

Johannes Beutler, S. J.

The First Letter to Timothy

Lectures at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome

Second semester 2002 / 2003

All rights reserved

1st Lecture: 1 Timothy – A Witness of Pauline Tradition

1. 1 Tim as part of the Pauline corpus

1 Tim makes part of a collection of three Pauline Letters which present striking similarities: 1 Tim, 2 Tim, and Tit. They all claim to be written by Paul, they all are addressed to important collaborators of Paul, and they all contain a number of “personal elements” which are meant to create the impression that they go back to the Apostle of the Gentiles. To these elements belong instructions for Timothy or Titus personally (1 Tim 1,3ff.18; 5,23; 6,13f.20; most of 2 Tim; Tit 1,5; 2,1 etc.), hope for future encounters (1 Tim 2,14; 4,13; 2 Tim 4,9.21; Tit 3,12), and even small details which create the impression of strong authenticity (best known example the wish that Timothy should bring to Paul the things he had left behind at Troas: the cloak and the books, 2 Tim 4,13).

On the other side, the three Letters we mentioned have in common that they contain a number of expressions and ideas which are alien to Paul in his recognized authentic letters. These expressions have been listed by HELMUT MERKEL, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (NTD 9/1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht ¹³⁽¹⁾1991, p. 5:

“godliness” (eusebeia): 1 Tim 2,2; 3,16; 4,7.8; 6,3.5.11; 2 Tim 3,5; Tit 1,1

“to live a godly life” (eusebôs zên): 2 Tim 3,12; Tit 2,12

“sound doctrine”: 1 Tim 1,10; 2 Tim 4,2; Tit 1,9; 2,1

“knowledge of truth”: 1 Tim 2,4; 2 Tim 2,25; 3,7; Tit 1,1

“good works”: 1 Tim 2,10; 5,10.25; 6,18; Tit 2,7.14; 3,8.14

“a saying you may trust”: 1 Tim 1,15; 3,1; 4,9; 2 Tim 2,11; Tit 3,8

“genuine faith”: 1 Tim 1,5; 2 Tim 1,5

“clear conscience”: 1 Tim 3,9; 2 Tim 1,3

“what has been entrusted” (parathêkê): 1 Tim 6,20; 2 Tim 1,12.14.

In the same time, central Pauline concepts are missing in the Pastoral Letters as:

“justice of God”, freedom, cross, son of God, revelation, body of Christ (ibid.).

Also missing is the opposition of flesh and spirit. Some Pauline concepts are used in a different sense (like “faith”, “gift of God’s grace”, “in Christ”). On the linguistic level, a number of Pauline particles or conjunctions are rare or missing. From all this arises the question in which degree these letters can claim to be “Pauline” (ibid.).

During the past two centuries there has been a growing consensus that the “Pastoral Letters” do not go back to Paul, but to some later author assuming the name of Paul. The history of interpretation

of the Pastoral Letters has been described recently by LUKE TIMOTHY JOHNSON, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AncB 35A), New York etc.: Doubleday, 2001, 20-55. A consensus about Pauline authorship which lasted from antiquity to the end of the 18th century was interrupted since the times of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1807) who denies the authenticity of 1 Tim and Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1812) who denies the authenticity of all three letters. Since Wilhelm M. W. de Wette and Ferdinand C. Baur this opinion became more and more standard. In the second half of the 20th century only a minority of authors retained the authenticity of these three letters. In German scholarship, the last representatives were J. Jeremias (1954, Johnson, 50, quotes the ed. of 1981) and G. Holtz (1972, Johnson, *ibid.*, quotes the ed. of 1992). In Anglo-Saxon scholarship there are a few more names, the better known ones being D. Guthrie (1957) and J. N. D. Kelly (1963).

The reasons for a later dating of the Pastoral Epistles are of different kind:

- linguistic observations (cf. above)
- observations regarding content (theology, church structure)
- arguments from the biography of Paul (difficulty to fit in the establishment of Timothy and Titus as shepherds at Ephesus and Crete)
- the situation of the church supposed in the Pastoral Letters (communities endangered by menaces from within and without)

Johnson contests the validity of arguments taken from the above mentioned fields. He underlines:

- that every Pauline Letter must be judged on its own
- that there is no such thing as a “Pauline theology” behind the individual letters (93)
- that different situations can lead to different kinds of letters
- that the weight of 18 centuries of consensus should not be underestimated.

