<sup>49</sup> Robertson, 691.

<sup>50</sup> Wallace, 372.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 674.

anacoluthon.”<sup>52</sup> Verse 5 is, therefore, a parenthetical interjection further elaborating on verse 4.

- The conditional is first class and follows the formula “εἴ + indicative / any mood, any tense,” where the slash divides protasis from apodosis.<sup>53</sup>
- Τίς functions as a true, indeterminate pronoun and S.<sup>54</sup>
- The main verb is οἶδεν, a verb of cognition requiring an ACl construction. Προστῆναι is a verb of ruling, requiring its object in the genitive.<sup>55</sup>
- Πῶς introduces the apodosis. The verb ἐπιμελήσεται is an example of the deliberative future. Since the question is conditioned on the protasis, the construction is erotemaic, i.e., a rhetorical question.<sup>56</sup>

Verse 6—μὴ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθεῖς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου.

- Μὴ νεόφυτον continues the list of negated adjectives begun in verse 4. The continuity of the construction clearly indicates that verse 5 is an anacoluthon.<sup>57</sup>
- The ἵνα clause with μὴ expresses purpose but could also indicate the result of νεόφυτον; there is no structural difference between these possibilities.<sup>58</sup>
- Εἰς with the accusative of the substantival of κρίνω indicates the change from the state of “not judged” to “under judgment.”
- The aorist tense of ἐμπέση together with its compounding ἐν, the state change indicated by εἰς and the meaning of κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου strongly emphasizes, even structurally, a certain irreversibility.
- The distinction of the type of genitive of τοῦ διαβόλου is purely on the basis of semantic considerations.

<sup>52</sup> Robertson, 435ff.

<sup>53</sup> Robertson, 876. Boyer, 108.

<sup>54</sup> Wallace, 347; Joh 3:3; Act 4:35; Rom 5:7; 1Ti 1:9, 18; Phl 18; Heb 2:9; Jam 1:5; 1Pe 4:11; 2Jo 10; Rev 3:20.

<sup>55</sup> Robertson, 510; Mar 10:42; 1Ti 2:12; Mat 2:22; Luk 2:2; 2Co 1:24; Jam 2:6; Luk 3:1.

<sup>56</sup> Robertson, 876; Mat 12:26; Mar 4:13; Joh 6:68; Rom 3:5; 6:1; 9:14; 1Co 14:7, 9, 16; 15:29, 51; Luk 20:15; Mar 6:37.

<sup>57</sup> Robertson, 1172.

<sup>58</sup> Robertson, 981f; Dana and Mantey, §220.

Verse 7—*δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου.*

- As in verse 2, *δεῖ* is a verb of expressing obligation and is impersonal, and as such, requires the AcI construction.<sup>59</sup> The accompanying infinitive *εἶναι* serves as S of *δεῖ*.<sup>60</sup> *ἔχειν* is the infinitive of the AcI construction and has an impersonal subject.
- The post-positive coordinating conjunction *δέ* is paired with *καί*. This pairing occurs over a hundred times in the New Testament. The pairing takes a number of meanings, but the exact sense cannot be determined on a structural basis.
- *Μαρτυρίαν καλὴν* is the accusative direct object of *ἔχειν* and is an anarthrous noun-adjective construction. Since there is no reason to infer any sort of predicate relationship between *μαρτυρίαν* and *καλὴν*, *καλὴν* is therefore in the fourth attributive position.<sup>61</sup>
- The article is used with *ἔξωθεν*, a substantival adverb and is a substantiver, i.e., which makes the adverb substantival.<sup>62</sup> “... the article is used somewhat freely with adverbs as with substantives and adjectives.”<sup>63</sup>
- As in verse 6, *ἵνα* occurs with *μὴ*, introducing either a negated purpose or result. The meaning cannot be determined structurally.
- The subjunctive of *ἐμπίπτω* is used in the *ἵνα* clause. The aorist tense indicates either punctiliar action or simply the continuation of the aspect of *δεῖ*. *Ἐμπίπτω* is not so rarely used as to indicate a specific choice of the prefixed preposition *ἐν*.
- Again, *εἰς* indicates a state transition, here from possessing *μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν* to being under the *ὀνειδισμόν καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου*. The ordering of *ὀνειδισμόν καὶ παγίδα* is significant, since *ἐμπέσῃ* is interposed.

## Semantic Domain Analysis

Semantic domain analysis examines word choices and constructions relative to possible word choices and constructions. In many cases, the preference for a particular word is clear evidence of intended connotation. “A semantic domain may be defined as an organized set of words, all

<sup>59</sup> Wallace, 756.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 600.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 233.

<sup>63</sup> Robertson, 765. Mat 6:34; 23:25ff; 27:62; Mar 4:11; Luk 5:10; 10:27; Joh 8:23; 12:16; Act 4:29; 20:26; Rom 3: 26; 15:22; 1Co 14:16; 2Co 1:17; 4:16; Eph 3:16; Phi 3:13; 4:8; Rev 3:14.

on the same level of contrast, that refer to a single conceptual category, such as kinship terms, animal names, color terms, or emotion terms. The items in any particular domain for a culture may be obtained by asking a sample of members to free list as many words as possible that belong to the domain”<sup>64</sup> “The structure of the semantic domain is defined as the arrangement of the terms relative to one another as represented in some metric system such as Euclidean space and described in terms of a set of interpoint distances obtained by scaling judged similarity data. The meaning of each term is defined by its location relative to all the other terms.”<sup>65</sup>

The study of the semantic domain of each word also can be used to understand where and how the author directs the attention of the reader. When a “flavorless,” common word is chosen, most authors indicate thereby that a more generous boundary on meaning is intended and that less attention is to be paid to the precise meaning of the word and more to the context. This principle is very evident in Luke’s writing, since he wrote with a very extensive and precise vocabulary and often used word choice to convey meaning. John, however, is on the other end of the spectrum, apparently purposely. He chooses very common words but carefully juxtaposes them to express quite profound ideas that emerge from contemplation of the context. Paul tends more toward Luke’s end of the spectrum.

In the semantic domain analysis below, not every word and phrase is examined thoroughly. Some words are omitted, because they are very specific and have no near synonyms, e.g., νεόφθον, or because they are very common and need little explanation, e.g., the article, or because the word or root word is repeated, e.g., καλός.

*Verse 1* — πιστὸς ὁ λόγος· εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ.

- πιστὸς<sup>66</sup>—Πιστός is classified by Louw and Nida within either the domain entitled “Hold a View, Believe, Trust,” in the subdomain entitled “Trust, Rely,” or within the domain entitled “Mode.” The latter “consists of the evaluation of events in relation to such factors as possibility, contingency, obligation, necessity, and inevitability.”<sup>67</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Weller and Romney quoted in Romney, et al., 519.

<sup>65</sup> The single most important semantic domain resource for English-speaking exegetes of the New Testament is Louw and Nida’s *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. It is an indispensable reference. Sadly no such work yet exists for studying the Old Testament. Romney, et al., 519.

<sup>66</sup> LN 31.86; 31.87; 71.17. Gal 3:9; Mat 25:21; 2Ti 2:2; 2Ti 2:11; Act 13:34.

<sup>67</sup> LN 71 domain description.

The substantival use as predicate nominative, i.e., “one who trusts in,” cannot be entirely ruled out by structural considerations, though such a use is proveably considerably less common than its use as a predicate adjective. Typically πιστός would be preceded by the article if it were substantivized. In the predicate position, πιστός is not expressing the mode of some implied action in ὁ λόγος. A search of the corpus indicates that πιστός ὁ λόγος is not idiomatic. For this reason, the alternative adjectives of the semantic subdomain must be considered. In particular, the derivatives of πείθω, βεβαιῶ, ἐδραῖωμα, θεμελιῶ and ὑπόστασις are most pertinent. Consideration of litotes with a negated equivalent is not statistically warranted.

Among these words there are four distinct axes of differentiation: dependence, reliance, trust, and basis vs. action. Were a derivative πείθω used in place of πιστός, the emphasis would have been placed more strongly upon the action of reliance by the one believing. Were a derivative of βεβαιῶ used in place of πιστός, the emphasis would have been placed more strongly on the reliability of the object of the believing. Were a derivative of ἐδραῖωμα used in place of πιστός, the emphasis would have been placed more strongly on the basis or foundation of the belief. Had a derivative of θεμελιῶ been used, the emphasis would have fallen more on the action of providing the basis for belief. Finally, had ὑπόστασις been used, the author would have been emphasizing the basis for trust. Some of these possibilities overlap more than others. The choice of πιστός seems to have been made in favor of the common adjective expressing the trustworthiness of the referent with a thought to the faith, even Christian faith, of the reader.

- ὁ λόγος.<sup>68</sup>—Of all the words used in the considered text, ὁ λόγος has the widest domain. Λόγος can mean statement, saying, speech, gospel, treatise, Word, account, reason, event, appearance, or accusation. The context quickly rules out speech, gospel, treatise, account, reason, event, appearance, and accusation, leaving the saying idea and the generic statement idea and the Word. While the latter is not ruled out by the context, it is also not supported by it. If the article is anaphoric—and thus the statement in 1Ti 2:15 is the intended referent for ὁ λόγος—there is nothing in that verse that

<sup>68</sup> LN 33.98; 33.99; 33.260; 33.51; 33.100; 57.228; 89.18; 13.115; 30.13; 56.7. Mat 4:4; Joh 4:41; Mat 21:24; Act 14:12; Col 3:16; Act 19:20; Act 1:1; Joh 1:14; Mat 18:23; Phi 4:17; Act 10:29; Mat 5:32; 1Pe 3:15; Act 8:21; Mat 18:16; Col 2:23; Act 19:38.

might limit ὁ λόγος to the Word of God specifically; likewise if the article is kataphoric.

The most common choice by translators is “saying.” In 1Ti 1:15, Paul uses the phrase πιστός ὁ λόγος in connection with a self-contained statement that he wants to encourage his readers to remember (if they do not already know it): πιστός ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι, ὧν πρῶτος εἰμι ἐγώ.—“Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptance: Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of which I am chief.” 1Ti 4:9 uses the phrase after the referent, and the referent is an extended statement—and not a particularly pithy one at that. It is best to approximate with “statement” and then adjust the final translation with a judgment call on the basis of the context.

Louw and Nida indicate that the generic usage of λόγος is precisely synonymous with the use of ῥημα: “Any difference of meaning ... would be only a matter of stylistic usage.” The alternatives to λόγος include many terms for various speeches, songs, poems, and utterances with emphasis on the manner of delivery of the content: derivatives of λέγω (not including λόγος), φημί, λαλέω (not including λαλιά, προσλαλέω, προσαγωγή). Since the predicate adjective narrows the semantic domain to trustworthiness, faithfulness, etc., the manner of the delivery is irrelevant, and thus these derivatives are irrelevant. Λόγος is devoid of such connotation in this case. Several other near synonyms are worth considering in more detail: ἀληθεύω—“to communicate truth,” νουθετέω—“to provide corrective instruction,” δηλώω—“to make evident or clear by explanation,” διδακτός—pertaining to that which is taught,” σωφρονίζω—“to instruct in wisdom,” λαλιά—“that which has been spoken or uttered,” φθόγγος—“an utterance with possible focus upon the clarity of the verbal sounds,” τόπος—a passage or statement,” φάσκω—“to speak with certainty,” ἐπαγγέλλομαι—“to announce openly,” λόγια—“sayings,” and διδαχή, διδασκαλία—“teachings,” ἀληθεύω—“to speak truth.”<sup>69</sup>

With πιστός, Paul is not aiming to connote certainty or exactness or even truthfulness, nor is he specifically teaching or correcting; the statement or saying itself is to be seen as faithful, presumably to the faith. This thought rules out all but the words

<sup>69</sup> LN 33.231; 33.152; 33.227; 33.229; 33.101; 33.104; 33.10; 33.218; 33.219; 33.97; 33.236; 33.251; 33.104. 1Th 5:12; Eph 6:4; Heb 12:27; 1Co 2:13; Tit 2:4; Joh 4:42; Luk 19:22; 1Jo 3:18; Rom 10:18; Luk 4:17; Act 8:32; Luk 4:21; Act 25:19; 1Ti 2:10; Heb 5:12; Act 7:38.



which focus on the grouping of the words. Λόγια would connote a familiar saying, but neither possible referent is such. Finally, τόπος would connote a whole topic rather than a specific saying. Τόπος would be a more likely choice if ὁ λόγος were anaphoric, since there is no clearly identifiable saying at the end of chapter 2. The choice of the more neutral λόγος does not necessarily weigh against anaphorism, since Paul has used πιστός ὁ λόγος elsewhere and it may have been a habitual personal mode of expression. It seems that Paul has purposely chosen the most flavorless word in the semantic domain for the purpose of focusing attention on the connotation imparted by the predicate.

- πιστός ὁ λόγος—This phrase also could have been replaced by other commonly used phrases, since it does not appear to be strongly idiomatic for Paul. For example, λόγος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ—[lit.] “a word in connection with truth” (e.g., Mat 22:16), πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν—“the whole truth” (e.g., Mar 5:33) or ἐπ’ ἀληθείας—“in accordance with truth” (e.g., Mar 12:14). See Rev 21:5 and 22:6 for examples where πιστός and ἀληθινός are paired. These examples focus on trustworthiness—faithfulness—by way of truthfulness.

The choice of πιστός might have been to deliberately call to mind the cognate ἡ πίστις and all its constellation of thoughts and verses. One rightly imagines how often Paul had spoken to young Timothy about ἡ πίστις and how fervently Paul wished for the Spirit to work mightily in his heart.

- ἐπισκοπῆς<sup>70</sup>—In Act 1:20, Luke quotes Psa 69:25 and Psa 109:8 from the Septuagint (Psa 108:8 LXX): γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βιβλῶ ψαλμῶν· Γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ, καί· Τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος.—“For it is written in the Book of Psalms, ‘May his camp become desolate, and let there be no one to dwell in it’; and ‘Let another take his office.’” The use of ἐπισκοπή for an office is thus established already three centuries earlier, where it does not yet have a connection to the pastoral ministry in particular, rather the word indicates an oversight in the sense of “caring for others.”<sup>71</sup>

There are a number of words that are used to speak of specific offices. These words derive from the names of those in the offices and attend those offices very closely. The names of these offices derive from the role of the incumbent. But in the case of ἐπισκοπή,

<sup>70</sup> LN 53.69. Act 1:20; 1Ti 3:1.

<sup>71</sup> LN 35.40. Act 1:20.

the name of the role of the incumbent derives from the name of the office, because that name describes a behavior. Those who are called pastors are so called because they care for the flock. The title comes from the action of the office, whereas, for example, the origin of the word ἀποστολή—"apostolate" is found in the ἀποστόλοι—"apostles" and their work, and the origin of the ἱερατεία—"priesthood" is found in the ἱερατεῖς—"priests" and their work.

- ὀρέγεται,<sup>72</sup>—Ἐπιποθέω—"to long for something, with the implication of recognizing a lack, to long for, to deeply desire" might be a substitute, focusing slightly more on the longing aspect than the desire itself, but Paul desires a less positive verb for the purposes of his synonymia.<sup>73</sup> Ζηλόω—"to set one's heart on something that belongs to someone else, to covet" is certainly a less positive idea, but it necessarily involves another person or group. It also would be a close synonym in context; the word focuses on the relative permanence of the desire in the person's heart.<sup>74</sup> Ἄρπαγή and its derivatives are too harsh in its connotation, indicating that the one desiring would resort to violent means if necessary.<sup>75</sup> Discussion of ἐπιθυμέω has been omitted since it appears below and is in the synonymia with ὀρέγεται.
- καλοῦ<sup>76</sup>—καλός is another word with a very wide domain, admitting at least three amoral subdomains and one moral subdomain. Since the context clearly indicates that καλός is being used in some sense with a moral connection, this discussion will omit discussion of the amoral subdomains, instead simply noting that καλός can mean "functioning in an agreeable manner," "providing benefit," or "fitting."<sup>77</sup> One of the difficulties with καλός in this context is its overlap with ἀγαθός, which clearly focuses on moral goodness. The distinction between the two is maintained in Homeric Greek and blurring in Ancient Greek. By the time of Koine Greek, the two roots are often used interchangeably, with καλός the more flexible of the two.

Ἄκακος—"pertaining to being without fault and hence guileless" introduces an element of internal truthfulness and might have

<sup>72</sup> LN 25.15. 1Ti 3:1; Heb 11:16.

<sup>73</sup> LN 25.18. Jam 4:5; Rom 15:23; 2Co 7:7.

<sup>74</sup> LN 25.21. Jam 4:2.

<sup>75</sup> LN 25.24. Luk 11:39.

<sup>76</sup> LN 65.22; 65.43; 66.2; 88.4. Mat 7:17; Mat 18:8; Mar 9:5; Joh 10:11; Gal 4:17.

<sup>77</sup> LN 65.22; 65.43; 66.2. Mat 7:17; Mat 18:8.

been too restrictive for the context.<sup>78</sup> Εὖ is a very broad term that evokes the thought of that which is beneficial, and while it can be used in the moral sense, καλός would be a far more common choice.<sup>79</sup> Χρηστός—“pertaining to being useful and benevolent” begs an object and is not as often used to express a moral quality.<sup>80</sup>

Ἀρετή—“the quality of moral excellence,” ἀγνεία—“the quality of moral purity,” and ἄμωμος—“pertaining to being without fault and hence morally blameless” focus more narrowly on moral excellence in the person, a direction that Paul is actually avoiding.<sup>81</sup> The work of the ministry cannot be a work of moral excellence on the part of the incumbent, for then it would be focused on the man and his behavior, but the office is actually focused on caring for the flock. That moral excellence is needed for the work is secondary and is clearly spelled out in the list in verses 2 through 8. While the office of the ministry is a holy office and an office that ideally would be without moral defect, Paul studiously steers the discussion from the moral qualities of the person to the needs of the office in service to the preaching of the word. He does this because the incumbents of the office are sinners, and the work of the office is not empowered by sinners, but by the Lord.

- ἔργου—Ἔργον is a very common word used of that which is done, the result of work or that which one normally does.<sup>82</sup> The referent in the sentence is found in the caring connotation of ἐπισκοπή. The many synonyms are almost all more specific. The single exception is ποίησις—“an act,” but ποίησις is not used in the third sense of ἔργον.<sup>83</sup> Πρᾶξις also is used of an activity or work, but “with possible focus upon the procedures involved.”<sup>84</sup> Πράγμα connotes a “measure of complexity and responsibility.”<sup>85</sup> Ἐξις would shift the focus to a repetitive aspect of the work, while χρεία would focus on the necessity of the work.<sup>86</sup> Δρόμος would shift the focus to the seriousness of the effort and possibly the attendant obligation.<sup>87</sup> Δαπανᾶω and its derivatives focus on the seriousness of the effort, while μόχθος

<sup>78</sup> LN 88.2. Heb 7:26.

<sup>79</sup> LN 88.6. Mar 14:7.

<sup>80</sup> LN 88.9. 1Co 15:33.

<sup>81</sup> LN 88.11; 88.29. Phi 4:8; 2Pe 1:3; 1Ti 4:12; 2Co 6:4–6.

<sup>82</sup> LN 42.11; 42.12; 42.42. Joh 10:32; 1Co 12:6; 1Co 1:9; Mar 13:34.

<sup>83</sup> LN 42.7. Rom 7:15; Joh 13:27; Jam 1:25.

<sup>84</sup> LN 42.8. Act 3:17; Act 26:26; Mat 16:27.

<sup>85</sup> LN 42.9. Rom 16:2.

<sup>86</sup> LN 42.10; 42.22. Heb 5:14; Act 6:3.

<sup>87</sup> LN 42.26. Act 20:24.

implies “unusual exertion of energy and effort.”<sup>88</sup> Καλοῦ ἔργου is a deliberately “flavorless” choice. The emphasis is to be paid to the synonymia of ὀρέγεται and ἐπιθυμεῖ.

- ἐπιθυμεῖ.<sup>89</sup>—See the discussion of ὀρέγεται above. The semantic domains of the two verbs overlap to a large extent.

Verse 2—δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μιάς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, φιλόξενον, διδακτικόν,

- τὸν ἐπίσκοπον<sup>90</sup>—Paul uses ἐπίσκοπος to indicate one who is in the office of ἐπισκοπή. Beginning at verse 8, Paul turns his attention to the duties and position of διάκονος, leaving only a few other nearly synonymous position terms and office terms to examine. Εὐπάρεδρον—“devoted service to God” as a predication would have skewed the thought in the direction of the man’s devotion to God, but Paul has in mind the requirements of the office and thus of the man that will serve in that office. Ποίμην—“shepherd” is clearly used of the ἐπίσκοπος, the undershepherd of the Good Shepherd, but this word, apart from the context of John 10, does little to focus on the office of overseer. Πρεσβύτερος—“presbyter, pastor” places more emphasis on the responsibility and socio-religious concern of the man and is thus a close synonym in this context, but it fails to be cognate with ἐπισκοπή.<sup>91</sup>
- ἀνεπίλημπτον<sup>92</sup>—Phrases derived from διακρίνομαι—“disapproval, criticism” and μωμάομαι—“faulting, finding blame” would focus attention more on the thoughts of the critics and less on the assailing of the ἐπίσκοπος. In adjectival form, μέφομαι—“to bring accusations against someone on the basis that the person in question is clearly to blame” would remove the critics from the consideration, but would also focus too much on the clarity of the situation. Ἀκατάγνωστος would be synonymous with ἀνεπίλημπτον and is in fact used by Paul at 1Ti 6:14 and Tit 2:8 for much the same purpose. Tit 1:6 employs ἀνέγκλητος—“one who cannot be accused of anything wrong” in place of ἀνεπίλημπτον. This use serves to further narrow

<sup>88</sup> LN 42.27; 42.48. 2Co 12:15; 2Th 3:8.

<sup>89</sup> LN 25.12; 25.20. Heb 6:11; Luk 17:22; Mar 4:19; Luk 22:15; Act 20:33; Mat 5:28; 1Ti 6:9; 2Ti 2:22; 1Pe 1:4; Gal 5:16.

<sup>90</sup> LN 35.43; 53.71. 1Pe 2:25; Tit 1:7.

<sup>91</sup> LN 53.67; 53.68; 53.72; 53.77. Rom 16:1; 1Ti 3:8; 1Co 7:35; Eph 4:11; Mat 26:57; Act 20:17.

<sup>92</sup> LN 33.415. Tit 2:8; 1Ti 6:14.

the understanding of ἀνεπιλημπτον. The pastor must be unassailable in that he cannot be rightly accused of any wrongdoing.<sup>93</sup>

- γυναικός<sup>94</sup>—Paul here chooses γυναικός to pair with ἄνδρα, a common formula for expressing the connection of a married couple. He does not employ σκευός, which would emphasize the sexual relationship between the couple.<sup>95</sup>
- ἄνδρα,<sup>96</sup>—Νυμφίος—“a young marriageable man” might have been employed here, especially given Timothy’s situation, but again, in keeping with γυναικός, Paul chooses the generic term for a husband.<sup>97</sup>
- νηφάλιον,<sup>98</sup>—Greek has many possible near synonyms for νηφάλιον. Ἐγκράτεια emphasizes the completeness of the self-control. Γυμνάζω would emphasize the training and discipline of the self-control—in the manner of an athlete. The ascetics exercised self-control by rough treatment of the body, i.e., ὑπωπιάζω and ἀφειδία. All of these would have pushed the connotation away from the simple notion of sober-mindedness as a quality and instead focused on it as an activity.<sup>99</sup>
- σώφρονα,<sup>100</sup>—Paul is not focusing on written rules with this term, thus the idiomatic phrase μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γεγραπται—“not above what is written” would be unsuitable. A litotes with ἀσώτως—“senseless” would be too strong and wide to express the considered self-control that Paul has in mind.<sup>101</sup>
- κόσμιον,<sup>102</sup>—Κόσμιον is quite difficult to translate properly. It originally seems to have conveyed the notion of “proper in terms of being attractive,” but in this context it does not strongly connote a certain, outward appearance. Καλός would be too broad here. It is used as a thematic word throughout verses 1 through 8 and thus is reserved anyway. Πρέπει, καθήκει, and ἀνήκει all express the idea of “fitting or right, [but] with the implication of possible moral judgment involved.” In the extended list, the potential of moral judgment is

<sup>93</sup> LN: 33.412; 33.414; 33.415; 33.431; 33.432. Act 11:2; 1Co 9:3; 2Co 6:3; 1Ti 6:14; Tit 2:8; Rom 9:19; Heb 8:8; Jud 16.

