

46 WORD BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

Pastoral Epistles

WILLIAM D. MOUNCE

General Editors: Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker

Old Testament Editors: John D. W. Watts, James W. Watts

New Testament Editors: Ralph P. Martin, Lynn Allan Losie

Contents

<i>Editorial Preface</i>	ix
<i>Author's Preface</i>	x
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xii
<i>Commentary Bibliography</i>	xxiv
<i>General Bibliography</i>	xxviii
INTRODUCTION	xli
Preliminary Issues	xlvi
The PE within the Framework of Paul's Life	xlviii
Historical Reconstruction from Acts	xlviii
Historical Reconstruction from the PE	liv
Historical Reconstruction from Early Church Tradition	lxiv
The Ephesian Heresy	lxi
The Response to the Heresy	lxxvi
Additional Issues	lxxxii
Conclusion	lxxxiii
Critical Questions about the PE within the Framework of Paul's Life	lxxxiii
The Historical Problem	lxxxiv
The Theological Problem	lxxxviii
The Linguistic Problem	xcix
Proposals regarding Authorship of the PE	cxviii
<i>Excursus: Pseudepigraphy</i>	cxxiii
Themes in the PE	cxx
Faith	cxx
Savior, Salvation, and Good Works	cxxxi
Outline	cxxv
TEXT AND COMMENTARY	
<i>1 Timothy</i>	1
I. Salutation (1:1–2)	3
II. The Ephesian Problem (1:3–20)	13
A. The Problem Stated (1:3–7)	13
B. The True Intention of the Law (1:8–11)	29
C. Paul's Example of Salvation by Grace (1:12–17)	44
<i>Excursus: "Faithful is the Saying"</i>	48
D. Encouragement and Warning for Timothy (1:18–20)	63
<i>Excursus: Prophecies about Timothy</i>	70
III. Correction of Improper Conduct	
in the Ephesian Church (2:1–4:5)	74
A. Salvation Is for All People (2:1–7)	74

B. Questions of Disruption and Leadership (2:8–15)	94
C. Overseers (3:1–7)	149
<i>Excursus: Bishops and Presbyters in the Postapostolic Church</i>	186
D. Deacons (3:8–13)	193
<i>Excursus: The Deacon and the Deaconess in the Postapostolic Church</i>	207
E. Heart of the Corpus (3:14–16)	212
F. The Source of the Heresy (4:1–5)	232
IV. Personal Notes to Timothy (4:6–16)	244
V. How Timothy Is to Relate to Different Groups in the Church (5:1–6:2a)	268
A. People of Various Ages (5:1–2)	268
B. Widows (5:3–16)	271
<i>Excursus: Widows in the Postapostolic Church</i>	300
C. Payment and Discipline of Elders (5:17–25)	302
D. Slaves (6:1–2a)	324
VI. Final Instructions (6:2b–21)	333
A. The Final Discussion of the Opponents (6:2b–10)	333
B. Encouragement to Timothy (6:11–16)	350
C. Words to the Rich (6:17–19)	364
D. The Final Encouragement to Timothy (6:20–21)	369
<i>Titus</i>	375
I. Salutation (1:1–4)	377
II. Qualities Necessary for Church Leadership (1:5–9)	384
III. Description of the Problem in Crete (1:10–16)	394
IV. Instructions and Theological Basis for Godly Living (2:1–3:11)	405
A. Instructions (2:1–10)	405
B. Theological Basis for Godly Living (2:11–15)	419
C. Continued Call for Godly Behavior (3:1–11)	434
V. Personal Comments and Final Greeting (3:12–15)	456
<i>2 Timothy</i>	461
I. Salutation (1:1–2)	463
II. Thanksgiving (1:3–5)	466
III. Encouragement to Timothy (1:6–2:13)	473
A. Call to Suffer without Shame (1:6–14)	473
B. Examples (1:15–18)	491
C. Continued Appeal to Timothy (2:1–13)	499
IV. Instructions for Timothy and the Opponents (2:14–4:8)	521
A. Timothy and Opponents Contrasted (2:14–26)	521
B. The Presence of Eschatological Evil (3:1–9)	541
C. Encouragement and Proclamation (3:10–4:8)	552
V. Final Words to Timothy (4:9–22)	585
<i>Indexes</i>	603

Editorial Preface

The launching of the *Word Biblical Commentary* brings to fulfillment an enterprise of several years' planning. The publishers and the members of the editorial board met in 1977 to explore the possibility of a new commentary on the books of the Bible that would incorporate several distinctive features. Prospective readers of these volumes are entitled to know what such features were intended to be; whether the aims of the commentary have been fully achieved time alone will tell.

First, we have tried to cast a wide net to include as contributors a number of scholars from around the world who not only share our aims but are in the main engaged in the ministry of teaching in university, college, and seminary. They represent a rich diversity of denominational allegiance. The broad stance of our contributors can rightly be called evangelical, and this term is to be understood in its positive, historic sense of a commitment to Scripture as divine revelation and the truth and power of the Christian gospel.

Then, the commentaries in our series are all commissioned and written for the purpose of inclusion in the *Word Biblical Commentary*. Unlike several of our distinguished counterparts in the field of commentary writing, there are no translated works, originally written in a non-English language. Also, our commentators were asked to prepare their own rendering of the original biblical text and to use those languages as the basis of their own comments and exegesis. What may be claimed as distinctive with this series is that it is based on the biblical languages, yet it seeks to make the technical and scholarly approach to the theological understanding of Scripture understandable by—and useful to—the fledgling student, the working minister, and colleagues in the guild of professional scholars and teachers as well.

Finally, a word must be said about the format of the series. The layout, in clearly defined sections, has been consciously devised to assist readers at different levels. Those wishing to learn about the textual witnesses on which the translation is offered are invited to consult the section headed *Notes*. If the readers' concern is with the state of modern scholarship on any given portion of Scripture, they should turn to the sections on *Bibliography* and *Form/Structure/Setting*. For a clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation, the *Comment* and concluding *Explanation* are designed expressly to meet that need. There is therefore something for everyone who may pick up and use these volumes.

If these aims come anywhere near realization, the intention of the editors will have been met, and the labor of our team of contributors rewarded.

General Editors: *Bruce M. Metzger*
David A. Hubbard†
Glenn W. Barker†
 Old Testament: *John D. W. Watts*
 New Testament: *Ralph P. Martin*

Author's Preface

The past thirteen years during which I have been immersed in this study have been a mixed blessing. It has been a joy to be devoted to God's word. 2 Timothy has always been my favorite book in the New Testament. It gives a personal look into Paul's heart as he writes to the one who I believe was his best friend, with words applicable especially to young pastors everywhere. These years for me have also seen their times of difficulty: sharp disagreement from those even within the evangelical camp in response to positions taken in my writing; personal tragedy in the death of my first two daughters; disappointment in discovering first hand that the answers of the academy often do not answer the real-life issues of the church. But God is good and sovereign, and to him I am thankful.

The target audience of the Word Biblical Commentary series is a broad one, and because the scope is so vast, I have chosen to focus on the needs of those involved in the life of the church. This is not to say that I have dismissed the issues critical to the scholar; indeed, I have struggled with them throughout the commentary. But my primary concern has been to be helpful to those in the pew and pulpit. With this in mind, I begin each verse with a discussion of its basic meaning and of Paul's flow of thought. Then I concentrate on word studies, and after that on the more technical issues.

I know that the tendency of some readers will be to judge this commentary on the basis of my views on authorship and the issue of women in ministry, but I hope that disagreements over these controversies will not keep readers from sharing my encounter with the Pastoral Epistles and from learning what Paul has to say about the ministry in general.

This commentary concentrates on an exposition of the text, and for tangential issues the reader is referred to other resources. My translations are idiomatic in order to reflect the nuances of the original Greek, even to the detriment of English usage. Words inserted into the translation, especially the article, are bracketed. I have tried to limit my word studies to the data in the PE, other Pauline literature, and the NT. I tended not to go outside this circle because of the problems inherent in using nonbiblical references even a century prior to or after Paul, unless the word clearly belonged to the Greco-Roman cultural milieu (excellent discussion of the broader ranges of meaning can be found in W. Lock, C. Spicq, and J. D. Quinn, as well as in standard dictionaries such as *TDNT* and *NIDNTT*). Unless otherwise stated, all biblical quotations are from the RSV or are my own translations. I discuss issues such as the meaning of words the first time they are mentioned in the text and thereafter make reference to that discussion. Questions of authorship have been restricted to the *Introduction*. In the *Explanation* sections I have summarized each passage and dealt with theological issues, including references to treatments of important themes in second- and third-century writings.

With regard to my predecessors, I found the commentaries by G. D. Fee, J. N. D. Kelly, and D. Guthrie to be the most helpful. C. Spicq, G. W. Knight III, and J. D. Quinn provided a rich source of details, and L. T. Johnson often had an interesting and helpful way of looking at the text. Although C. J. Ellicott published his com-

mentary in 1856, I discovered it to be surprisingly contemporary (e.g., his recognition of the ad hoc nature of the instruction and its relationship to the historical situation in Ephesus). I also found that John Chrysostom has come at the text with a refreshing passion. Unfortunately, I. H. Marshall's commentary for the ICC series as well as those by W. L. Liefeld and J. D. Quinn (posthumously edited by W. C. Wacker) arrived too late for me to study. P. H. Towner's *The Goal of Our Instruction* is an excellent work, and I look forward to his commentary for the NICNT series. While I disagreed with A. T. Hanson's work almost constantly, I did appreciate his explanation of the more critical positions on the PE.

Of all the commentaries, I am most indebted to Fee's work, and in many ways see my contribution as an expansion of the road that he has paved, viewing the PE as letters written to specific historical situations. Most of the major commentaries (in English) in the last several decades have, like Fee, supported the authenticity of the PE. I hope that my efforts will help readers to appreciate the truly epistolary and ad hoc nature of these three books, addressed, like Paul's other letters, to real people in real-life situations, and to recognize the almost glaring differences between the PE and the Christian literature of the second century.

I am glad to express my thanks and indebtedness to the many people who have helped me in this endeavor. To Professors Tom Schreiner, Craig Blomberg, Robert Mounce, Aida Spencer, and Craig Keener, who read some or all of the commentary and were free with their criticisms and suggestions, I am profoundly indebted, especially as they helped me understand their positions that differ from mine. Thanks to my editors, Professor Ralph Martin, Dr. Lynn Losie, and Melanie McQuere, who improved the manuscript in many places and edited my text to conform to the style of the series. When I thought the task was simply too great, the Lord brought Ron Toews, Roger Smith, Foster Chase, and the Teknon Corporation into my life, through whose generosity I was enabled financially to finish the task. Thanks go to my church for its support, encouragement, and the opportunity to serve, especially to Richard Porter, Steve Yoell, and Doug Welbourn. Thanks also are due to my students Miles Van Pelt and Juan Hernández, Jr., for their months of library work on the text and on the indexes, to David and Carole Lambert for many hours of help, and to the members of my last seminar on the PE: Ted Kang, John Lin, Jim Cheshire, Tom Haugen, Ryan Jackson, Harold Kim, and Mathias Kuerschner. And while authors generally thank their wives, let not the frequency of that sentiment ever question the value that my wife Robin has brought to my life and the study of this text. Without Robin's patience, support, love, and encouragement to leave a secure job and move to Spokane, Washington (where our only support would have to be from the Lord) so that I could finish this writing project and others, I probably would have given up years ago.

The PE are part of God's "two-edged sword," cutting deeply into the human heart. I am privileged to have been able to immerse myself in these chapters and so to have caught a clearer glimpse of Paul and the gospel, and for that I will be eternally grateful.

WILLIAM D. MOUNCE

March 1999

Garland Avenue Alliance Church, Spokane, Washington

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, Massachusetts

1 Timothy

I. Salutation (1 Tim 1:1–2)

Bibliography

Audet, J. P. “Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharistia in the First Century.” *SE* 1–3 (1961) 643–62. **Aune, D. E.** *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. LEC 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987. **Berger, K.** “Apostelbrief und apostolische Rede: Zum Formular frühchristlicher Briefe.” *ZNW* 65 (1974) 190–231. **Bornkamm, G.** “Formen und Gattungen im N.T.” *RGG*. 999–1005. **Deissmann, A.** *Bible Studies*. 1–59. **Doty, W. G.** *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship, NT Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973. **Exler, F. X. J.** *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography*. 1923. Repr. Chicago: Ares, 1976. **Feneberg, W.** “Timotheus, mein Sohn, der Apostel zwischen Juden und Heiden.” *Entschluss* 40 (1985) 27–29. **Foley, L. P.** “Fidelis, Faithful.” *CBQ* 1 (1939) 163–65. **Friedrich, G.** “Lohmeyers These über ‘Das paulinischen Briefpräskript’ kritisch beleuchtet.” *ZNW* 46 (1955) 272–74. **Funaioli, G.** *Studi in Letteratura Antica* I. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1948. 157–74. **Funk, R. W.** *Language, Hermeneutic and the Word of God*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. 250–74. **Hatch, W. H. P.** *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion*. HTS 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1917. **Hebert, G.** “‘Faithfulness’ and ‘Faith.’” *Theology* 58 (1955) 373–79. **Hout, M. van den.** “Studies in Early Greek Letter-Writing.” *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 2 (1949) 19–41, 138–51. **Jewett, R.** “The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction.” *ATR* 51 (1969) 18–34. **Käsemann, E.** “Liturgische Formeln im N.T.” *RGG*. 993–96. **Kirk, J. A.** “Apostleship since Rengstorf: Towards a Synthesis.” *NTS* 21 (1975) 249–64. **Koskenniemi, H.** *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1956. **Lieu, J.** “‘Grace to You and Peace’: The Apostolic Greeting.” *BJRL* 68 (1985) 161–78. **Lohmeyer, E.** “Probleme paulinischer Theologie: I. Briefliche Grussüberschriften.” *ZNW* 26 (1927) 158–73. **Mullins, T. Y.** “Benediction as a New Testament Form.” *AUSS* 15 (1977) 59–64. **O’Brien, P. T.** *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. NovTSup 49. Leiden: Brill, 1977. **Robinson, J. M.** “Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums.” In *Apophoreta*. FS E. Hünchen, ed. W. Eltester and F. H. Kettler. BZNW 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964. 194–235. **Roller, O.** *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe*. **Roloff, J.** *Apostolat—Verkündigung—Kirche*. **Sanders, J. T.** “The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letter of the Pauline Corpus.” *JBL* 81 (1962) 348–62. **Schenk, W.** *Der Segen in Neuen Testament: Eine begriffsanalytische Studie*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967. **Stowers, S.** *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. LEC 5. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986. **Thatcher, T.** “The Relational Matrix of the Pastoral Epistles.” *JETS* 38 (1995) 41–45. **Torrance, T. F.** “One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith.” *ExpTim* 68 (1957) 111–14. **Vouga, F.** “Der Brief als Form der apostolischen Autorität.” In *Studien und Texte zur Formgeschichte*, ed. K. Berger. Tübingen: Franke, 1992. 7–58. **Wendlund, P.** *Die urchristlichen Literaturformen*. HNT 1/2. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1912. **White, J. L.** *Light from Ancient Letters*. FFNT. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986. **Wiles, G. P.** *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers: The Significance of the Intercessory Prayer Passages in the Letters of St Paul*. SNTSMS 24. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1974.