On the other side, he admits that 2 Peter is clearly later than the time of Peter and thus pseudographical (84). From this follows that early Christian pseudography cannot be ruled out even from an extremely conservative standpoint. As far as the authenticity of other NT writings is concerned, the question must be asked whether we should still believe that the Gospel of Matthew should be ascribed to Levi - Matthew, one of the Twelve, only because through all centuries up to the time of illumination he was considered to be the author of the First Gospel. The denial of some kind of “Pauline theology” will find only few adherents. The elements of Paul’s theology do in fact form a coherent whole, even if Paul does not treat the same subjects in all of his letters. Authors have long remarked a difference between the three Pastoral Letters on one side and the rest of the Pauline Letters (may they be proto- or deutero-Pauline). We suppose in the following lectures the growing consensus in international scholarship, remaining open of course for a new quest for the authorship of 1 Tim or all of the Pastoral Epistles respectively.

2. 1 Tim as part of the corpus of Pastoral Letters

1 Tim is meant to be a letter to Timothy and not just a kind of “community rule”. This position is defended with good reasons against M. Dibelius, H. Conzelmann by JEFFREY T. REED, *To Timothy or not? A Discourse Analysis of 1 Timothy*, in: Stanley E. Porter – D. E. Carson (ed.), *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics. Open Questions in Current Research (JSNT.S 80)*, Sheffield: JSOT Press 1993, 90-118. According to linguistic analysis, Timothy appears to be the only recognizable addressee of the letter. All groups mentioned in the letter are referred to him. In the event structure, the letter tries to instruct Timothy for various needs of the community and asks him to pass on these admonitions to others. In particular, 1 Tim 3,14-15 is an instruction for Timothy how he (and not just someone) has to behave in the house of God. From these observations follows that 1 Tim cannot be regarded a rule for establishing church order or to fight heresy, but a personal instruction for Paul’s deputy how he has to meet these challenges of his community.

Similar observations may be made concerning 2 Tim and Tit.

The question whether 1 Tim, 2 Tim and Tit form a whole, a corpus remains a debated one (see above, Johnson). Most contemporary authors opt for a corpus of Pastoral Letters. They seem to have been conceived as a corpus of Letters right from the beginning. A more detailed analysis of the relation of the three letters to each other is presented by MICHAEL WOLTER, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition (FRLANT 146)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1988. There are striking parallels between Tit and 1 Tim over against 2 Tim. Both letters are strongly interested in community and domestic order. Timothy and Titus are instructed to organize community and family life according to the principles transmitted by the apostle. 2 Tim does not contain such rules. It is much more a personal document of “Paul” leaving this life (4,6-8), a kind of testament. If the three documents have been planned together, the question must be answered why “Paul” wrote three letters instead of just one. The answer may be that Tit and 1 Tim show some insistence on the rules handed on by Paul, perhaps according to the rule of the “two witnesses” known from Deuteronomy (19,15ff). Since 1 Tim is more biographical than Tit, the sequence may be 1 Tim – Tit. 2 Tim could serve as a personal conclusion giving the collection the ring of a “testament” of Paul in analogy to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs or other Testaments of intertestamental literature. For further details see Wolter.

3. 1 Tim as a document of Pauline tradition

The Pastoral Letters as a whole and 1 Tim in particular stand in Pauline tradition. If these documents claim to be written by Paul, although according to form and content they rather betray a later period, they are to be seen in the light of early Christian pseudepigraphy. Among the many more recent publications we may mention one of the better known ones: NORBERT BROX, *Falsche Verfasserangaben Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie* (SBS 79), Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk 1975. The author admits that the claim of documents to belong to a certain author was a disputed question in antiquity as far as its legitimacy was concerned. On the other side, pseudonymity was an accepted practice in the Greco-Roman as well as in the biblical world. The writings of the great Greek authors were imitated in schools, partly in the form of letters (best known example the so-called letters of Socrates), Old Testaments and Apocryphal texts claim the authorship of heroes of the past: Moses for legal texts and collections, Solomon for wisdom texts. Apocryphal literature as such is pseudonymous by definition. In early Christianity there was a discussion about the justification of lies in certain circumstances, and biblical examples are given for them by church fathers in certain circumstances. All this creates a certain readiness to accept Christian pseudepigraphy as a means for assuring the future of faith in troubled times. The authenticity of New Testament Writings followed for the early church not exclusively or primarily from the fact that they were written by apostles or the persons who claimed to be the authors, but from their acceptance in the communities because of the authenticity of their “apostolic” teaching.