<sup>94</sup> LN 10.54. Mat 5:31.

<sup>95</sup> LN 10.55. 1Th 4:4.

<sup>96</sup> LN 10.53. Mat 19:10; Joh 4:17–18.

<sup>97</sup> LN 10.56. Mat 25:1.

<sup>98</sup> LN 88.87. 1Ti 3:2.

<sup>99</sup> LN 88.83; 88.85; 88.88; 88.89; 88.90. 1Co 9:25; Act 24:25; Jam 1:26; 1Ti 4:7; 1Co 9:27; Col 2:23.

<sup>100</sup> LN 88.94. Tit 2:2, 12,

<sup>101</sup> LN 88.95; 88.97. 1Co 4:6; Luk 15:13.

<sup>102</sup> LN 66.10; 88.48. 1Ti 2:9; 1Ti 3:2.

front-loaded into ἀνεπιλημπτον. ἐυθετος—"appropriately useable" would nicely connect with Jesus' words regarding entry into the ministry in Luk 9:62, but Paul is enumerating qualities that a pastor *in situ* and the candidate by extension must possess. Ἐυσχημότως expresses the idea of "proper in a pleasing way" but would typically be used adverbially. Δίκαιος would specifically refer to "properness as a result of justification." In the Christian context, this is true of the pastor, but also of every other Christian. Ἄτιος focuses on the worthiness of the individual, whether intrinsic or earned, and so would be counterproductive to Paul's emphasis on the καλοῦ ἔργου. Ἀρεστός, with its emphasis on desirability, is too far afield, and δεκτός, with its emphasis on appropriateness, is too ambiguous to be used as a limiter in this list.<sup>103</sup>

- φιλόξενον,<sup>104</sup>—In 1Ti 5:10, Paul employs πόδας νίπτω—"to wash feet" to indicate that widows are to be welcoming by means of this humble duty, no doubt harkening back to the welcoming that the Lord gave to His disciples on Maundy Thursday. Here Paul does not have in mind an event or action but rather a qualification, and so he employs the compound word φιλόξενον. The context requires that φιλία be recognized and thus φιλόξενον is to be understood as the sum of its elements.<sup>105</sup>

Verse 3—μὴ πάροιον, μὴ πλήκτην, ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικῆ, ἀμαχον, ἀφιλάργυρον,

- μὴ πάροιον,<sup>106</sup>—At 1Co 6:10, Paul uses μέθυσος to indicate drunkenness. The choice of the rarer word πάροιον may indicate that Paul is using the compound word close to the sense of the sum of the component words. Οἰνοφλυγία—"besotted" is clearly comprehended in the prohibition. Luke used οἰνοπότης, which focused attention on the act of drinking, in particular with sinners.<sup>107</sup>
- μὴ πλήκτην,<sup>108</sup>—Both σκληρός—"harsh, cruel, demanding" and αὐστηρός—"austere, exacting to the point of blows" refer to belligerent character traits, but both push the context toward the physical

<sup>103</sup> LN 66.1; 66.2; 66.3; 66.4; 66.5; 66.6; 66.8; 66.9. Eph 5:3; Act 22:22; Eph 5:4; Mar 9:5; Luk 9:62; 1Co 14:40; Phi 1:7; Act 26:20; Eph 4:1; Act 6:2; 2Co 6:2.

<sup>104</sup> LN 34.58. 1Pe 4:9.

<sup>105</sup> LN 34.59. 1Ti 5:10.

<sup>106</sup> LN 88.288. 1Co 6:10; Luk 7:34; Tit 1:7.

<sup>107</sup> LN 88.283; 88.284; 88.285; 88.288. Act 2:15; Rom 13:13; 1Pe 4:3; Eph 5:18; 1Co 6:10; Luk 7:34; Tit 1:7.

<sup>108</sup> LN 88.137. 1Ti 3:3.

striking. Apparently Paul intends to focus on striking in general, and even especially on psychological and rhetorical striking.<sup>109</sup>

- ἐπεικῆ,<sup>110</sup>—The primary synonym for ἐπεικῆ are the derivatives of πραῦ, which all have the connotation of meekness and mildness. At 1Ti 6:11, Paul chooses πραῦτης, but here he uses the much more nuanced term ἐπεικῆ that often appears in context with persons of power exercising gentleness in restraint.<sup>111</sup>
- ἄμαχον,<sup>112</sup>—The root μαχή indicates unarmed struggle, such as in a wrestling match. It is semantically extended to cover rhetorical and psychological struggle. A number of other words are similarly extended and could have been used with the α-privative or negated. Ἀντιτάσσομαι, ἀνθίστημι, ἀντίκειμαι, ἀντιδιατίθεμαι, ἐναντιόομαι are all close synonyms, meaning “to oppose someone” or “to be hostile toward someone.” Paul avoids the notion of a conflictless pastor by avoiding the negatives of these common words here.<sup>113</sup> Likewise, ἐναντίος—“hostile” and its compounds and derivatives all indicate hostility to some degree, but the pastor’s position is not without hostility.<sup>114</sup> Likewise, μάχαιρα—“sword,” πολεμός—“war,” ἀγών—“intense struggle,” and πάλη—“intense struggle” used figuratively all indicate conflict, and negated would imply that the pastor should not ever be inclined to enter into a conflict, but this is not Paul’s point, thus the choice of ἄμαχον.<sup>115</sup>
- ἀφιλάργυρον,<sup>116</sup>—A negated form of πλεονεξία—“greed for material possessions” also would have served well here, but it seems that Paul desires to call silver to mind specifically, likely to allude to Judas Iscariot’s behavior as the fallen member of the Twelve.<sup>117</sup>

Verse 4—τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος·

- τοῦ οἴκου<sup>118</sup>—Οἶκος—“household” is a very comprehensive, general term. All of the synonyms tend to narrow the connotation to one

<sup>109</sup> LN 88.135; 88.138 Jud 15; Luk 19:21..

<sup>110</sup> LN 88.63. Tit 3:2.

<sup>111</sup> LN 88.59; 88.60. Eph 4:2; 1Ti 6:11; Mat 11:29.

<sup>112</sup> LN 39.24.1Ti 3:3.

<sup>113</sup> LN 39.1. Act 18:6; Gal 2:11; Luk 13:17; 2Ti 2:25; Act 13:45.

<sup>114</sup> LN 39.6. 1Th 2:15; Heb 10:27; Tit 2:8; Eph 6:4.

<sup>115</sup> LN 39.25; 39.26; 39.29. Mat 10:34; Jam 4:1–2; Joh 18:36; Phi 1:30; Eph 6:12.

<sup>116</sup> LN 25.109. 1Ti 3:3.

<sup>117</sup> LN 25.22. Col 3:5; 2Pe 2:14.

<sup>118</sup> LN 7.2; 10.8; 57.21. Mar 2:1; Luk 11:51; 1Co 1:16; Act 7:10; Mar 6:4; Mar 12:40; Act 7:10.



aspect or another of the household. Οἱ ἴδιοι focuses on possession, both of relatives and wealth. Κτήμα—“property or possessions,” ὑπαρξίς—“possessions or property,” οὐσία—“property or wealth,” and σκευός—“goods or belongings” all focus on the material components of the οἶκος, but Paul clearly has in mind the human beings, too, as is in evidence with προϊστάμενον.<sup>119</sup>

- προϊστάμενον,<sup>120</sup>—The concept of leadership also can be expressed with ἡγέομαι, πκατευθύνω, φέρω, and ἄγω, but προϊστάμενον pictures forward leadership with the leader at the front. Ποιμαίνω also invokes that picture but in the context of a flock of sheep instead of a household. Similarly, κυβέρνησις—“to steer the ship” evokes the idea of the leadership of a ship’s captain. Ὁδηγός—“guide” also focuses on one at the fore, giving direction, but in unfamiliar terrain. Πατήρ also might have served but focuses on the vocation and not the stance of leadership, which is ultimately what Paul is driving toward in verse 5.<sup>121</sup>
- τέκνα<sup>122</sup>—The general term for children is used here, selecting the component of the household that Paul is most interested in introducing for the sake of his argument in Verse 5. Παιδίον, κάρπος, and γένεσις all draw the parents into the picture, but Paul means to select only the children for his argument, because their behavior reflects upon the particular leadership capability needed for service in the office.<sup>123</sup>
- ὑποταγή<sup>124</sup>—Πείθομαι and πειθαρχέω both express “subject to in obedience” and so miss the connotation of ordering present in ὑποταγή. Paul could have employed εὐλαβέομαι, which indicates “obedience with reverence possibly as a result of awe,” but the word is typically used of obedience to God rather than to His appointed authorities. Ἀκούω and its derivatives, ἐπιδέχομαι, φυλάσσω and its derivatives, τηρέω and its derivatives, δογματίζομαι, and δικαιοῶ all focus attention on the idea of listening to commands, but the pattern of behavior that Paul is describing with the state of ὑποταγή

<sup>119</sup> LN 10.12; 57.4; 57.15; 57.16; 57.19; 57.20. Joh 1:11; Act 4:32; 1Co 11:21; Mat 19:22; Act 2:45; Mat 24:47; Luk 15:12; Mar 3:27.

<sup>120</sup> LN 36.1. Luk 22:26; Heb 13:7; 1Th 5:12; 2Th 3:5; Act 15:29; 2Pe 1:21; Rom 8:14.

<sup>121</sup> LN 36.2; 36.3; 36.4; 36.8. Mat 2:6; 1Co 12:28; Rom 2:19; 1Co 4:15; Joh 8:44.

<sup>122</sup> LN 10.36. Luk 1:7; Joh 4:51.

<sup>123</sup> LN 10.37; 10.38; 10.24. Luk 11:7; Luk 1:42; Mat 1:1; Luk 2:4.

<sup>124</sup> LN 36.18; 36.15; 36.16; 36.18; 36.19; 36.21; 36.22. Tit 2:9; 2Co 9:13; Heb 13:17.



is beyond the thought of a chain of command. Ὑπήκοος focuses on humble obedience but fails to convey the ordering of the family which is implicit in ὑποταγή.<sup>125</sup>

- σεμνότητος.<sup>126</sup>—Κοσμίως is ruled out as a potential synonym, because it is already used in the list in another way. It seems likely that αἰδώς—“modesty implying respect generally when referring to children” would have been used in place of σεμνότητος if the prepositional phrase were referring to the children and not to the ἐπίσκοπος. Εὐσχημόνως describes a fitting manner of behavior but does not specify what that manner is.<sup>127</sup>

Verse 5 — (εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστήναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται;)

- οἶδεν,<sup>128</sup>—Οἶδεν is the most generic vocable expressing the idea of knowing and generally connotes the internal, mental state and its effect on behavior rather than the method by which the knowledge was acquired or the manner in which the knowledge was acquired. Paul’s choice indicates that of the many compound verbs from γινώσκω with their specific connotations, none are suitable. Γινώσκω itself focuses more on the possession of the knowledge and does not hint at its use or behavioral implications. Σοφία and its derivatives and cognate would tend to connote the potential for the knowledge to influence behavior. A litotes with ἄγνοια or another such word would redouble the emphasis on the possession of knowledge but would not connote the effect on behavior.<sup>129</sup>
- ἐκκλησίας<sup>130</sup>—Οἱ ἅγιοι—“the holy ones” and λαός—“people [of God]” both focus on the group as composed of individuals, whereas ἐκκλησία focuses on the corporate body and its possessions. Σῶμα would capture the corporate nature but excludes the possessions.<sup>131</sup> Paul has in mind to draw parallels between the relationship of the

<sup>125</sup> LN 36.15; 36.16; 36.18; 36.19; 36.21; 36.22. Mar 1:27; Rom 16:19; 1Co 14:1; Phi 2:8; Tit 2:9; 2Co 98:13; Heb 13:17; Mat 19:20; Joh 14:15; 1Co 7:19; Col 2:20–21.

<sup>126</sup> LN 88.46. 1Ti 2:2.

<sup>127</sup> LN 88.48; 88.49; 88.50. 1Ti 3:2; 1Ti 2:9; Rom 13:13.

<sup>128</sup> LN 28.1; 28.7. Rom 1:21; Luk 16:15; Mat 25:13; Mat 10:19; Phi 1:22; Luk 1:77; Mat 7:11.

<sup>129</sup> LN 28.2; 28.3; 28.4; 28.6; 28.8; 28.9; 28.11; 28.13; 28.14; 28.15; 28.16. Mat 11:27; 1Ti 4:3; Col 1:9; Rom 1:28; Act 19:15; Act 15:7; 1Co 4:4; 1Pe 2:19; Act 26:5; 1Pe 1:20; Aact 2:23; Act 2:31; 1Co 1:17; 1Co 3:10.

<sup>130</sup> LN 11.32. 1Co 1:2; Rom 16:16;.

<sup>131</sup> LN 11.27; 11.12; 11.34. 1Co 1:2; Act 3:23; Eph 4:12.

man to his οἶκος and the relationship of that man in the office with his ἐκκλησία.

- ἐπιμελήσεται;<sup>132</sup>—Here ἐπιμελόμαι is used in the sense of “caring for with diligent concern.” There are many close synonyms including, θάλπω—“caring for tending toward cherishing,” διακονέω—“caring for by rendering humble service,” ἐπισκοπέω—“caring for with an emphasis on continuous responsibility,” and τρέφω and τροφοφορέω—“to care for by supplying nourishment.” While ἐπίσκοπος has a cognate in ἐπισκοπέω, the combination of ἐπίσκοπος and ἐπιμελόμαι is complementary and more common.<sup>133</sup>

Verse 6—μὴ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθείς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου.

- τυφωθείς<sup>134</sup>—There is a surprisingly large number of synonyms for τυφώω and its derivatives: αὐθάδης—“arrogant, self-willed,” ὑψωμα—“exaggerated sense of one’s importance,” ὑψηλός—“arrogant, proud,” ὑψηλοφρονέω, ὑψηλαφρονέω—“acting haughty,” ὑπερφρονέω—“acting with unwarranted pride,” ὑπεραίρομαι—“puffed up with pride,” ἐπαίρομαι—“acting haughty,” ὑπερηφανία—“bordering on insolence,” ὑπερήφανος—“ostentatiously proud,” φυσίωσις, φυσίομαι, φυσίω—“having an inflated view of oneself,” ἀλαζονεία—“arrogance without basis,” ἀλαζών—“braggart,” κενοδοξία—“pride without basis,” and κενόδοξος—“falsely proud.” With this many overlapping terms, Paul’s choice is exceedingly precise. Often τυφωθείς is translated with “puffed up,” but ὑπεραίρομαι is not an exact synonym. In fact, τυφώω is very deliberately evocative of its origins in the word τύφω—“to smoke or smoulder.” Besides “being filled with smoke,” i.e., “full of hot air,” τυφώω also expresses the “blinding” aspect of conceit or pride.<sup>135</sup>
- κρίμα<sup>136</sup>—The judgment idea expressed in κρίμα has many variations: ἀνακρίνω, διακρίνω—“carefully judging,” κρίσις—“basis for rendering a judgment,” διάκρισις—“careful judgment,” διάκρινω—“to distinguish,” δοκιμάζω—“to regard as worthy on the basis of testing,”

<sup>132</sup> LN 30.40; 35.44. 1Ti 3:5; Luk 10:34; Act 27:3.

<sup>133</sup> LN 35.36; 35.37; 35.38; 35.39; 35.40; 35.45. Eph 5:29; Mat 25:44; Act 6:1; Heb 12:15; Mat 25:43; Act 15:14; 1Ti 5:8; Act 1:20; Rev 12:14.

<sup>134</sup> LN 88.218. 1Ti 3:6.

<sup>135</sup> LN 88.206; 88.207; 88.208; 88.209; 88.210; 88.211; 88.212; 88.213; 88.214; 88.215; 88.216; 88.217; 88.219; 88.220; 88.221. Tit 1:7; 2Co 10:5; Luk 16:15; 1Ti 6:17; Rom 12:3; 2Co 12:7; 2Co 11:20; Mar 7:22; Jam 4:6; 2Co 12:20; 1Co 4:6; 1Co 8:1; Jam 4:16; 2Ti 3:2; Phi 2:3.

<sup>136</sup> LN 30.110; 56.24; 56.30. Joh 7:24; Rom 11:33; 2Th 1:5; Joh 5:30; Rom 5:16; Joh 7:51; Jam 5:12; 2Pe 2:3.

ἀποδιορίζω—“to judge that there is a significant distinction,” ἀποδοκιμάζω—“to judge not worthy,” καταγινώσκω—“to judge to be bad,” αὐτοκατάκριτος—“condemned by one’s own actions,” and βλέπω εἰς πρόσωπον—“to judge on external appearances.” As with τυφώ above, the number of possibilities makes Paul’s word choice more significant. Κρίμα is the most neutral term for a judgment. This generality increases the relative importance of the connected genitive, τοῦ διαβόλου.<sup>137</sup>

- ἐμπέση<sup>138</sup>—Ἐπίπτω is one of a class of verbs that indicate experiencing. Typically these verbs indicate a state change and are often accompanied by an appropriate prepositional phrase to indicate the origin state, the destination state, or both. Τυγχάνω, ἐπιτυγχάνω—“to experience something that is happening,” κατατίθεμαι—“to experience receiving something bestowed,” λαμβάνω (and its derivatives and compounds)—“to experience something negative,” φέρω—“to experience something burdensome or difficult,” ἔχω—“to experience something over a duration,” πάσχω—“to experience something through or with suffering,” ἀπέχω—“to experience something to the limit,” ὑπέχω—“to experience something to which a person is subjected,” εἰσέρχομαι, εὐρίσκω—“to begin to experience,” περιπίρω—“to experience something adverse or severe,” ἀναδέχομαι—“to experience as a recipient,” πράσσω—“to experience and engage in,” τίνω—“to experience something bad,” γέυομαι—“to experience with focus on personal involvement,” βαστάζω—“to experience under grievous difficulties,” ἐκχέομαι—“to fully experience,” and ἔχω μέρος ἐν—“to take part in (with others).”<sup>139</sup> Paul’s word choice builds on the picture of πίπτω—“to fall.” The devil’s judgment is the judgment that he is falling headlong down into without the ability to stop himself.

<sup>137</sup> LN 30.109; 30.111; 30.112; 30.113; 30.114; 30.115; 30.116; 30.117; 30.118; 30.119; 30.120. 1Co 2:15; 1Co 14:29; Mat 16:3; Joh 3:19; 1Co 12:10; Act 15:9; Rom 14:22; Rom 1:28; 2Co 10:18; Jud 19; Mar 8:31; 1Jo 3:20; Tit 3:11; Mat 22:16.

<sup>138</sup> LN 15.121; 90.71. Mat 12:11; Jam 5:12; Jam 1:2; Luk 10:36; 1Ti 3:6.

<sup>139</sup> LN 90.61; 90.62; 90.63; 90.64; 90.65; 90.66; 90.67; 90.68; 90.70; 90.73; 90.75; 90.76; 90.77; 90.78; 90.80; 90.82; 90.83. Act 24:2; 2Ti 2:10; Heb 11:35; Act 19:11; Rom 11:7; Act 24:27; Joh 7:23; Mat 23:14; Rom 5:11; Heb 11:36; Luk 23:14; Rom 1:27; 1Ti 6:12; Heb. 6:7; Heb 13:13; Joh 16:33; Mar 3:10; Mat 4:24; Act 28:8; Rev 2:10; Gal 3:4; Luk 6:24; Jud 7; Luk 22:40; Mar 9:43; Mat 11:29; Heb 9:12; Act 7:46; 1Ti 6:10; Heb 11:17; Eph 6:21; 2Th 1:9; Mat 16:28; Heb 6:4; Gal 5:10; Jud 11; Rev 20:6.

Verse 7—δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου.

- μαρτυρίαν<sup>140</sup>—All of the near synonyms arise as compounds of μαρτυρέω. Συμμαρτυρέω means confirming by testimony. Συνεπιμαρτυρέω means “to join one’s witness to that of others.” Καταμαρτυρέω is “witnessing against,” while ψευδομαρτυρέω means “to give false testimony.” The plain substantive derives from the simplex verb and indicates the testimony of one who testifies under any circumstances.<sup>141</sup>
- ὀνειδισμόν<sup>142</sup>—An ὀνειδισμός is an insult or a speaking of words against a person in a manner that is not justified. Paul’s choice not to employ καταλαλέω—“to speak evil of, to slander,” ὑβρίζω—“to speak against arrogantly” and its compounds, ἐκβάλλω—“to insult (possibly to psychologically ostracize),” δυσφημέω—to attribute ill repute or to give a bad reputation,” κακολογέω—“to revile or denounce,” and βλασφημέω—“to injure reputation” amplifies the connotation of ὀνειδισμός. Those outside the church really are not justified in speaking against the pastor and hurting his reputation, but Paul here is indicating that they will do so especially to a pastor whose sins become known. Λοιδορέω—“to slander or insult strongly” focuses on the vehemence of the insult and does not touch upon the justifiability of the communication.<sup>143</sup>
- παγίδα<sup>144</sup>—A παγίς is a trap, a device which presents sudden danger by killing, disabling, or entrapping the victim. The word came to be used of anything or any situation which might present a sudden danger. Paul uses παγίδα in the sense of an instrument for gaining control. δαυμάζω and ζωγράφω—“to bring under control or make behave” and Βρόχον ἐπιβάλλω—“to throw a bridle on” lack the sense of sudden danger. Ἐνέχομαι—“to be under the control of another person or of an institution” and its derivatives do not support the idea of a state change from no danger to helplessly endangered. Δουλόομαι—“to enslave” does not present the danger aspect as strongly, especially in the first century. Εὐπερίστατος—“the exertion

<sup>140</sup> LN 33.265. 1Ti 3:7; Rev 3:1.

<sup>141</sup> LN 33.266; 33.267; 33.269; 33.271. Rom 2:15; Act 14:17; Mat 27:13; Mar 14:56.

<sup>142</sup> LN 33.389. Mar 15:32; Heb 10:33.

<sup>143</sup> LN 33.387; 33.390; 33.393; 33.396; 33.398; 33.399; 33.400. Jam 4:11; 2Co 12:20; Luk 11:45; Heb 10:29; 1Co 4:12; 1Pe 3:9; Luk 6:22; 1Co 4:13; 2Co 6:8; Mat 15:4; Tit 3:2; Rom 3:8; Rom 2:24; Mat 27:39; Mat 15:19.

<sup>144</sup> LN 6.23; 21.4; 37.15. Luk 21:34–35; 1Ti 6:9; Rom 11:9.

of tight control” and συλαγωγέω—“taking booty” view the trap from the point of view of the one setting the trap and are thus ruled out. Finally, περιπίπτω—“to become physically controlled” might point in the direction of demonic possession, which is possibly comprehended in Paul’s thought but only infinitesimally.<sup>145</sup>

## Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis looks at larger units of text in an attempt to understand argument development, concept ordering, and prioritization, etc. The primary focus of such analysis is the inferential particles and conjunctions, for these indicate the course of the main argument through the text. Beginning with the assigned text, reasons are sought in the preceding discourse and conclusions are sought in the text which follows.