See also the *Bibliography* for 2 Tim 1:3–7.

Translation

¹Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus because of the command ^a from God our savior and Christ Jesus our hope, ²to Timothy, [my] true spiritual son: Grace, mercy, peace from God [the] Father ^b and Christ Jesus our Lord.

Notes

^aX reads ἐπαγγελίαν, “promise,” probably through assimilation to 2 Tim 1:1; cf. Gal 3:29. Cf. TCGNT², 571; L. T. Johnson, 110–11.

^bX² D² Ψ TR a vg^{ms} sy sa bo^{ms} insert ἡμῶν, “our,” after πατρός, “Father,” in imitation of ἡμῶν after κυρίου, “Lord.” It is omitted by X* A D* F G I 33 81 104 365 1175 1739 1881 pc lat bo.

Form/Structure/Setting

The standard format in ancient letters was succinct: name of author, name of recipient, and greetings. For example: Paul, to Timothy, greetings (see examples in Exler, *Form*). Vv 1–2 follow this same pattern, yet as was typical for Paul he enlarges each element. Sometimes these enlargements are minor (2 Corinthians; Ephesians; Colossians) although with some indication of what is to follow (Philippians; cf. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 3–4). Other times the enlargements are quite significant, laying out the basic message and flavor of the letter. For example, Rom 1:1–7 establishes the systematic, theological nature of the letter. Gal 1:1–6 and 1 Cor 1:1–3 show that Paul’s authority was being questioned. It is in the salutation that the author establishes the relationship between sender and recipient (see White, *Light*, 198).

The significance of the salutation in 1 Timothy has often been overlooked. In relatively few words, a large part of the Ephesian problem is addressed, the core of Paul’s solution given, and the tension between a private letter and a public message established. (1) The Ephesian problem arose because the church had turned away from Paul’s authority and from the salvation through Christ that he preached. So Paul begins by asserting that his apostleship is by a command from God and Christ (cf. Spicq, 1:313); this will be placed in contrast to the opponents who merely “wish” to be teachers (v 7). (2) The solution is that the church should listen to Timothy’s teaching since Timothy, and not the opponents, is Paul’s spiritually legitimate son. (This is spelled out in more detail in *Form/Structure/Setting* on 1 Tim 1:3–7.) (3) The letter is private in that it is written to Timothy, but public in that Paul is writing through Timothy to the church. The epistle’s conclusion (6:21) makes this dual nature obvious when it says, “Grace be with you [plural]” (cf. *Introduction*, “Historical Reconstruction from the PE”).

The style of the salutation is relatively balanced and formal. ἐπιταγήν, “command,” is modified by two clauses—“God our savior” and “Christ Jesus our hope”—a pattern made clear by the twice-repeated ἡμῶν, “our,” at the end of each clause. The threefold blessing (v 2) also comes from both God and Christ. There is a debate regarding the origin of this greeting. It is argued that it is an adaptation from normal letter-writing style, or borrowed from Christian liturgy or a sermon, or Paul’s invention, or a combination of these proposals. See summaries in Furnish (*II Corinthians*, 107) and O’Brien (*Colossians*, 4–5; this work provides an excellent bibliography).

Comment

1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατ’ ἐπιταγήν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, “Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus because of the

command from God our savior and Christ Jesus our hope.” There was trouble in the Ephesian church. People were turning away from Paul’s gospel and were following other leaders and their heretical teaching. Therefore Paul begins on a note of authority (see *Form/Structure/Setting*; Brox, 98). Paul is in charge. He became an apostle by direct command of both God and Christ, and the Ephesians are reminded that Timothy carries Paul’s authority (v 2). An apostle is someone sent as an official representative, bearing the authority of the one who sent the apostle. Whatever other nuances can be present in this term, the dominant note in this context is one of authority (cf. Spicq, 1:314; on *apostle* see Spicq, “Excursus V. Une théologie de l’apostolat,” 2:595–99; Kirk, *NTS* 21 [1975] 249–64; Roloff, *Timotheus*, 55–56; id., *Apostolat*, 9–37; Burton, *Galatians*, 363–84; bibliography in Cranfield, *Romans* 1:52 n. 1). The opponents are attacking Paul’s authority, but Paul is an apostle and therefore must be heeded. In all but four of Paul’s letters, he introduces himself as an apostle (Romans) of Christ Jesus (1, 2 Corinthians; Galatians; Ephesians; Colossians; 1, 2 Timothy; Titus), often in apparent defense of his apostleship (especially 1 Corinthians and Galatians). He also calls himself a “servant” (Titus) of Jesus Christ (Romans; Philippians) and a “prisoner” (Philemon). In 1 and 2 Thessalonians he does not use a title, partly because he is writing with Silvanus and Timothy.

Although it is somewhat unusual—only insofar as we have a limited number of his writings for comparison—for Paul to credit his apostleship to a “command” from God, it is well suited to the context. A questioning of Paul’s authority and his definition of the gospel underlies all of the PE. Instead of following Paul’s gospel of grace (1 Tim 1:12–17), his opponents preached a gospel of myths and babblings about words, a message based on a misunderstanding of the law (1 Tim 1:4, 7). Lock paraphrases, “I Paul, writing with all the authority of an Apostle of Christ Jesus, and in obedience to the direct commandment of God” (4). See also B. B. Warfield’s argument cited in *Form/Structure/Setting* on 1 Tim 1:3–7. Timothy is not questioning Paul’s authority, but the epistle is only semiprivate, and much of it is directed toward the Ephesian church. In Titus 1:3 Paul also credits his apostleship to a command from God; in the more personal and private 2 Timothy, which does not deal with the opponents as much, Paul describes his apostleship as a result of the “will” of God (2 Tim 1:1).

1 Timothy 1:1–2

¹Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus because of the command from God our savior and Christ Jesus our hope, ²to Timothy, [my] true spiritual son: Grace, mercy, peace from God [the] Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

2 Timothy 1:1–2

¹Paul, an apostle of Christ through [the] will of God according to [the] promise of life that [is] in Christ Jesus; ²to Timothy [my] beloved son: Grace, mercy, peace from God [the] Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

Titus 1:1–4

¹Paul, a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ, for [the] faith of [the] elect of God and [the] knowledge of [the] truth that produces godliness, ²for the sake of the hope of eternal life, which the God who does not lie promised before times eternal, ³but he revealed his word at the proper time in the proclamation, [with] which I was entrusted by the command of God our savior. ⁴To Titus, a true son in a common faith. Grace and peace from God [the] Father and Christ Jesus our savior.

Since Paul's concept of his own apostolic calling came directly from the Damascus-road experience, here he is thinking of that event (cf. Acts 9:15; 22:14–15; 26:16–18; Gal 1:15–16; cf. S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982]). On this use of κατά, "because," see M. J. Harris, *NIDNTT* 3:1200–1201; BAGD, 407 (II5ad).

ἐπιταγή denotes an authoritative "command" carrying associations of divine and kingly orders. It is a forceful term, its verbal cognate, for example, being used of Jesus' commands to demons (Mark 1:27; Luke 8:3; see G. Dellling, *TDNT* 8:36–37). In secular Greek it can refer to commands given by people and by gods (MM, 247), especially commands from oracles and the gods (LSJ, 663). Simpson refers to inscriptional data showing that the phrase κατ' ἐπιταγήν, "because of the command," was a standard formula equivalent to "by order of" (24). In the LXX the verb form (ἐπιτάσσειν) occurs five times, describing a royal decree (Esth 1:8; 3:12; 8:8, 11; Dan 3:16). In Paul it denotes a command from God (Rom 16:26; 1 Cor 7:6, 25; 1 Tim 1:1; Titus 1:3), from himself (2 Cor 8:8), or the authority with which Titus is to declare Paul's instructions (μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς, "with all authority"; Titus 2:15). The actual phrase κατ' ἐπιταγήν appears in five of these passages (Rom 16:26; 1 Cor 7:6; 2 Cor 8:8; 1 Tim 1:1; Titus 1:3). It occurs seven times in the NT, every time used by Paul. (The verbal form ἐπιτάσσειν occurs ten times in the NT, but only once in Paul's letters.)

Having said that his apostleship was authorized by a command, Paul identifies the two sources of that command. It was from both "God our savior and Christ Jesus our hope." (θεοῦ, "God," and Χριστοῦ, "Christ," both modify ἐπιταγήν, "command.") The only other Pauline salutation that says Paul's apostleship is from both God and Christ is Gal 1:1, where Paul's authority was also under attack ("Paul an apostle—not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father" [RSV]). In Titus Paul also credits his apostleship to a "command from God" (1:3). As was the case in Galatia, so in Ephesus and Crete Paul's authority may have been under attack. For a discussion of the christological implication of this, see v 2. On the concept of God as "savior" and how the use of the term in the PE is polemical, directed toward the Ephesian worship of emperors as saviors, see *Introduction*, "Themes in the PE."

Our text has the order "Christ Jesus" (reversed in the TR). This is the normal order for Paul, although he also writes "Jesus Christ" with sufficient frequency that the order is not necessarily significant. In 1 Timothy the UBSGNT text has "Christ Jesus" twelve times and "Jesus Christ" twice (6:3, 14). The order "Christ Jesus" reflects the historical sequence in which Paul came to know first the risen Christ and then the earthly Jesus. On the other hand, the epistles by James, Peter, John, and Jude invariably have "Jesus Christ" (thirty-three times), the writers having known him first as the earthly Jesus (see references in Burton, *Galatians*, 393; also Elliott, *Greek Text*, 199–201, for a list of the variants in the PE that alter the order of the names).

Jesus is further identified as ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, "our hope." ἐλπίς, "hope," and ἐλπίζειν, "to hope," occur eighty-four times in the NT, fifty-five in Paul, eight in the PE. Jesus is "not merely the object of [our hope] . . . or the author of it . . . but its very substance and foundation" (Ellicott, 2). Unlike secular apathy and pessimism, Christian hope is sure. It is never a fearful dreading of what lies ahead; rather it is an eager and confident anticipation of what God has in store for believers. It is not so

much a subjective emotion as an objective fact. It is sure because it is centered on Christ and is a gracious gift of God (cf. Rom 5:2, 5; 8:24, 25; 15:4, 13; E. Hoffmann, *NIDNTT* 2:242–43; Spicq, 1:316). Because “our hope” is centered on Christ, it is a title for him (1 Tim 1:1; cf. Acts 28:20; Col 1:27; esp. in Ignatius [*Eph.* 21; *Magn.* 11; *Trall.* salutation, 2; *Phil.* 11]). A true widow sets her hope on God (1 Tim 5:5); the rich should do likewise and not trust in riches (1 Tim 6:17). Paul’s apostleship is “to further the faith of God’s elect . . . in hope of eternal life” (Titus 1:1–2), and believers await their “blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and savior Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:13). Hope is the result of regeneration (Titus 3:5, 7; cf. 1 Pet 1:3), and as a consequence it affects the believers’ conduct (cf. Rom 5:2–5; Ridderbos, *Theology*, 488–89) as they look forward to God’s salvation, having their “hope set on the living God, who is the savior of all people” (1 Tim 4:10). Hope describes both Jesus (1 Tim 1:1; Titus 2:13) and the believer (1 Tim 4:10; 5:5; 6:17; Titus 1:2; 3:7). The hope of the OT and Judaism has come to fruition in Jesus Christ (cf. Ps 65:5, which combines the ideas of hope and salvation). See further A. Barr, “‘Hope’ (ἐλπίς, ἐλπίζω) in the New Testament,” *SJT* 3 (1950) 68–77; C. F. D. Moule, *The Meaning of Hope* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963).