This perspective can be found as well in the Constitution “*Dei Verbum*” of Vatican II. In n. 18, the Council claims the apostolic origin of all four gospels, but retains only that they have been written by apostles or “apostolic men”. For the letters of the New Testament, the Council retains that they have been written by Paul or are other “apostolic writings” without going into details whether this means that they have an apostle as author or not (n. 20). This means that apostolicity is much more a question of authenticity in content than according to authorship.

As far as exegesis is concerned, the task of the exegete seems to be in the first instance to interpret texts and not to identify authors. This must be said very clearly over against all tentatives to make the question of (Pauline or non-Pauline) authorship THE question of the Pastoral Epistles. It is astonishing to see that Johnston consecrates the first 154 pages of his commentary almost exclusively to this question. The best way of treating the question of authorship seems to be to treat it after the interpretation of the text and not as the key to all understanding of our documents.

If the pseudonymous character of the Pastoral Epistles as a whole and of 1 Tim in particular is accepted as a working hypothesis, the question arises: what is the particular function and scope of these letters? Very inspiring is the suggestion of MICHAEL WOLTER (above, p. 3) to see in them an instrument of assuring the Pauline communities of their continuity with Paul their founder. In the course of the first century, dangers from within and without the community menaced their existence, among other problems the rise of the upcoming gnosis. In this moment, it was important for the Pauline communities to assure themselves that they still stand in the Pauline tradition, in the tradition of their founder. If this perspective is accepted, 1 Tim 1,12-17 has an important role to play. Paul would serve not only as an example of faith for the readers (as often affirmed), but he presents himself as the first of the converts also in a temporal sense. His instructions about ministry and sound doctrine are not just rules to be followed in all Christian communities but the way how he assures the future of his communities. In the second lecture, we shall see that the literary genre of his instructions resembles the *mandata principis*, instructions of rulers since the time of the Ptolemees and Seleucides, which concern as well their officers as their subjects. The officers or delegates are told how to behave correctly and how to instruct others to do the same. It is precisely in this perspective that the Pastoral Epistles are to be read. Tit and 1 Tim would be centred more towards concrete instructions for the benefit and the structure of the communities, 2 Tim would serve as a kind of “testament of Paul” in which he recommends himself and his heritage to Timothy before his departure into his heavenly home (2 Tim 4,6-8). As the point of departure of the Pauline trajectory, the “Paul” of the Pastoral Letters can be compared to other apostolic figures of the first generation: Peter for the tradition behind the letters named after him (and possibly Mark), John for the Johannine writings and communities. The assurance of the present by linking it to normative persons of the past is not a Christian invention, but an accepted principle in antiquity, in the Greco-Roman as well as in the biblical world. Also under this aspect, the author of the Pastoral Letters appears to be indebted to the cultural world in which he lives.

2nd Lecture: Division and Literary Form of the Letter

1. Division

1 Tim has the form of a letter with epistolary elements occurring particularly at the beginning and at the end. The body of the letter is determined by instructions given to Timothy concerning his personal conduct and his responsibility in the community. We may structure the letter roughly as follows:

- 1,1-2 The prescript
- 1,3-11 First warnings for Timothy concerning false teaching
- 1,12-17 Paul's Thanksgiving
- 1,18-20 Continued instruction for Timothy
- 2,1-7 Prayer for all human persons and those in power
- 2,8-15 Instructions for men and women
- 3,1-7 Instructions about bishops
- 3,8-13 Instructions about deacons
- 3,14-16 Personal conclusion of instruction about ministry. A Christological hymn.
- 4,1-5 Announcement of false teachers
- 4,6-10 Rules for Timothy in this regard
- 4,11-16 Further rules for Timothy
- 5,1-8 Instruction about behaviour towards men, married women, and widows
- 5,9-16 Instruction about widows
- 5,17-22 Instruction about presbyters
- 5,23-25 Personal instruction for Timothy
- 6,1-2 Instruction about slaves
- 6,3-5 Instruction about heretics
- 6,6-10 Godliness and self-sufficiency
- 6,11-16 Final instructions for Timothy
- 6,17-19 Instructions about the rich
- 6,20 Warning against the so-called "gnosis"
- 6,21 Final blessing

While in ch. 2-3 prevail prescriptions about the organization of the community, in ch. 5-6 the author formulates principles for a "domestic code", but with relevance for community structure. The "presbyters" and the "widows" seem to belong to both areas of concern of the author.