After the customary address, Paul begins his letter with a warning against false teachers, who “have wandered away into vain discussion.”<sup>146</sup> The false teaching apparently stems from a misunderstanding of law and gospel, possibly along the lines of Judaizing, since μύθοις και γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις—“myths and endless genealogies” are mentioned specifically. To hedge against antinomianism, Paul writes, καλὸς ὁ νόμος—“the law is good” in 1Ti 1:8. Paul’s review of God’s grace, beginning at 1Ti 1:12, stresses the intent of God ἀμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι—“to save sinners,” even the ἀμαρτωλὸς πρῶτος—“foremost among sinners.” Two men, Hymenaeus and Alexander, presumably of Timothy’s congregation, had gone the way of the unrepentant, and Timothy would need to contend with them and for them.<sup>147</sup>

Chapter 2 picks up the theme that God sincerely πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι και εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν—“desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.”<sup>148</sup> In this context, Paul instructs on worship practices for both men and women.<sup>149</sup> These instructions are faithful. Timothy has the desire to serve as pastor, as a servant of the God who would save us, as a servant of God’s people, and

<sup>145</sup> LN 37.1; 37.2; 37.3; 37.4; 37.5; 37.6; 37.10; 37.11; 37.14; 37.16; 37.17; 37.19; 37.20; 37.21; 37.22; 37.23; 37.24; 37.25; 37.27; 37.28; 37.29; 37.31. Mar 5:4; Jam 3:7; 2Ti 2:26; 1Co 7:35; Rom 6:19; Gal 5:1; Heb 2:15; Heb 12:1; Col 2:8; Luk 10:30; Act 12:11; Act 2:24; 1Pe 2:13; 2Co 5:14; Luk 4:42; Joh 1:5; Col 3:15; 1Ti 2:12; Rom 5:14; Act 27:16; 1Co 7:15; Rom 6:6; Rom 16:18; 1Co 9:19; Gal 4:3; Gal 2:4; Joh 10:28; 2Ti 3:6; Phi 3:21; Act 19:35.

<sup>146</sup> 1Ti 1:6.

<sup>147</sup> 1Ti 1:18ff.

<sup>148</sup> 1Ti 2:4.

<sup>149</sup> 1Ti 2:8 [for men]. 1Ti 2:9–15 [for women].

as a man in the midst of a messy fracas of sinners that is far more than he can handle by his own reason or strength. Now the stage is set for the assigned verses.

The necessity expressed by δεῖ clearly arises as a result of the referent to οὖν in verse 2. Since the necessity of the qualifications does not logically follow from the action of desiring the office, the referent must be something in the apodosis of verse 1 or in the preceding chapters. Again, desire does not necessitate qualification, but the nature of the work itself does; οὖν refers the reader back somehow to κάλου ἔργου. That this "good work" requires the qualifications indicates that κάλου is not used in the amoral sense, i.e., of good quality, but rather the moral sense, i.e., virtuous, righteous, etc. The good work is serving as an undershepherd with the Good Shepherd, saving sinners from eternal death by preaching the real law and gospel and nothing else.

Verse 5 indicates that at least verse 4 is argumentative and not the mere statement of some supporting fact. Since verse 4 is an adjectival participular in the list of qualifications, the entire list is part of the argument. St. Paul is not stating some factual set of rules, but arguing actively that the nature of the work requires that those who seek the office need to meet the qualifications. That the apostle argues so, supports the assertion of Chrysostom, Fee, Knight, Valleskey, Stellinghorn, et al., that the list of qualifications is summarized by the first adjective in the list, ἀνεπιλημπτον. Detractors ought not be able to assail the incumbent of the office by publicizing evidence of his sin.

Many authors look for some significance in the number of items in the list or in the numbers of similar items or in the number negated in one way as opposed to another. Some justify exegetical decisions about the structure of the list and adjust the count of the elements. Simply put, no numerologizing is called for by the text or the context.

The presence of δεῖ before the conjunctions immediately places verse 7 into structural parallel with the extended sentence beginning in verse 2. The repetition of καλός in verse 7 again invokes the moral framework of the argument, this time with ἀπὸ τῶν ἕξωθεν. The assessment of suitability in verse 2 through verse 6 is argued from a point of view internal to the body of believers, while in verse 7, the assessment of suitability is argued from a point of view imagined to be outside of the body of believers. The rest of the chapter concerns other workers in the church.

## Commentary

The following commentary draws together all of the analyses to draw conclusions and prepare for the translation.

*Verse 1* — πιστός ὁ λόγος· εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ.

Is the function of πιστός ὁ λόγος merely as an instrument of emphasis as Fee argues? Scott and others argue that the phrase introduces credal content in connection with a “salvation theme.”<sup>150</sup>

In every other case in the Scriptures, πιστός ὁ λόγος refers to a vaguely salvific motif and/or the resultant life to come, although the paucity of examples does not make for a compelling case. In half of those cases, the phrase is clearly kataphoric and in the other, anaphoric.

The struggle with the variant ἀνθρωπίνος likely attends the tensions that scribes felt when attempting to place 3:1a. Ἀνθρωπίνος would remove the connection with the other “faithful sayings” and would clearly remove the connection to a salvific theme. Surprisingly, the variant appears both attached to the end of chapter 2 and to the beginning of chapter 3.

Chrysostom writes, Πιστός ὁ λόγος. Πρὸς τοῦτο εἴρηται, οὐ πρὸς τὸ, Εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρεγεται. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀμφιβαλλόμενον ἦν, διὰ τοῦτο λέγει, Πιστός ὁ λόγος, ὅτι δυνήσονται πατέρες ἀπολαύειν τῆς τῶν παιδῶν ἀρετῆς, καὶ μητέρες, ὅταν αὐτοὺς ἐκθρέψοσι καλῶς.—“This is a faithful saying.’ This relates to the present subject [chapter 2], not to what follows, respecting the office of a Bishop. For as it was doubted, he affirms it to be a true saying, that fathers may be benefited by the virtue of their children, and mothers also, when they have brought them up well.”<sup>151</sup> The material at the end of chapter 2 also seems to fit a general salvific theme, and, grammatically, anaphorism is more likely than kataphorism.

Of late, the advocates of feminist theology have made an effort to nullify the doctrinal import of chapter 2 by appealing to the supposed pseudepigraphal nature of the letter or to the thought that the chapter is descriptive of the culture of early eastern Mediterranean Christianity (and thus not doctrinally prescriptive). For this reason, an awareness of the controversy regarding the placement of πιστός ὁ λόγος is useful.

<sup>150</sup> Cited in Knight, 152.

<sup>151</sup> Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (PG 62, 546). Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (NPNF1 13, 436). Because of the rise of feminist theology and the content of chapter 2, it would probably prove helpful to study exegetically the meaning of πιστός ὁ λόγος as an ending to the content of chapter 2.



Another approach used by advocates of feminist doctrine and exegesis takes up Leo's assertion that the ἔργου of the apodosis must be translated with an ambiguity similar to that applied to τις, i.e., "he desires a good thing," is sustained neither grammatically nor by usage, especially when the vocation is clearly conceptualized in the protasis.<sup>152</sup> While Leo's rationale had nothing to do with the contemporary feminist movement, his assertion is the start of one of two parts of an argument of feminist theologians for neutering any gender specificity, especially in μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα in verse 2.<sup>153</sup> This argument appears to have arisen primarily to counter the use of the verse as a basis for prohibiting female pastors.

Tatian (c. A.D. 120–c. 180) uses the verb ὀρέγω as follows: Τί μοι καθ' εἰμαρμένην ἀγρυπνεῖς διὰ φιλαργυρίαν; τί δέ μοι, καθ' εἰμαρμένην πολιάκις ὀρεγόμενος, πολλάκις ἀποθνήσκεις; ἀπόθνησχε τῷ κόσμῳ, παραιτούμενος τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ μανίαν· ζῆθι τῷ θεῷ, διὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καταλήμψεως τὴν παλαιὰν γένεσιν παραιτούμενος. Οὐκ ἐγενόμεθα πρὸς τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀποθνήσκομεν δὲ δι' ἑαυτοῦς.—"How is it that you are fated to be sleepless through avarice? Why are you fated to grasp at things often, and often to die? Die to the world, repudiating the madness that is in it. Live to God, and by apprehending Him lay aside your old nature. We were not created to die, but we die by our own fault."<sup>154</sup> Note the contextual overlap with First Timothy, e.g., ἀφιλαργυρίαν. Ὀρέγω is typically used of a covetous, greedy sort of wanting. No doubt there were belly-fillers who were desiring to enter into the ministry for personal gain.<sup>155</sup>

In 1Ti 6:5, Paul specifically identifies the common characteristic of false teachers and those seeking gain for themselves in the office: εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις, τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ, τετύφωται, μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραὶ, διαπαρατριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας, νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν.—"If anyone teaches a different doctrine and does not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching that accords with godliness, he is puffed up with conceit and understands nothing.

<sup>152</sup> Leo cited in Huther, 115.

<sup>153</sup> See William Witt's summary of the argument at <http://willgwitt.org/theology/concerning-womens-ordination-womens-ministry-in-the-new-testament-bishops-presbyters-deacons/>.

<sup>154</sup> Tatian, *Address of Tatian to the Greeks* [ἸΠΠΟΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ] (PG 6:830). Tatian, *Address of Tatian to the Greeks* (ANF 2:69ff).

<sup>155</sup> Phi 3:19.



He has an unhealthy craving for controversy and for quarrels about words, which produce envy, dissension, slander, evil suspicions, and constant friction among people who are depraved in mind and deprived of the truth, imagining that godliness is a means of gain.” Paul does not propose a subset relationship here, i.e., that some false teachers are eager for gain, but rather he identifies the two groups convertibly; those who teach falsely are those who seek gain from the office, and, conversely, those who seek gain from the office are false teachers.

The connection between those who seek gain and false teachers was likely already clear or strongly suspected even by young Timothy. Thus the motives behind the act of desiring the office would have to be considered carefully. Since ὀρέγω is so strongly connected to wrongly motivated desire, Paul uses the mechanism of a synonymia to reorient and narrow the semantic domain of ὀρέγω, in effect, redirecting the reader away from the covetous aspect of ὀρέγω to the basic meaning of the verb apart from its cultural context, yet nonetheless presenting the same strongly flavored verb that he will later use to speak of the ρίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν, that is φιλαργυρία, in 1Ti 6:10.

The synonymia of ὀρέγομαι with ἐπιθυμέω would seem to strongly emphasize their semantic overlap. Consider the use of this same pairing in the *Epistle of Aristeas*: Ἐπιφωνήσας δὲ τοῦτῳ πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον εἶπε Τίς ὄρος τοῦ βασιλεύειν ἐστίν; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Τὸ καλῶς ἄρχειν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ τῷ πλοῦτῳ καὶ τῇ δόξῃ φερόμενον ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἄσχημόν τι ἐπιθυμῆσαι, εἰ καλῶς λογίζοιο. πάντα γὰρ σοι πάρεστιν ὡς οὐδέν. ὁθεὸς δὲ ἀπροσδεής ἐστι καὶ ἐπιεικής. καὶ σὺ καθόσον ἄνθρωπος ἐννοεῖ, καὶ μὴ πολλῶν ὀρέγου, τῶν δὲ ἰκανῶν πρὸς τὸ βασιλεύειν.—“What is the true aim of kingship?’ And he said, ‘To govern oneself aright, and not to be carried away by wealth and fame into extravagant and unseemly *desires* ... if you want to reason rightly. For you have all needful things at [your] command; but God has need of nothing and is gentle with all. Let your thoughts be such as become a man, and *do not reach after* many things, but only after such as suffice for your kingly office.’”<sup>156</sup> This letter was quite famous, since it was

<sup>156</sup> *Ep. Arist.* 211. The editors of *Translations of Early Documents II* note, “The document known as the ‘Letter of Aristeas’ purports to be a contemporary record, by a Greek holding a high position at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.), of the translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch into Greek, undertaken at the instance of the royal librarian, Demetrius of Phalerum. The familiar name ‘the Septuagint,’ by which the Greek Old Testament as a whole came to be known, owes its origin to the story here told of the seventy-two translators of the Law. The narrative is communicated in the form of a letter from Aristeas to his brother Philocrates. Aristeas claims to have been a member of the embassy sent from Alexandria to Jerusalem to obtain a copy of the Law and the services of a company of Palestinian translators.” In the interests

the source of the account of the seventy-two interpreters sent from Jerusalem to Alexandria to translate the Old Testament into Greek (i.e., the Septuagint) in the second century B.C. Josephus paraphrased a significant portion of the letter in his *Antiquities of the Jews*.<sup>157</sup> It is quite possible that Paul, with his excellent command of Jewish and classical thought, here alludes to the spirit of the advice to kings and the word choice in the *Epistle of Aristeas*.

“The office should seek the man, not man the office” has oft been quoted to those desirous of a particular station or ecclesiastical office, especially for personal gain, but the quotation is not applicable to the aspiration engendered in those who seek an office in order to protect or otherwise sacrifice for the good of others.<sup>158</sup> When such is the case, our understanding of the relationship between his motivation and the office immediately inverts, and we say that the office has sought out the man, even though it is his desire to serve. For example, when violence comes to a nation, a young man may desire to serve in the military, as was the case after the attack upon Pearl Harbor. Even though the armed forces did not seek him out, the urge to serve would be perceived as having come to him as a result of the dire circumstances of the nation, and his answering of that urge would be perceived as noble. Likewise, that a man should seek the office after once glimpsing the dire circumstances of the world is not discouraged but encouraged by Paul in this verse, and yet does not ἀνεπιλημπτος and its attendant list clearly dissuade those who seek the office for any personal gain or glory, whether overtly or cryptically?

Luther writes, “*Multos tales semper video qui contemptis omnibus bonis operibus hoc arrogant ut doceant, illi quaerunt gloriam. Non dicit sic Paulus, sed: qui episcopatum quaerit, der mus von herzen ein fromer man sein, sincere, ein kern, ein aufbund von einem fromen. Ita est ein officium quamquam molestum opus, quia expositum omnibus moribus, qui sunt diversissimi omnium detractoribus, expositus est omni periculo vitae, facile est labi in docendo, consolando. Nisi cogeret eum deus ipse, potius recederet*

of readability, I have updated the English translation to (slightly) more contemporary American English.

<sup>157</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 245f.

<sup>158</sup> Attributed to Silas Wright by Edward Parsons Day in *Day's Collacon*, 684. Apparently, the original context was political. “According to biographies, this is in character. Wright was a nineteenth century representative and senator from New York and served as governor of New York. In 1844, he declined a Supreme Court appointment, refused to be considered for the presidential nomination, and declined, when nominated, to be candidate for the vice presidency.” *Dictionary of American Biography*, Vol. 20, 556.

*in desertum*. . .—I always see many of the sort who seize the office of teaching in contempt of all good works. They are looking for glory. Paul does not speak in this tone. Rather, he says: whoever aspires to the office of a bishop must be from his heart a righteous man, sincere, good to the core, a model of piety. Thus it is a duty, although a difficult work, for it is exposed to all styles of life, the most contrary of all, even to detractors, and the incumbent is exposed to every peril of life. It is easy to fall into error while teaching and comforting. If God Himself were not driving such a person, he would prefer to withdraw into the desert.”<sup>159</sup>

The very idea of the necessity of meeting such a list of qualifications creates instantly a tension in the sinful heart, and contemporary American culture certainly amplifies that discomfort. Since a “real ‘murican” is imagined to determine his own destiny, it is oft thought that he should be suitable, within reason, not by meeting externally imposed qualifications, but by virtue of his will in the matter. Are not children told, “When you grow up, you can be anything you want to be”? The reality of the office, though, is that not every child is created suitable to the task, nor would the circumstances of every man’s life permit. In light of the scriptural teaching concerning vocation, this truth should not be surprising, but when a man with earnest desire must be turned away for good reasons, what consternation often arises in his thinking! Ὁρέγομαι is certainly the proper word choice, and the first-class conditional the proper choice of structure to make the author’s point that desire for the office rides the razor’s edge between the desires of the old and new natures present in every Christian.

Many translators render the synonymia rather inert by using the same verb for both ὀρέγομαι and ἐπιθυμεί, following the precedent of Jerome’s Vulgate, “*si quis episcopatum desiderat bonum opus desiderat.*” Luther, “Das ist gewißlich wahr: So jemand ein Bischofsamt *begehrt*, der *begehrt* ein köstlich Werk.” The connotation of *desiderat* is decidedly less aggressive than *begehren*, but regardless, the effect of the figure of speech is lost. The King James Version follows Jerome here. Erasmus’ glosses in his 1516 translation preserve the effect. Among popular modern English translations, the Revised Standard Version, English Standard Version, and New International Version translate “aspire . . . desire.” This word choice reverses the poles of the tension in the verse by placing the word that focuses on desire second, since aspiration has become more or less devoid of a covetous aspect in modern parlance. The translation fails to reflect the tension present in the original. The tension

<sup>159</sup> WA 26, 49. AE 28, 282.

can be preserved by highlighting the mental desire in the protasis and the ongoing desire in the apodosis, relying on the inferential statement in verse 2 to explain the nature of the good work that is the object of the ongoing desire.

A precise, fully elaborated definition of ἐπισκοπῆς is well beyond the scope of this paper but has been summarized in "The Public Ministry of the Word" and systematically presented by Johann Gerhard and others.<sup>160</sup> Since the word ἐπισκοπή (at the very least) implies caring oversight, especially in juxtaposition to διακόνους, and the purview of the oversight is identified in verse 5 as the church, ἐπισκοπῆς here refers to the pastoral office in particular. Lock's assertion that the number of ἐπίσκοπον in verse 2 "may imply that there was only one in the community" is without support.<sup>161</sup>

The anarthrous καλοῦ ἔργου is not precisely indeterminant, but rather qualitative.<sup>162</sup> Rather than "a good work," an encapsulation of the totality of the work of the office, καλοῦ ἔργου indicates a quality of the work of the office, i.e., it is "good work." In context with ἀνεπίλημπτος, etc., καλοῦ clearly indicates the moral subdomain of the goodness concept.<sup>163</sup>

Verse 2 — δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μίᾳς γυναικὸς ἀνδρα, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, φιλόξενον, διδασκτικόν,

That the tenses of δεῖ ... εἶναι are significant for identifying a temporal quality in the requirements is supported neither structurally, nor grammatically, nor semantically. Verbs of obligation (such as δεῖ) with an indicative infinitive "are semantically equivalent to a potential mood."<sup>164</sup> The rather wooden phrase, "it is necessary," often used for δεῖ, fails to convey this potentiality. It is, therefore, more appropriate here to

<sup>160</sup> See in particular the citations in "The Public Ministry of the Word" regarding the office: AC XIV; AC V; AC XXVIII; Ap VII; Ap VIII; Ap XIII; Treatise 10; Treatise 60ff; Treatise 67; SC Fifth Petition; SC Office of the Keys and Confession; SA III.4, 7; and their treatment of the content of Mat 6:12; 7:15–16; 9:36–38; 16:19; 18:15–20; 20:28; 28:18–20; Luk 10:16; Joh 20:21–23; 21:15ff; Act 14:23; Rom 10:14–17; 12:6–8; 1Co 1:17; 4:1; 12:4–6, 27–31; 14:34–35; Eph 4:11–12; Phi 1:1; 1Ti 2:11–13; 3:2, 8; 4:13–14; 2Ti 2:2; 3:16; 5:17; Tit 1:5; Heb 13:17; 1Pe 2:9; 5:1–4; 1Jo 4:1–2.

<sup>161</sup> Lock, 35.

<sup>162</sup> Wallace, 244.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Tit 2:14; Heb 10:24; Phi 1:6. Note that in the first two cases, the plural is used distributively. Here the singular refers to the work of the ministry in aggregate. By the time of the writing of the New Testament, the distinction marked in Classical Greek (See esp. Plato, *Gorgias*. 474d–75d.) between καλός and ἀγαθός had become thoroughly blurred, such that the context selects the meaning.

<sup>164</sup> Wallace, 748.

use the slightly outdated English construction with “ought.” With the introduction of the potentiality, the question arises whether the qualifications that follow are truly prerequisite. The resolution of the question is found in the potentiality connotation expressed in *ἀνεπίλημπος*. Therein the idea of future assailing is held in potential. Whether a man should enter the ministry without meeting the qualifications is the focus. That a man could enter the ministry without meeting the qualifications is entirely foreseen and thus heads off any Donatism. Thus, the internal motive for disqualification and external motive for disqualification are here equally yoked.

The force of necessity is here not in the needing for the qualifications. If a man seeking the office should think, “These things I must do to enter the office,” then he believes the office to be a good work and not good work; there is a difference. “Good works are never so sinful as when we believe them to be good.”<sup>165</sup> The good work that must be done is not work redounding to the honor of the one doing the work, whether in part or in whole, but rather this good work, the ministry, requires the desire of the New Man in the individual, his heartfelt longing to do good for others as Christ has done for him. This is the difference between the profit motive and the prophet’s motive!

Paul employs an extended list structure of nonconvertible subset propositions with adjectives and adjectivals. These adjectives and adjectivals are all qualifications that will be examined and expected within the body. The pastor must be *ἀνεπίλημπος* within the congregation, within the body of believers he serves. In verse 7, Paul further expands *ἀνεπίλημπος* to include the *μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἔξωθεν*. The pastor must be unassailable from within and without. As Chrysostom notes, Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐνεδρεύεσθί ἔμελλε τὰ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, διὰ τοῦτο συμμετρημένην εἶπεν ἀρέτην, οὐκ ἐκείνην τὴν ἀνω τὴν ὑψηλὴν· τὸ γὰρ νηφάλιον εἶναι καὶ κόσμιον καὶ σώφρονα πολλῶν ἦν.—“But because the Churches were to be exposed to attacks, he requires not that superior and highly exalted virtue, but a moderate degree of it, for to be sober, of good behavior, and temperate, were qualities common to many.”<sup>166</sup>

What about false accusations or unsubstantiated accusations? Within a congregation, would a pastor remain *ἀνεπίλημπος* when false accusations or unsubstantiated accusations are leveled against him? Does it not seem that this might be a new vector of attack: Christian

<sup>165</sup> Quote of unknown origin, probably of Luther.

<sup>166</sup> Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (PG 62, 519). Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (*NPNF1* 13, 439).

leaders thrown not to the lions but to Facebook? The negative force of the adjective is not found in an attendant μή or οὐ, but rather in the privation of the α-privative. Ἀνεπίληπτος indicates that the pastor is not to be one who has not been blamed or is not blamed, but rather that he is one who is against whom no charge can rightly “stick.” Since the adjective addresses the situation within the congregation or calling body, false accusations and unsubstantiated accusations should never be entertained in the first place.<sup>167</sup>

Many take the list of adjectives and adjectivals in verses 2 through 6 to be explaining ἀνεπίληπτον, often giving no structural justification for this opinion. Lenski makes the interesting note that that the δέ in verse 7 should be taken as “introduc[ing] what may be termed the conclusion of the whole. It thus reverts to the very first predicate that an overseer in a congregation must be ‘irreproachable’.”<sup>168</sup> In essence, he identifies the δέ in verse 7 as a correlative conjunction and infers the correlation in this verse. While this theory provides the lacking structural justification, it is not at all clear how this inference could be proven; thus it is best to leave ἀνεπίληπτον as a simple, but contextually more significant, element of the list.

Whereas ἀνεπίληπτον is a very wide requirement, the next requirement, μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, is much more specific, but just how specific is the subject of much debate. Luther preferred to approach such phrases with the principle that the verse must fit the whole tenor of the text and indeed of the entire Bible understood according to the distinction of law and gospel. Such an interpretation is indeed called for, yet, for the sake of considering all the possibilities, a legalist hermeneutic brings more grist to the mill, i.e., a more comprehensive list of nuanced possibilities to consider.

Woods notes that there are at least eight possible meanings for the phrase and gives the reasoning, support and weaknesses of each:

#### 1. Marriage to the Church

This view holds that γυναικὸς is metaphorical, building on the bride picture of Eph 5:23. The pastor must be “married” to the Church. Woods opines that this view is often seen as arising from

---

<sup>167</sup> When the process of Christian discipline enjoined by Matthew 18 is followed, such false and unsubstantiated accusations generally do not stand. Nevertheless, a congregation can be hornswoggled by a group bent on evil, whose unfounded accusations create a situation in which no one in the congregation can hear the message of the gospel.

<sup>168</sup> Lenski, 589.

the heretical Roman discipline of priestly celibacy, citing Kent.<sup>169</sup> Regardless, this interpretation is plainly inconsistent with the historical-grammatical hermeneutic, since it is neither the obvious sense, nor is it contextual.