The promise of hope was one of Christianity’s most outstanding features in a world in which hope had little place. Popular belief was dominated by pessimism. The philosophers had dismissed the Olympian gods but had not replaced them with an alternative that provided hope for people. Most could see only the fear and senselessness of chance and the arbitrariness and finality of fate. Stoicism, perhaps the most influential philosophy among the cultured in the first century A.D., taught an apathetic determinism in which individual choice and freedom were absent; one must simply accept whatever fate decides. K. A. Kitchen cites the epitaph “I am of good courage, I who was not, and became, and now am not. I do not grieve” (*ISBE* 2:753). Magic and superstition also abounded. An example of the futility of the times is illustrated by the magical incantation to be used when approached by an unfriendly god: “Lay at once your right [fore-]finger upon your mouth and say, ‘Silence! Silence! Silence!’ (a symbol of the living, incorruptible god). ‘Guard me, Silence!’ Then whistle long, then sneeze, and say . . . and then you will see the gods looking graciously upon you” (“A Mithras Liturgy,” in Barrett, *New Testament Background*, 132). Barrett omits what the person is to say, which A. Dieterich (*Eine Mithrasliturgie* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1903] 2–15) shows to be a conglomeration of sounds that appears to be gibberish. The world was without “hope and without God” (Eph 2:12; cf. 1 Thess 4:13). But “when the time had fully come, God sent forth his Son” (Gal 4:4) so that the indwelling Christ could become “the hope of glory” (Col 1:27). The world was without hope; the message that Jesus is “our hope” (1 Tim 1:1) stood out like a shining beacon in a dark world. For an excellent description of the hopelessness of the ancient world, see Angus, *Environment of Early Christianity*; see also Lohse, *New Testament Environment*, 226–32; R. Bultmann and K. H. Rengstorff, *TDNT* 2:517–33; E. Hoffmann, *NIDNTT* 2:238–44; K. A. Kitchen, *ISBE* 2:751–55.

2α Τιμοθέω γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει, “to Timothy, [my] true spiritual son.” Having identified himself, Paul turns to the second of the three parts of the standard greeting: “to Timothy.” Timothy is Paul’s spiritual son (cf. Phil 2:2) and therefore carries Paul’s authority to the Ephesian church. This is in contrast to the opponents, who are not Paul’s children and therefore should not resist Timothy’s

authority and teaching. Paul similarly identifies Titus as his γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, “true son in the common faith” (Titus 1:4). In 2 Timothy Paul calls Timothy his “beloved child” (1:2). (For a discussion of Timothy’s identity, see *Introduction*, “Historical Reconstruction from the PE, B. 1 Timothy.”)

γνήσιος, “true,” conveys both intimacy and authority. It originally referred to children born in wedlock, hence “legitimate,” as opposed to children born illegitimately (νόθος) or adopted (F. Büchsel, *TDNT* 1:727; Simpson, 26; MM, 128–29). It can also be used figuratively to mean “genuine,” e.g., of writings, hence meaning “sincere” as in 2 Cor 8:8. In Phil 2:20 the cognate adverb γνήσιως describes Timothy’s sincere concern for the Philippian. Later, a Philippian is called γνήσιε σύζυγε, “true yokefellow” (Phil 4:3; cf. ἑτεροζυγοῦντες, “unequally yoked,” 2 Cor 6:14). Spicq calls Timothy Paul’s “legal representative” (1:317). Father-son terminology was common in the Jewish and Hellenistic world for the teacher-student relationship. Because it was so widespread, no one single example can be Paul’s source (Spicq, 1:317). τέκνον, “child,” was a common designation for spiritual progeny; it is possible that Timothy was converted under Paul’s ministry (see *Introduction*, “Historical Reconstruction from the PE, B. 1 Timothy”; 2 Kgs 2:12; Rom 9:7; 1 Cor. 4:14, 15; Gal 3:7; 4:19; Phil 2:22; 1 Thess 2:11; Phlm 10; 1 Pet 5:13; cf. his use of τέκνιον, “little child,” in his epistles; cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, 13; Str-B 3:339–41; G. Schrenk, *TDNT* 5:953–54, 958–59, 977–78, 1005–6; A. Oepke, *TDNT* 5:638–39).

The Ephesian church must listen to Timothy because he, and he alone, is Paul’s legitimate son ἐν πίστει, “in faith.” There are two decisions to be made here. (1) Is ἐν instrumental (“because of faith”) or locative (“within the sphere of faith”)? (2) Is πίστει objective (thinking of Timothy’s “faith” or “the Christian faith”) or subjective (“faithfully”)? To understand the phrase as “because he has been faithful” makes good sense in light of the historical situation. Timothy is Paul’s true son because Timothy has been faithful to Paul’s gospel, in contrast to the opponents. In this case γνήσιος, “true,” is translated “legitimate” since it emphasizes Timothy’s authority in contrast to the opponents’ lack of authority. But this may be reading too much into the salutation, and perhaps it is best to see “in faith” as clarifying that Timothy’s sonship is spiritual, not physical. Titus is called γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, “a true son in a common faith,” a faith that binds together the Jewish Paul and the gentile Titus. This thought could also be present here.

2b χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, “Grace, mercy, peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.” Having identified himself and the addressee, Paul completes the third part of the salutation: the greeting. ἀπὸ, “from,” governs both θεοῦ, “God,” and Χριστοῦ, “Christ,” showing that the trilogy of blessing comes from both persons of the Godhead acting in concert. This is the same grammatical and christological formulation that is in v 1 (see below).

Through subtle literary devices Paul is making a christological statement about the relationship between God and Christ. Twice Paul uses the same grammatical construction: one preposition governing two nouns. Paul is an apostle “because” of the command issued jointly by “our” God and Christ. The christologically sensitive grammatical structure is also present in Gal 1:1: Παῦλος ἀπόστολος . . . διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς, “Paul an apostle . . . through Jesus Christ and God the Father.” Burton (*Galatians*, 5) comments that Paul does not think of God and Christ as having different relationships with himself in terms of his apostleship;

together they have only one relationship with Paul. Bruce adds that the “unselfconscious” way that Paul joins God and Christ is a witness to his Christology (*Galatians*, 73). In fact, this same construction is present in six of Paul’s introductory statements, “Grace to you . . . from God . . . and Christ” (Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Eph 1:2; Phil 1:2; 2 Thess 1:2; see Cranfield, *Romans* 1:72). The grammatical structure shows that Paul sees God and Christ acting in unison. This is especially noteworthy in light of Paul’s monotheistic background. I agree with Simpson that this is “no slender proof of his [Paul’s] conviction of the deity of Christ” (25). Another interesting observation is made by Barrett when he says that v 2 could possibly be translated “God our Savior, *even* Christ Jesus our hope” (38). This is similar to I. H. Marshall’s suggestion that 1 Tim 2:5 be translated “There is one who is God, one who is also the mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus” (“The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament,” in *Reconciliation and Hope*, FS L. L. Morris, ed. R. Banks [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974] 166). Paul, throughout his salutations, especially in the PE, joins God and Christ together.

Accompanying these two grammatical subtleties is perhaps another literary device that does not carry as much weight. In both the NT and the PE, the title σωτήρ, “savior,” is applied to both God and Christ. Outside of the PE this flexibility is best explained by the words of Jude 25, “to the only God, our Savior through Jesus Christ.” The Father is the source and the Son is the agent. But perhaps in the PE this fluctuation is another way in which Paul clarifies his Christology. God and Christ are so united that both perform the same task. Paul has already said as much with his grammatical construction, and he will be saying it even more clearly when he quotes the hymn, “our great God and savior Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:13). (This could be the same type of subtle literary device used by Luke when he records Jesus’ words: “Return to your home, and declare how much *God* has done for you. And he went away, proclaiming throughout the whole city how much *Jesus* had done for him” [Luke 8:39; cf. the same phenomenon in Luke 17:15–16].) These observations form a substantial argument for Paul’s Christology: God and Christ are so joined that they perform the same functions in unison, whether it be issuing a command, pronouncing a benediction, or acting as savior (see *Introduction*, “Themes in the PE”).

This salutation is typical, although slightly different, from Paul’s normal style. His usual greeting is “Grace to you and peace from God our Father and Lord Jesus Christ” (Romans; 1, 2 Corinthians; Galatians; Ephesians; Philippians; 2 Thessalonians; Philemon). Both Galatians and 2 Thessalonians have the variant πατρός καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν, “Father and our Lord,” as in the PE. In Colossians Paul stops the salutation at “Father” and in 1 Thessalonians at “peace.” In the PE Paul says “Grace, mercy, peace from God [the] Father and Christ Jesus our Lord” (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; cf. 2 John 3 and the *v.l.* in Titus 1:4) and “Grace and peace from God [the] Father and Christ Jesus our savior” (Titus 1:4; see variants). The variations are not significant and simply show that Paul, like all other writers, does not always say things in exactly the same way. Chrysostom adds that the inclusion of ἔλεος, “mercy,” was appropriate for a person like Timothy—someone especially dear to Paul—and, I would add, someone in an especially difficult historical circumstance (“Homily 1”; NPNF 13:409). The normal Greek greeting was the simple verb χαίρειν, lit. “rejoice” (see Jas 1:1; Acts 15:23; 23:26; bibliography in J. H. Ropes, *A*

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James, ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1916] 127). The normal Hebrew greeting was שָׁלוֹם *šālôm*, “peace” (Tob 7:12; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 78:2). Paul substitutes the noun χάρις, “grace,” for the verb χαίρειν, and the Greek εἰρήνη, “peace,” for שָׁלוֹם *šālôm*. In 1 Timothy Paul has “mercy” and not his usual “to you,” again showing normal variation typical of any writer who has moved beyond a wooden style. “Grace” and “mercy” are found together in the salutation of every Pauline letter and often in their closing, although not necessarily in conjunction with each other (2 Cor 13:11, 14; Gal 6:16, 18; 2 Thess 3:16, 18; cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 51). They are closely connected in Rom 5:1–2 (cf. Rom 16:20; Eph 6:23–24). “Mercy” and “peace” occur in Gal 6:16 (with “grace” in v 18), Eph 2:4–5, and 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 78:2.

χάρις, “grace,” is a one-word summary of God’s saving act in Christ, stressing that salvation comes as a free gift to undeserving sinners. It is an enormously significant word in Paul’s theology; of its 155 occurrences in the NT, 100 are in Paul’s letters. In classical Greek it was a colorless word without religious connotations. It described something that brought pleasure or approval or something that was attractive (L. B. Smedes, *ISBE* 2:548; cf. especially the use of הֵן *hên*, “to show favor, be gracious,” in the OT; BDB, 336). Here too it was not especially a religious term, being used of both God and people (Burton, *Galatians*, 423). But Paul’s use of the word shows a much deeper concept than “favor,” being closer to חֶסֶד *hesed*, “steadfast kindness,” “covenantal faithfulness,” which, however, is translated by ἔλεος, “mercy,” in the LXX (cf. Spicq, 1:317–18). This provides an excellent illustration of how the historical definition of a word, or its use in the LXX, has no necessary connection with its NT meaning. Paul chooses a neutral word devoid of any deep truth and fills it with his own understanding of God’s gift of salvation. It can be defined only within the context of Paul’s view of salvation (cf. use of ἀγάπη, “love,” in 1 Tim 1:5).

χάρις, “grace,” occurs thirteen times in the PE. Apart from salutations (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4), thanksgivings (1 Tim 1:12; 2 Tim 1:3), and final greetings (1 Tim 6:21; 2 Tim 4:22; Titus 3:15), grace is shown to be the basis for God saving Paul (1 Tim 1:14; cf. v 12; Rom 5:20), for God saving others (2 Tim 1:9; Titus 2:11), and for justification (Titus 3:7). Paul encourages Timothy to “be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus” (2 Tim 2:1). The expression of the concept is fully Pauline, especially as stated in 2 Tim 1:9 (God “saved us and called us with a holy calling, not in virtue of our works but in virtue of his own purpose and the grace which he gave us in Christ Jesus ages ago”). On χάρις, “grace,” see summaries by Spicq, 1:318; Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 622; O’Brien, *Colossians*, 4–5; H. Conzelmann, *TDNT* 9:387–415; Trench, *Synonyms*, 225–26; W. Manson, “Grace in the New Testament,” in *The Doctrine of Grace*, ed. W. T. Whitley (London: SCM Press, 1932) 33–60; J. Moffatt, *Grace in the New Testament* (New York: Long & Smith, 1932); and the bibliographies in BAGD, 878; H. Conzelmann and A. Zimmerli, *TDNT* 9:372–73 n. 115.

ἔλεος, “mercy,” describes acts of pity and help that are appropriate within a relationship between two people. In classical Greek, mercy was the response when something unfortunate and undeserved happened to someone (R. Bultmann, *TDNT* 2:477). It was an emotional response to a bad situation. But in the LXX it translates חֶסֶד *hesed*, and this association governs its meaning in the NT. N. Glueck argues that חֶסֶד *hesed* indicates not so much love and faithfulness as it does the conduct

proper to the covenantal relationship between God and Israel (*Hesed in the Bible* [Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1967]; cf. N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* [London: Epworth, 1944] 94–130; summary by R. L. Harris, *TWOT* 1:305–7). Mercy therefore primarily defines a relationship and secondarily elicits a response of pity to those within the relationship. Mercy is not a subjective emotion but an objective act appropriate for this relationship. This is why חסד *hesed* can also be translated by δικαιοσύνη, “righteousness,” another term describing conduct appropriate to a certain relationship (cf. Ladd, *Theology*, 440; cf. Gen 19:19; 20:13; 21:23; 24:27; Prov 20:28). From this would naturally develop the association between God’s mercy and his faithfulness, loyalty, and love. This also holds true when a person has mercy for another. It is not just that one should have mercy, but that one should act in a manner appropriate to the relationship and within that context have mercy (examples in E. R. Achtemeier, *IDB* 3:352–54; cf. Luke 1:58; 1 Pet 1:3). Because the biblical concept of mercy was governed by that of covenant, the concept of mercy developed the connotation of help or kindness that could be asked or requested of a superior, but never demanded (P. C. Craigie, *EDT*, 708). This accounts for the similarity between the biblical concepts of grace and mercy; both are gifts of God to an undeserving people. On the concept of mercy in the OT, see R. Bultmann, *TDNT* 2:479–81; E. R. Achtemeier, *ISBE* 3:352–53; Eichrodt, *Theology*, 232–39; H.-H. Esser, *NIDNTT* 2:594–95; Trench, *Synonyms*, 225–26.