The structure of Tit is similar to the one of 1 Tim:

- 1,1-4 Prescript
 - 1,5-16 Reminder of establishment of Elders/Bishops as protection against heretics
 - 2,1 Exhortation of Titus to preach a sound doctrine.
 - 2,2-10 “Domestic code”:
 - 2 senior men
 - 3-5 senior women, younger women
 - 6-8 young men
 - 9-10 slaves
 - 2,11-14 Appearance of God’s grace in Christ
 - 2,15 Final exhortation concerning teaching of Titus
 - 3,1-2 Exhortation concerning submission to authorities and reasonable behaviour towards all
 - 3,3-7 New life in Christ through justification operated by Christ’s grace and regeneration
 - 3,8 Exhortation to good works on the basis of the justification granted by God
 - 3,9-11 Warning concerning heretics, dealing with heretics
 - 3,12-14 Mention of co-workers, exhortation to help them
 - 3,15 Final greetings and blessing
- Again, instructions about community order precede those on domestic duties, and again both areas are connected. Always Titus is addressed in his responsibility to instruct the members of his communities.

2 Tim has a different ring. It is much more a private letter addressed to Timothy in the moment of Paul’s farewell, as we saw. The letter may be structured in the following way:

- 1,1-2 Prescript
- 1,3-5 Prooemium: thanksgiving and prayer for Timothy
- 1,6-14 Exhortation for Timothy to administer his position according to the example of Paul
- 1,15-18 Experiences of Paul with fellow-Christians during his Roman captivity
- 2,1-7 Exhortation of Timothy to preach the message without fear
- 2,8-13 Reminder of Christ’s resurrection from the dead
- 2,14-26 Warning concerning the preaching of void doctrines
- 3,1-9 Announcement of eschatological perversity and vices
- 3,10-17 As a contrast the virtues of Timothy according to the example of Paul
- 4,1-5 Exhortation to fearless preaching in view of upcoming heresies
- 4,6-8 according to the example of Paul facing his coming end
- 4,9-18 Personal informations of Paul
- 4,19-21 Greetings and further personal informations
- 4,22 Final blessing

For the structure of 1 Tim see now: PETER G. BUSH, A Note on the Structure of 1 Timothy: NTS 36 (1990) 152-156. The author distinguishes four parts of the letter: I. Greeting (1,1-2); II. Introductory Background (1,3-11), III. The Body of the Letter (1,12 – 6,21a); IV. Greetings (6,21b). In the body of the letter, he sees an inclusion between 1,12-20 and 6,11-16.20.21a: “Passing on the Gospel under God’s Supervision”. The problem is, that 6,17-19 interrupt this beautiful harmony and have to be considered as misplaced. In addition, the affinity of 1,3-11 and 1,18-20 does not come out sufficiently (Paul takes up his παραγγελία of Timothy after the autobiographical section of 1,12-17). The sections about different groups in the community appear hardly in Bush’s proposal (for fear of basing the structure of 1 Tim too much on comparison with similar documents such as Tit). As a whole, the proposal of Bush needs reconsideration.

2. Literary Form

As appears from the analysis given above, determining the form of 1 Tim according to ancient letter format is not so easy. In particular, the structure of the letter body is rather difficult to determine. In comparison with the genuine Pauline letters, a “prooemium” is missing in 1 Tim and only found in a way in 2 Tim. The language of 1 Tim and Tit resembles much more instructions given to an officer or a deputy of a person in charge of the communities. This is the reason why recent authors have preferred to look for the literary parallels of the Pastoral Letters (1 Tim and Tit) in the correspondence of Greek or Roman authorities with their officers or delegates. See for this approach again MICHAEL WOLTER, Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition (FRLANT 146), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1988, pp. 161-180, and LUKE TIMOTHY JOHNSON, The First and Second Letters to Timothy (AncB 35A), New York etc.: Doubleday 2001, pp. 137-142.

The analysis can start (according to Johnson, 137) with the observation that the verb παραγγέλλω together with the noun παραγγελία appear as typical expressions in our letter (as in Tit): the verb in 1,3; 4,11; 5,7; 6,13.17, the noun in 1,5 and 1,18. The instructions given about the role of men, women, bishops, elders, deacons, slaves constitute a major part of the letter, similar to Tit. The “Paul” of our letter(s) instructs his delegate to establish a given order in his communities which has to be observed upon command of Paul. In the same time, the delegate has to serve his community as a model of immaculate conduct. Such kind of instructions is found in antiquity in letters of kings or other rulers to their delegates or deputies in distant areas from the time of the diadochs. Examples are given by Wolter as well as by Johnson from early Hellenistic times. Wolter quotes among other texts PTebtunis 703, the so-called “mandata principis”, Hellenistic royal letters from

the Seleucid and Ptolemaic Empire and (from a later period) Julian, ep. 39/84a; 47-48/89ab. The same texts appear at least in part also in Johnson's commentary.