In Luther's comments on First Timothy, there is no doubt that he had the Roman discipline of priestly celibacy in mind. After appealing to the account of Paphnutius at the Council of Nicæa, who opposed the legislation of clerical celibacy, Luther writes, "Hence Paul calls it a 'doctrine of demons' and a 'pretension,' a lie, a departure from the faith, a false appearance, because it is directly contrary to the divine ordinance (1Ti 4:1-2). For Christ wants a minister of the Word to have a wife, but the pope does not."<sup>170</sup>

Alternatively, the pastor must be "married" to the Church in a metaphorical way that does not place any conditions on the pastor in regard to earthly marriage. Such an approach would result in an understanding of *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* that is not an observable qualification of any sort, but the list is clearly a list of requirements (*δεῖ*) with attendant observable behaviors. Thus this approach is ruled out contextually.

## 2. Monogamous marriage is mandatory.

Mindful of the argument following in Verses 4 and 5, and in view of 1Ti 4:3, which indicates that there were already false teachers advocating for celibacy, some hold that *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* requires that those seeking the office be married.

Ironside espouses this view: "Then he is said to be the 'husband of one wife.' It is amazing to think that in one of our greatest religious systems they hold that a clergyman of any character must have no wife. Scripture distinctly states that a bishop is to be 'the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach.'"<sup>171</sup>

Liddon opposes this view: "... this ignores *μίας*; is quite irreconcilable with I Cor. vii. 7; cf. St. Jer. *adv. Jovinian*, i. c. 34, *Si juxta sententiam Apostoli non erunt episcopi nisi mariti, ipse apostolus episcopus esse non debuit* [- if the Apostle's meaning be that marriage is necessary in a bishop, the Apostle himself ought not to have been a bishop.]" Jerome's argument, however, fails to observe

<sup>169</sup> Woods, 1.

<sup>170</sup> AE 29, 21. Luther here also appeals to 1Co 7:7 and 9:5 in his argument. See Hefele, 329 and 468, and *Ap. Const.* VI, 17, for more information about Paphnutius and his contribution to the early debate about clerical celibacy.

<sup>171</sup> Ironside, <http://www.studylight.org/commentaries/isn/1-timothy-3.html>.



that the ἐπισκοπή in verse 1 is not the same office as the office of apostle. The apostles were called immediately. Their lives, in many cases, did not conform to the requirements for the pastoral office listed in verses 2 through 6. For example, Simon the Zealot was, at one time, an avowed member of an organized group of Jews who employed what would be termed terrorist or guerilla methods.<sup>172</sup> Saul of Tarsus was complicit in the murder of Stephen and was actively engaged in persecuting the Christians when the Lord called him into the apostolic ministry.<sup>173</sup> Some of the apostles were married, others not.

Luther's quote in point 1 above continues, "... some argue that it is not permissible for a bishop to live as a celibate. Paul does not force either marriage or celibacy upon anyone."<sup>174</sup> Luther understood 1 Co 7:7 and 9:5 to be indicating that marriage was an honorable estate for lay and clergy alike, and thus for him μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα was to be understood not as a rule about clergy marriage but as a qualification regarding the qualities needed in one who would occupy the office.

Paul encourages the unmarried Corinthians to continue in their celibacy during that time of distress, and that encouragement seems likewise inconsistent with the thought that marriage is mandatory for pastors.<sup>175</sup>

### 3. Monogamous marriage only once with no remarriage possible

"Tertullian and the Montanists interpreted 1 Timothy 3:2 as a prohibition on second marriages. The *Apostolic Constitutions* permitted a married man to be ordained. ... Other portions of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and *Apostolic Canons* attempted to exclude remarried widowers from church office."<sup>176</sup>

Much is made of marriage being a picture of the connection of Christ the Bridegroom and His Church. The Church is united in the one body of Christ, and thus the picture of the two being made one flesh in marriage is to remain inviolate. While it is certainly true that this picture, presented by God Himself to mankind in His Word, is to be cherished, so that love, and ultimately Christ, is seen within the marriage, this does not prohibit a widower from remarrying. The picture is not somehow broken by the mortality of

<sup>172</sup> Act 1:13; Luk 6:15.

<sup>173</sup> Act 9.

<sup>174</sup> *AE* 29, 21.

<sup>175</sup> 1 Co 7:8, 25–33.

<sup>176</sup> Woods, 5.



the first wife or the desire of the widower to be married again. In fact, Paul speaks to the legitimate remarriage of a widow directly in Rom 7:1–3 and 1 Co 7:39; presumably the same applies to widowers. Paul does in fact argue obliquely in favor of the remarriage of widower pastors in verse 4. Good governance of the household is desirable, looked for in a pastor and needed, and it is not a stretch to imagine a situation wherein a widower pastor with young children should certainly remarry.

Liddon wrote, “The antithesis of *μᾶς* is not ‘none,’ but ‘two’ or ‘many.’”<sup>177</sup> Some have taken this in support of the view that no remarriage is possible, but by this statement, Liddon is not unduly limiting the available antitheses, but rather is working to dispel the false binary argument. Some, however, conclude from his statement: while marriage is, therefore, not mandatory for the *ἐπίσκοπος*, plural marriage and successive marriage are both ruled out on the basis of the number of wives. Concluding such from this particular statement of Liddon is misconstrual, because he does not contend that counting (wives or marriages) is the idea inherent in *μᾶς* in the context.<sup>178</sup>

#### 4. Monogamous marriage with no prior divorce

This view is, in a sense a continuation of the previous. While it is certainly true that God hates divorce, the idea can be taken too far when the picture is imagined to be of equal or greater practical importance than that which is pictured, as, for example Judaism did with the pictures presented in the ceremonial law. When the importance of marriage is inappropriately magnified, divorce becomes an unforgivable stain, despite what the rest of God’s Word has to say about the matter. In turn, *μᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* is then forced into the Pharisaical mold to make it to prohibit such “sinful, divorced men” from entering the ministry.

<sup>177</sup> Liddon, 27.

<sup>178</sup> Liddon does, however, conclude, “The true estimate of a second marriage is expressed by Clement Alex. *Strom.* Iii. c. 12 [sic]: οὐ γὰρ κεκάλθται πρὸς τοῦ νόμου, οὐ πληροὶ δὲ τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείας τὴν κατ’ ἐπίτασιν τελειότητα [- (for it was not forbidden by the Law), but he does not fulfil the heightened perfection of the gospel ethic.]” (Liddon, 26f). Liddon also provides a useful list of patristic references here: “On the consideration due to lay Christians who have married again, see St. Epiphanius, *Hær.* 48; St. Cyril Jerus. *Catech.* iv. 26. That ‘digami’ were excluded from all orders of the Ministry in the ancient Church, cf. *Const. Apost.* vi. 17; Origen, *Hom.* 17, in *Luc.*; Tertullian, *de Exhort. Castite.* c. 7; St. Augustine, *de Bono Conjug.* c. 18; St. Jerome, *Ep. ad Ageruch.* cxxiii. 6.”

While this argument concerning *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* is manifestly unscriptural and invalid, Paul does make an actual argument about divorced men entering the ministry in verse 4. The pastor should know how to govern his household, and divorce often indicates that a man has difficulty in governing, but not always. It has certainly happened that a pastor's wife has walked away from him for inscrutable reasons. It has certainly happened that the temptation to adultery has ensnared a pastor's wife, sometimes attended by such an irreversible condition that the marriage bond is irrevocably broken.

At first glance, the view that divorced men may not serve would seem to be the position that Schuetze and Habeck take in the widely used *Shepherd in Christ*: "In the two chief passages concerning the qualifications of a pastor it is taken for granted that in general he will be a married man, the husband of one wife. This rules out not only bigamy, but also premarital and extramarital relations, but not remarriage in the event of a wife's death."<sup>179</sup> Note that they are silent here on the matter of remarriage after divorce. Commenting on the qualifications of the pastor, Valleskey holds that "While once again the interpretation 'married only once' fits grammatically, it does not square with the rest of Scriptures, which do permit the 'innocent' party in a divorce to remarry (Mat 19:9; 1Co 7:15) and do permit a person to remarry upon the death of his spouse (Rom 7:1-3; 1Co 7:39)."<sup>180</sup>

#### 5. Married only once with no post-conversion divorce

This variation appeals to the theory behind the preceding two views with the twist that a man's sins committed before conversion are somehow excusable after his conversion and thus in the consideration of the man's eligibility for service in the office. This theory is nothing more than a nascent form of Donatism attempting to find an exception to an underlying Pharisaism. Ultimately, the argument against this view is the same as for the previous two views.

#### 6. Monogamous marriage (vs. polygamous marriage)

It goes without saying that monogamy is God's pattern for marriage, even though the Old Testament is replete with

<sup>179</sup> Armin W. Schuetze and Irwin J. Habeck, 7.

<sup>180</sup> Valleskey, "The Victory of Christ For the Pastor and His Own Personal Warfare in the Light of 1 Timothy 3:1-7," 2

examples of polygamous Christians.<sup>181</sup> Some understand *μίας γυναικός* to mean “monogamous.” Chrysostom writes, Δεῖ οὖν, φησί, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μίας γυναικός ἄνδρα. Οὐ νομοθετῶν τοῦτό φησιν, ὡς μὴ εἶναι ἐξὸν ἄνευ τούτου γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμετρίαν καλύων· Ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξῆν καὶ δευτέρους ὁμιλεῖν γάμος.—“A Bishop then,’ he says, ‘must be blameless, the husband of one wife.’ This he does not lay down as a rule, as if he must not be without one, but as prohibiting his having more than one. For even the Jews were allowed to contract second marriages, and even to have two wives at one time.”<sup>182</sup> Surprisingly, Calvin concurs.<sup>183</sup>

In 1 Ti 5:9, Paul writes, *Χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγυῖα, ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή*,—“Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age, having been the *wife of one husband*,” Since polyandry was not practiced, it is that *μίας γυναικός* means monogamous.

7. Moral boyfriend/fiancé/husband who is faithful to his girlfriend/fiancée/wife

This view is supported by a somewhat obscure grammatical point: “Sometimes with a noun which the context proves to be definite the article is not used. This places stress upon the qualitative aspect of the noun rather than its mere identity. An object of thought may be conceived of from two points of view: as to identity or quality. To convey the first point of view the Greek uses the article; for the second the anarthrous construction is used.”<sup>184</sup> Thus *μίας γυναικός* should be considered adjectival and the phrase rendered with “a one-woman man” rather than “husband of one wife.”

8. Moral husband who has always been faithful to his girlfriend/fiancée/wife

This view holds—without textual justification—that the qualification applies to the man throughout his life. Lenski notes, “In those days [first century] mature men were chosen for the eldership, who, as a rule, were married and had families. . . . The bulk of the membership from which the elders had to be chosen had come

<sup>181</sup> Gen 1:26–28, 31; 2:24; Mat 19:4–6; 1 Co 7:8–17; Eph 5:21–33; 1 Ti 1:10 [a sign of the times]; Heb 13:1–5.

<sup>182</sup> Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (PG 62.547); Chrysostom, Homily X on First Timothy (NPNF1 13.438).

<sup>183</sup> Calvin, 77.

<sup>184</sup> Dana and Mantey, §149.

from paganism. . . . Converts to the gospel did not at once step into perfect sexual purity.”<sup>185</sup>

The number of permutations represented doubles when the condition of fatherhood is required. Paul employs in verse 4 the argument that the man's ability to govern the congregation is reflected in his ability to govern his own household. In order to draw the two situations into parallel to make the argument, it is necessary for him to consider a household wherein children submit to the father, but this rhetorical maneuver certainly cannot be pressed to enjoin the requirement of marriage upon the *ἐπίσκοπος*, since the recipient himself is a young, presumably unmarried man.

The assumption that *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* is idiomatic leads to the idea that there is a certain and specific referent meaning for the phrase. Much harm and confusion has resulted from borrowing an idiomatic construction from or reflecting a phrase or idea particular to the destination language. On the one hand, if one assumes that *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* means “husband of one wife,” marriage becomes a requirement for the ministry,” but on the other hand, if it means “husband of but one wife,” then polygamy or remarriage is prohibited. Finally, if the phrase is translated “husband of at most one wife” then marriage is not required. The difficulty with all of these examples is in the over-specificity forced upon *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα* by the circumstances of the destination language, circumstances which most likely were not experienced in the same manner by those speaking the origin language. The unprecedented frequency of contemporary irregularities in marital relationships impels the reader to overspecify meaning. The possibility, however, that the phrase is a purposely less exacting construction must not be overlooked. Insofar as possible, the exegete must examine the text from outside the current cultural biases, preferably with an eye to how the phrase lines up with other similar constructs in the corpus of literature surrounding the phrase.

As many note, in the Early Church, against the backdrop of gnostic dualism, the increase of the assertion that tradition is a valid source of doctrine and the rising tide of asceticism demonstrably and progressively narrowed the understood meaning of *μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*. Liddon writes, “The later condemnation of a second marriage, as *εὐπρεπῆς μοιχεία* [lit. “decent adultery”] (Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, c. 33), goes beyond the Apostolic teaching; as does the Montanistic language of

---

<sup>185</sup> Lenski, 580ff.

Tertullian, *de Monogamia*, c. 12.”<sup>186</sup> Lenski notes, “The fact that Origen stoutly affirms this is not strange when we remember that he castrated himself; his exegesis is dominated by his peculiar asceticism.”<sup>187</sup> There is no clear scriptural basis for this progressive narrowing.

Lenski argues, “Others conclude that remarriage is here forbidden because they think that ‘one husband’s wife’ which occurs in 5:9 refers to a widow who had never had more than one husband. But the two passages are identical in wording, their sense is entirely the same so that we are able to get nothing out of the one that is not already contained in the other.” In light of the well-attested, residual polygamy still practiced by the Jews, and the conspicuous absence of polyandry in the historical records of the time, Lenski’s argument fails to resolve the question.<sup>188</sup>

The best argument ruling out a prohibition on remarriage, even remarriage of the divorced, is found in John 4. Jesus agrees, in fact strongly, that the woman at the well of Sychar does not have a husband, even though she has had five husbands: λέγει αὐτῇ· Ὑπαγε φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου καὶ ἐλθέ ἐνθάδε. ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνὴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Καλῶς εἶπας ὅτι Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω· πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες, καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστιν σου ἀνὴρ· τοῦτο ἀληθές εἶρηκας.—“Jesus said to her, ‘Go, call your husband, and come here.’ The woman answered him, ‘I have no husband.’ Jesus said to her, ‘You are right in saying, “I have no husband”; for you have had five husbands, and the one you now have is not your husband. What you have said is true.’”<sup>189</sup> If a man loses his wife to death or divorce, he has no wife according to this manner of counting. If he marries again after the loss of his first wife, then he has one, not two wives. The phrase μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα should not be understood to be addressing the issue of remarriage, but rather the relationship that the man has within his marriage presently or the relationship that he will endeavor to build with a woman in the future. The husband should have eyes for no other woman than his wife. Those in the office must endeavor to “lead a chaste and decent life in word and deed,” not only

<sup>186</sup> Liddon, 26.

<sup>187</sup> Lenski, 580.

<sup>188</sup> See Justin Martyr, *Tryph.* c. 134: οἵτινες καὶ μέχρι νῦν καὶ τέσσαρας καὶ πέντε ὑμᾶς γυναῖκας ἕκαστον συγχωροῦσι—“who even till this time permit each man to have four or five wives.” Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. l. 2 is of lesser value in this argument, since it deals with marriages and betrothals in Herod’s family. Chrysostom writes, “This he does not lay down as a rule, as if he must not be without one, but as prohibiting his having more than one. For even the Jews were allowed to contract second marriages, and even to have two wives at one time. For ‘marriage is honorable’” (*NPNF1* 13.438).

<sup>189</sup> Joh 4:16–18.

because it is enjoined upon every Christian, but especially as a blameless example to the flock.<sup>190</sup>

The choice of phrase certainly rules out polygamy, which was still practiced among the Jews, though it was forbidden by Roman law.<sup>191</sup> Yet, the choice of phrase also seems to prevent any theory ruling out remarriage on the basis of these words, since specific alternative phrases were certainly available, e.g., ἀπαξ γεγάμεν, μὴ δις γεγαμηκότα, or γυναικὶ συνεζευγμένον.<sup>192</sup> The widening of the idea to encompass sexual immorality in general is not textual, but it is obviously contextual. "Among you there must not be a hint of sexual immorality. . . ." <sup>193</sup> Any instruction to those seeking to enter the ministry must surely contain this component, though not on the basis of μίᾱς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα.

Some assert that Paul's *a minore ad maius* argument, particularly in verse 4, requires that those in the office be married with children, presumably so that the quality of their leadership in the family can be assessed. The issue is somewhat clouded in modern thinking by the normalizing of birth control; marriage in the abstract was simply not separable from the idea of childbearing to the first century world. But must a man even be married in order to be unassailable in the office? A marriage requirement hardly seems likely, given that no mention is made whatsoever of Timothy marrying, though this is an *argumentum ex silentio*.<sup>194</sup> Nor does the fact that Peter was married clinch the argument, since apostles were clearly in an office apart.<sup>195</sup> Paul clearly commends marriage to every man, except those rare ones to whom God has granted unusual self-control over the lusts of the flesh or whose circumstances do not permit marriage.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>190</sup> *SC*, Sixth Commandment.

<sup>191</sup> Lock, 36; Not until A.D. 212 is there record in Roman law regarding polygamous marriage among the Jews: the *lex Antoniana de civitate* excepts Jews from the general prohibition on polygamy. There are, however, extant Hellenistic marriage contracts, showing that polygamy was not common among the first century B.C. Greeks either. See Knight, 158.

<sup>192</sup> Zahn, 121. So-called "serial monogamy" is the idea of remarriage after remarriage for the sake of changing partners. This idea is clearly excluded from consideration on the basis of Mal 2:16, *et al.*

<sup>193</sup> Eph 5:3.

<sup>194</sup> The putative tradition of handing out wives with the calls at seminary graduation was quite a joke at the mid-century, yet there was some serious sentiment behind the wry humor, e.g., the marriage of the Rev. E. Edgar Guenther and Minnie Guenther on the way to what would become the Wisconsin Synod's White Mountain Apache mission (Mr. Albert Rovey, conversation of March 21, 2017).

<sup>195</sup> Mat 8:14.

<sup>196</sup> 1Co 7:2, 8, 9.

Lenski notes that Timothy was probably one of the youngest candidates, one of the first of the second spiritual generation after the apostles. Most of the pastors of the church of Paul's day would have been chosen from among older, proven members. Only later were young men educated specifically for the office.<sup>197</sup>

The “next three qualifications look at the worker in relation to no one else or outside influence.”<sup>198</sup> Νηφάλιον is a later spelling of the adjective νηφαλέος derived from νήφω. In Classical Greek, the word meant “not mixed with wine,” but the Koine use admits a much wider domain. The same word is used at Tit 2:2, but is in a nearly identical context. The verb νήφω is used in 1Th 5:6, 8; 2Ti 4:5; 1Pe 1:1; 4:7 and 5:8. In 1Th 5:6, ἀλλά makes the strong contrast of καθεύδωμεν—“those who are asleep” against γρηγορώμεν καὶ νήφωμεν—“let us keep awake and be sober.” While the original meaning of νηφάλιον does indicate the opposite of drunkenness, the meaning of this adjective—as with “sober” in English—was expanded to include the composite of the opposites of the behaviors typically associated with drunkenness, i.e., sleepiness, impulsiveness, foolishness, lack of control, etc.<sup>199</sup> Also, since both νήφαλιος and σώφρων are used and both can mean sobriety relative to drunkenness, it is highly unlikely that both are used in this same sense. Thus, the word is accurately translated with “temperate” or “sober,” the meaning both in 1Th 5:6 and the verse under consideration. 2Ti 4:5 commands νήφε ἐν πάσιν—“be temperate/sober in connection with all things.” While it could be argued that ἐν πάσιν is responsible for expanding the domain of νήφε, either in connection with all things or at all times, the inclusion of μὴ πάροινον in 1Ti 3:3 conclusively proves that the semantic domain of νηφάλιον must exceed the core meaning of sobriety with respect to intoxicant consumption, since Paul's list would clearly not be furthered by such close synonyms. Paul is enumerating various, differing requirements.

In 1Pe 4:7 also, σώφρων and νήφαλιος are juxtaposed: Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς—“The end of all things is at hand; therefore be self-controlled and sober-minded for the sake of your prayers.” 1Pe 4:2f contrasts ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίας—“human passions” with θελήματι θεοῦ—“the will of God.” Human passions lead to debauchery: “lewdness, lusts, drunkenness, revelries, drinking parties

<sup>197</sup> Lenski, 580.

<sup>198</sup> Faught, 4.

<sup>199</sup> BAGD indicates that the semantic domain had already experienced considerable expansion in Aristotle's day and in the *Epistle of Aristeia*. See also the use of νήφω in 1Th 5:6; 2Ti 4:5 and 1Th 5:7–8.



and abominable idolatries.” The self-denial of following the path laid out by human passions is the idea behind *σώφρων* and *νήφαλιος*.

The difference between *σώφρων* and *νήφαλιος* can be seen in Luk 8:35: ἐξήλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εἶρον καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ’ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξήλθεν ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.—“Then people went out to see what had happened, and they came to Jesus and found the man from whom the demons had gone, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and *in his right mind*, and they were afraid.” *Σώφρων* exhibits a noetic connotation that *νήφαλιος* does not have. *Σώφρων* means sober in the sense of self-controlled.<sup>200</sup> *Νήφαλιος* means sober in the sense of temperate or even-keeled and thus not exhibiting the behaviors that attend upon drunkenness.

The next adjective, *κόσμιον*, is juxtaposed with *σώφρων* in the phrase *ζήσαντα σωφρόνως καὶ κοσμίως*—“lived soberly and respectably/modestly” in three ancient Carian inscriptions and a Lycian inscription.<sup>201</sup> The combination appears to have been used as a conventional part of an epitaph.

Philo (c. 20 B.C.–A.D. 40) wrote, ἢ τοῖς μὲν μηδὲν ἡμαρτηκόσιν, ἕως ἂν ἀπολούσωνται καὶ περιρρανάμενοι καθαρθῶσι τοῖς εἰωθόσι καθαρσίσι, ἄβρατος ὁ νεὼς ἐστὶ, τοὺς δὲ ἐνόχους ἀνεκπλύτοις ἄγεσιν, ὧν τὰ μιάσματα οὐδεὶς ἀπονίψει χρόνος, ἄξιον ἐπιφοιτᾶν καὶ ἐνδιατριβεῖν τοῖς ἔδεσιν, οὐς οὐδ’ ἂν οἰκία δέξαιτο κοσμίῳ ἀνδρῶν οἷς μέλει τῶν ὁσίων;—“If those who have committed no sin are forbidden access to the sanctuary, until they have bathed and purged themselves with purifying water according to the

<sup>200</sup> Cf. Mar 5:15; Rom 12:3; 2Co 5:13; 1Th 5:6, 8; 1Ti 2:9, 15; 2Ti 1:7, 4:5; Tit 1:8; 2:2, 5; 2:2–6.