Paul uses ἔλεος, “mercy,” and ἐλεεῖν, “to be merciful,” twenty-four times (Rom 12:8; 15:9; 1 Cor 7:25; 2 Cor 4:1; Gal 6:16; Eph 2:4; Phil 2:27), twelve in Rom 9–11 (Rom 9:15 [2x], 16, 18, 23; 11:30, 31 [2x], 32) and seven in the PE. Both sides of the theological coin evident in the OT are also found in Paul. On the one side, people cannot demand God’s mercy (Rom 9–11); he is free to grant it as he wills. On the other, God’s mercy will come to those who are in relationship with him. Thus letters can be started (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; *v.l.* in Titus 1:4; cf. 1 Pet 1:3; 2 John 3; Jude 2) and ended (Gal 6:16) with a pronouncement of God’s mercy. Since mercy is the appropriate conduct of God toward Christians, Paul says it is the basis of his own salvation (1 Tim 1:13, 16; cf. 1 Cor 7:25) and of others (Titus 3:5; cf. Eph 2:4; 1 Pet 1:3; especially Rom 11:32). It is both a present reality (2 Tim 1:16; cf. Phil 2:27) and a future hope (2 Tim 1:18; cf. Jas 2:13; Jude 21–23; summary in H.-H. Esser, *NIDNTT* 2:597).

εἰρήνη, “peace,” likewise describes an objective relationship between God and the believer. It is not so much an emotion or feeling as it is a reality. J. Murray, commenting on Rom 5:1, says that peace “is not the composure and tranquillity of our minds and hearts; it is the status of peace flowing from the reconciliation . . . and reflects primarily upon God’s alienation from us and our instatement in his favor. Peace of heart and mind proceeds from ‘peace with God’ and is the reflection in our consciousness of the relationship established by justification” (*The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968] 159). In classical Greek, εἰρήνη meant the cessation of war and eventually included the idea of peaceful relations. In the OT, שלום *šālôm* describes the external absence of hostility and the ensuing general sense of well-being given by God (H. Beck and C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 2:777–79; G. Lloyd Carr, *TWOT* 2:930–32; E. M. Good, *IDB* 3:705–6). These primarily external definitions are found in the NT (H. Beck and C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 2:780), but here the word is charged with a christological significance. Peace is possessed by Christ and given to his followers (Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 143;

1 TIMOTHY 1:1–2

cf. John 14:27). Because believers are justified (Rom 5:1), to be at peace with God is to be in the objective position of one who has been reconciled (Gal 5:22; Phil 4:7). From this objective stance develops the subjective feeling of peace. εἰρήνη, “peace,” occurs in every epistolary salutation in the NT except James and 1 John as well as in many of the closings (Rom 16:20; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 6:16; Eph 6:23; 1 Thess 5:23; 2 Thess 3:16; cf. Phil 4:9). Its only other occurrence in the PE is in 2 Tim 2:22, where it is part of a list of goals toward which Timothy is to strive, along with righteousness, faith, and love. It is commonly found in salutations in Semitic usage (references in Str-B 3:25; see also Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 143–46; Ridderbos, *Theology*, 182–86; G. von Rad and W. Foerster, *TDNT*2:400–417; bibliography in H. Beck and C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 2:783).

Explanation

Paul begins his letter to Timothy and the Ephesian church on a note of authority. His apostleship comes directly from God, and that authority now resides in Timothy, his true spiritual son. The church must therefore listen to Timothy. Two basic thoughts emerge from the salutation. Through subtle literary devices Paul is making a christological statement about the relationship between God and Christ, who work together so closely that together they issue Paul’s call to apostolic ministry and give grace, mercy, and peace.

Paul’s second point is that believers stand in an objective relationship with God, and as a result their hope is certain. Mercy and peace are not primarily emotions. Both are based on the fact that believers have a relationship with God, and consequently God has mercy on the believer and the believer has peace with God. God acts in accordance with the relationship as he has defined it, and that includes having mercy. Believers do not just feel peaceful; they actually are at peace with God, and the feelings of peace and security that evolve from such a relationship are more secure than mere emotions. In addition, grace, mercy, and peace are all freely given to undeserving people. If they had to be earned, they could not be, for no price would be sufficient (Ps 49:7–9, 13–15; Matt 16:26). Rather, this trilogy comes only as a gift, and this is why the Christian hope is secure. It resides not in human ability but in divine grace. Although believers can never demand it, God will shed his mercy on those who are in relationship with him. The believers do not just feel peaceful; they actually are at peace with God. Therefore, the Christian hope is sure as it looks forward to the eschatological salvation and mercy coming at the final judgment. As Spicq (1:316) comments, it is precisely because God is our savior that our salvation is secure.

II. The Ephesian Problem (1 Tim 1:3–20)

A. The Problem Stated (1 Tim 1:3–7)

Bibliography

Bjerkelund, C. J. *Parakalō: Form, Funktion und Sinn der Parakalō-Sätze in der Paulinischen Briefen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1967. **Colson, F. H.** “Myths and Genealogies’—A Note on the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles.” *JTS* s.s. 19 (1917–18) 265–71. **Harrelson, W.** “The Idea of Agape in the New Testament.” *JR* 31 (1951) 169–82. **Hort, F. J. A.** *Judaistic Christianity*. 130–46. **Karris, R. J.** “The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles.” *JBL* 92 (1973) 549–64. **Kittel, G.** “Die γενεαλογίαι der Pastoralbriefe.” *ZNW* 20 (1921) 49–69. **Koester, H.** “The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Philippians III).” *NTS* 8 (1962–63) 317–32. **Sandmel, S.** “Myths, Genealogies, and Jewish Myths and the Writing of the Gospels.” *HUCA* 27 (1956) 201–11. **Sohn, O. E.** “Study on 1 Timothy 1, 3–11.” *CTM* 21 (1950) 419–28. **Viviano, B. T.** “The Genres of Matthew 1–2: Light from 1 Timothy 1:4.” *RB* 97 (1990) 31–53. **Warfield, B. B.** “Some Exegetical Notes on 1 Timothy: I. ‘The Progress of Thought in 1 Timothy i. 3–20.’” *PresR* 8 (1921) 500–502.

For a bibliography on the form of ancient letter writing in general, see *Bibliography* for 1 Tim 1:1–2.

Translation

³Just as I urged you to stay on in Ephesus while I was traveling to Macedonia, in order that you might command certain people not to continue teaching a different gospel ⁴or to devote themselves to endless myths and genealogies, since they produce speculations ^a rather than the stewardship ^b from God by faith, —. ⁵But the goal of this command is love from a clean heart and a clear conscience and a sincere faith. ⁶Some, having fallen short of these things, have turned aside to senseless babble, ⁷wishing to be teachers of the law even though they do not understand either what they are saying or concerning what things they are so dogmatically asserting.

Notes

^aThe simple ζητήσεις, “speculations,” is read by D F G Ψ 0285^{vid} 1739 1881 TR; Ir. The compound ἐκζητήσεις, “speculations” (8A 33 81 1175 *pc*), is a rare word. It is more likely that a scribe would replace a rare word with a better-known word. Cf. *TCGNT*², 571.

^bD* (2-80μιν) latt; Ir have οἰκοδομήν, “edification,” instead of οἰκονομίαν, “stewardship.” οἰκοδομήν was probably thought to make a better parallel to ἐκζητήσεις, “speculations.” οἰκονομίαν, “stewardship,” is preferred as the more difficult reading and as better related to the historical situation; i.e., the opponents were church leaders who were supposed to be good stewards of the church; see *Comment*. Cf. *TCGNT*², 571; Lock, xxxvi.

Form/Structure/Setting

The majority of commentators divide 1 Tim 1:3–20 into four distinct units, with vv 8–11 and vv 12–17 being digressions only somewhat related to the discussion and

vv 18–20 following more naturally after v 7. However, 1:3–20 may be viewed as a unit that discusses the essentials of the Ephesian heresy and Paul’s refutation. Paul uses verbal and conceptual links to tie vv 3–20 together. (1) Vv 3–7 describe the problem and what Timothy must do about it, v 3 setting the tone for the entire chapter (Spicq, 1:320). Paul must stop the opponents from teaching their myths, based on OT law, that are producing meaningless speculations. (2) In v 7 Paul says the opponents want to be teachers of the law but are ignorant of it, and in vv 8–11 he discusses the true intention of the law, not as a digression but to indicate the error of the opponents. They are using the law to govern the lives of all people, even Christians who are justified and living righteously by faith. (3) In v 11 Paul says that he was entrusted with the gospel, and in vv 12–17 he discusses his conversion (Acts 9:1–19), for it was at that time that he received his commission to preach the gospel. He identifies himself with sinners in vv 8–11 and shows how God’s mercy and grace saved him so that he could be an example of the fact that salvation is not by human merit; it is not obtained by observing myths or the law but by God’s mercy and grace. Vv 12–17 are a theological contrast to vv 8–11. (4) Having given his theological refutation of the Ephesian heresy, Paul reminds Timothy that God has called him to this type of work and has fully enabled him for the task. He should not be discouraged. Paul closes with a final note of urgency; the situation has become so bad that Paul has already excommunicated two of the opponents’ leaders.

Warfield also sees the cohesiveness of chap. 1. Starting with 1 Tim 2:1 he shows how παρακαλῶ, “I urge,” looks back to παρεκάλεσα, “I urged,” in 1:3, τῆς παραγγелиας, “this command,” in v 5, and ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν, “this command,” in v 18. Then, starting with 1 Tim 1:1 and Paul’s statement that he is an apostle “according to the appointment” of God, Warfield argues as follows:

As Paul writes not formally, but out of his heart, he may be thought to have held in mind at the very opening of the letter what he was about to say, and to have allowed this to color his opening expressions. Now, what these words κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ declare is that Paul is writing in fulfilment of the duty that developed on him as an apostle, appointed to that office by God. In accordance with that duty he reminds Timothy of the exhortation that he had already given him, to silence the false teachers at Ephesus (i. 3 sq.). These teachers, in contrast with Paul’s appointment, had *taken upon themselves* (θέλοντες, verse 7) the function of teaching, and in accordance with this assumption *taught otherwise* (ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, verse 3) than the Gospel that had been *intrusted to him* (verse 11). The key-words thus far are the κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν of verse 1, the θέλοντες of verse 7, and the ἐπιστεύθην of verse 11. And the idea is that Paul had received a commission from God, these others were self-appointed; that he preached was therefore due to his obedience to the call of duty, that they preached, to their self-will; what he preached was the truth committed to him, what they preached their own crude inventions; and the result of his preaching was edification in Christian graces, while the result of their preaching was emptiness and folly. All this furnished good reason for silencing them. . . .

He goes on humbly to declare how it happens that he, of all men, was entrusted with the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God. . . . It is as much as if Paul had said, “I make no claim to be in myself superior to these teachers—it is not I, but the Gospel that I preach that is superior; and I was not entrusted with this Gospel on account of any merit in me, but only on account of God’s infinite grace—a thing altogether unaccountable, since I am the chief of sinners, and yet again not unaccountable, for it is God’s gracious purpose to save sinners, and in whom could be more fully shown all His long-suffering than in me, the chief?” . . .

But one thing more is needed: a justification of his selection of Timothy for this difficult and delicate task. This is what is given us in verses 18–20. “This charge,” says the Apostle, “I have committed to thee, child Timothy, in accordance with . . .” This is the key to these verses. The reason assigned is twofold: first, Timothy had been long ago designated by certain prophecies as a suitable soldier for such a warfare (verse 18); and secondly, he was exhibiting just the graces that proved his hold on the true Gospel of God’s grace to be secure, and pointed to him as the proper person to rebuke this teaching (verse 19). These verses, of course, contain more than this. They are in their whole tone and expression an encouraging trumpet call to Timothy to play the man in this noble warfare; an expression of confidence from the Apostle; and a warning against the evils of the heresy he had to face. But their formal contents chiefly concern the designation of Timothy for this duty; and as such they visibly round out and complete the subject begun at verse 3, and leave the Apostle free to begin in the next chapter the new exhortations to convey [that for] which the letter was written. (*PresR* 8 [1921] 500–502)

Vv 3–7 break into four divisions: historical situation (v 3a), Paul’s command and description of the problem (vv 3b–4), purpose for the command (v 5), and further description and historical urgency (vv 6–7). Paul is repeating a charge he has already given to Timothy to stop those in the church who are teaching error. They are teaching the law, but they are both arrogant and ignorant. Whereas the end result of their teaching is speculation, the end result of Paul’s teaching is love. The keynote of this section is authority, continuing from the salutation in the use of παραγγέλλειν, “to command” (vv 3, 5). The description of the opponents is similar to the description in Titus 1. This suggests that despite the significant differences between 1 Timothy and Titus, both letters address the same heresy. The similarity also suggests that 1 Timothy and Titus were written at the same time.

1 Timothy 1

μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (v 3)
“not to continue teaching a different gospel”

μὴ δὲ προσέχειν μύθοις (v 4)
“not to devote themselves to myths”

καθαρὰς καρδίας (v 5)
“clean heart”

συνειδήσεως (v 5)
“conscience”

ματαιολογίαν (v 6)
“senseless babble”

Titus 1

διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ (v 11)
“teaching what is not proper”

μὴ προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις (v 14)
“not being devoted to Jewish myths”

καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς (v 15)
“clean to the clean”

συνείδησις (v 15)
“conscience”

ματαιολόγοι (v 10)
“senseless babblers”

The urgency and seriousness of the historical situation is made clear by two facts. (1) Contrary to his usual practice, Paul gives no thanksgiving for Timothy or the Ephesian church (cf. *Form/Structure/Setting* on 2 Tim 1:3–5). The only other Pauline epistles in which this is the case are 2 Corinthians (although 2 Cor 1:3–7 may be a thanksgiving in the form of a praise), Galatians, and Titus. It is generally recognized that Paul was angry with the Galatians, prompting him to launch directly into his polemic. This is somewhat the same situation in 1 Timothy and

Titus, and to some degree in 2 Corinthians (cf. Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 117). Although addressed to Timothy, 1 Timothy is largely public in intention, and as in Galatians one of the basic problems in Ephesus was the questioning of Paul's apostolic authority and the preaching of another gospel (cf. *Introduction*, "Reconstruction from the PE"). So dispensing with the usual niceties, Paul launches into the problem (cf. Houlden for a similar understanding). In 2 Timothy, which is a personal letter, Paul does give thanks for Timothy.