According to a wide-spread opinion (N. Brox, J. Roloff, L. Oberlinner, in the tradition of Dibelius – Conzelmann), the scope of the Pastoral Letters is to prepare the communities for the fight against upcoming heresy by reinforcing tradition and by the establishment of a church-order of which Timothy and Titus would be the first representatives. If the dependence of the Pastoral Letters upon the above-mentioned group of letters to delegates of rulers and kings is taken seriously, another solution offers itself: Timothy and Titus are the delegates of Paul in a certain place for a certain period, and they have to structure rather than to establish ministry in their congregations. This explains why "Paul" speaks in 1 Tim about his future coming to Timothy (3,14) and gives his instructions only for the case that his arrival should be delayed (3,15). Similarly, Titus is to come to Paul (3,12), and the instructions for him concern the time while he is in charge of the church of Crete (1,5). Only in 2 Tim Paul announces his coming death (4,6-8). Here the typical instructions about church order are missing.

A different proposal of classifying the literary genre of the Pastoral Letters has been made by RICHARD I. PERVO, *Romancing an Oft-Neglected-Stone: The Pastoral Epistles and the Epistolary Novel*, in: *Journal for Higher Criticism* 1,1 (1994) 3-32 (cf. the website of this review in: <http://www.depts.drew.edu/jhc>). According to this author, the Pastoral Epistles stand in the tradition of Epistolary Novels in Greco-Roman antiquity. These novels seem to have in common the following elements: 1) They are pseudonymous by nature; 2) historical in setting; 3) characterological in orientation; 4) philosophical / moral in aim; 5) they constitute a collection; 6) they generally are of narrative kind. (Pp.29f). As the author sees himself, particularly this last element makes it difficult to attribute the Pastoral Letters to this category. There may be nevertheless some common elements which might be worth considering. The examples analysed by Pervo are the Letters of Chion and Epistles of the Socratics. His conclusion: "Formally I should characterize the PE (Pastoral Epistles) as a collection with some features of the epistolary novel, rather more like the Socratic Epistles than like *Chion of Heraclea*. There is no way to ascertain whether the Pastor, as the author is commonly called, was familiar with such works." (45)

3rd Lecture: The text and the reception of 1 Timothy. 1 Tim 1,1-2 The Prescript

1. The text and the reception of 1 Timothy

a) The text

See LUKE TIMOTHY JOHNSON, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AncB 35A), New York etc.: Doubleday 2001, 16-19.

As Johnson rightly observes, the documentation of a New Testament Writing by manuscripts is the proof of its existence and use, while the absence cannot be used in the same way as an argument for its non-existence or lack of use, since it would be an *argumentum e silentio*.

The Letters to Timothy are not attested by Papyri. There is nevertheless Papyrus evidence for Titus: Tit 1,1-15 and 2,3-8 is attested by P³² and Tit 3,1-5.8-11.14-15 is attested by P⁶¹. While the latter Papyrus is dated around 700 A.D., P³² is dated by Nestle-Aland²⁷ around 200 A.D., and this is a very early date. Supposing that 1 and 2 Tim formed early a corpus with Tit as “The Pastoral Epistles”, the witness for Tit at the beginning of the third century is important for the existence and the use of these letters. Among the uncial codices we may name as witnesses for 1 Tim:

4th century: Sinaiticus (Ⲛ) – not Vaticanus (B), where 1 Tim – Phlm are missing

5th century: Alexandrinus (A), Bezae Cantabrigensis (D) in the section, which is conserved in Paris, Ephraemi Rescriptus (C) with 1 Tim 1,1 – 3,9; 5,20 – 6,20; also 2 Tim 1,1-2; I (016), most of 1 Tim; 048 (Vatican Library, Gr. 2061) with 1 Tim 5,5 – 6,17; 6,20-21

6th century: H (*015) with 1 Tim 1,7 – 2,13; 3,7-13; 6,9-13

For the 9th century see codices F, G, K, L, Ψ and 049.