<sup>201</sup> The following inscriptions are labeled by their designations in the Searchable Greek Inscriptions database: “Κυρεῖνα Πωλλίωνα Ἡρκουλιανόν ζήσαντα σωφρόνως καὶ κοσμίως. Κλαυδία Ἐπιγόνου” Magnesia 244 [Honorary inscription by boule, demos, and gerousia (of Magnesia Mai.) for Tiberius Claudius Pollio; 1; found at Magnesia Mai.: Kondoleon, Anektd. Mikras. Epigr. 8, no. 7; \*IMagnesia 162.] URL: <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/260685?hs=244-262>; θέντα ἔλαιον δι’ ὅλης ἡμέρας, ζήσαντα σωφρόνως καὶ κοσμίως Tralles 182 [Honorary/funerary inscription for Tiberius Claudius Ep[ig]onianos by boule, demos, and gerousia, on marble base; 1/2; found at Tralles: Sterrett, MDAI(A) 8, 1883, 318–319, no. 2; Sterrett, Inscriptions of Tralles no. 2; Pappakonstantinou, Hai Tralleis no. 18; \*ITralles 75.] URL: <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/263032?hs=389-407>; ... ζήσαντα σωφρόνως καὶ σεμνῶς καὶ ἀωαλογοῦν- I. Kaunos 73 [Posthumous dedication for a priest of Nike and Zeus Olympios. Base of light gray marble with upper and lower moldings. Caria-Kaunos (Dalyan, nr.)-Rom. Imp. period] URL: <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/345137?hs=102-120>, τῶν Σεβαστῶν Κυανειτῶν τῆς πόλεως, ζήσαντα σωφρόνως καὶ κοσμίως ἀξίως τοῦ γένους α[ὐ]- TAM II 773 [Lycia, E.-Arneai-Rom. Imp. period] URL: <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/284663?hs=337-357>.



customary rites, is it fitting that the sacred building should be the resort and abode of men labouring under the curse of ineffaceable crimes, the pollution of which no length of time will wash away—men who would not be admitted into the dwelling houses of *decent men* who take any thought for what the law of holiness permits or forbids?” Κοσμίωv ἀνδρῶv is the broad opposite to “men labouring under the curse of ineffaceable crimes.”<sup>202</sup>

The word appears in Ecc 12:9:

וַיְהִי קְהֵלֶת חֲכָם עוֹד לְמַדְדֵּת אֶת־הָעַם וְאִזְנוֹ וְחִקְרֵת תְּקִן  
מְשָׁלִים הַרְבֵּה׃

- Καὶ περισσὸν ὅτι ἐγένετο Ἐκκλησιαστῆς σοφός, ἔτι ἐδίδαξεν γνῶσιν σὺν τὸν λαόν, καὶ οὖς ἐξιχνιάσεται κόσμιον παραβολῶν—“Besides being wise, the Preacher also taught the people knowledge, weighing and studying and arranging many proverbs with great care.” The idea of orderliness of thought was connected with κόσμιον.

Bengel’s oft-quoted statement, “*Quod sōphron est intus, id κόσμιος est extra.*—What sobriety is within, good behavior is without,” is best understood in light of his elaboration: “*Homo novus festum quiddam est, et abhorrer ab omni eo quod pollutum, confusum, inconditum, immoderatum, vehemens, dissolutum, affectdram, tetricum, perperum, lacerum, sordidum est: ipsi necessitati naturae materiaeque, quae ingerendo, digerendo, egerendo agitatur, parce et dissimulanter paret, corporisque corruptibilis recta habet vestigid.*—The new man is something sacred, and shrinks from every species of pollution, confusion, disorder, excess, violence, laxity, assumption, harshness, depravity, mutilation, meanness; he sparingly and privately obeys the necessity of nature and of material food and keeps all the traces of the corruptible body concealed.”<sup>203</sup> Thus κόσμιος describes the outward dignity and modesty that arise from an orderly, sober mind and is the narrow opposite of ἀτακτος.<sup>204</sup> Taken together, νηφάλιον, σῶφρονα, and κόσμιον, describe a man “whose whole make-up [is] ‘orderly,’ spiritually, mentally, and in his habits.”<sup>205</sup>

The other two adjectives in the verse, φιλόξενον and διδασκτικόν, are considerably less nuanced. Φιλόξενον appears in 1Ch 12:3 (LXX); 1Ti 5:10; Rom 12:13; Heb 13:2; 1Pe 4:9; and 3Jo 5f. It is clear that this compound word is true to the meaning of the parts, but additional cultural context must be supplied to complete the meaning. Xenophon

<sup>202</sup> Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus*, 529ff.

<sup>203</sup> Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, 823. Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament*, 518. See Trench, 345, for a very thorough listing of primary sources.

<sup>204</sup> Lock, 38.

<sup>205</sup> Lenski, 583.

(III B.C.) writes, κάκεινος μέντοι ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν χρημάτων τήν τε ἄκραν φυλάττων διέσωζεν αὐτοῖς καὶ τᾶλλα διοικῶν ἀπελογίζετο κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. καὶ ὅποτε μὲν ἐνδείσειε, παρ' ἑαυτοῦ προσετίθει, ὅποτε δὲ περιγένοιτο τῆς προσόδου, ἀπελάμβανεν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἄλλως φιλόξενός τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς τὸν Θετταλικὸν τρόπον.—“And [Polydamas of Pharsalus] did, in fact, use these funds to guard the Acropolis and keep it safe for them, and likewise to administer their other affairs, rendering them an account yearly. And whenever there was a deficit he made it up from his own private purse, and whenever there was a surplus of revenue he paid himself back. Besides, he was hospitable and magnificent, after the Thessalian manner.”<sup>206</sup>

In the corpus, φιλόξενον simply meant “hospitality (toward strangers or outsiders),” but the meaning is narrowed in the scriptural context. Christians are to be hospitable to Christian strangers and traveling preachers—with the exception of those teaching false doctrine—and the ἐπίσκοπος is to be especially loving toward these outsiders, who are brothers by faith.<sup>207</sup> An especially beautiful picture of this idea is found in *Shepherd of Hermas*: “*De decimo vero monte, in quo arbores erant tegentes pecora: tales sunt qui crediderunt quidam episcopi, id est praesides Ecclesiarum. Alii vero, hi lapides, qui non ficto, sed alacri animo semper in domos suas servos Dei receperunt*—Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ δεκάτου, οὗ ἦσαν δένδρα σκεπάζοντα πρόβατά τινα οἱ πιστεύσαντες τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν: ἐπίσκοποι φιλόξενοι, οἵτινες ἠδέως εἰς τοὺς οἴκους ἑαυτῶν.—And from the tenth mountain, where were trees which overshadowed certain sheep, they who believed were the following: bishops given to hospitality, who always gladly received into their houses the servants of God, without dissimulation.”<sup>208</sup>

Assessing the meaning of διδακτικόν is complicated only by its rarity. The word also appears in a few rather obscure works and in Philo's *De Praemiis et Poenis*: ὁ μὲν οὖν ἡγεμῶν τῆς θεοφιλοῦς δόξης, ὁ πρῶτος ἐκ τύφου μεθορμισάμενος πρὸς ἀλήθειαν, διδακτικῆ χρησάμενος ἀρετῆ πρὸς τελείωσιν, ἄθλον αἴρεται τὴν πρὸς θεὸν πίστιν.—“The leader in adopting the godly creed, who first passed over from vanity to truth, came to his consummation by virtue gained *through instruction*, and he received for his reward belief in God”<sup>209</sup> The word also appears in 2Ti 2:24: δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἤπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδακτικόν, ἀνεξίκακον. ...—“And the Lord's servant must not be quarrelsome but kind to everyone, *able to teach*, patiently enduring evil ...” where the context

<sup>206</sup> Xen. Hell. 6.1.3.

<sup>207</sup> Rom 16:17.

<sup>208</sup> *Sancti Hermæ* (PG 2:1004). Lightfoot, 394. *Shepherd of Hermas* (ANF 2:52).

<sup>209</sup> Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis*, 326ff.

indicates that *διδασκτικός* does not connote skillfulness in teaching but rather readiness to teach. The lack of a precise English term for “ready/willing/apt to teach” means that a circumlocution is required to render the term. Traditionally, the phrase “apt to teach” has been employed, but apt can connote a certain level of skill, e.g., “He is an apt teacher.” To avoid this confusion, it is perhaps better to employ the translation “able to teach,” as does the English Standard Version, or even “ready to teach.” Unfortunately, the English cognate “didactic” is overloaded with a number of connotations that make it unsuitable.

*Verse 3—μή πάροινον, μή πλήκτην, ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικῆ, ἄμαχον, ἀφιλάργυρον,*

While Paul expresses in verse 2 qualities that are required for the ministry, in verse 3 he turns his attention to flaws that a pastor must not have. This verse is, in fact, an excellent study in a few of the finer points of negation in the Greek language. The use of *μή* to negate the first two elements expresses a different kind of negation than the  $\alpha$ -privative prefixed to the last two. *Πάροινον* and *πλήκτην* both implicitly express actions, and *μή* is used to negate the action or some aspect of the action.

In 1Co 6:10, Paul chooses the word *μέθυσος* to mean drunkard; his choice hearkens to Pro 23:21 and 26:9 and focuses attention on the dismal state of drunkenness. Luke used the word *οἰνοπότης* in Luk 7:34 to focus attention on the action of drinking. Here the choice of the less common word, with its preposition-derived prefix, angles the reader toward the habitual aspect.<sup>210</sup> The *παρά* prefix also connotes a certain secretiveness.<sup>211</sup> Thus the *ἐπίσκοπος* is not to be a tippler, i.e., a habitual drinker. That the *ἐπίσκοπος* should not be found in the state of drunkenness is made clear by the rest of the context, but no Pharisaical prohibition is laid upon a pastor being found in the company of drunkards as was proposed in Luk 7:34. Let Jesus' words in Luk 7:35 and Paul's

<sup>210</sup> This use of *πάροινος* is illustrative of the drifting of semantic domain. In Classical Greek, *πάροινος* was often used to emphasize the state of drunkenness and not the habit. The meaning was already expanded by Aristotle's time. In the first century, examples abound of a purposeful re-emphasis on the meaning of *πάρα* in the compound noun: being alongside wine, even in bed, married to it. In the second century, Lucian purposely wrote affectedly in the style of Classical Greek, even the Attic dialect, and likewise employed the earlier meaning. His popularity seems to have moved the connotation back from the emphasis on the habitual drinking.

<sup>211</sup> Robertson notes that *παρεισάγω* in 2Pe 2:1, *παρεισδύω* in Jud 4, and *παρείσακτος* in Gal 2:4 all have a secretive aspect. He also notes a counterexample in *παρεισέρχομαι* in Rom 5:20, but the semantic domain of this word is strongly shifted by its frequent use in military and judicial contexts. See App. BC 3.10, Diod. 12.27, Plb. 1.7 for evidence of this shifting. See Plut. Pel. 9 for a use that does have the secretive aspect.

in 1Co 15:33 be the guide in such situations: *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*.—"And wisdom is justified by all her children," that is, the gospel is even for the drunks and drug-addled and has won over His own even from among them, and *μὴ πλανᾶσθε· φθειροῦσιν ἦθη χρηστὰ ὀμίλια κακαί*.—"Do not be deceived: 'Evil company corrupts good habits.'"

Jerome (A.D. 347–420; feast day September 30) wrote to Julius Nepotianus, "*Nunquam vinum redoleas, ne audias illud Philosophi: Hoc non est osculum porrigere, sed vinum propinare. Vinolentos Sacerdotes et Apostolus damnat, et vetus lex prohibet (Levit. 10). ... Quidquid inebriat, et statum mentis evertit, fuge similiter ut vinum. Nec hoc dico, quod Dei a nobis creatura damnetur (siquidem et Dominus vini potator est appellatus (Matth. 11): et Timotheo dolenti stomachum, modica vini sorbitio relaxata est (1. Tim. 5), sed modum pro ætatis, et valetudinis et corporum qualitate exigimus in potando*.—Let your breath never smell of wine, lest the philosopher's words be said to you, 'Instead of offering me a kiss, you are giving me a taste of wine.' Priests given to wine are both condemned by the apostle and forbidden by the old law. ... Whatever intoxicates and disturbs the balance of the individual, avoid as you would wine. I do not say that we are to condemn what is a creature of God. The Lord himself was called a 'wine-bibber,' and wine in moderation was allowed to Timothy because of his weak stomach. I only require that drinkers should observe that limit which their age, their health or their constitution requires."<sup>212</sup>

Some have wondered whether *πάροις* must necessarily be attached to the consumption of wine. (NB: Thank goodness Paul does not write *μὴ παράζυθος* or *μὴ παράμπυρα* [not a beer swiller]!) Wine certainly was the intoxicant of choice of the Greeks, and even though beer is only very rarely mentioned, it was well known to the Greeks.<sup>213</sup> Opium and other

<sup>212</sup> Jerome, Epistola LII (*PL* 22:536). Jerome, Letters 52 (*NPNF2* 6:94).

<sup>213</sup> *WA* 26, 49; *AE* 28, 286: "*Scribit grecis, ubi non est cerevisia*.—Paul is writing to Greeks, where there is no beer." (Ach, du Schande! Could he even bring himself to say it German? *ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λήρος τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα*—"it seemed to them that these words were pure nonsense." [Luk 24:11]); Xen. *Anab.* 4.5.26–27: *οἶνος κριθίνος ἐν κρατήρῃσιν. Ἐνήσαν δὲ καὶ αὐτὰ αἱ κριθαὶ ἰσοχειλεῖς, καὶ κάλαμοι ἐνέκειωτο, οἱ μὲν μείζους οἱ δὲ ἐλάττους, γόνατα οὐκ ἔχοντες· τούτους ἔδει ὅποτε τις διψῶν λαβόντα εἰς τὸ στόμα μύζειν. Καὶ πάλυ ἀκατος ἦν, εἰ μὴ τις ὕδωρ ἐπιχέοι· καὶ πάλυ ἡδὺ συμμαθόντι τὸ πῶμα ἦν*.—"Here were also wheat, barley, and beans, and barleywine in large bowls. Floating on the top of this drink were the barley-grains and in it were straws, some larger and others smaller, without joints; and when one was thirsty, he had to take these straws into his mouth and suck. It was an extremely strong drink unless one diluted it with water, and extremely good when one was used to it."

intoxicants were described by Pliny the Elder and others.<sup>214</sup> Πάροινος here is chosen to connote the habitual aspect. While the word would not be chosen in a discussion of other intoxicants, the connotation would certainly carry. 1Co 6:12 clarifies, Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει· πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπὸ τινος.—“All things are lawful for me, but all things are not helpful. All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.”<sup>215</sup>

Πλήκτης onomatopoeically conjures the sound of an angry, repeated striking with the fist. This is not the dutiful striking in battle, but rather the outrageous kind of striking that arises from violent tendencies.<sup>216</sup> Most certainly, the ἐπίσκοπος must not be given to trying to resolve disputes by fisticuffs, but the larger semantic domain of πλήκτης must be invoked, since the list enumerates facets of the required character of the ἐπίσκοπος and is not a description of his actions but of attitudes. A pastor ought not be “*mordax, percussit lingua*—a snappish person who lashes out with his tongue.”<sup>217</sup> He must not be a pugnacious bully. As Peter writes, μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου—“not domineering over those in your charge, but being examples to the flock.”<sup>218</sup>

Μὴ πλήκτης is a most important, practical qualification for the ἐπίσκοπος. His duty is to preach God's Word and not his opinion. In order to be able to do that duty, he must refrain at all times from expressing his thoughts in favor of the words of eternal life. Sometimes so-called “best practices” are not so in the context of a particular parish, social group, or culture. It is incumbent upon the pastor to be so very pleasantly flexible on such matters and absolutely, unabashedly firm in matters where the Word of God is clear. How difficult it is to separate these situations in that internal conflict between Adam and the New Man!

Placing μὴ πάροινον and μὴ πλήκτην together is likely not intended for structural effect, but rather arises often in the Greek corpus and

<sup>214</sup> Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*, 115.

<sup>215</sup> Note the connection with μέθυσος in 1Co 6:10.

<sup>216</sup> Aristotle, *Eud. Eth.* 2, 1221b: λέγω δ' οἷον ὀξύθυμος μὲν τῷ θάττον πάσχειν ἢ δεῖ, χαλεπὸς δὲ καὶ θυμῶδης τῷ μᾶλλον, πικρὸς δὲ τῷ φυλακτικὸς εἶναι τῆς ὀργῆς, πλήκτης δὲ καὶ λοιδορητικὸς ταῖς κολάσει ταῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς.—“I mean for instance that a man is called quick-tempered from feeling the emotion of anger sooner than he ought, harsh and passionate from feeling it more than he ought, bitter from having a tendency to cherish his anger, *violent* and abusive owing to the acts of retaliation to which his anger gives rise.”

<sup>217</sup> *WA* 26, 52ff. *AE* 28, 286.

<sup>218</sup> 1Pe 5:3.

thinking, because physical and verbal violence so often follows drinking to excess.<sup>219</sup> The pair is almost idiomatic. Similarly, the pairing of σώφρονα with μὴ πάροιον and κόσμιον with μὴ πλήκτην is likely not intended for structural effect, but meant conceptually to pare down the possibilities to the balanced characteristics that Paul has in mind.

Ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικὴ is a parenthetical interjection that counterbalances μὴ πλήκτην. Claudius Ptolemy is particularly helpful in understanding the meaning of ἐπιεικὴ and its pairing with πλήκτης.<sup>220</sup> Τῷ δὲ τοῦ Ἄρεως συνοικειωθείς ἐπὶ μὲν ἐνδόξων διαθέσεων ποιεῖ τραχεῖς, μαχίμους, στρατηγικούς, διοικητικούς, κεκινημένους, ἀνυποτάκτους, θερμούς, παραβόλους, πρακτικούς, παρρησιαστικούς, ἐλεγκτικούς, ἀνυστικούς, φιλονείκους, ἀρχικούς, εὐεπιβούλους, ἐπιεικείς, ἐπάνδρους, νικητικούς, μεγαλοψύχους δὲ καὶ φιλοτίμους καὶ θυμικούς καὶ κριτικούς καὶ ἐπιτευκτικούς: ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων ὕβριστάς, ἀδιαφόρους, ὤμους, ἀνεξιλάστους, στασιαστάς, ἐριστικούς, μονοτόνους, διαβόλους,

<sup>219</sup> This double pairing is very similar to, possibly even mimicked by, Lucian (c. A.D. 125–180) in the description of his popular character, Thrasyclus in Τιμών (a.k.a. *Misanthrope*): “Isn’t this Thrasyclus? No other! With his beard spread out and his eyebrows uplifted, he marches along deep in haughty meditation. ... *Correct* in his demeanour, *gentlemanly* in his gait, and inconspicuous in his dress, in the morning hours he discourses forever about virtue ... but when he comes to dinner after his bath and the waiter hands him a large cup (and the stiffer it is the better he likes it) then it is as if he had drunk the water of Lethe, for his practice is directly opposed to his preaching the morning. ... He is the height of gluttony and insatiability, and he gets so *drunken* and *riotous* that he not only sings and dances, but even abuses people and flies into a passion” (55f). See <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0441%3Asection%3D55>. It is worth noting that for those who believe First Timothy to have been published after *Misanthrope*, this connection might be made to shore up the theory of the pseudepigraphical nature of the Pastoral Epistles.

<sup>220</sup> Claudius Ptolemy (c. A.D. 100–c. 170) is useful for examining the broad and narrow opposites of a wide variety of words that label personality traits, because he was a consummate astrologer and listed the putative effects and implications of the positions of the planets and stars, which represented the Greek gods. Some positions were thought “honorable” and others “in opposition.” In the third book of the *Tetrabiblos*, he lists the putative effects of a various planetary conjunctions. When these conjunctions occurred in honorable positions in the sky, those souls dominated by the particular planets because of their birth were thought to be affected in a variety of ways, mostly positive. When the conjunctions occurred in opposition, the effects were the opposite, though the opposites defined by the Greeks were not as moderns might see them. The opposites must be seen relative to the framework of the Hippocratican (Hippocrates of Kos [c. 460–c. 370 B.C.]) humors. Thus, for example, the effects of a conjunction in an honorable position that increased the phlegmatic humor would produce instead a choleric humor in opposition. The large lists of characteristics for each conjunction of planets in honorable position or in opposition give great insight into the semantic domain structure of the characteristics.



οιηματίας, πλεονέκτας, ἄρπαγας, ταχυμεταβόλους, κούφους, μεταμελητικούς, ἀστάτους, προπετεῖς, ἀπίστους, ἀκρίτους, ἀγνώμονας, ἐκστατικούς, ἐμπράκτους, μεμψιμοίρους, ἀσώτους, ληρώδεις καὶ ὄλως ἀνωμάλους καὶ παρακεκινημένους.—“Jupiter allied with Mars in honourable positions makes his subjects rough, pugnacious, military, managerial, restless, unruly, ardent, reckless, practical, outspoken, critical, effective, contentious, commanding, given to plotting, *respectable*, virile, fond of victory, but magnanimous, ambitious, passionate, judicious, successful. In the opposite position he makes them insolent, indiscriminating, savage, implacable, seditious, contentious, stubborn, slanderous, conceited, avaricious, rapacious, quickly changeable, light, readily changing their minds, unstable, headstrong, untrustworthy, of poor judgement, unfeeling, excitable, active, querulous, prodigal, gossipy, and in all ways uneven and easily excited.”<sup>221</sup> Ἐπεικὴ is not a narrow opposite to πλήκτης or the motivation behind the striking. A king at war—Jupiter (Zeus) in conjunction with Mars (Ares)—must be both. Ἐπεικὴ expresses a tempering of the urge to strike, and while ἐπεικὴ could be translated with “gentleness” in some contexts with the older English connotation (e.g., gentleman), here it is better to translate with “forbearing” or “restrained.” The pastor must be ready to be forceful in spiritual, rhetorical battle and yet remain respectable and restrained.<sup>222</sup> This is the wider context provided by 1Ti 1:18: ἵνα στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν—you may wage the good warfare. . . .”

In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle uses ἐπεικὴ in the sense of “equitable” and thereby gives a third century B.C. definition of the word: ἀν οὖν ἡ ἀόριστον, δέη δὲ νομοθετησai, ἀνάγκη ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ὥστε κἂν δακτύλιον ἔχων ἐπάρηται τὴν χεῖρα ἢ πατάξῃ, κατὰ μὲν τὸν γεγραμμένον νόμον ἔνοχος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀδικεῖ, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἀληθὲς οὐκ ἀδικεῖ, καὶ τὸ ἐπεικὲς τοῦτο ἐστίν. εἰ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον τὸ ἐπεικὲς, φανερόν ποῖά ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπεικὴ καὶ οὐκ ἐπεικὴ, καὶ ποιοὶ οὐκ ἐπεικεῖς ἄνθρωποι: ἐφ’ οἷς τε γὰρ δεῖ συγγνώμην ἔχειν, ἐπεικὴ ταῦτα, καὶ τὸ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ ἀδικήματα μὴ τοῦ ἴσου ἀξιῶν, μηδὲ τὰ

<sup>221</sup> Ptol. 3.13.

<sup>222</sup> There are certainly other passages which could be brought to bear to demonstrate that a pastor ought to be a gentle soul like the Savior, especially 1Co 4:21 and 1Th 2:7, which are specific to Paul’s pastoral activity as apostle. Other passages demonstrate that gentleness is to be a characteristic found in all Christians, since they follow in the way of the Savior, e.g., Mat 11:29; Mat 21:5; Eph 4:2; and 1Pe 3:4. Paul is familiar with πραΰτης; he uses it in 1Co 4:21; Eph 4:2; 1Th 2:7; and 1Ti 6:11, and that word is a much better fit for the idea of “gentle.” Tit 3:2 has both ἐπεικὴ and πραΰτης in proximity: μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, ἀμάχους εἶναι, ἐπεικεῖς, πάσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους.—“to speak evil of no one, to avoid quarreling, to be restrained/equitable, and to show perfect gentleness toward all people (personal translation).”