(2) The second indication that the Ephesian problem is serious is the anacoluthon in Paul's opening statement, a grammatical error that is not uncommon in Paul's writings (Rom 2:17; 5:12; 9:22; 1 Cor 1:6; Gal 3:6; Eph 1:4; Phil 1:7; 1 Thess 1:5; cf. Acts 24:2–4; 2 Pet 1:3; BDF §§465, 466–70; Robertson, *Grammar*, 435–50). Paul's intensity is likely caused in part by the attacks on his apostolic authority that Timothy was encountering. He begins with "Just as . . ." but never completes his thought. (καθώς, "just as," introduces a subordinate clause, which is a protasis without an expressed apodosis, requiring that something like οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ, "so also now I urge," be supplied [Ellicott, 3].) Some translations smooth out the anacoluthon here by inserting a phrase (KJV and Wey add "so do" at the end of v 4) or by altering the grammar (NEB omits "just as"; NRSV, NIV, and NASB change the infinitive *to remain* to the finite *remain*, thus changing a subordinate clause to an independent clause); the translation given here introduces a dash at the end of the sentence.

Vv 3b–4 contain three doublets: (1) two infinitives indicating what certain people are no longer to do ("to teach," "to devote themselves"); (2) two nouns describing what was absorbing the attention of these people ("myths," "genealogies"); and (3) two nouns that contrast the result of such activity ("speculations," "stewardship"). The second and third doublets are each subordinate to the one that precedes, and the second element in each is expanded by a word or phrase.

Comment

3a Καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε προσμεῖναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, "Just as I urged you to stay on in Ephesus while I was traveling to Macedonia." Paul reminds Timothy of an earlier discussion in which he gave instructions on how to deal with the Ephesian heresy and encouraged Timothy to carry through with his task. Either this letter is an enlargement of that contact (which seems unlikely if their previous contact was personal and not by a letter now lost) or it is an official recapitulation for the benefit of the Ephesian church. It reinforces Timothy's authority and spells out how the Ephesian church should behave. Paul eventually wanted to come to Ephesus in order to deal with the situation personally (1 Tim 3:14–15). The opposition to Timothy was intense, fueled perhaps by a timidity of youth on Timothy's part, although this should not be overemphasized (cf. *Introduction*, "Historical Reconstruction from the PE, B. 1 Timothy"). Fee is right in stressing that this verse is key to understanding both the occasion and the purpose of the letter. The epistle is a written response to a specific historical situation, and its discussion should be interpreted in that light (cf. *Introduction*, "Historical Reconstruction from Acts"). For those rejecting the authenticity of the PE, this verse refers to a fictitious situation, and the words to Timothy are really words to postapostolic ministers (e.g., Oberlinner, 9–11).

The main point of interest here is the historical situation of this earlier

encounter. There is no time period in Acts into which this verse fits (contra Roloff, 62–63, who pictures Timothy staying behind [Acts 19:21], as he often did, to help stabilize the church). In Acts 20:1 Paul is leaving Ephesus for Macedonia, but he had just spent three years in Ephesus, and it is unlikely that the theological problems recorded in the PE could have arisen during this time. On his subsequent trip back through Macedonia, Timothy went ahead to Troas (Acts 20:5) but left after seven days. There is a hint, though, that trouble would eventually come after Paul's third missionary journey; in Paul's prophecy to the Ephesian elders he says that "after my departure fierce wolves will come in among you" (Acts 20:29–30), suggesting that the problems recorded in the PE occurred after Acts. All this becomes one of the important arguments for dating the PE after Acts 28 (cf. *Introduction*, "Historical Reconstruction from Acts").

Paul says he was πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, "traveling to Macedonia," when he originally urged Timothy to stay on at Ephesus. Were Paul and Timothy together in Ephesus while Paul was preparing to go to Macedonia, or was Paul going to Macedonia from some other location? Dibelius-Conzelmann (15) say that "every unprejudiced reader" must think that Paul was in Ephesus (cf. also Kümmel, *Introduction*, 375), but the text does not say this. (1) Kelly argues that the epistle shows firsthand knowledge of the problem, which would necessitate Paul's having been in Ephesus. But Paul had been in Ephesus for three years (Acts 20:31). This, plus communiqués, could have kept him in touch with the church. The excommunication of the two elders (1 Tim 1:20) need not have been in person; the similar act in 1 Cor 5:5 was not in person. (2) If Paul had been in Ephesus, the emphasis on authority throughout the letter would most likely have been unnecessary. Paul would have dealt with that issue when he was present. (3) 1 Tim 3:14 shows that Paul wants to come soon, which would not make sense if he had just been there. (4) In 1 Tim 3:14 Paul says that he hopes to "come," not to "return," to Ephesus, implying that he had not been with Timothy in Ephesus during this period. It seems that the best historical reconstruction does not see the encounter occurring in Ephesus, primarily on the force of 1 Tim 3:14. Timothy had been sent to Ephesus and later traveled to meet Paul, who was on his way to Macedonia (after the Roman imprisonment and on his way to Spain or Crete?). Timothy returned to Ephesus; Paul wrote the letter in support of Timothy's task in Ephesus and planned to come himself when he could (see *Introduction*, "Historical Reconstruction from the PE"). There is no theological significance attached to this conclusion, but merely historical curiosity. If Paul were in Ephesus when he encountered Timothy, there would be a theological problem in that he earlier prophesied that the Ephesian elders would never again see him (Acts 20:25). However, this prophecy evidently did not present a problem for Paul since he was planning to see the Ephesians again (1 Tim 3:14). Perhaps Acts 20:25 refers only to the Ephesian elders at that time and not to the church as a whole.

Paul had previously "urged" (παρακαλεῖν) Timothy to keep working in Ephesus. παρακαλεῖν has a range of meanings extending from "to summon, ask" to "to comfort, encourage, request, urge" (BAGD, 617) as seen in its use in military language (Spicq, 1:321). It is frequently used in pastoral and missionary admonition (K. Grayston, "A Problem of Translation: The Meaning of *parakaleo*, *paraklesis* in the New Testament," *ScrB* 11 [1980] 27–31; O. Schmitz and G. Stählin, *TDNT* 5:773–99; G. Braumann, *NIDNTT* 1:569–71; MM, 484; cf. παρατίθεσθαι, "to entrust," in v 18). It does not mean

“to command” as does παραγγέλλειν in v 3b. The word occurs elsewhere in the PE eight times. It is found in summary statements of Paul’s charge, combined with “teach” (διδάσκειν; 1 Tim 6:2) and “convict” (ἐλέγχειν; 2 Tim 4:2; Titus 2:5). Bishops must be able to teach, urge, and convict (Titus 1:9). Paul urges Timothy to make sure prayers are said for all people (1 Tim 2:1). Titus is to encourage younger men to control themselves (Titus 2:6). Most significantly, Timothy is not to “rebuke” (ἐπιπλήσσειν) the older men but to “encourage” them (παρακαλεῖν; 1 Tim 5:1). There is a difference between how Timothy and Titus should deal with the opponents and how they should deal with others in the church. In dealing with the opposition they are to command, to speak with the authority given by God through Paul (1 Tim 1:1), but with the others they are to be gentle, urging and encouraging proper belief and conduct (cf. *Introduction*, “The Response to the Heresy”). παρακαλεῖν is repeated in 1:5 and 2:1, stylistically tying the larger unit together.

3b–4a ἵνα παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, “in order that you might command certain people not to continue teaching a different gospel or to devote themselves to endless myths and genealogies.” Timothy is to stop Paul’s opponents from teaching their false gospel. He is also to stop the opponents themselves from pursuing a lifestyle devoted to these myths. In an epistle that shows a significant concern for behavior, it is meaningful that Paul begins by stating that the opponents’ teaching is wrong, that “myths and genealogies” are opposed to the true gospel. Because the Ephesian heresy most likely lacked a well-defined theological core, because the letter is a repetition of what Paul and Timothy had earlier discussed, and because Timothy already knew Paul’s teaching, there is no need for Paul to go into a theological discussion of why the opponents are wrong (see *Introduction*, “Historical Reconstruction from the PE”). For a comparison with Paul’s description of the heresy in Titus 1, see *Form/Structure/Setting*.

παραγγέλλειν, “to command,” is both a military and a legal term, describing a military command or an official summons to court (MM, 481; O. Schmitz, *TDNT* 5:762; Dittenberger, *Sylloge* 4:489). Paul directs Timothy to stand before the Ephesian church and, as if he were a general or a judge, strictly, officially, and authoritatively to command the false teachers to stop. Paul uses the word elsewhere to describe his own authoritative commands (1 Cor 7:10, cf. 11:17; 1 Thess 4:10, cf. 4:2; 2 Thess 3:4, 6, 10, 12). In the PE he uses the verb five times. Twice it is addressed to Timothy as Paul tells him to command the opponents to stop teaching heresy (1 Tim 1:3) and to keep the commandment pure (1 Tim 6:13). Three times Paul tells Timothy to command and teach Paul’s instructions to others (1 Tim 4:11), specifically his instructions to widows (1 Tim 5:7) and the rich (1 Tim 6:17). The cognate noun παραγγελία, “command,” is a summary description of Paul’s charge to Timothy (1 Tim 1:5, 18). Rebuke is a primary theme in the PE (see *Introduction*, “Themes in the PE”).

Timothy is to command τισίν, “certain people,” to stop teaching heresy; Paul does not identify his opponents at this time (cf. 1 Tim 1:6, 19; 5:15, 24; 6:10, 21), as is his practice elsewhere (1 Cor 4:18; 2 Cor 10:2; Gal 1:7; cf. Heb 10:25; 1 Clem. 1:1). Lock (8) thinks this is “tactful” because most of the troublemakers had not gone to the extreme as had Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim 1:20; Paul’s naming these two indicates the severity of their opposition; cf. 2 Tim 4:10, 14–15). The opposition appears to have been led primarily by men: (1) The named opponents

are men (1 Tim 1:20; 2 Tim 2:17; 4:14–15). (2) The opposition comes from within the leadership of the church, which was primarily male (1 Tim 3:1–7). (3) 2 Tim 3:6–7 suggests that the opponents were men who had won a following among some women.

Timothy is directed to command the opponents to stop ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, “to teach another teaching.” The linear aspect of the verb implies that the opponents’ teaching is an ongoing process (cf. 1:20). ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν is a fascinating word. In this context, it means “to teach doctrine that is essentially different” from Paul’s gospel. It occurs elsewhere only in 1 Tim 6:3, where the following phrase defines it as not adhering “to the healthy words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching that is according to godliness.” In classical Greek, ἕτερος meant “another of a different kind” (LSJ, 701), and ἄλλος meant “another of the same kind.” But by the time of the NT this distinction was not always present (BAGD, 315 [1bg]; Turner, *Grammatical Insights*, 197–98; F. Selter and C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 2:739; H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2:702–4). However, the context of 1 Tim 1:3 shows that this old meaning is present here (cf. Mark 16:12 [TR]; Luke 9:29; Rom 7:23; 1 Cor 15:40; Jas 2:25). It is not that the teaching of the opponents was merely different; it is that their teaching was essentially different and therefore wrong. It is the same situation that Paul found himself in with the Galatians (Gal 1:6–9). They were turning to a ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, “different gospel,” although, as Paul quickly qualifies, there is no ἄλλο, “other,” gospel but only perversions. The translation “novelties” (Lock, 8; Scott, 7; Kelly 43) misses the point: it is not that the teaching is new and unusual but that this false gospel was essentially different from Paul’s.

For a discussion of the heresy, see *Introduction*, “The Ephesian Heresy.” It appears to have been a form of aberrant Judaism with Hellenistic/gnostic tendencies that overemphasized the law and underemphasized Christ and faith, taught dualism (asceticism, denial of a physical resurrection), was unduly interested in the minutiae of the OT, produced sinful lifestyles and irrelevant quibbling about words, and was destroying the reputation of the church in Ephesus. The opponents’ teaching and behavior conflicted with what God intended, which was above all characterized by faith. The use of “different” has strong implications for the concept of orthodoxy. If this was a *different* gospel, then there must have been *the* gospel accepted as the basis of Christian truth against which this new teaching could be compared and judged “different.” Kelly agrees when he comments that this “suggests that there is an accepted norm of apostolic teaching” (44). This is true even at the early time of Galatians (Gal 1:6–9).

ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν is a compound of two words, ἕτερος, “other,” and διδασκαλεῖν, “to teach,” apparently coined here by Paul. It is not found anywhere else except in 1 Tim 6:3 and later Christian literature (Ignatius *Pol.* 3.1; Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 3.32.8). Similar compounds are found: νομοδιδάσκαλοι, “teachers of the law” (1 Tim 1:7; Luke 5:17; Acts 5:34); καλοδιδάσκαλοι, “teaching what is good” (Titus 2:3); κακοδιδασκαλεῖν, “to teach evil” (1 *Clem.* 2:10; 2 *Clem.* 10:5); κακοδιδασκαλία, “evil teaching” (Ignatius *Phil.* 2.1); ψευδοδιδάσκαλος, “false teacher” (2 Pet 2:1; Hermas *Sim.* 9.22.2; Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* 3.4.2; cf. 1QH 4:16). The closest expression in the NT is ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, “different gospel” (Gal 1:6; cf. 2 Cor 11:4).