One may ask for the reasons of the absence of Papyrus evidence for 1-2 Tim. These Papyri are fragmentary anyhow, and the attestation of Tit by P³² shows in any case the Pastoral Letters were not completely ignored. If P⁴⁶ which contains most of the Pauline Letters does not attest the Pastoral Letters, it might be observed with Johnson that this document ignores all Letters of Paul written to individuals including Philemon, but contains Hebrews, possibly forming a corpus of Letters of Paul to seven local communities (Rome, Corinth, the Galatian communities, Ephesus, Colossae, Thessalonike and the community of the “Hebrews”). On the other side, both Letters to Timothy are used and quoted in the Old Latin version by Tertullian at the end of the second cent., and this seems to prove the existence of the original text about the middle of the second cent. (cf. Johnson, 18).

b) The reception

The earliest mention of 1-2 Tim in texts of the magisterium is the so-called *Decretum Damasi* (A.D. 382, DS 180), which nevertheless is debated according to its authenticity and attested with certitude not before Pope Gelasius I (A.D. 495; cf. DS 350); earlier in time is the mention of the Pastoral Letters in the Ep. of Pope Innocence I. “*Consulenti tibi*” from A.D. 405 (DS 213) as far as this document mentions 13 (or 14) Pauline Letters. The later Councils list the Pastoral Letters among the canonical writings of the NT: Florence (A.D. 1442, DS 1335) and Trent (A.D. 1546, DS 1503).

As far as early lists of NT writings are concerned, the absence of the Pastoral Letters from Marcion’s list is often observed and explained in different ways. On the other side, the Muratorian Fragment (about 200 A.D.: KIT 1, p. 9) contains the Pastoral Letters in the sequence of Tit and 1-2 Tim and attests the use and the acceptance of these Letters in the Roman community.

Among the Apostolic Fathers, an attestation of 1 Tim by Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch does not seem to find any longer general acceptance, as also Johnson admits (20 with note 16: C. Spicq, D. A. Hagner). The earliest undisputed witness seems to be Polycarp of Smyrna in his (Second) Letter to the Philippians, dated some time between 110 and 135 A.D. In 4,1 we find an echo of 1 Tim 6,10 with 6,7 (greed as the root of all evil, and the fact, that we did not bring anything into the world as we shall not bring out of it anything). Further possible allusions are Pol 8,1 (the identification of Christ with our hope according to 1 Tim 1,1) and 12,3 (exhortation to prayer for all in power according to 1 Tim 2,2). These coincidences seem to rule out in any case a late dating of the Pastoral Epistles about the middle of the 2nd cent., as sometimes proposed. 1 Tim 2,2 might have been used also by the Apologists Theophilus of Antioch and Athenagoras of Athens (Johnson 20). Tertullian has already been mentioned. His contemporary Irenaeus of Lyons knows and quotes 1 and 2 Tim, with a quotation from 1 Tim 1,4 at the beginning of his *Adv. Haer.*, I, introduced by “as the Apostle says” (Johnson, 21). The churches of Alexandria (Clement, Origen) and of Rome (Hippolyt) know the Pastoral Letters in the 2nd cent. Cyprian is another witness.

From all this can be inferred that 1 Tim has been an accepted Letter by the end of the second cent. A.D. and even earlier, with a first mention in the first half of this century. Later important mentions are found in the Apostolic Constitutions, Eusebius of Caesarea, Augustin and John Chrysostom, the first commentary being the one by Ephraem the Syrian still in the 4th cent., followed by Theodore of Mopsuestia.

2. 1 Tim 1,1-2 The Prescript

1 Tim starts with a prescript, indicating that it wants to be understood as a letter. It follows the general form of a New Testament Letter: A to B, followed by a formula of greeting or blessing.

a) The text

Only two variants are mentioned in Nestle-Aland²⁷ for these two verses:

In v. 1 **ℵ** reads ἐπαγγελίαν instead of ἐπιταγήν. This seems to come from 2 Tim 1,1.

In v. 2 **ℵ**² D² Ψ ℳ and some versions insert ἡμῶν after πατρός. This seems to follow from the pronoun found at the beginning of most Pauline Letters after πατρός (Rom, 1-2 Cor, Eph, Phil, Col, 2 Thess?, Phlm). We should follow the omission in **ℵ*** A D* F G I and important minuscals.

b) Translation

In general, the translation of the section does not present serious difficulties. Unusual is the word ἐπιταγή in a letter opening. It means here not a specific command, but the command by which Paul has been appointed an apostle. (See below, d, for semantics).

c) Syntax

In v. 1, Paul indicates himself as the writer of the letter and an apostle, specifying with a construction depending on κατά how he has become an apostle. In v. 2 he names the addressee of the letter, as usual in the dative, specifying who Timothy is for him: his genuine child in faith. Then follows the salutation in a new sentence according to oriental rather than Greek style: three nouns indicating the content of Paul's wish and followed by the naming of those from whom these gift of grace should come: the Father and Jesus Christ, the Lord of the writer as well as of the addressee.