ἀμαρτήματα καὶ τὰ ἀτυχήματα: ἔστιν ἀτυχήματα μὲν γὰρ ὅσα παράλογα καὶ μὴ ἀπὸ μοχθηρίας, ἀμαρτήματα δὲ ὅσα μὴ παράλογα καὶ μὴ ἀπὸ πονηρίας, ἀδικήματα δὲ ὅσα μῆτε παράλογα ἀπὸ πονηρίας τέ ἐστιν: τὰ γὰρ δι' ἐπιθυμίαν ἀπὸ πονηρίας.—“If then no exact definition is possible, but legislation is necessary, one must have recourse to general terms; so that, if a man wearing a ring lifts up his hand to strike or actually strikes, according to the written law he is guilty of wrongdoing, but in reality he is not; and this is a case for *equity*. If then our definition of *equity* is correct, it is easy to see what things and persons are *equitable* or not. Actions which should be leniently treated are cases for *equity*; errors, wrong acts, and misfortunes, must not be thought deserving of the same penalty. Misfortunes are all such things as are unexpected and not vicious; errors are not unexpected, but are not vicious; wrong acts are such as might be expected and vicious, for acts committed through desire arise from vice.”<sup>223</sup> At the risk of diachronic anachronism, this idea fits together well with the Ptolemy's first century use of the word and is helpful for understanding what Paul means by ἀλλὰ ἐπιεικῆ. Toward the end of the third century, Theodore of Mopsuestia (A.D. 350–428) wrote, “Not striking without reasonable cause, for sometimes this is permitted, if for a good reason and not with undue fierceness.” This statement makes little sense without the proper understanding of ἐπιεικῆ.<sup>224</sup>

Ἄμαχον and ἀφυλάργυρον are both relatively less complicated than compound words that have taken on a life of their own in the language; the α-privative is generally considerably easier to interpret. Μάχη is mostly used in the plural number, first to mean an actual battle, often between two individuals, without weaponry. The domain is expanded to include quarreling, i.e., verbal fighting.<sup>225</sup> The difficulty with ἄμαχον lies in the two possible sides of the battle: either the thing described is not a thing that can be assailed because it is too powerful, strong, fearsome, etc., i.e., indomitable, or the thing described does not enter into combat or quarrel. Either Paul is indicating that the ἐπίσκοπος should be one that people have no wish to quarrel with—because they know that they will lose—or Paul is indicating that the ἐπίσκοπος should not be quarrelsome. The second case is by far the rarer in the corpus.<sup>226</sup>

If the semantic domain of μὴ πλήκτης is indeed expanded, there would be considerable overlap with ἄμαχος, but in Tit 3:2 (*supra*) there

<sup>223</sup> Aristot. *Rb.* 1.13.

<sup>224</sup> Theodore of Mopsuestia, *TEM* 2:109 quoted in *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scriptures*, Vol. 9, 171.

<sup>225</sup> See 2Co 7:5; 2Ti 2:23; Tit 3:2, 9; Gen 26:20; 31:36; 2Ti 2:24.

<sup>226</sup> See Liddell-Scott entry for ἄμαχος for a list of uses consistent with “indomitable.”



is no potential overlap. Furthermore, ἄμαχος is there used with the infinitive, which places the adjective into a stative description of “the people” in Tit 3:1; “the people” are those who will hear Titus’ preaching. It would be nonsensical for Paul to use ἄμαχος in the sense of “indomitable” there, and thus Paul has in mind the less common use of ἄμαχον. This understanding fits with Paul’s enumeration of characteristics, for ἄμαχον there takes the expanded meaning into an adjectival form, i.e., “not quarrelsome” or “peaceable.”

Ἀφιλάργυρος is used very consistently in the corpus to indicate a freedom from avarice. The base compound word φιλάργυρια is used primarily of avarice, and often extreme avarice or greed for money, a lusting after money or wealth. The word is constructed from φιλία and ἄργυρος, literally “love of silver,” but the meaning of ἄργυρος was the common metal of coinage, and thus the meaning was broadened first to include the love of money and then the love of wealth and finally the love of any worldly wealth of any and all forms. In 1Ti 6:10, φιλάργυρια is called ρίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν—“a root of all kinds of evils.” While Paul speaks a general truth about one of the basic sinful desires, the words at the end of the verse are particularly of interest: ἦς τινες ὀρεγόμενοι ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύνας πολλὰς.—“It is through this craving that some have wandered away from the faith and pierced themselves with many pangs.” Not only is the same verb of desiring used that is used in 1Ti 3:1, i.e., ὀρεγόμενοι, this time without the redirecting synonimia, but here Paul also seems to be alluding to Judas Iscariot, who lusted after silver, first from the γλωσσόκομον, “moneybag,” then from the chief priests; lost his faith; and pierced himself with many pangs. Ἀφιλάργυρος is thus the powerful, cautionary word Paul chose for Timothy and is more than a mere qualification but is also a reminder that the treasure of the Word is carried in the clay jar of the ἐπίσκοπος.

*Verse 4*—τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος·

Paul now argues from the lesser to the greater about an important means for identifying the needed quality of leadership. The pastor must be able to lead the congregation effectively and nowhere is this quality more readily observable than in the man’s home life.

The most common use of the active voice of προϊστημι has the meaning “to choose one as leader” or “to set one up as leader over.” The passive then means “to be chosen to be leader over.” The middle

then is the idea of “setting oneself up as leader over.” These uses are all present in Herodotus (c. 484–c. 425 B.C.). The present middle participle expresses the ongoing activity of leading, in this case, τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου—his own household. Οἶκος is a much more comprehensive idea of household than is found in modern American culture. The typical household would include multiple generations, possibly other close relatives, slaves, and servants, and all that is physically a part of the estate. Paul here focuses in particular on the idea that the pastor must lead or govern his household well. The pastor, therefore, ought to be able to lead people and employ manpower and resources efficiently in pursuit of the welfare of all involved in his οἶκος.

Paul employs προϊστημι at Rom 12:8 to indicate one who leads, and he attaches ἐν σπουδῇ—with diligence. Thus the activity of leadership is at least part of the person's conscious activity. One does not lead by accident. In 1Th 5:12, the sense is further established: Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, εἰδέναι τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ νουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς,—“We ask you, brothers, to respect those who labor among you and are over you in the Lord and admonish you.” The ἐπίσκοπος leads with authority that is ἐν κυρίῳ—“in connection with the Lord.”<sup>227</sup> The connection in 1Th 5:12 is the call.<sup>228</sup> The leadership exercised in the family is also ἐν κυρίῳ, with the connection found in the order of creation leading to the vocation of father in the household.<sup>229</sup>

The structure of verse 4 suggests the question, “Is τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος exegetical, an attendant circumstance, or the second element of a two-element list, which is itself part of the larger list from verse 2 through verse 6?” If it were the first option, then the meaning of καλῶς would necessarily include having children in submission with all dignity, and the sentence would focus only on the leadership of people within the household. The idea of the attendant circumstance is that at the same time he governs his household well, it will also be true that he has his children in submission with all dignity; there may be some unspecified relationship between the two activities.

<sup>227</sup> The phrase ἐν κυρίῳ is very common in the New Testament: Rom 14:14; 16:2, 8, 11–13, 22; 1Co 1:31; 4:17; 7:22; 7:39; 9:1, 2; 11:11; 15:58; 16:19; 2Co 2:12; 10:17; Gal 5:10; Eph 2:21; 4:1, 17; 5:8; 6:1, 10, 21; Phi 1:14; 2:19, 24, 29; Phi 3:1; 4:1, 2, 4, 10; Col 3:18, 20; 4:7; 1Th 3:8; 1Th 4:1; 1Th 5:12; 2Th 3:4, 12; Phl 20; Rev 14:13. It is primarily used by Paul. A variety of meanings arise in the varying contexts, but the very generic handling with “in connection with” is adequate for understanding the gist of the phrase and the similar ἐν Χριστῷ. This phrase is worthy of its own study.

<sup>228</sup> Rom 10:15.

<sup>229</sup> Gen 2; 1Ti 2:12–13.

Finally, the third option would indicate that the pastor must govern all aspects of his household well and have his children in submission with all dignity; both elements would be equal in importance.

The clearly semantically parallel sentence with *προϊστημι* in 1Ti 3:12 makes it structurally apparent that the third option is the intended sense: *διάκονοι ἕστωσαν μίας γυναικὸς ἄνδρες, τέκνων καλῶς προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων*.—"Let deacons each be the husband of one wife, managing their children and their own households well." The children and household are thought of independently, despite the children being members of the *οἶκος*. The pastor must lead his household well, and he must have his children in submission with dignity.

The sense of the present tense of *ἔχοντα* is customary and indicates that the children ought to be continuously in the state of submission.<sup>230</sup> Thus Kretzmann's comment holds true: "... daß Wort *ἔχειν* hat hier die Stärke von *κατέχειν* und bedeutet darum „halten“—the word *ἔχειν* takes the sense of *κατέχειν* and means, therefore, 'to hold.'"<sup>231</sup>

*Ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος* bears closer examination. *Ἐν* indicates a state, i.e., the state of submission. The use of *ἐν* indicates that the described individual (or group) is (are) in some way within the bounds of the state of submission, in this case behaving within the state of submission.

*Ἐποταγή* can be found in contexts where the submission is forced, or in contexts where the submission is the result of dutiful will, in which case it means "subordination (of oneself)." For example, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (c. 60 B.C.—after 7 B.C.) wrote, *ὁ δὲ ἀσπαστῶς δεξάμενος τὴν ἄνευ κινδύνων ὑποταγὴν τοῦ ἔθνους σπονδάς τε ποιεῖται πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης τε καὶ φιλίας ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς ὁμολογίαις, αἷς Τυρρηνοῦς πρότερον ὑπηγάγετο, καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἀπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἄνευ λύτρων*.—"Tarquinius gladly accepted this *submission* of the nation, unattended as it was by any hazards, and made a treaty of peace and friendship with them upon the same conditions upon which he had earlier received the *submission* of the Tyrrhenians; and he restored their captives to them without ransom."<sup>232</sup> Both the Sabines and Tyrrhenians submitted themselves after losing to Rome in battle. This same connotation can be found primarily in the use of the active voice of *ὑποτάσσω* for *תתתן*, e.g., in Psa 8:7 LXX, which is Psa 8:7 BHS and Psa 8:6 ESV, and is very prevalent in the

<sup>230</sup> Wallace, 521.

<sup>231</sup> Kretzmann, 88.

<sup>232</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Dionysii Halicarnasei Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt*, 390; *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, 237.

sections of the Septuagint dealing with the Israelites' subjugation of the Promised Land.

2Co 9:13 is an example of dutiful submission: διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀπλότῃ τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας.—“By their approval of this service, they will glorify God because of *your submission that comes from your confession* of the gospel of Christ, and the generosity of your contribution for them and for all others.” Similarly, in 1Ti 2:11, Paul writes that γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μαθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ—“a woman should learn in silence with all *submission*.” This submitting is a “self-sub-ordination.” Μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος limits the possibility to this latter connotation of ὑποταγῇ.

Josephus used the same phrase in his autobiography: παρὰ τούτων οὖν πύθεσθε, τίνα τρόπον ἐβίωσα, εἰ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς ἐνθάδε πεπολίτευμαι. καὶ δὴ ὀρκίζω ὑμᾶς, ὦ Γαλιλαῖοι, μηδὲν ἐπικρύψασθαι τῆς ἀληθείας, λέγειν δ' ἐπὶ τούτων ὡς δικαστῶν, εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς πέπρακται.—“Inquire of them how I have lived, and whether I have not behaved myself with all decency, and after a virtuous manner, among them. And I further conjure you, O Galileans! to hide no part of the truth, but to speak before these men as before judges, whether I have in any thing acted otherwise than well.”<sup>233</sup> Behaving with all decency is not the same as living virtuously, but both are a part of “living well.” Living well is the study of the philosophers of the ancient world, and so it seems that Josephus is appealing to the backdrop of philosophy in his defense.

Aristotle provides this useful definition: σεμνότης δὲ μεσότης αὐθαδείας καὶ ἀρεσκευείας: ὁ μὲν γὰρ μηδὲν πρὸς ἕτερον ζῶν καταφρονητικὸς αὐθάδης, ὁ δὲ πάντα πρὸς ἄλλον ἢ καὶ πάντων ἐλάττων ἀρεσκευός, ὁ δὲ τὰ μὲν τὰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀξίους οὕτως ἔχων σεμνός.—“Dignity is a middle state between Self-will and Obsequiousness. A man who in his conduct pays no regard at all to another but is contemptuous is self-willed; he who regards another in everything and is inferior to everybody is obsequious; he who regards another in some things but not in others, and is regardful of persons worthy of regard, is dignified.”<sup>234</sup>

The pastor's children are to be in submission, not because they have been so subjugated and dominated by their father that they submit purely from fear of his wrath, but rather they fear and love their father and so are subordinate to him, because he has served them by teaching

<sup>233</sup> Josephus, *Josephus*, 96; *The Complete Works of Josephus*. 13.

<sup>234</sup> Aristot. *Eud. Eth.* 3.1233β, 34.

them properly; they have been properly taught and disciplined and secondarily fear the consequences of disobedience. The father will not be regardful of his children in a state of rebellion or in the midst of tomfoolery and so overlook their wrong actions, but rather he will correct them and discipline them as is his duty. Such a man is seen both within the household and from without as a man carrying out his responsibility as a father μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος—“with all dignity.”<sup>235</sup>

This assessment of the meaning of μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος is in good accord with 1Ti 2:2: ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι.—“that we may lead a peaceful and quiet life, godly and dignified in every way.” In this citation, ἐν is used instead of μετά, because in 1Ti 2:2, a state is referenced, whereas in 1Ti 3:4, the phrase is adverbial.

Calvin, et al., apply μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος to τέκνα to describe or prescribe the proper behavior of children in a pastor’s household.<sup>236</sup> This application fails for two reasons: (1) μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος limits the verb, and (2) the verse is an adjectival in the list structure of verses 2 through 6 that describes the ἐπίσκοπος and not his οἶκος. Overall, Calvin seems to be focused on the standard of behavior that the pastor and his family must uphold, almost as a condition of employment, rather than on the necessity of the preaching.

Verse 5—(εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται;)

The protasis is duplicated from verse 4 and indicates that the verse is a parenthetical explanation. Paul furnishes the reason for his digression from the simple list of attributes, indicating that he is employing an *a minore ad maius* argument. He does not conclude his argument with a statement but rather with a rhetorical question. The force of πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται is very helpful in establishing the overarching character of the ἐπίσκοπή: the office. The pastoral ministry must be one of service to others, especially to those whom he oversees as ἐπίσκοπος; it is the work of ἐπιμελεῖν—“to take care of.” Ἐπιμελόμαι very clearly connotes “care out of loving concern” and is not indicating mere administrative concern, care for the sake of order, or care for the sake of preservation. The welfare of the object of ἐπιμελόμαι is highlighted by the verb. 1Ti 1:5 confirms, τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρὰς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου,—“The aim of our

<sup>235</sup> See Pro 13:24; 19:18; 23:13; 29:17; Eph 6:4; Heb 12:6–11; Rev 3:19.

<sup>236</sup> Calvin, 82ff.

charge is love that issues from a pure heart and a good conscience and a sincere faith.”

In the corpus, ἐπιμελόμαι means “to take care of,” “to have charge of,” “to have the management of,” or “to be curator of.”<sup>237</sup> But in the Septuagint, ἐπιμελόμαι is used for the tender command of Joseph, that his father be brought to him: εἶπας δὲ τοῖς παισὶν σου Καταγάγετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με, καὶ ἐπιμελοῦμαι αὐτοῦ.—“Then you said to your servants, ‘Bring him down to me, that I may set my eyes on him.’”<sup>238</sup> In the New Testament, Jesus used ἐπιμελόμαι in the Parable of the Good Samaritan: καὶ προσελθὼν κατέδησεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον, ἐπιβίβασας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτήνος ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὐρίον ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκεν τῷ πανδοχεῖ καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐπιμελήθητι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὃ τι ἂν προσδαπανήσης ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι.—“He went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine. Then he set him on his own animal and brought him to an inn and *took care* of him. And the next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper, saying, ‘*Take care* of him, and whatever more you spend, I will repay you when I come back.’”<sup>239</sup>

Jesus’ use in the Parable of the Good Samaritan contextually selects the caring aspect of ἐπιμελόμαι. The parable is part of the Savior’s answer to the question of the lawyer, “And who is my neighbor?” which is meant to deflect Jesus’ pointed interpretation of the hypothetical, albeit impossible, way one could save himself by his own merit. Jesus is driving at love being the fulfillment of the law, specifically God’s love in Christ and the love that is engendered by His love for us. The Samaritan’s actions are placed in strong contrast against the backdrop of the actions of the robbers, Levite, and priest, none of which are loving. Likewise, context selects the caring aspect in verse 5. The argument revolves around the love that a father has for his children: love that compels him to train them, to discipline them, to provide for their welfare in his οἶκος. If a man is not compelled by love for his own children, such that he will do his fatherly duty no matter how difficult or distasteful some of the work might be, then he will not do his pastoral duty. The motivation to oversee the flock must arise from love for the Savior and for the sheep. He would be but a hired hand without love.<sup>240</sup>

<sup>237</sup> Liddell and Scott, ἐπιμελόμαι.

<sup>238</sup> Gen 44:21.

<sup>239</sup> Luk 10:25f.

<sup>240</sup> Joh 10.

Verse 6—μη νεόφυτον, ἵνα μη τυφωθῆς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου.

In this verse, Paul resumes and concludes the list of adjectival phrases begun in verse 2. Νεόφυτον is a compound word, combining νέος and φύτον. Taken literally, it means a shoot or something newly planted, a scion. In the Old Testament, the word invariably indicated “something newly planted,” but in Psa 127:3; 143:12, and Isa 5:7, persons are referred to as νεόφυτα in simile, and in Job 14:9 in metaphor.

The semantic domain is enlarged by way of metaphor by the time of the New Testament writers and is used by Paul to mean, “one who is new,” presumably to the faith. Luther summarized, “*Non solum qui aetate iuvenis, sed eruditione et scientia scripturae; loquitur potissimum de aetate eruditionis et sanctimoniae, wen einer nemlich in die schriftt komen.*—He is speaking not only about one who is a young man in age but also about him who is young in understanding and knowledge of Scripture; he speaks especially about the age in understanding and in saintliness, when a person is a newcomer in the Scriptures.”<sup>241</sup> Νεόφυτον is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament and also rare in the corpus of contemporaneous Greek literature.<sup>242</sup>

As the Church organized, the word came to be thought of, first, as a group preparing for entry into church life, and then as a rank preliminary to entry into ecclesiastical life. This use is already apparent at the Council of Nicaea; thus by the time Tertullian (c. A.D. 155–c. 240) uses the word, it had already begun to take on the technical sense that it has in the modern Roman Catholic Church.<sup>243</sup>

Neophyte ... [is] a term applied in theology to all those who have lately entered upon a new and higher state or condition of life, e.g., those who have begun the ecclesiastical life, or have joined a religious order. More particularly is it used of those who, lately converted from heathenism, have by the sacrament of Baptism, been transplanted into the higher life of the Church. From very early times there have been prohibitions against neophytes in this last sense being promoted too quickly to Holy Orders and

<sup>241</sup> WA 26, 55. AE 28, 290.

<sup>242</sup> Νεόφυτος is one of the words singled out by Schleiermacher and others in their argument against Pauline authorship. See Harrison, 18ff and Schleiermacher, 241. Jacquier and Rüegg contend that the word occurs in the Septuagint and was thus known to Paul. Harrison counters—weakly, in my opinion—that νεόφυτος and other such words “have a long life but a short vogue” (Harrison, 65). Such a blanket assertion is very much unwarranted.

<sup>243</sup> See Zahn, 124.



to positions of responsibility in the Church. Thus the Council of Nicaea in its second canon lays down rules on this subject, on the ground that some time is necessary for the state of a Catechumen and for fuller probation after baptism; for the Apostolic decree is clear which says, "Not a neophyte, lest being puffed up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the devil" (1 Timothy 3:6). The period which should elapse after conversion before promotion is not fixed but (Bened. XIV, "De syn.", vii, 65–6) is left to the discretion of the bishop and will vary with the individual.<sup>244</sup>

Assigning the label "neophyte" to a group of people does not make them neophytes. Nor does the mere removal of the label "neophyte" make a person not a neophyte. While in theory a mentoring pastor determines when and whether a candidate is prepared and thus no longer a neophyte, in practice, most churches, and, by extension, church bodies, have adopted time-honored, formal educational traditions, e.g., the Evangelical Lutheran method of three years of classwork and a vicarage.

The ἵνα clause with μή expresses negation or avoidance of the purpose but also the expected result of νεόφυτον and is thus a pure final clause; "so that not" is too wooden to serve well as the translation, though "lest" is somewhat archaic already.<sup>245</sup>

The verb τυφώω derives from the noun τῆφος—"smoke." The aorist passive participle τυφωθείς means "besmoked" or "blinded by smoke" and carries the connotation that the smoke has filled the space and blinded the eyes. The meaning is extended metaphorically to mean "made conceited" or "blinded by conceit." Lock defines the word, "It combines the ideas of conceit and folly; he may behave arrogantly to others and teach foolishly."<sup>246</sup> "Puffed up" does not capture both aspects, and so fails to inform in the matter of the devil's motivations for continuing in his rebellion against the Almighty.<sup>247</sup>

The meaning of the last phrase, εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου, depends strongly on the identification of ὁ διάβολος. At least three arguments can be made in favor of τοῦ διαβόλου meaning "of the devil."

<sup>244</sup> *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, "neophyte." URL: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/10742a.htm>

<sup>245</sup> Robertson, 981f. Dana and Mantey, §220.

<sup>246</sup> Lock, 39.

<sup>247</sup> Sadly, support is lacking for Zahn's fun little phrase, "aufgeblasene Neuling-[lit.] inflated newbie."



- Without exception, throughout the New Testament ὁ διάβολος refers to the fallen angel known as Satan.<sup>248</sup> In the Septuagint, an exception can be found in Est 7:4 and 8:1, where διάβολος refers to Haman, but the context is very clear there.<sup>249</sup>
- In the verses leading up to verse 6, there is no antecedent consistent with an anaphoric article, nor do the verses that follow permit the article to be kataphoric. The article is clearly monadic.<sup>250</sup>
- Finally, 2Ti 2:26 mostly likely ought to be rendered in a manner consistent with the meaning of verse 6: καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, ἐξωγρημένοι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.—“and they may come to their senses and escape from the snare of *the devil*, after being captured by him to do his will.”

If τοῦ διαβόλου were to mean “of [some] deceiver,” all three of these aforementioned conclusions would fail.

Ἐμπίπτω is used both literally, meaning “falling physically,” and figuratively, meaning “falling into a state from another state,” and can also be used to picture the onset of a condition. εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση has judgment as the destination state, specifically the κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου—judgment of the devil. Louw and Nida group ἐμπίπτω with other “experiencers,” words which indicate a “coming to experience” and so translate ἐμπίπτω with “to experience judgment.”<sup>251</sup> Εἰς is “a marker of an involved experiencer.”<sup>252</sup> The genitive is objective; the devil is the object of the judgment. From this determination, some paraphrase with “same judgment as the devil,” e.g., Fee. The paraphrase is certainly justifiable. Chrysostom comes to the same conclusion: τουτεστιν, εἰς τὴν καταίκην τὴν αὐτὴν, ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπονοίας ὑπέμεινε.—... that is, into the same condemnation which Satan incurred by his pride.<sup>253</sup>

Lock concludes instead that the genitive is objective: “κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου not (as Chrys. Pelag. Thdt. Calvin, Bengel) ‘the judgment passed on the devil,’ which is not parallel to and would naturally be τὸ κρίμα, but ‘some judgment which the devil, the slanderer, the setter at

<sup>248</sup> Mat 4:1, 5, 8, 11; 13:39; 25:41; Luk 4:2f, 13; 8:12; Joh 6:70; 8:44; 13:2; Act 10:38; 13:10; Eph 4:27; 6:11; 2Ti 2:26; 3:3; Tit 2:3; Heb 2:14; Jam 4:7; 1Pe 5:8; 1Jo 3:8, 10; Jud 9; Rev 2:10; 12:9, 12; 20:2, 10.

<sup>249</sup> 1Ch 21:1; Est 7:4; 8:1; 1Ma 1:36; Psa 108:6; Job 1:6f; 2:1f; Wis 2:24; Zec 3:1f.

<sup>250</sup> Wallace, 223.

<sup>251</sup> LN 90M.fn13.

<sup>252</sup> LN 90.59.