Along with stopping the heretical teaching, Timothy is to stop Paul’s opponents from being “addicted to endless myths and genealogies,” shifting from teaching to personal behavior. Not only are they to stop teaching others, but they themselves

are no longer to devote themselves to these myths. “Endless myths and genealogies” are almost exegetical to “another teaching,” describing the content of the teaching. This is one of the few hints in the PE regarding the content of the Ephesian heresy, which presumably comprised myths based on minor people in the OT genealogies. The salvation and lifestyle the opponents preached was adherence to these mythical reconstructions.

προσέχειν has a range of meaning extending from “to pay attention to” to “to devote oneself to” and “be addicted to.” (It also means “to cling to” as in the variant to 1 Tim 6:3.) It occurs twenty-four times in the NT; all five of Paul’s uses are in the PE. In light of the Ephesian problem, the stronger meaning of “to devote oneself to” is probably meant. The opponents are not simply teaching error; they have adopted a lifestyle that is contradictory to Paul’s gospel. Elsewhere Paul says that deacons should not be addicted to much wine (1 Tim 3:8) and that Timothy is to devote himself to the public reading of Scripture, to preaching, and to teaching (1 Tim 4:13). Paul tells Timothy that in the last days some believers will devote themselves to deceitful spirits and demonic teachings (1 Tim 4:1). Titus likewise is directed to instruct members of the Cretan church not to devote themselves to Jewish myths (Titus 1:14). προσέχειν is also used to describe the devotion of the people of Samaria to Simon (Acts 8:10, 11), another illustration of how strong the word can be.

ἀπέραντος, “endless,” occurs in biblical literature elsewhere only in the LXX (Job 36:26; 3 Macc 2:9). It is a formation from πέρας, “end” or “limit,” with an alpha privative, meaning “not” (cf. 1 Tim 1:9). It implies “limitlessness,” possibly “interminable” or “unrestrained.” One of Paul’s major complaints against the heresies is not so much that they were wrong—although they were; see v 10—but that they were silly and produced only improper behavior. One can picture the teachings of the opponents, going on and on, not saying anything true or of any significance, and never coming to a conclusion, always creating more and more myths and quibbling. ἀπεράντοις, “endless,” could be modifying “genealogies” or both “myths and genealogies.” In either case, ἀπεράντοις would receive its gender from γενεαλογίαις, “genealogies.” καί could mean either “and” or “even.” This yields such possible meanings as “myths and endless genealogies,” “endless myths and genealogies,” or “endless myths that are derived from genealogies.” Since the genealogies are probably those in the OT, it is doubtful that they would be called endless, and so the translation “endless myths and genealogies.”

By calling them μῦθοι, “myths,” Paul is pointing out their legendary and untrustworthy nature (Spicq, 1:93–94) and is implicitly contrasting them with the gospel that is rooted in historical events (Spicq, 1:98). Many compare the myths and genealogies to Jewish allegories of creation or interpretations of the OT patriarchs and their family trees such as are found in *Jubilees* or Pseudo-Philo *Biblical Antiquities* (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 135–37; Jeremias, 14–15; Spicq, 1:94–97, 322; Towner, 45; id., *Goal*, 28; Roloff, 64; Kittel, ZNW20 [1921] 49–69; Lock, xvii; see *Introduction*, “The Ephesian Heresy”). Spicq (1:97, making a comparison to the Stoic reinterpretation of Homer) and Towner (*Goal*, 28) add the possibility of speculative rabbinic exegesis. Some see a mixed background of Judaism and Gnosticism (Oberlinner, 14, although elsewhere he lessens the Jewish influence [cf. on Titus 1:14]; Quinn, 109–12, 245–47, who includes stories about Jesus, 158–65, 245). The word occurs five times in the NT, four in the PE. Elsewhere Paul calls the myths profane, silly (1 Tim 4:7), and Jewish (Titus 1:14), paralleling them with

“commands of people.” He says that people will wander from the truth into myths (2 Tim 4:4). The only other occurrence of the word in the NT is 2 Pet 1:16, in which the author says that those who make known the power and coming of Jesus have not followed cleverly devised myths (cf. Wis 17:4 [A]; Sir 20:19). In every occurrence the word is used in a negative sense (cf. Spicq, 1:93–98).

γενεαλογία, “genealogy,” is a tracing of one’s descent or family tree (cf. Colson, *JTS* 19 [1917–18] 265–71; Kittel, *ZNW* 20 [1921] 16–69; Sandmel, *HUCA* 27 [1956] 201–11; G. Stählin, *TDNT* 4:762–95). Towner sees genealogies in a broader literary category than simple lists such as are found in Matt 1:1–17. The word γενεαλογία also occurs in Titus 3:9 (cognate verb in Heb 7:6; cf. γενεά, “clan, race, tribe,” in Col 1:26 and Heb 3:10). The word is found in Scripture elsewhere only in 1 Chr 5:1. *Myth* and *genealogy* are often joined in Greek literature. The scarcity of the pair in Scripture outside the PE is explained by the fact that the heresy had not arisen until the end of Paul’s life. Previous to the Ephesian situation, the Judaizing influence showed itself in other ways. In *Introduction*, “The Ephesian Heresy,” the background of the “myths and genealogies” is analyzed, and it is argued that they are Jewish with some Hellenistic/gnostic elements. This conclusion is largely based on this verse and other similar statements (Titus 1:14). The Jewish element accounts for the misunderstanding of the law (1:7, 8–11) and the quarrels about it (Titus 3:9).

4b αἵτινες ἐκζητήσεις παρέχουσιν μάλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει, “which produce speculations rather than the stewardship from God by faith, —.” Timothy must stop the opponents because their teaching leads people to mere speculation. The opponents, because they are teaching these endless myths and genealogies, are continually speculating about unimportant matters instead of administering the office of steward—an office they received from God. The proper way to administer their office is not through mythical interpretations but through faith. Paul has no objection to honest inquiry, but the opponents are anything but sincere (cf. *Introduction*, “The Ephesian Heresy”).

V 4b gives both sides of the theological coin. On the negative side, it states that their teaching produces speculation. αἵτινες, “which,” although normally functioning as an indefinite pronoun, can introduce a clause that gives the reason or consequence of a previous statement (Abbott-Smith, *Lexicon*, 326; cf. Titus 1:11; Gal 4:24; Phil 4:3; cf. Luke 8:3; 10:42; Acts 10:47; 11:28). The consequence of the myths is speculations. In the active voice, παρέχειν means “to present,” “to grant” (1 Tim 6:17), or “to cause” (1 Tim 1:4; Gal 6:17). In the middle voice it is reflexive, meaning “to present oneself” (Titus 2:7; cf. Col 4:1). The aspect is also linear, showing that these myths were presently and constantly causing speculations.

ἐκζητήσεις, “speculations,” is one of the general descriptions of the Ephesian heresy. Instead of producing godliness, the heresy resulted in futile speculation. Simpson’s description (27) of the opponents as “puzzle-brains” is appropriate. ἐκζήτησις, “speculation,” is an unusual word, occurring in the NT only here. In fact, this appears to be its first occurrence in Greek literature. The simple ζήτησις, “speculation,” occurs in 1 Tim 6:4, 2 Tim 2:23, and Titus 3:9, where it describes the Ephesian heresy as its cognate does here (cf. variant in 1 Tim 1:4; cf. Acts 15:2, 7; 25:20; cf. John 3:25). The addition of the preposition ἐκ could make ἐκζητήσεις an intensive form, “extreme speculations.” Fee argues that since the simple forms of both the verb and noun are well attested, the compound must have this intensive nuance. But since in Koine Greek distinctions between simple and perfective forms

are often blurred and Paul uses both forms to describe the same phenomenon, the variation is one of style. For other examples of the perfective use of prepositions (e.g., ἀπό, διά, κατά, σύν), see Moule (*Idiom-Book*, 87–88), Robertson (*Grammar*, 563–65), BDF (§318.5), and Metzger (*Lexical Aids*, 81–84).

The other side of the theological coin contrasts “speculations” with what sound doctrine ought to produce: stewardship. οἰκονομία has a nonfigurative use, designating the office of “stewardship” (Luke 16:2–4; Col 1:25). In its figurative sense it is applied to God’s “plan” of salvation. As such, it can refer to God’s actual plan (Eph 1:10; 3:9) or a person’s responsibility within that plan (1 Cor 9:17; Eph 3:22; Col 1:25). Related is the οἰκονόμος, who is the actual “steward” (Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 4:2; Gal 4:2). Especially important for this passage is the use of οἰκονόμος figuratively for ministers as God’s stewards in Titus 1:7 (cf. 1 Cor 4:1; 1 Pet 4:10). The use of οἰκονομία in this passage is somewhat difficult as evidenced by the variant οἰκοδομήν, “edification,” which forms a better parallel with ἐκζητήσεις, “speculations” (see *Note b*). Scott (9) suggests that perhaps Paul is thinking of Jesus’ parable of the talents with its teaching of stewardship. A reference to the actual parable, however, is unlikely, though conceptually it makes good sense. J. Reumann suggests that both meanings are joined: God’s “plan” of salvation is worked out in connection with God’s “steward” (“Οἰκονομία-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*,” *NTS* 13 [1966–67] 147–67). The troublemakers in the Ephesian church were church leaders, those who had been appointed stewards (using the language of Titus 1:7) over God’s household. Instead of pursuing this office through faith, they defined salvation in terms of their mythical reinterpretations based on OT genealogies. Therefore, Paul offsets “speculations,” what the opponents were producing, with “stewardship,” what they should have been accomplishing. Ellicott defines οἰκονομία as “the scheme of salvation designed by God, and proclaimed by his Apostles, . . . the fables and genealogies supplied questions of a controversial nature, but not the essence and principles of the divine dispensation” (6). According to this interpretation, θεοῦ, “God,” is a subjective genitive indicating the origin of the office of stewardship. By including this fact, Paul is emphasizing the severity of the heresy. These people accepted the office of steward, an office ordained by God, and yet they were abusing the office. The final phrase, ἐν πίστει, should be understood instrumentally, “by [the proper exercise of] faith.” The office is accomplished by faith, not by being devoted to endless myths and genealogies. (On *faith*, see *Introduction*, “Themes in the PE.”) Paul does not finish this sentence; hence the dash in the *Translation* above (see *Form/Structure/Setting*).

5 τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου, “But the goal of this command is love from a clean heart and a good conscience and a sincere faith.” The opponents’ preaching resulted in speculation. The goal of Paul’s command that they stop their false preaching is love, thus repeating a basic conviction of the early church that the greatest command, in that it sums up all the other commands, is the command to love (Matt 22:34–40; Rom 13:8–10; Gal 5:14) and that love is more significant than ritual observance such as law keeping (cf. vv 8–11). Paul then gives the threefold source of this love: it comes from a clean heart, a good conscience, and a sincere faith. In Ephesus, as in Corinth, the heresy manifests itself in the absence of love, the Christian virtue fundamental to spiritual well-being. Paul may also be directing

a slight warning to Timothy in this verse. His attitude must also be one of love. It will be difficult to confront and correct the opponents, and especially difficult to do so with the attitude of love, but do so he must. If this is the case, it is the first mention of an important theme in the PE: Timothy must beware of the same traps into which the opponents have fallen and must be sure always to maintain the correct attitude (cf. 1 Tim 4:16).

δέ should be given its full adversative force of “but,” differentiating the results of the heresy (vv 3b–4) from the results of Paul’s command (v 5). τέλος indicates the “goal” of Paul’s gospel (cf. Rom 6:21–22; 10:4; cf. Matt 26:58; Heb 6:8; Jas 5:11; 1 Pet 1:9). The article τῆς, “this,” is anaphoric, referring to the command (παράγγελις) in v 3. The RSV translates the article with “our,” joining Paul’s and Timothy’s ministries. παράγγελιας, “command,” is the cognate noun of the verb παραγγέλλειν, “to command,” in v 3, carrying the same nuance of authority. This command encompasses not only the negative aspect of prohibiting the false teaching (v 3) but also the positive aspect of true stewardship (v 4b). This idea of a command is repeated in 1:18 (cf. 2:1). Some argue that the command is the OT law, in which case Paul is saying that the OT law, properly understood and applied, results in love, not in speculation, perhaps looking forward to the discussion of law in vv 8–11; but the article τῆς, “this,” appears to look back to the command in v 3. If Paul is thinking of love not just as a quality missing from the opponents but as the goal of Christianity, i.e., the greatest command, then Paul may be including the specific command in v 3 with all the commands related to being a good steward, perhaps even God’s command that he be an apostle (v 1).

The concept of love runs throughout Scripture. God’s love is the basis of redemption (John 3:16) and of a person’s own love for both God and for others. The beauty of the word ἀγάπη, “love,” has often been pointed out. As defined in Scripture, this love offers itself freely to someone who does not deserve it; this love does not seek to possess the beloved. There is little evidence for its secular use before the LXX, and whatever meaning it may have had is enhanced by Christian usage. It is a word that can be defined only within the context of biblical theology (cf. χάρις, “grace,” in the *Comment* on 1 Tim 1:2). ἀγάπη stands in stark contrast to ἔρως, which designates the physical “love” that is merited and seeks to possess; it is the customary word for sexual passion (LSJ, 695). The other two words for “love” are φιλία, “friendship,” and στοργή, “affection,” between parents and children, the latter not occurring in the NT (cf. the negative adjective ἀστοργος, “unloving,” in 2 Tim 3:3 and Rom 1:31).