What is noteworthy is the fact that the following sentence does not seem to have a verb of its own so that it might be recommended to see in the following verses the continuation of the formula of greeting and blessing in 1,2. We shall come back to this later. In any case, one should remain open for the individual form of a NT Letter over against the elements given by letter format. Most commentaries seem to neglect this problem posed by the syntax of 1,3f.

d) Semantics

- The sender (v. 1)

The vocabulary by which the sender presents himself is at the same time indebted to Paul and different from his style and way of thinking. That Paul is an “apostle” is expressed at the beginning of most of his other letters (except Phil, 1-2 Thess and Phlm). A preferred expression would be that he is κλητός, “called” by God. Perhaps because this expression is too strongly inspired by biblical language (dependence on the Hebrew root of כָּרַץ), the “Pastoral Paul” (M. Wolter) chooses the alternative expression κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ. The noun ἐπιταγή corresponds well to Greek usage, in secular as well as in religious contexts where it means a divine oracle or command. Liddell-Scott-Jones refer for this latter usage besides Rom 16,26 (perhaps post-Pauline) and 1 Cor 7,6 (cf. also 7,25 and 2 Cor 8,8) to *SIG* 1153 (Athens). While in Paul the word seems to mean rather an individual command of God in a particular situation, in 1 Tim 1,1 the sense seems to be broader: God’s command as the basis of Paul’s apostolic activity (in the same sense also Tit 1,3; in 2,15 ἐ. becomes the insistence of Titus on what has been entrusted to him towards others).

In two genitive constructions, God and Jesus Christ are specified. God is characterized as “saviour” (σωτήρ). This is one of the favourite expressions of the Pastoral Letters. It is applied to God besides our text in 1 Tim 2,3; 4,10; Tit 1,3; 2,10; 3,4, to Jesus Christ in 2 Tim 1,10; Tit 1,4; 2,13; 3,6. In the gospels, the term occurs only three times (Lk 1,47; 2,11; John 4,42), in the undisputed letters of Paul only once (Phil 3,20). Except in Lk 1,47, in the gospels and Paul the word is always applied to Jesus. All the other occurrences are found in New Testament Letters after Paul. The term is used also in Greco-Roman religion for saviour Gods or Emperors as saviours in a religious sense. The use in the Pastoral Letters seems to stand under the influence of this usage.

In the other genitive construction, Jesus Christ is characterized as “our hope” (ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν). The noun occurs 53 times in the NT, never in the gospels, but exclusively in Acts and NT letters. The only instance where it is identified with Christ besides our text is Col 1,27.

- the addressee (v. 2a)

Timothy is known from various Pauline Letters as co-author (2 Cor, Phil, 1-2 Thess). According to Acts 16,1, he came from Lystra and had a Jewish mother and a Greek father. This is why Paul, according to Luke, circumcised him before taking him with himself for his future missionary journeys. The authenticity of this Lukas version remains debated.

Timothy (also mentioned in a final greeting in Rom 16,21) seems to have served as an emissary of Paul in his relations with the Christians at Corinth (1 Cor 4,17; 16,10), Philippi (Phil 2,19) or Thessalonike (1 Thess 3,2,6). Cf. also Hebr 13,23. This is probably the reason why he was a suitable candidate as an addressee of two letters of the “Pastoral Paul”. Timothy is called by Paul in our text “his genuine child in faith”. The same expression occurs in Tit 1,4. Authors observe the difference over against “his beloved child” (ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ) in 2 Tim 1,2. Whereas 1 Tim and Tit correspond more strongly to the type of *mandata principis*, 2 Tim has the more personal tone of a testament, under this aspect closer to the Farewell Discourses of Jesus (where the verbal noun is missing, but the idea is present: John 13,34; 14,21; 15,9,12; τεκνία 13,33). πίστις is used in 1 Tim 1,2 as opposed to natural sons, without further specification, as usually in the Pastoral Letters.

- the wish (v. 2b)

The wish which corresponds to the Greek formula χάριεν (in the NT attested in Acts 15,23) follows more or less the Pauline pattern which is itself inspired by oriental and biblical usage. The wish: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη occurs in all Pauline letters, in most of them (except Gal, Col and 1 Thess) expanded by the formula ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This salutation is rather faithfully observed in 1 Tim 1,2, with the exception of the insertion of ἔλεος and the transposition of ἡμῶν from πατρός to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, emphasizing slightly more strongly Jesus Christ as the common source of salvation of the writer and the addressee. The noun ἔλεος is occasionally used by Paul (Rom 9,23; 11,31; 15,9; Gal 6,16), but never in letter openings. In this latter context it is found in 2 Tim 1,2; 2 John 3; Jude 2, possibly under biblical influence (the word is very frequent in the LXX, mostly as equivalent for רַחֵם, but with six more possible Hebrew reference words).