<sup>253</sup> PG 62, 550; NPNF1 13, 439.

variance, the accuser of the brethren (Apoc. 12:10, cf. Jud 9, 2P 2:11 κρίσιν), passes upon him.”<sup>254</sup>

Lenski argues, however, that “Judgment, moreover, is never ascribed to the devil: *God* judges. The very word means the judicial announcement of a verdict or the verdict as it stands. Where did Satan ever sit on a throne of judgment and render a verdict? ... The claim that this thought would require τὸ κρίμα is untenable because every genitive already limits and makes definite its governing noun just as in the English ‘the devil’s judgment.’”<sup>255</sup> His argument is compelling in light of the foregoing identification of διάβολος with Satan in these verses. Paul’s statement that he had οὖς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ—“handed [Hymenaeus and Alexander] over to Satan” does not indicate that Satan is to judge Hymenaeus and Alexander, but rather that Hymenaeus and Alexander were fellow convicts to be locked up for a time in the same cell as a true monster.<sup>256</sup>

Τυφωθείς does not indicate that pride is the reason for the κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου. This conclusion is reached when the full meaning of τυφώω is obscured behind the assumption that “puffed up” is a good translation. The devil is painfully blinded by conceit. His sin has made him mad with rage, and he lashes out against God and everything dear to God. The more he sins, the more angry he becomes. He is the archetype of the sinner, who has decided to follow sin down from perfection to the depths of utter corruption and of hell. There is no repentance, only more sin.

The κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου is the same as the judgment upon every *unrepentant* sinner and results in the same sentence: eternal death in hell beneath the infinite wrath of God. The point is not some particularly strong or unusually pointed judgment, but rather that Satan, once a noble and mighty angel, fell and continues headlong down, and God judged him. This *argumentum a fortiori*—argument from the greater (to the lesser)—holds forth that the neophyte in particular and pastor in general should regard himself as the lesser in this argument, that is, subject to the same judgment of sin.

It seems likely that Paul had Hymenaeus and Alexander in mind. They had blasphemed.<sup>257</sup> They had been sidetracked from the gospel of the overflowing grace of God in Christ Jesus.<sup>258</sup> They were falling under

<sup>254</sup> Lock, 39.

<sup>255</sup> Lenski, 589.

<sup>256</sup> 1Ti 1:20.

<sup>257</sup> 1Ti 1:20.

<sup>258</sup> 1Ti 1:14.

the same judgment that was made about the devil long before. They were unrepentant sinners, whose blasphemy needed to be opposed and whose souls needed to be saved from the sentence of damnation. The evangelical backdrop for κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου must be seen at 1Ti 1:15ff, where Paul indicates that God forgives, i.e., judges innocent for the sake of Christ, even the “foremost of sinners.” There still is hope for these two wayward men, and that hope is the center of the office into which Timothy has entered.

Verse 7—δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου.

The combination of δέ with καί is quite common. In this case, the presence of δεῖ before the conjunctions immediately places verse 7 into structural parallel with the extended sentence beginning in verse 2. The connotation of ἐκ in the compound ἔξωθεν implies that δέ is contrastive.<sup>259</sup>

Wallace contends that the use of ἀπό with the genitive here indicates the ultimate agent, i.e., “the person who is responsible for the action, who may or may not be directly involved (though he or she usually is).”<sup>260</sup> Ἀπό expresses five ideas: a separation from person or place, a source, a cause, a partitive idea, or an agency. The use for an agent is rare. To broaden the idea of a passive verb so that ἀπό can be considered to express the ultimate agent, as Wallace here contends, is not necessary; rather, in the construction, ἀπό simply expresses a distributive idea midway between the source and partitive ideas: “the witness from/of outsiders.” This use is supported by Luk 22:71, where μαρτυρία is similarly juxtaposed with ἀπό. See also 3Jo 7 for a similar use in the phrase ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνικῶν. Ultimately, this prepositional phrase indicates that the good witness that the candidate must have is the good witness among and from the members of the outside world and not the good witness of the candidate within the group of the members of the outside world, as many translations tend toward with “among.”

Knight contends that ἔξωθεν is limited to those outside the Church, i.e., “unbelievers,” finding support for his view in the fact that verses 4 through 7 speak exclusively about those within the Church. This is an undue limitation. As Faught notes, “Paul does not discuss the qualities

<sup>259</sup> Wallace, 671. Lenski theorizes that the δέ of verse 7 coordinates with verse 2.

<sup>260</sup> Wallace, 433. Note that Wallace here invokes the concept of ultimate agent with a broadened idea of a passive verb. Cf. Mat 10:28; 12:38; 20:23; 27:9; Mar 1:13; 15:45; Luk 7:35; Act 2:22; 1Co 1:30; 4:5; Gal 1:1; Phl 3; Heb 6:7; 2Pe 1:21 for uses of ἀπό with the genitive to indicate ultimate agent. Note that ὑπό with the genitive is more commonly so used.

of an ἐπίσκοπος in verses four through seven based on a division of spiritual status—faith and unbelief; churched and unchurchd—but on the basis of contact and interaction. [ἔξωθεν] is the ‘catch-all’ group ... all those who are not members of [the household] and church family but of the community.”<sup>261</sup> The article with the adverb is a substantive. Together with the plural number, τῶν ἔξωθεν indicates some group of outsiders that is somehow specific to the train of thought. Thus far, Paul has singled out those inside the congregation, and here he collects everyone else into another group, the outsiders.

The source of the good witness, i.e., from the outsiders, is thus the reason for the combination of δέ and καί. The δέ is contrastive, and the καί is intensive. Not only must the one seeking the office possess the qualities enumerated in verses 2 through 6, he must even possess a good reputation from the outsiders. “He will have a good reputation if, when he is out among people, he demonstrates that he is: a man of integrity and conviction; a man whose speech and actions are above reproach; a man whose simple ‘yes’ and ‘no’ are as good as an oath; a man who always speaks the truth, even if he knows it will be met with criticism, but who does so in a gentle, loving manner (Eph 4:15); a man who, though he may not be able to pray and worship and work with the heterodox, does not look upon them as the ‘enemy,’ but rejoices over whatever of the truth of God they are proclaiming.”<sup>262</sup>

The repetition of ἐμπέση creates a parallel with verse 6; εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν is placed in parallel with εἰς χρίμα. As the neophyte who is blinded with conceit experiences (lit. falls into) the devil’s judgment, so also the pastor who fails to retain a good reputation with outsiders falls under a tempest of reproach. The parallel is structural but not grammatical; the meaning precludes the notion that the genitives must be functionally identical.

A παγίς is a device, such as a snare or deadfall, which is designed purposely to catch someone or some beast unawares and force it from a state of safety into a state of death, disability, or entrapment. As in

<sup>261</sup> Fought, 9. Augustine: “This is not the praise given a man by a few wise and just people but popular report. Indeed, popular report bestows greatness and renown on a man, which is not desirable for its own sake but is essential to the success of good men in their endeavors to benefit their fellow men. So the apostle says that it is proper to have a good report of those that are without. For though they are not infallible, the luster of their praise and the odor of their good opinion are a great help to the efforts of those who seek to benefit them. This popular renown is not obtained by those who are highest in the church, unless they expose themselves to the coils and hazards of an active life.” *Contra Faustum Manicæum*. 22.56. *NPNF1* 4.294.

<sup>262</sup> Valleskey, 48.

English, the semantic domain of the word is broadened to cover any design which brings sudden danger. In this verse, τοῦ διαβόλου is subjective, that is, the trap belongs to the devil; the devil is the one doing the trapping. The παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου—"trap of the devil" indicates that the trap is of the devil's design and deployment.

Paul intends here to indicate that the danger is not just internal in the temptation to unrepentance but also external. Outsiders can turn on a pastor, especially an inexperienced one who is even momentarily ἄτακτος, and such vehement pressure can force an otherwise faithful man not just out of the ministry, but even into the great spiritual danger of Satan's snare. The devil certainly desires to catch pastors when they fall. Paul desires that no servant of the Lord experience neither the reproach of outsiders nor the snare of the devil, and thus the warning.

### Translation

... Faithful is the statement.

Should one be desirous of the office, he is wanting good work. Thus the pastor ought to be unassailable, a one-woman man, temperate, sensible, proper, hospitable, ready to teach, not a tippler, not one who lashes out (but rather is restrained), peaceable, not a lover of money, managing his own household well, with all dignity keeping his children in submission (After all, if one does not know how to manage his own household, how can he take care of the church of God?), not a neophyte, lest he be blinded by conceit and so experience the devil's judgment. But he should even have a good reputation with outsiders, so that he does not fall into disgrace and the trap of the devil.

### Conclusions

Properly defined, ἀνεπιλημπτος can serve as the summary qualification for one who desires to the office, but the very idea of ἀνεπιλημπτος is difficult for the natural mind to accept; it necessarily depends not only upon the candidate's actions and attitudes but also upon the congregation, community, and culture. Every man is a sinner. Every pastoral candidate is a sinner. Every pastor is a sinner.

Should a man's sins become known in a congregation, if they should strike the wrong chord and stir up the congregation and community, such that the discord is louder in the community and among the brethren than his pastoral work and preaching could be, then he must not hesitate to make way for another who is not so encumbered. Candidates for the office must be vetted and properly instructed in this

matter, since aspiration will not overcome indignation except by arrogance.

"There is no gift of God more excellent and salutary than a faithful, suitable, and sincere minister of the Word. But now the gifts of God cannot be obtained except through prayers (Luk 11:13; Joh 16:24; Jam 1:5, 17). It is God who makes ministers of the New Testament suitable (2Co 3:5). Therefore it is He whom we must ask to send the man He has selected."<sup>263</sup>

The community in which a pastor works also must have a good testimony about the man, such that even if they despise the Lord and bear false witness against His man, they ultimately only attest to his Christian love and concern that God's Word reach those for whom Christ died. If, however, they have witnessed and taken note of his sinfulness and so testify truthfully against the pastor, then that man has lost his ability to work effectively there. Similarly, should a pastor come to be thought of as a Caspar Milquetoast: weak, ineffectual, salt that has no saltiness, (dah, gentlemen ...)—then he also ought to step aside.

The call into the office necessarily includes the bold preaching of God's Word, and "it is the call that makes the pastor."<sup>264</sup> If the preaching of the pastor fails to be the Word of the Lord, then he has stepped outside the office.<sup>265</sup> If the word of the pastor—though in truth it be the very Word of the Lord—is not heard by the people, because the man's sinful actions and bad reputation are louder by far, then the primary duty of the office cannot be carried out by that man in that place. The salvation of souls must ever remain the paramount consideration, and that salvation is not accomplished apart from the faithful hearing of the gospel.

Those who have stepped aside to ensure that the preaching of the Word remains prominent may or may not be able to return to the work of the ministry. In the verses considered, Paul has not issued a list of rules for determining the eligibility of a man, but rather has carefully laid out what is required for a man to be able to preach successfully. The reinstatement of a pastor, then, is not a matter of checking off a list of behavioral and historical necessities, but rather a careful and honest consideration and appraisal—both by those responsible for calling and the man himself—of what the man will be able to do, and that consideration revolves around the meaning that Paul has injected into

---

<sup>263</sup> Gerhard, 168.

<sup>264</sup> Mischke, 3.

<sup>265</sup> Mat 7:15; Gal 1:6–9; 1Jo 4:1; Rom 16:17.

ἀνεπίληπτος. Best practice is not excluding candidates on the basis of a list. Paul enjoins upon Timothy and the Church a best practice that involves the careful wrestling with these words, with the candidate's past and conscience, with the best construction on the events of the past, with a clear and deep understanding of the needs of the congregation and its knowledge of the man, with a clear understanding of how the man is perceived by the community, etc.

Can a man such as Chad Bird or Tullian Tchividjian be properly called to re-enter the pulpit? Given the publicity surrounding these men, probably not in the English-speaking world. Could such a one serve where his previous sins are not known? Possibly. Could such a man serve without genuine repentance? Yes, but he is under the same condemnation as the devil, and even though the blessed means of grace would not go forth in vain from him, he and his congregation would be encircled by the snare of the devil. Could a congregation call a man, knowing that he is a sinner living in repentance? Could he serve in genuine repentance? That is simply a part of the office. Could he be called if the salacious details were public knowledge? He probably should not, nor should he be called to such a situation. Can one who should not serve in the ἐπισκοπή publicly proclaim God's Word by means of mass media? That is a question with many nuances that the text of First Timothy 3:1–7 does not answer. Someone else will need to write that one. LSQ

---

## Bibliography

Unless otherwise noted, all English quotations of the Holy Bible are from the *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version* (ESV) and all Greek quotations of the Holy Bible are from *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition* (SBLGNT).

### Bible

*The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*. Wheaton: Good News Publishers, 2016.

*The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition*. Society of Biblical Literature and Logos Bible Software, 2010.



## Large Collection and Multivolume Set Abbreviations

*AE* = *Luther's Works*. American Edition.

*ANF* = *Ante-Nicene Fathers*

*NPNF1* = *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, First Series

*NPNF2* = *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Second Series

*PG* = *Patrologia Graeca*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.

*PL* = *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864.

*WA* = *D. Martin Luthers Werke*. Weimerer Ausgabe.

## Printed Resources

*Atti della R. Accademia della Scienze di Torino*, Torino: Stamperia Reale, 1872. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=b0BQAQAAMAAJ&pg=PA482&dq=%22In+questo+monastero+ritrovai+una+quantit%C3%A0+grandissima%22&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiT6ea-vuPRAhXB7YMKHTXhCewQ6AEIITAB#v=onepage&q=%22In%20questo%20monastero%20ritrovai%20una%20quantit%C3%A0%20grandissima%22&f=false>.

Aeliani, Claudii. *De natura animalium libri xvii, varia historia, epistolae, fragmenta*. vol. 1. Leipzig: Aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1864.

Aeschylus. *Aeschylus, with an English translation by Herbert Weir Smyth, Ph. D. in two volumes*. Translated by Herbert Weir Smyth. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1926. URL: <https://archive.org/details/aeschyluswitheng02aescuoft>.

Aland, Barbara, and Kurt Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 26<sup>th</sup> Edition. 10<sup>th</sup> Printing. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1986.

American Council of Learned Societies. *Dictionary of American Biography*. Vol. 20. Edited by Dumas Malone. New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1936. URL: <https://archive.org/details/dictionaryofamer20amer>.

*The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. American Edition. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885. 14 vols. Repr., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1994.

Aristotle. *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, vol. 22. Translated by J. H. Freese. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1926.

Aristotle. *Aristotle's Eudemian Ethics*, Edited by F. Susemihl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1884. URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0049:book=3:section=1233b&highlight=semno%2Fths>.



- Aristotle. *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, vol. 20. Translated by H. Rackham. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1981. URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0050:book=3:section=1233b>.
- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. W. D. Ross, ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. [Aristot. *Rb.*]
- Barnes, Albert. *Barnes Notes on the Old and New Testaments*. URL: [http://biblehub.com/commentaries/barnes/1\\_timothy/1.htm](http://biblehub.com/commentaries/barnes/1_timothy/1.htm).
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Bengel, D. Joh. Alberti. *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1860. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=ywUHAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- Bengel, John A. *Gnomon of the New Testament*. vol. 2. Translated by Charlton T. Lewis and Marvin Vincent. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins, 1862.
- Boyer, James L. “First Class Conditions: What Do They Mean?” *Grace Theological Journal* 2, no. 1 (1981): 75–114.
- Braine, David, and Michael Clark. “Varieties of Necessity.” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 46 (1972): 139–188.
- Buttrick, George A. et al., eds. *The Interpreter’s Bible*. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1955.
- Calvin, John. *Commentary on First Timothy*. In *Calvin’s Commentaries*. Repr. Translated by William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
- The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Edited by Robert Audi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Chrysostom, John. Homily IX on First Timothy. In PG 62 and *NPNF1* 13.435.
- Chrysostom, John. Homily X on First Timothy. In PG 62 and *NPNF1* 13.437.
- Clement of Rome. *First Epistle to the Corinthians* [ἸΠΠΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Α΄]. In PG 1.256f.
- Crosby, Henry L., and John N. Schaefer. *An Introduction to Greek*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1928.
- Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. 15<sup>th</sup> Printing. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Day, Edward Parsons. *Day’s Collocon*, New York: International Printing and Publishing Office, 1884. URL: <https://books.google.com/>

books?id=Qo\_Mhkcu8iAC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summa  
ry\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Dionysii Halicarnasei Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt*. Vol. 3. Karl Jacoby, ed. Leipzig: Aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1867. URL: <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=O2sxAQAAAJ&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PA390>.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. In *Loeb Classical Library*. Edited by G. P. Goold, Vol. 347. Translated by Ernest Cary. Cambridge: Harvard, 1939.

Erasmus, Desidarius. *Novum Instrumentum Omne*. Basil: Johann Froben, 1516. URL: <https://www.originalbibles.com/erasmus-new-testament-1516-first-edition-greek-and-latin-pdf/>.

Eusebius of Pamphylia. *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Liber Tertius*. In PG 20.

Eusebius of Pamphylia. *Church History*. In NPNF2 1:45f.

Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. In *Oxford Theological Monographs*. Edited by J. Barton, et al. New York: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Faught, Arthur L. "Quality Service from Qualified Servants: An Exegesis of 1 Timothy 3:1-13." Paper presented to the North Atlantic District, Colonial South Pastors' Conference, Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church, Falls Church, Virginia, October 21, 2003.

Fee, Gordon D. *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*. Vol. 13 of *New International Biblical Commentary*. 6<sup>th</sup> Printing. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.

Gaebelein, Frank E., and J. D. Douglas, eds. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.

Gerhard, Johann, Richard J. Dinda, and Benjamin T. G. Mayes. "On the Ministry." In *Theological Commonplaces*. St. Louis: CPH, 2011.

Harrison, P.N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. Humphrey/Milford: Oxford University Press, 1921. URL: [https://books.google.com/books?id=6\\_VJAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA438&dq=%22a+history+of+the+councils+of+the+church%22+Paphnutius&hl=en&csa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj6q9jI1-3SAhUI1GM-KHTDXCTkQ6AEIHDA#v=onepage&q=%22a%20history%20of%20the%20councils%20of%20the%20church%22%20Paphnutius&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=6_VJAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA438&dq=%22a+history+of+the+councils+of+the+church%22+Paphnutius&hl=en&csa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj6q9jI1-3SAhUI1GM-KHTDXCTkQ6AEIHDA#v=onepage&q=%22a%20history%20of%20the%20councils%20of%20the%20church%22%20Paphnutius&f=false).

Hefele, Charles J. *A History of the Councils of the Church*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2007.

Hermas. *Shepherd of Hermas*. In PG 2:891f, ANF 2:9f.

Hillman, D. C. A. *The Chemical Muse: Drug Use and the Roots of Western Civilization*. New York: St. Martin Press, 2008.

- Huther, Joh. ed. *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus*. Translated by David Hunter. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890.
- Ignatius of Antioch, [*Epistle*] to the *Philippians* [ΠΙΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ]. In PG 5.48f. URL: [https://books.google.com/books?id=-AQRAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=-AQRAAAAYAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).
- Ignatius of Antioch. *Epistle to the Ephesians* [ΠΙΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ]. In PG 14.747f.
- Ignatius of Antioch. *Epistle to the Magnesians* [ΠΙΡΟΣ ΜΑΓΝΗΣΙΟΥΣ]. In PG 1.757f.
- Ignatius of Antioch. *Epistle to the Philippians* [ΠΙΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ]. In PG 5:920f.
- Ironside, H. A. "Commentary on 1 Timothy 3:4". *Ironside's Notes on Selected Books*. URL: <http://www.studylight.org/commentaries/isn/1-timothy-3.html>. 1914.
- Jerome. Letter 52. In *PL* 22:527f, *NPNF2* 6:89f.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Josephus*. Vol. 1. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. *Loeb Classical Library*. Vol. 186. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926. URL: <https://ryanfb.github.io/loebolus-data/L186.pdf>.
- Josephus, Flavius. *The Complete Works of Josephus*. Translated by William Whiston. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1981.
- Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Kretzmann, P. E. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1918.
- Langford, Justin. *Defending Hope, Semiotics and Intertextuality in 1 Peter*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2013.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon*. Reprint. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.
- The Letter of Aristeas*. URL: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/swete/greekot.vii.ii.html>.
- Liddell, Henry G, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented by Sir Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Liddon, Henry P. *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by J. R. Harmer. London: Macmillan and Co., 1907.

- Lock, Walter. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. 3<sup>rd</sup> printing. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1952.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: UBS, 1989.
- Mathewson, David. "Rethinking Greek Verb Tenses in Light of Verbal Aspect: How Much Do Our Modern Labels Really Help Us." Paper presented at Gordon College, Spring 2006.
- McEvoy, James. *Robert Grosseteste*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- McKay, Kenneth L. *A New Syntax of the Verb in the New Testament: An Aspectual Approach*. In *Studies in Biblical Greek*, Book 5. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*. Corrected edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. New York: Oxford, 1992.
- Mischke, Carl H. "The Call to the Public Ministry with Special reference(sic) to Termination and Reentry". WELS. URL: <http://wlsessays.net/handle/123456789/3330>.
- Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Mounce, William D., *Basics of Biblical Greek*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Nelson, Max. "Did Ancient Greeks Drink Beer?" *Phoenix* 68 (1/2): 27-46. URL: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/llcpub/25>.
- Philo. *De Specialibus Legibus*. In *Loeb Classical Library*. Vol. 7. Edited by G. P. Goold. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge: Harvard, 1998. URL: <https://ryanfb.github.io/loebolus-data/L320.pdf>.
- Philo. *De Praemiis et Poenis*. *Loeb Classical Library*. Vol. 8. Edited by G. P. Goold. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge: Harvard, 1999. URL: <https://ryanfb.github.io/loebolus-data/L341.pdf>.
- Philo. *The Works of Philo of Judea*. Translated by Charles Duke Yonge. London: H. G. Bohn, 1854-1890. URL: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/index.html>.
- Plato. *Dialogs of Plato*. Vol. 4. 5 vols. Translated by B. Jowett. Oxford: Clarendon, 1871.
- Plato. Gorgias. URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0177%3Atext%3DGorg.%3Asection%3D474d>.

- Plato. *Gorgias*. In *Platonis Opera*. Edited by John Burnet. Book 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1903. pp. 447–527. URL: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015031716312;view=1up;seq=259>.
- Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*. In *Loeb Classical Library*. Vol. 392. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Cambridge: Harvard, 1938. URL: <https://ryanfb.github.io/loebolus-data/L392.pdf>, [https://www.loebclassics.com/view/pliny\\_elder-natural\\_history/1938/pb\\_LCL392.115.xml?readMode=recto](https://www.loebclassics.com/view/pliny_elder-natural_history/1938/pb_LCL392.115.xml?readMode=recto).
- Plummer, Alfred, “The Pastoral Epistles,” in *The Expositor’s Bible*. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. London: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1903.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. 3<sup>rd</sup> printing. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Ptolemy, Claudius. *Tetrabiblos*. Edited and translated by F. E. Robbins. In *Loeb Classical Library*. Vol. 350. Cambridge: Harvard 1940. URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Ptol.+3.13&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0636>, <https://ryanfb.github.io/loebolus-data/L350.pdf>, [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/ptolemy/tetrabiblos/3d\\*.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/ptolemy/tetrabiblos/3d*.html).
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Romney, A. Kimball. “Statistical methods for characterizing similarities and difference between semantic structures” in *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 91(1): 518–523.
- Schleiermacher, Frederick. “Über den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an den Timotheos. Ein kritisches Sendschreibung an J. C. Gass.” Reprinted in Friedrich Schleiermacher. *Sämmtliche Werke*. Vols. 1 and 2. 221–320. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1836. URL: [https://books.google.de/books?id=nEvwAcBALHkC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.de/books?id=nEvwAcBALHkC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).
- Schuetze, Armin W., and Irwin J. Habeck. *The Shepherd Under Christ: A Textbook for Pastoral Theology*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1974.
- Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. 3<sup>rd</sup> printing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Stuebs, Paul A. “Exegesis of I Timothy 3—With Practical Application for the Ministry.” Paper presented to the Dakota–Montana District Pastoral Conference, Northwestern Lutheran Academy, Mobridge, South Dakota, April 1–2, 1975.