In the PE, every time the word *love* occurs it is paired with *faith*, except in 2 Tim 1:7, often within a list of virtues. It characterizes Paul’s life (2 Tim 3:10) as it should the lives of Timothy (1 Tim 4:12; 6:11; 2 Tim 2:22) and older men (Titus 2:2). It comes from God (2 Tim 1:7) and is the goal of Paul’s gospel (1 Tim 1:5). The faith and love that are in Christ Jesus have overflowed to accomplish Paul’s salvation (1 Tim 1:14), and love provides the guideline by which Timothy is to follow Paul’s teaching (2 Tim 1:13). It is part of the salvation process (1 Tim 2:15). It is a keyword in the PE, probably necessitated by a lack of love in the Ephesian church (cf. Gen 20:5–6; Job 11:13; Pss 24:4; 51:10; Matt 5:8; cf. cognate ἀγαπᾶν, “to love,” in 2 Tim 4:8, 10; ἀγαπητός, “beloved,” in 1 Tim 6:2 and 2 Tim 1:2). On love, see V. P. Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1973); A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, tr. P. S. Watson (New York: Harper and Row, 1969); J. Piper, *Love*

Your Enemies, SNTSMS 38 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979); C. Spicq, *Agape in the New Testament*, tr. M. A. McNamara and M. H. Richter (St. Louis: Herder, 1963); B. B. Warfield, "The Terminology of Love in the New Testament," *PTR* 16 (1918) 1–45, 153–203; articles and bibliography in C. Brown, W. Günther, and H.-G. Link, *NIDNTT* 2:538–51; G. Quell and E. Stauffer, *TDNT* 1:21–55.

Following ἀγάπη, "love," is a triad describing the source (ἐκ, "from") of that love. The reigning idea is sincerity. Love comes from a heart cleansed of sin, a conscience clear of guilt, and a faith devoid of hypocrisy. This trilogy is not exhaustive, nor does it claim to be. It is not an attempt to describe fully the gospel or the concept of love. It is rather three concepts particularly appropriate to the Ephesian situation since the opponents were depraved in mind (1 Tim 6:5) with seared consciences (1 Tim 4:2) and corrupt faith (2 Tim 3:8). This connection to the opponents was recognized in the last century (cf. Ellicott, 8). It is not mere "moralism taking the place of theology" (Hanson, [1983] 57) but deep truths made practical and relevant in the historical situation.

(1) Love comes from a heart cleansed of sin, the heart being the "hidden person" (1 Pet 3:4). This stands in contrast to the opponents who are liars (1 Tim 4:2), persisting in sin (1 Tim 5:20), depraved of mind (1 Tim 6:5), and bereft of the truth (1 Tim 6:5). καθαρὸς, "clean," carries with it the OT concept of ceremonial cleansing in preparation for God's service. Paul elsewhere speaks of a cleansed heart (2 Tim 2:22), a clear conscience (1 Tim 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3), and a cleansed people (Titus 1:15). Because Israelite thought did not divide the person into material and immaterial, it associated different functions with specific bodily organs. The heart was the chief organ, the unifying organ, the source of a person's intellectual, emotional, and spiritual powers, the contact between the person and God (J. Behm, *TDNT* 3:605–14; R. C. Denton, *IDB* 2:549–50).

(2) The love produced by Paul's gospel comes from a conscience clear of guilt. (On the translation of ἀγαθός as "clear," see *Comment* on 1 Tim 2:10.) συνείδησις, "conscience," is another significant Pauline term. It is that innate and universal (Rom 2:14–15) knowledge that condemns wrong and commends right. It is the inner awareness of the moral quality of one's actions. It is a compound of σύν, "together," and εἰδέναι, "to know"; the Latin is the same construction (*con plus scio*) from which we get the word *conscience*. Initially it meant "to know together," corporate, universal knowledge (cf. B. F. Harris, "ΣΥΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ [Conscience] in the Pauline Writings," *WTJ* 24 [1962] 174–77).

The term συνείδησις, "conscience," is not found in the OT, although its function is performed by the heart (לֵב *lēb*; 2 Sam 24:10; Job 27:6; Pss 32:1–5; 51:1–9). Other than the above-mentioned references, συνείδησις is found in the NT fourteen times (Rom 13:5; 2 Cor 1:12; 4:2; 5:11; cf. Acts 23:1; 24:16 [both contained in speeches of Paul]; Heb 9:9, 14; 10:2, 22; 13:18; 1 Pet 2:19; 3:16, 21). A. M. Rehwinkel (*EDT*, 267) summarizes its threefold function in Scripture: (a) to urge right and hinder wrong; (b) to pass judgment on a decision or action; (c) to produce guilt or commendation in the heart. In the PE it occurs six times, in both positive and negative senses. An ἀγαθός, "clear," conscience is a source of love (1 Tim 1:5). Timothy is to hold on to an ἀγαθός, "clear," conscience (1 Tim 1:19) just as Paul has a καθαρός, "cleansed," conscience (2 Tim 1:3). Deacons must hold to the mystery of the faith with a καθαρός, "cleansed," conscience (1 Tim 3:9). The opponents have rejected (ἀπωθεῖν; 1 Tim 1:19), seared (καυστηριάζειν; 1 Tim 4:2a), and defiled

(μαίνειν; Titus 1:15) their own consciences. Conscience is present in Paul's life (Rom 9:1; cf. 1 Cor 4:4 [σύννοια]) as well as in Christians' (1 Cor 8:1–13; 10:23–11:1) and Gentiles' (Rom 2:15) lives. It is, however, not the ultimate judge of right and wrong but serves only as a guide (1 Cor 4:4) since it can be seared by sin (1 Tim 4:2; 2 Tim 3:8; Titus 1:15; Rom 14:20; 1 Cor 8:7–12). See, for example, B. J. Harris's critique (*WTJ* 24 [1962] 173–86) of H. Rashdall, who elevates conscience to the point of saying “no one really makes his submission even to the teaching of our Lord absolute and unlimited, except in so far as the ethical injunctions of that authority commend themselves to his conscience” (*Conscience and Christ* [New York: Scribner's, 1916] 33; cf. H. Osborne, “ΣΥΝΕΙΔΗΣΙΣ,” *JTS* o.s. 32 [1931] 167–79). “Rejected,” “seared,” and “defiled,” although somewhat synonymous, show a slight progression from the voluntary decision to ignore the truth (“rejected”) to the consequence of that act (“seared,” “defiled”). C. A. Pierce argues that conscience is not a technical Stoic term but a common word in the Koine used only to evaluate past actions (*Conscience in the New Testament* [London: SCM Press, 1955]), an interpretation corrected by M. E. Thrall to include present and future actions (“The Pauline Use of Συνείδησις,” *NTS* 14 [1967–68] 118–25). For further study of conscience, see especially B. J. Harris, *WTJ* 24 (1962) 173–86; C. Maurer, *TDNT* 6:898–919; also Ladd, *Theology*, 477–78; Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 170–71; Ridderbos, *Theology*, 288–93; H. C. Hahn and C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 1:348–53 (see bibliography); A. M. Rehwinkel, *The Voice of Conscience* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956); id., *EDT*, 267–68; O. Hallesby, *Conscience* (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1950); C. Spicq, “La conscience dans le Nouveau Testament,” *RB* 47 (1938) 50–80; bibliography in *TLNT* 3:335–36; J. Stelzenberger, *Syneidēsis im Neuen Testament* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1961).

(3) In the third part of the triad Paul tells Timothy that love should issue from a sincere, genuine, unhypocritical faith. The opponents have destroyed their consciences and are so hypocritical that they teach for the insincere motive of making money (1 Tim 6:5, 10). This helps us see that the opponents were not sincere but were knowingly and purposefully deceiving the church. ἀνυποκρίτου, “sincere,” is a compound of an alpha privative, meaning “not” (cf. 1 Tim 1:9), and ὑπόκρισις, “hypocrisy,” hence “without hypocrisy.” Elsewhere it is connected with faith (2 Tim 1:5) and love (Rom 12:9; 2 Cor 6:6; cf. 1 Pet 1:22; it modifies *wisdom* in Jas 3:17). πίστεως, “faith,” here is the usual Pauline use, meaning “trust” (cf. *Introduction*, “Themes in the PE”). Love proceeds from a trusting faith that is sincere. Some writers object that this could hardly be Pauline since an insincere faith is no faith at all (see similar discussion in *Comment* on 2 Tim 1:5). The same objection, however, could be raised with the phrases “sincere love” (Rom 12:9; 2 Cor 6:6), “counterfeit faith” (2 Tim 3:8), or “a different gospel” (Gal 1:6). ἀνυποκρίτου, “sincere,” highlights a characteristic already present in faith. Deception of oneself and others is always possible (Kelly, 46; Fee, 8). By saying “sincere faith” Paul is contrasting himself with the opponents who have seared their consciences and are deceiving themselves and others.

6 ὧν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν, “Some, having fallen short of these things, have turned aside to senseless babble.” Instead of pursuing love coming from a clean heart, a clear conscience, and a sincere faith, the opponents had digressed into senseless babble. They wanted to teach the law, but they did not even know what they were talking about. These two verses emphasize

the urgency of the problem, as do vv 19–20. They hint at the content of the heresy and the attitude of the opponents, and also introduce an important theme in the PE. The opponents did not choose to follow the heresy because it was intellectually more acceptable; they chose to abandon love. In other words, the root of the heresy was not an intellectual but a moral problem (cf. 1:19; Spicq, 1:329).

ἀστοχεῖν is a compound of an alpha privative, meaning “not,” and στόχος, “mark.” The original idea was “to miss the mark” (LSJ, 262); other suggestions are “to not aim at” (Lock, 10–11) and “to fall short of” (Barrett, 42). It occurs elsewhere in the NT in 1 Tim 6:21 and 2 Tim 2:18, both in connection with the false teachers (cf. Sir 7:19; 8:9). ὧν, “of which” (genitive of separation; Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 41), is the object of ἀστοχήσαντες, “having fallen short,” referring back to the three sources of love in v 5. Paul continues his practice of not specifically identifying the opponents; he refers to them as τινές, “some” (cf. 1 Tim 1:3). ἐκτρέπειν means “to turn aside.” Of its five occurrences in the NT, four are in the PE, and each time it is used figuratively (cf. Amos 5:8 and Heb 12:13 for the literal use; Spicq, 1:329). The opponents had turned aside to senseless babble (1 Tim 1:6), the people were wandering off into myths (2 Tim 4:14), and some young widows had strayed after Satan (1 Tim 5:15). Timothy also must avoid godless chatter (1 Tim 6:20). There is an entire collection of words in the PE that continues this theme, words such as ἀπωθεῖν, “to repudiate” (1 Tim 1:19), ἀφιστάναι, “to depart” (1 Tim 4:1; cf. 2 Tim 2:19; cf. Luke 8:13), ἀποπλανᾶν, “to wander away” (1 Tim 6:10), and ἀποστρέφειν, “turn away” (2 Tim 4:4; cf. 2 Tim 1:15; Titus 1:14). This gives weight to the argument that the trouble arose from within the Ephesian church; the leaders themselves, who had once been going down the right path, had wandered off into another direction. Spicq refers to the path of these false teachers as “progressive deviation” (1:329).

Instead of pursuing love, they turned aside into ματαιολογία, “senseless babble.” The basic meaning of the word group μαται- is the difference between what appears to be and what actually is, hence “senseless,” “vain,” “nothing” (O. Bauernfeind, *TDNT* 4:519). The heresy discusses what on the surface appears to have substance, but in reality does not even exist. It is senseless babble, what is falsely called knowledge (1 Tim 6:20) but really is a morbid (1 Tim 6:4), stupid (Titus 3:9), and senseless (2 Tim 2:23) controversy that is unprofitable and futile (Titus 3:9). ματαιολογία occurs only here in the NT. ματαιολόγος, “senseless babbler,” occurs only in Titus 1:10. The adjective μάταιος, “senseless,” occurs six times: the Ephesian heresy was unprofitable and senseless (Titus 3:9); if Christ has not been raised, then the believer’s faith is senseless (1 Cor 15:17); compared to the Lord, the thoughts of the wise are senseless (1 Cor 3:20); the ways of non-Christians are senseless (Acts 14:15; 1 Pet 1:18; cf. Jer 2:5; 4 Kgdms 17:15); one’s religion is senseless if the tongue is not controlled (Jas 1:26). The cognate ματαιότης, “vanity,” occurs some forty times in Ecclesiastes in the phrase “Vanity of vanities; all is vanity” (cf. Rom 8:20; Eph 4:17; 2 Pet 2:18). When the OT wants to ridicule idols, it can call them *ἄνω* *ἰδω* (*šāwē’*) (“vain,” “non-existent”; Jer 18:15; Pss 24:4; 31:7; *NIDOTTE* 4:54–55).

From these examples it is clear that the Ephesian elders had wandered off into that which was completely and totally worthless, vain, ineffectual. This is one of Paul’s most frequent charges: they do nothing but engage in senseless arguments about insignificant words. O. Bauernfeind calls it “empty prattle” (*TDNT* 4:524). Simpson says that “these whipper-snappers have an exchequer of words, but no fund of insight,” and adds that this is what Philo calls “syllable squabblers” (29). By

contrast, Spicq says that “the gospel message is not a rational philosophy, but an immutable divine revelation” (1:329). What a difference between the false teaching and love coming from a clean heart, clear conscience, and a sincere faith!

7 θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσιν μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαίουνται, “Wishing to be teachers of the law, even though they do not understand either what they are saying or concerning what things they are so dogmatically asserting.” Their senseless babble results from a desire to teach the law even though they are ignorant of it. Their desire is exceeded only by their ignorance, and this theme of their ignorance continues throughout the PE (cf. 1 Tim 6:4). Along with the overt references to the Ephesian heresy being Jewish, this verse shows that the heresy involved the OT. However, this verse also shows that the opponents were not part of Judaism proper, which could not be described as being ignorant of the law. The opponents were at best a splinter group of Judaism, and calling them a group may suggest more organization and coherence than the opponents exhibited.

The opponents’ motive was a desire to teach the law or, perhaps in a less noble vein, a desire to be known as teachers of the law and to receive the admiration associated with such a position (cf. the Jewish scribes castigated by Jesus). Phillips translates, “They want a reputation as teachers of the law.” In light of the tenor of v 7b, “teachers of the law” can be sarcastic, impugning their motives (although the word itself is not derogatory; Oberlinner, 19). This accords with Paul’s comments elsewhere that they were teaching for the sake of money, an impure motive (1 Tim 6:5, 10; cf. 1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:17–18; Titus 1:7; *Introduction*, “The Ephesian Heresy”). Chrysostom speaks of their love of power and preeminence (“Homily 1”; NPNF 13:413). In chap. 3 Paul will give his response to the problem: Timothy must be sure that an overseer is a skilled teacher who is able to confront and rebuke the opponents (see *Comment* on 1 Tim 3:2).

νομοδιδάσκαλοι, “teachers of the law,” is a compound of νόμος, “law,” and διδάσκαλος, “teacher” (for similar constructions, see ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, “to teach a different gospel,” in 1 Tim 1:3, and especially καλοδιδάσκαλος, “teaching what is good,” in Titus 2:3). Paul does not actually specify what law they were teaching, but 1 Tim 1:8–11 suggests that it was the Mosaic law. The heresy was primarily Jewish (cf. *Introduction*, “The Ephesian Heresy”), and the two other occurrences of the word νομοδιδάσκαλος are used of Gamaliel (Acts 5:34) and the scribes (Luke 5:17), also suggesting a Jewish background (cf. K. H. Rengstorff, *TDNT* 2:159, who says the word was a Christian term that differentiated Christianity from Judaism on the essential point of the law). Another question concerns what part of the OT law they were teaching: ceremonial, moral (NEB translates “teachers of the moral law”), or all of it? Vv 8–11 deal with the moral law, but genealogies (1 Tim 1:3) are in the narrative portion of the Torah. Therefore “law” should be understood as the Mosaic law (cf. discussion of law in *Comment* on 1 Tim 1:8–11).

νοεῖν does not mean simply “to know” but rather “to understand,” “to comprehend.” A look at its use elsewhere in the NT implies that there is an element of contemplation as well (Matt 16:9, 11; John 12:4; Rom 1:20; Eph 3:4; Heb 11:3; cf. J. Behm, *TDNT* 4:950–51). For example, Timothy is instructed to “contemplate [νόει] on what I [Paul] say, for the Lord will give you understanding [σύνεσιν] in all things” (2 Tim 2:7; cf. 1 Cor 1:19; Eph 3:4; Col 1:9;). μὴ νοοῦντες, “not understanding,” is used here as a concessive participle (“even though”).

The opponents do not know ἃ λέγουσιν, “what they are saying,” or περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται, “concerning what things they are so dogmatically asserting.” The two phrases are basically synonymous, their plurality emphasizing the ignorance of these so-called teachers. The shift from ἃ, “which,” to τίνων, “what,” need only be stylistic (but see below) since τίς, “what,” was becoming a substitute for the relative pronoun (Lock, 11; Robertson, *Grammar*, 737). διαβεβαιοῦνται, “dogmatically asserting,” however, is a little different from λέγουσιν, “are saying.” It is a compound verb of βεβαιοῦν, meaning “to confirm,” “to guarantee,” with the preposition διὰ in its perfective use (cf. ἐκζητήσεις; 1 Tim 1:4). This gives the meaning of “to assert dogmatically,” which fits this context (cf. LSJ, 390, for examples, especially the meaning “to be positive”). They are proclaiming their gospel with complete and total confidence, and with complete and total ignorance. They are devoted to their gospel (προσέχειν; v 4), preaching with dogmatic authority, and are wrong. It is no wonder that Paul begins his epistle on a note of authority. διαβεβαιοῦν, “to assert dogmatically,” occurs elsewhere in the NT only in Titus 3:8 where Paul tells Titus to assert dogmatically and confidently the instructions Paul had given him.

Lock (11) mentions Hort’s argument that διαβεβαιοῦνται may be a subjunctive (citing forms in 1 Cor 4:6; Gal 4:17), which would be translated “or on what points they ought to insist.” Paul criticizes them not for being dogmatic but for being dogmatic about the wrong issues. This is an interesting distinction, but in light of the severity of the problem it is doubtful that Paul would want the opponents to be dogmatic about anything. Another interesting variation is Barrett’s suggestion (42) that τίνων is masculine, indicating that these so-called teachers of the law did not understand the law (ἃ, neuter “which”) and did not apply the law to the right people (τίνων, masculine “whom”). This interpretation would provide a link to vv 8–11, which discuss for whom the law was intended. But to differentiate the two words is perhaps too fine. If something that specific had been intended, we should expect some sort of grammatical or lexical indication. ἃ and τίνων are general terms. (Moffatt translates ἃ as “words” and τίνων as “themes.”)

Explanation

At some time before the writing of this letter, Timothy had gone to Ephesus to deal with false teaching in the church. He had wanted eventually to leave Ephesus, but Paul, while on his way to Macedonia, met with Timothy and urged him to stay. Paul was now writing as a follow-up to that conversation. The situation in Ephesus was serious. Some of the people had already gone astray, and what they were teaching was foolishness. Paul launched into the matter at hand in much the same way as he did in the letter to the Galatians, not following his usual practice of expressing thanks for the people to whom he was writing. This might seem unusual in writing to a friend, but quite natural when it is realized that he was writing through Timothy to the Ephesian church. This also explains the note of authority running throughout this section. The language is strong; Timothy was to command the opponents to stop their senseless babble.

Vv 3–7 set the historical stage for the epistle. Certain people were teaching a gospel that was essentially different from Paul’s. Leaders in the church were teaching myths they had created based on OT genealogies. Not only were they in error theologically, but their lifestyle was also wrong. Rather than exercising their responsibilities in the church as good stewards of God through faith, they were

producing nothing except mere speculation. The goal of Timothy's command—that the false teachers stop teaching—was love. Not only was love absent in the opponents' lives, but Timothy needed to maintain love as the goal of his teaching and behavior as well. Paul's opponents had made a moral choice to set aside cleansed hearts, clear consciences, and a sincere faith. Their problem was not intellectual but moral, and their behavior was a direct result and a clear indicator of their immorality. But Paul's emphasis on their behavior did not mean that their theology was acceptable. Along with being immoral, they were charged with being ignorant of what they were dogmatically teaching.

B. The True Intention of the Law (1 Tim 1:8–11)

Bibliography

Dodd, C. H. *The Bible and the Greeks*. 1935. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964. **Easton, B. S.** "New Testament Ethical Lists." *JBL* 51 (1932) 1–12. **Idé, A. F.** *Battling with Beasts: Sex in the Life and Letters of St. Paul: The Issue of Homosexuality, Heterosexuality and Bisexuality*. Garland, TX: Tangelwuld, 1991. **Kamlah, E.** *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1964. **Lagrange, M. J.** "Le catalogue de vices dans l'épître aux Romains, 1.28–31," *RBn.s.* 8 (1911) 534–49. **Malherbe, A. J.** "Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Christian Fathers*, ed. W. E. March. San Antonio, TX: Trinity UP, 1980. 19–35 (reprinted in A. J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989] 121–36). ———. *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986. **McEleney, N. J.** "The Vice Lists of the Pastoral Epistles." *CBQ* 36 (1974) 203–19. **Sabugal, S.** "El autotestimonio sobre la conversión de San Pablo en 2 Cor 4,6 y 1 Tim 1,11–14." *Revista Agustimiana de Espiritualidad* 16 (1975) 355–62. **Vögtle, A.** *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge: Exegetisch, religions- und formgeschichtlich untersucht*. NTAbh 16.4–5. Münster: Aschendorff, 1936. **Westerholm, S.** "The Law and the 'Just Man' (1 Tim 1:3–11)." *ST* 36 (1982) 79–95. **Wibbing, S.** *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihr Traditionsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Texte*. BZNW 25. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1959.

Translation

⁸*But we know that the law is good if someone uses^a it lawfully, ⁹knowing this, that law is not valid for a righteous person but for [the] lawless and rebellious, irreligious and sinners, unholy and profane, those who beat their fathers and mothers, murderers, ¹⁰fornicators, homosexuals, kidnappers, liars, perjurers, and everything else that is contrary to healthy teaching, ¹¹which is in conformity to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God with which I was entrusted.*

Notes

^aThe present is replaced with the aorist χρήσται, "used," by A P; Cl.

ZONDERVAN

Pastoral Epistles, Volume 46

Copyright © 2000 by Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Previously published as *Pastoral Epistles*.

Formerly published by Thomas Nelson. Now published by Zondervan, a division of HarperCollins Christian Publishing.

Requests for information should be addressed to:

Zondervan, 3900 Sparks Dr. SE, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546

This edition: ISBN 978-0-310-52208-9

The Library of Congress has cataloged the original edition as follows:

Library of Congress Control Number: 2005295211

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are from the *New Revised Standard Version of the Bible*, copyright © 1989 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and are used by permission. All rights reserved.

The author's own translation of the Scripture text appears in italic type under the heading *Translation*.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other—except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the prior permission of the publisher.

The Graeca, Hebraica, and Semitica fonts used to print this work are available from Linguist's Software, Inc., P.O. Box 580, Edmonds, WA 98020-0580 USA; tel. (425)775-1130.

Printed in the United States of America

Editorial Board

Old Testament Editor: Nancy L. deClaisse-Walford (2011–)
New Testament Editor: Peter H. Davids (2013–)

Past Editors

General Editors

Ralph P. Martin (2012–2013)
Bruce M. Metzger (1997–2007)

David A. Hubbard (1977–1996)
Glenn W. Barker (1977–1984)

Old Testament Editors:

John D. W. Watts (1977–2011)

James W. Watts (1997–2011)

New Testament Editors:

Ralph P. Martin (1977–2012)

Lynn Allan Losie (1997–2013)

Volumes

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Genesis 1–15 | Gordon J. Wenham | 28 | Ezekiel 1–19 | Leslie C. Allen |
| 2 | Genesis 16–50 | Gordon J. Wenham | 29 | Ezekiel 20–48 | Leslie C. Allen |
| 3 | Exodus | John I. Durham | 30 | Daniel | John E. Goldingay |
| 4 | Leviticus | John E. Hartley | 31 | Hosea–Jonah** | Douglas Stuart |
| 5 | Numbers | Philip J. Budd | 32 | Micah–Malachi** | Ralph L. Smith |
| 6a | Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9, 2nd ed. | Duane L. Christensen | 33a | Matthew 1–13 | Donald A. Hagner |
| 6b | Deuteronomy 21:10–34:12 | Duane L. Christensen | 33b | Matthew 14–28 | Donald A. Hagner |
| 7a | Joshua 1–12, 2nd ed. | Trent C. Butler | 34a | Mark 1–8:26** | Robert A. Guelich |
| 7b | Joshua 13–24, 2nd ed. | Trent C. Butler | 34b | Mark 8:27–16:20 | Craig A. Evans |
| 8 | Judges | Trent C. Butler | 35a | Luke 1–9:20 | John Nolland |
| 9 | Ruth–Esther | Frederic W. Bush | 35b | Luke 9:21–18:34 | John Nolland |
| 10 | 1 Samuel, 2nd ed. | Ralph W. Klein | 35c | Luke 18:35–24:53 | John Nolland |
| 11 | 2 Samuel | A. A. Anderson | 36 | John, 2nd ed. | George R. Beasley-Murray |
| 12 | 1 Kings, 2nd ed. | Simon J. Devries | 37a | Acts 1–14* | Stephen J. Walton |
| 13 | 2 Kings | T. R. Hobbs | 37b | Acts 15–28* | Stephen J. Walton |
| 14 | 1 Chronicles | Roddy Braun | 38a | Romans 1–8 | James D. G. Dunn |
| 15 | 2 Chronicles | Raymond B. Dillard | 38b | Romans 9–16 | James D. G. Dunn |
| 16 | Ezra, Nehemiah | H. G. M. Williamson | 39 | 1 Corinthians* | Andrew D. Clarke |
| 17 | Job 1–20 | David J. A. Clines | 40 | 2 Corinthians, rev. ed. | Ralph P. Martin |
| 18a | Job 21–37 | David J. A. Clines | 41 | Galatians | Richard N. Longenecker |
| 18b | Job 38–42 | David J. A. Clines | 42 | Ephesians | Andrew T. Lincoln |
| 19 | Psalms 1–50, 2nd ed. | Peter C. Craigie, Marvin E. Tate | 43 | Philippians, rev. ed. | Gerald F. Hawthorne, rev. by Ralph P. Martin |
| 20 | Psalms 51–100 | Marvin E. Tate | 44 | Colossians, Philemon** | Peter T. O'Brien |
| 21 | Psalms 101–150, rev. ed. | Leslie C. Allen | 45 | 1 & 2 Thessalonians** | F. F. Bruce |
| 22 | Proverbs | Roland E. Murphy | 46 | Pastoral Epistles | William D. Mounce |
| 23a | Ecclesiastes | Roland E. Murphy | 47a | Hebrews 1–8 | William L. Lane |
| 23b | Song of Songs/Lamentations | Duane H. Garrett, Paul R. House | 47b | Hebrews 9–13 | William L. Lane |
| 24 | Isaiah 1–33, rev. ed. | John D. W. Watts | 48 | James | Ralph P. Martin |
| 25 | Isaiah 34–66, rev. ed. | John D. W. Watts | 49 | 1 Peter | J. Ramsey Michaels |
| 26 | Jeremiah 1–25 | Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley, Joel F. Drinkard Jr. | 50 | Jude, 2 Peter** | Richard J. Bauckham |
| 27 | Jeremiah 26–52 | Gerald L. Keown, Pamela J. Scalise, Thomas G. Smothers | 51 | 1, 2, 3, John, rev. ed. | Stephen S. Smalley |
| | | | 52a | Revelation 1–5 | David E. Aune |
| | | | 52b | Revelation 6–16 | David E. Aune |
| | | | 52c | Revelation 17–22 | David E. Aune |

*forthcoming as of 2014

**in revision as of 2014