Tatian, *Oratio Adversus Græcos*. In PG 6.

Tatian, Address of Tatian to the Greeks. In *ANF* 2.

Trench, Richard C. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., 1890.

Valleskey, David J. "The Victory of Christ For the Pastor and His Own Personal Warfare in the Light of 1 Timothy 3:1–7.0" Paper presented at the MN District Pastoral Conference, Resurrection Lutheran Church, Rochester, Minnesota, May 3, 2000.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walther, C. F. W. *Kirche und Amt*. Zwickau: Verlag des Schriftenbereins der sep. evang. Luth. Gemeinden in Sachsen, 1894.

Witt, William. "Concerning Women's Ordination: Women's Ministry in the New Testament (Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons) or a Presbytera is not a 'Priestess' (Part 2)" URL: <http://willgwitt.org/theology/concerning-womens-ordination-womens-ministry-in-the-new-testament-bishops-presbyters-deacons/>.

Wohlenberg, G. *Die Pastoralbriefe (der erste Timotheus-, der Titus-, und der zweite Timotheusbrief)*. Edited by D. Theodor Zahn, et al. In *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 13. 18 vols. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1906.

Woods, Andy. "The Meaning of 'The Husband of One Wife' in 1 Timothy 3:2."

Xenophon. *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*. Vol. 3. 7 vols. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1922. [Xen. Hell.] URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Xen.+Hell.+6.1&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0205>. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Xen.+Hell.+6.1&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0206>.

### Websites and Online Information (not in print)

Alcorn, Randy. "Meaning of 'The Husband of One Wife' in 1 Timothy 3" URL: <http://www.epm.org/resources/2010/Feb/23/meaning-husband-one-wife-1-timothy-3/>.

URL: <http://www.christianiconography.info/ignatiusAntioch.html> [iconography and hagiographic information].

URL: [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%A1%CE%B7%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AC\\_%CF%83%CF%87%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B1](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%A1%CE%B7%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AC_%CF%83%CF%87%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B1).

Ramey, William, "A Greek Exegetical Library Edition" 2016 Edition (diagrams).

Searchable Greek Inscriptions. Cornell University and Ohio State University, 2015. URL: [epigraphy.packhum.org](http://epigraphy.packhum.org).

Sowell, Eric B. "Guide to Basic Greek Diagramming" URL: <https://www.inthebeginning.org/e-diagrams/documents/intermediategreetodiagramming.pdf>.

Ciampa, Roy E. Reference Charts for New Testament Textual Criticism. URL

<http://www.skypoint.com/~waltzmn/ManuscriptsUncials.html> retrieved January 6, 2017.

<http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/texte/Papyri-list.html> [now defunct]

[http://www.ma.ultranet.com/~twseid/iam/table\\_gkmss.html](http://www.ma.ultranet.com/~twseid/iam/table_gkmss.html) [now defunct]

<http://www.entmp.org/manuscripts> [now defunct]

# Funeral Sermon for the Rev. Harry Kenneth Bartels

*Rob A. Lawson  
Pastor, Concordia and Bethany Lutheran Churches  
Hood River and The Dalles, Oregon*

---

LSQ Vol. 62, No. 4 (December 2022)

---

**Obituary:** Harry Kenneth Bartels was born on November 15, 1929 in Vesta, Nebraska, to Ernest and Susie Bartels. He was baptized on December 8, 1929 and confirmed on June 13, 1943 at St. John Lutheran Church, Tecumseh, Nebraska. He graduated from Concordia Lutheran Seminary, Springfield, Illinois in June 1955. He married Ardyce Elaine Kollmorgen on June 19, 1955. Harry and Ardyce were blessed with two boys, Tim and Mark. Harry served Lutheran congregations in Oxford and Packwaukee, Wisconsin; Ashippun, Wisconsin; Shenandoah, Iowa; Sharpsburg, Pennsylvania; Gibsonia, Pennsylvania; Fort Wayne, Indiana; Brownsburg, Indiana; and Tacoma, Washington. Harry had a special love for church music. He had the honor of being one of the three compilers of the Evangelical Lutheran Hymnary for the Evangelical Lutheran Synod. He conducted Bach Cantata presentations at Parkland Lutheran Church. He wrote 32 hymns and 10 original melodies. Harry is survived by his wife Ardyce; by his brothers Loren (Sally), Lavern (Eloise), Dwayne (Janene); by his sister Ruth; by his sons Tim (Dawn) and Mark (Sherri); by 6 grandchildren Jessica (Brad) Hall, Jeremy Bartels, Jaimie (Byron) Rombaoa, Matthew (Dani) Bartels, Jonathan (Catherine) Bartels and Nathan Bartels; and by 9 great-grandchildren. He is preceded in death by his brother Ernest (Lois). Harry Bartels died on August 4, 2022, in Portland, Oregon. Blessed be his memory! Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him.

---



**D**EAR FELLOW REDEEMED AND ESPECIALLY YOU,  
 dear family members:

In late July of 1750, as Johann Sebastian Bach lay dying from the effects of a stroke he had suffered, he thought of the organ prelude he had composed many years before on the hymn *When In the Hour of Utmost Need* (#257 in our *Evangelical Lutheran Hymnary*). Knowing his hymnal better than most, he realized that the tune assigned to that hymn was also used for the hymn we just sang: *Before Thy Throne I Now Appear*. The two hymn texts complement each other so that the expressive character of Bach's organ setting fits both equally well. The text that now went through his head as he lay on his deathbed, though, was the second. In particular the first and last stanzas:

Before Thy throne I now appear,  
 O Lord, bow down Thy gracious ear  
 To me and cast not from Thy face  
 Thy sinful child that begs for grace.

Grant that in peace I close mine eyes,  
 But on the Last Day bid me rise  
 And let me see Thy face fore'er—  
 Amen, Amen, Lord, hear my prayer!  
 (ELH 564:1&7)

Bach asked a friend to play for him the chorale prelude setting of *When in the Hour of Utmost Need*, only now, in his head, he heard it as *Before Thy Throne I Now Appear*. Listening to the piece, Bach realized that it could benefit from some improvements in a number of details. He asked the friend to change the title of the piece to reflect that hymn and then, from his bed, he dictated the changes necessary in order for him to be ready to appear before his Creator's throne.

Johann Sebastian Bach died in Christ on July 28, 1750. His now revised organ chorale prelude on the hymn *Before Thy Throne I Now Appear* was entered into the records as his last composition. It demonstrates one final instance of an entire life spent striving after what he called "well-tempered church music to the glory of God." More notably, it offers a glimpse at Bach's knowledgeable and devout Lutheran faith, a faith deeply rooted in repentance over sin, and God's grace in Christ; a faith immersed in God's Word and the richness of the Lutheran devotional heritage. Bach's was a carefully cultivated baptismal faith. He was

prepared over a life-time of full and regular use of the means of grace for just this moment when he would need to stand before God's throne at the doorstep of eternity.

Now, anyone who knew Harry Bartels knows why I've led with that story from the final days of Harry's favorite church musician. One could well sum up the great composer's entire life of faith and faithfulness with the final verse of today's Old Testament Lesson from Isaiah 25: *And it will be said in that day: "Behold, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us. This is the Lord; we have waited for Him; we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation"* (v. 9).

The promised salvation of God in Christ—this is what drove Bach. It's the heart and soul of his musical output. A person can certainly love Bach's music, and derive a certain human joy and inspiration from it, without appreciating or even knowing anything about the theology Bach proclaimed in his music. Many do. One can also be very knowledgeable of and believe and love the theology proclaimed in Bach's music without necessarily appreciating his music. Again, many do.

Harry loved both, but it's the theology that drove the love. He had a deep and abiding God-given love for the riches of the Gospel, the good news of Jesus Christ—God in the flesh; God suffering, bleeding and dying for sinners such as him; to restore him and us to God's love and life. Harry had a passion for proclaiming this in both sermon and song as the hymns he's left behind testify to so well.

Harry's faith was that of one who was quite aware of the blackness and depravity of his own heart. His was a love for the Gospel that could only live in and issue from one who had come to full terms with his own propensity to sin against the One who had bought him at so great a price, and who knew no other way out than to cling to that One.

The writer to the Hebrews says that in Christ's Church we have not come to that mountain of God's implacable law that thunders forth the Deity's fiery wrath against the unholy, incapable of conforming to its strict demands, and so frightens them that they desperately, but futilely, shield their eyes and ears from its terrifying sights and sounds. Rather, we have come to that mountain where forgiveness from God is declared and holiness is bestowed because of the saving work of God's Son on Mount Golgotha. We have come to Jesus, the Savior, the Mediator of the new covenant. That new covenant is simply that sin is paid for and redemption is accomplished by the shedding of His innocent blood. Sinners are cleansed of guilt and shame by the sprinkling of that blood on their consciences. In the words of stanza 3 of Blessed Martin Luther's

great creedal hymn: *Here* [that is, in the Church, on Mount Zion, by the work of the Spirit] *forgiveness and salvation daily come through Jesus' merit* (ELH 38). In other words, here we come to the holy Gospel.

Like his beloved Bach, Harry was so thoroughly familiar with the tradition of Lutheran hymns. He knew their content and he got their purpose: to instruct the soul in these truths; to comfort sinners and strengthen faith in Christ by this Word of God in a way that perhaps only the combination of words and music can do. The Lutheran heritage of hymns shaped and informed his own output of hymnody, especially the central message of that heritage: the distinction between Law and Gospel, between Mount Sinai and Mount Golgotha and Zion. His twelve-stanza hymn in celebration of the Lutheran Reformation is really quite a special poetic treatment of that truth. Just listen:

The Gospel shows And thus bestows The grace of God the Father,  
 And of His Son, Who by death won, As both our Lord and Brother,  
 Forgiveness for What we deplore—For all of our transgression,  
 That we might be By Him made free From this vile world's oppression.

To bring us men To God again The Son came from His Father;  
 Sent down from heav'n, True Manhood giv'n Through Mary, Virgin  
 Mother,  
 He wrought for us All righteousness, God's Law in full obeying,  
 By His dread cross Redeeming us, For our offenses paying.

Behold such grace! He took our place To bear sin's dreadful burden,  
 God's curse, all woe, For us below, And thus procured our pardon;  
 And now to all the Gospel's call Christ's merits freely offers,  
 And bids the lost Be saved by trust—Such grace the Gospel proffers!

So, too, it brings To him who clings In faith to Christ the Savior  
 True peace from God Through Christ bestowed Who gained for us  
 God's favor;  
 God's wrath He stilled, He reconciled Us sinners to our Maker;  
 All who believe, This peace receive, Are of it now partaker(s?).

God's grace and peace, Hold fast to this, The Gospel's precious content,  
Bought for the lost At greatest cost—Christ's blood for our atonement;  
O let not men From this again, No, not an angel turn you;  
Believe the Lord, Confess His Word, Though proud false brethren  
spurn you.  
(Bartels 26:1–5)

What a treasure! Yes, Harry's hymn, but more importantly, Christ's blood for our atonement that his hymn extols! Harry trusted in the gift of his baptism because in baptism Jesus sprinkled His atoning blood to wash away his sins. Harry's greatest joy was our Lord's Holy Supper—not the theologizing and debating of it, but the receiving of Christ's body and blood for the forgiveness of sins. Harry did focus on the doctrine of the Supper, and he did debate it with great urgency, but not as some exercise. Years ago a certain Lutheran professor declared that all theology is Christology. He was right! All true, saving theology is ultimately about Christ, and the purpose of theology is to bring Christ to sinners and sinners to Christ. Nowhere is this more clear than in the Sacrament of Christ's true body and blood where Christ and His gifts won on the cross are distributed most concretely and intimately.

The sacrament of the altar animated Harry because it animated his faith, for it is the very New Testament in the blood of Jesus. In the sacrament, the blood of Jesus is sprinkled into the repentant heart, together with the life-giving body of Jesus, to clean out guilt and shame and thus to feed and nourish faith in Christ. From head to toe, from inside out, the faith of Harry Bartels was soaked in the bloody righteousness of Jesus.

For Harry the means of grace: baptism, the preaching of the gospel, the word of absolution, and the Holy Supper, were the points of contact with a gracious Savior who loved him and gave Himself for him that he might have life and have it in abundance. Again, you can see this in the hymns he wrote. One verse stands out: verse 6 of *King of Righteousness, Our Savior*, a hymn for Palm Sunday and the First Sunday in Advent (both of which days feature the gospel of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem.) Harry attached this footnote to the text: "Composed for use during the distribution of the Lord's Supper, as the tune appointed reflects." The tune is *Soul, Adorn Thyself with Gladness*. Verse six says:

We, Your Church, Jerus'lem's Daughter,  
 Cleansed by You through Baptism's Water,  
 Pray You, guard us by the preaching  
 Of Your Word, Your mighty teaching;  
 Strength too from Your Supper give us,  
 This, Your Feast of Love, so move us;  
 Through These keep us Yours forever,  
 Glorious King, great Bridegroom-Savior!  
 (Bartels 13:6)

As Harry believed, so he ministered. What he loved and rejoiced in for himself, he wanted others to share in and rejoice in. A faithful pastor loyally and reliably preaches and teaches the fullness of the true Christian faith. He reverently conducts the services in God's house. He diligently prays for his parishioners. He urges them to remain steadfast to the Lord in faith and life. And he firmly and lovingly admonishes them to frequently hear the Holy Gospel and receive the Blessed Sacrament.

The mark of Pastor Bartels' faithfulness was the many he baptized and confirmed, absolved and communed at the altar of the various parishes he served. And also his unwavering fidelity to the pure Christian faith, as articulated in the Lutheran Confessions, and as practiced in her historic liturgy. Proclaiming and dispensing the Lord Jesus and His mercy and grace; sprinkling the saving blood in His Gospel and Sacraments—that is the will of the Father. And through the ministry of devout pastors like our sainted Pastor Harry Bartels, the Lord's name is truly hallowed and His kingdom comes.

*"Behold, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us. This is the Lord; we have waited for Him; we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation"* (Isaiah 25:9). Now Pastor Harry Bartels, a faithful Christian and a faithful steward of the mysteries of God has heard the promised welcome from the Lord Jesus: *"Well done, thou good and faithful servant... Enter into the joy of your Lord"* (Matt 25:21). And there's even more joy to come, for him and for all the faithful departed (and for us too). *"He is risen! He is not here!"* (Mark 16:6) said the angel the women at the empty tomb. Harry's soul lives and rejoices in the nearer presence of the Lord as His body rests in peaceful sleep until the reappearing of the Lord Jesus. Then, on that day ... well, let's hear it in Harry's own words:

Glorious He'll raise now all who confess Him  
Those who in faith here honor and bless Him! Alleluia!

To heaven's gladness He will receive us.  
Where nothing then shall any more grieve us! Alleluia!  
(ELH 355:6-7)

Dear Ardys, Tim and Dawn, Mark and Sherri, children and grandchildren: *"You have come to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to the innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are registered in heaven, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect, to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than that of Abel"* (Hebrews 12:22-24). Your faithful departed husband, father, grandfather, pastor & friend is there. He is now numbered among the company of heaven we sing of in the preface of the Holy Communion. You are not left with memories only, but your link to him, your remembrance of him and your oneness with him is in Jesus Christ. It is the blood of the new testament in Christ. You will now join him on the Lord's Day to partake of that *"feast of choice pieces"* (Isaiah 25:6) and well-refined wines and fat things that He is blessed to participate in now without end. Be comforted. Be at peace. The wait will soon be over. Until then, let us pray:

Jesus, graciously direct us Through each day O'er life's way;  
From the foe protect us.  
And though many woes surround us, We'll not fear With You here,  
Nothing shall confound us.

Keep us through each day confessing From within All our sin,  
You in faith addressing,  
Trusting You for pardon ever Won for us One the cross  
God the Son, our Savior.  
(Bartels 10:1-2)





# Until the End Comes the Gospel is Proclaimed in Our Broken World

Glenn R. Obenberger  
President  
Evangelical Lutheran Synod

---

LSQ Vol. 62, No. 4 (December 2022)

---

**Editor's Note:** Preached on June 5, 2022 at Saude Evangelical Lutheran Church, Lawler, Iowa, on the occasion of the rededication of its sanctuary after a restoration project.

**Prayer:** Lord Jesus, we thank You for calling us by Your Gospel into Your kingdom of grace. Grant that we be members not of Your visible Church only, but of the invisible community of saints, living temples of Your Spirit. Keep us steadfast in the true faith, and finally receive us into Your kingdom of eternal glory. Amen. (*Concordia Psalter*, p. 204, Ps. 89)

**Text:** *Jesus left the temple and was going away, when his disciples came to point out to him the buildings of the temple. But he answered them, "You see all these, do you not? Truly, I say to you, there will not be left here one stone upon another that will not be thrown down." As he sat on the Mount of Olives, the disciples came to him privately, saying, "Tell us, when will these things be, and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?" And Jesus answered them, "See that no one leads you astray. For many will come in my name, saying, 'I am the Christ,' and they will lead many astray. And you will hear of wars and rumors of wars. See that you are not alarmed, for this must take place, but the end is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be famines and earthquakes in various places. All these are but the beginning of the birth pains. Then they will deliver you up to tribulation and put you to death, and you will be hated by all nations for my name's sake. And then many will fall*

*away and betray one another and hate one another. And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray. And because lawlessness will be increased, the love of many will grow cold. But the one who endures to the end will be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come. (Matthew 24:1–14, ESV)*

**G**RACE, MERCY AND PEACE BE UNTO YOU FROM God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ! What a special festival for us to gather together for today, one of the three chief festivals of the Church year—Pentecost, the feast of the Holy Spirit. And it fits well with rededicating your sanctuary today, the place where the Spirit regularly pours out His gifts to you.

In Christ Jesus, who will never let the gates of hell prevail against His kingdom here on earth through the continual outpouring of the Spirit, dear fellow redeemed:

Imagine standing here with Jesus today and marveling at the beauty of this place and He responds: *“You see all this, do you not? Truly, I say to you, there will not be left here one stone upon another, one board affixed to another, that will not be thrown down”* (Matt 24:2). Now the disciples did not just personally invest in the rebuilding of the temple and the temple grounds, but their joy over the beauty of God’s house was proper. Just as yours is today. Yet Jesus brought them back to earth, so to speak, to be reminded how broken this world is. When the temple was first imagined by David and built by his son, Solomon, there was great joy among the believers that the house of the Lord would reflect His glory by its beauty. So, surely, the members and friends of Saude Lutheran Church should be filled with joy today. But as we gather here and rejoice in what has been accomplished here, we should hear our text and recognize the greater joy: *Until the End Comes the Gospel Is Proclaimed in Our Broken World.*

The world we live and worship in is no less broken than it was in Jesus’ day. In truth, it is even worse. The disciples said to Jesus: *“Tell us, when will these things be, and what will be the sign of Your coming and of the end of the age?”* (Matt 24:3). Jesus answered: *“[Y]ou will hear of wars and rumors of wars. See that you are not alarmed, for this must take place, but the end is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be famines (food shortages) and earthquakes in various places. All these are but the beginning of the birth pains. ... many will fall away and betray one another and hate one another. ...*

*And because lawlessness will be increased, the love of many will grow cold”* (Matt 24:6–8, 10, 12).

Does any of this sound familiar to you? Most certainly! The walls of the temple of Jesus’ day would come down about 40 years later when the Roman Empire would crack down on the rebellion of the Jews. Now we could find relief by pointing out that the Jews primarily rejected the Christ when He came to His temple, so they deserved it—we might think. But the visible Church here on earth has not fared much better these last two thousand years. The Christian Church has had enemies by such names as Muslims, Nazis, Communists, Hindus, Satanists, arsonists that have destroyed houses of the Lord. The world’s brokenness only multiplies, it does not lessen.

Why do believers make their houses of worship to be places of beauty and sacredness? We recognize that in these houses of the Lord, Jesus comes in the appointed means of Word and Sacrament by the work of the Spirit. Here we receive the greatest gifts of all: forgiveness, life and salvation. But cannot those gifts be offered and received in crude places of worship, like barns and stables, cellars and basements, even bomb shelters? Yes, and they have. But in good days, as the lives of believers prosper in this life, they naturally desire to make God’s house reflect that prosperity and affluence.

But keep in mind, my fellow sinners, the brokenness of the world is not disassociated from you. It is a result of your sin, my sin and sin of the entire human race. Wars are caused by the hatred and greed of mankind. Famines are not simply due to bad weather, but when nation rises up against nation. Love growing cold is not something found only in unbelievers, but in you and me. We can so easily be caught up in the unloving responses to our neighbors whose attitudes and actions appear crude and rude. If we get cut off on the road, we will want to express our displeasure in different ways, the least of which might be with a firm and prolonged use of the horn of discipline. Responding in kind seems so right, proper and just at the time to our sinful natures. But think how we are contributors to this ongoing brokenness all around us. It is from this that God sent His Son to rescue us, even from ourselves.

As bleak as all this sounded to the disciples and to us today, Jesus also said: “But the one who endures to the end will be saved.” Are you one of those who will endure to the end and be saved? If you look for the answer within yourself, the answer cannot even rise to a tentative “maybe”; it has to be a resounding “NO.” You and I are sinners and we have no answer to our many sins which are found within us.

But again, the answer is found in the One whom the Father sent to save each one of us, namely Jesus Christ, our holy Substitute. Then the answer to the question whether you will endure and be saved is “Yes! Amen!” Jesus has done all to save you. The faith which you need to have in Him, is the work of God through the Holy Spirit. So, Salvation is completely God’s work. It was willed from eternity before the world was created. It was won for all sinners on the cross on Good Friday. It has been distributed to you and kept for you by the Spirit in Word and Sacrament. When salvation is all God’s work there is nothing uncertain about it.

Prominently you have printed out the words of the song of praise to the Triune God—“Holy, holy, holy!” Our holy gracious Lord is worshipped here. In rededicating this sanctuary, you are promising to worship the only true God. You expect that His Word will continue to be preached here faithfully, His Sacraments administered properly to the welfare His Church.

Did you catch that this work among you is part of what Jesus revealed to His disciples will be going on until the end? Jesus said: “[T]his gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and THEN the end will come” (Matt 24:14, emphasis added). Yes, because of the brokenness of this world this place may not be standing when the end will come, but the Good News proclaimed here will still be sounding out in the world and will reach the uttermost parts of the world.

But also beware, my fellow redeemed, the devil remains the great deceiver. Jesus also tells us: “See that no one leads you astray. For many will come in my name, saying, ‘I am the Christ,’ and ... many false prophets will arise and lead many astray” (Matt 24:4–5). There may come a day when you are confronted by false prophets. Notice: Jesus said they will come in in HIS Name! They may even imply they are your saviors, enticing you to trust their slippery words of deceit. One day, God forbid, you may have to choose between this place of beauty with a sacred history for your family and the word of truth preached and administered in a garage or barn. The being led astray which Jesus warns about is not being led astray from this place, but from His word that sets you, the sinner, free from sin: its guilt, its shame and its condemnation.

As a repentant believing sinner, you regularly confess to your sinfulness, your brokenness, and your desperate need of a Savior. For all the times you have sought refuge in man-made places and promises of peace and safety, you are forgiven. Christ Jesus came to suffer, die and rise

again for you, so that all your false worship forbidden in the first three commandments has been paid for, died with Him and no longer clings to Him nor to you. You have truly been set free—having all your sins forgiven and being dressed in your Savior's everlasting righteousness.

May God use the beauty of this place to highlight for you the Word of peace and truth, for which you gather regularly to receive. God has blessed this congregation to beautify the place where He comes dispensing the greatest gifts ever to be received. We pray that it will stand used for this very salutary purpose until the end of days. Thanks be to our gracious Lord who enables His faithful people to have the desire and wherewithal to create and maintain a place which glorifies Him and benefits His Church. Until the end comes the Gospel is proclaimed in our broken world transporting us from our brokenness to that perfect place of everlasting paradise all for Jesus' sake. Amen. (LSQ)





Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary  
6 Browns Court  
Mankato MN 56001

PRINTED MATTER