In adopting the classical formula of a letter opening used by Paul and his immediate school, the author reveals himself to be indebted to Pauline tradition. By modifying this scheme with the insertion of the above mentioned elements he shows his concern for the “inculturation” of the Pauline message to the world of his readers. Thus, from the beginning 1 Tim appears as a genuine product of the “Pastoral Paul”.

4th Lecture: 1 Tim 1,3-11 First warnings for Timothy concerning false teachings

1. Context

As indicated before, 1 Tim 1,3f follows vv. 1-2 as an incomplete construction. Authors like Johnson call it “anacolouthic” (161). But there is the possibility of connecting the two verses with the two preceding ones in a loose way as one construction: Paul (that is me) writes to Timothy: As I have told you ... The continuation of vv. 3-11 is found in vv. 18-20, with vv. 12-17 being an interruption of autobiographical character. The link is made by the initial ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν παρατίθεμαί σοι in v. 18, taking up the καθὼς παρεκάλεσα of v. 3 and the τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας in v. 5. Why the “Pastoral Paul” has interrupted his discourse in this way remains a matter of speculation. One formal reason is the wish to have a kind of “thanksgiving” in the initial section of his letter, without making it the starting point. Another reason lies in the fact that Paul wants to establish a link of Christian tradition with himself, important for the first subject raised by him in his letter: remaining steadfast in faith over against all upcoming heresies. A final reason may be found in the fact that Paul wanted to bring a narrative element concerning himself at the beginning of the corpus of the three Pastoral Letters, with Tit being an expansion on the subjects raised in 1 Tim and 2 Tim being the conclusion, again of more personal character as the “testament of Paul” (M. Wolter). Again, this *narratio* would not stand at the beginning since it rather serves the argument introduced beforehand: faithfulness to the belief once received and adopted.

2. Text

The text of the little unity does not present serious difficulties, as it was already the case in vv. 1-2. The rather unusual ἐκζητήσεις in v. 4 (hapax in the NT and only attested in Christian literature: W. Bauer) has been replaced by the usual ζητήσεις in D F G Ψ and a number of other documents including *ℳ*. This is clearly a facilitation of a *lectio difficilior* (*praeferenda*). In the same verse, D* replaces the unusual οἰκονομίαν (9 times in the NT, 5 times in Pauline Letters except our verse) with οἰκοδομήν (18 times in the NT, 15 times in Pauline Letters), in the second version with οἰκοδομίαν (never in the NT). The reading οἰκοδομήν had only a few Latin followers and Irenaeus in its favour. There is no need to adopt it. The χρήσηται instead of χρῆται in v. 8 (A P, Cl) may come from the wish to place the use of the Law rather in the past than in the present by theological reasons. This is why this reading may rather not be considered.

3. Syntax and structure

The paragraph consists of three sentences of unequal length. Vv. 3-4 seem to depend on the salutation of vv. 1-2 and are characterized by the first and second person singular. Vv. 5-7 form a second sentence, written thoroughly in the third person, first singular, then plural. The transition to the plural occurs in v. 6, where in a relative clause the persons are described who deviate from right conduct with a main verb and three participles. The longest sentence is found in vv. 8-11. Here, the author returns to the first person, this time in plural, and then moves to the third person: from οἴδαμεν to εἰδώς; in a ὅτι-sentence the νόμος becomes the subject, with two dative objects: in the singular (δικαίῳ) and then in the plural with a long list of persons deviating from right use of the law. At the end, the author gives up his construction and concludes with remaining categories of evildoing (not evildoers), contrasting such behaviour to sound doctrine as represented by his own preaching of the gospel with which he had been entrusted.

The double use of first person creates in any case communication between the writer and the addressee – a communication which remains open for the reading community of the letter.

4. Interpretation on the semantic level

- Paul's command (vv. 3-4)

“Paul” starts with a reminder of the command he had entrusted to Timothy when he left him at Ephesus while himself continuing his journey to Macedonia. The content of his command was that Timothy should instruct (“command”) others. We see the structure of *mandata principis* observed by the recent authors. It is interesting to see that the content of the instruction handed down from Paul through Timothy to the congregation(s) is not the establishment of church order or hierarchy, but fidelity to the faith and doctrine received. This is to be maintained over against interpretations of the Pastoral Epistles in general and 1 Timothy in particular which see such establishment of ministry as the primary goal of these letters.

The vocabulary of the instruction Timothy has to observe and to hand down is strongly characterized by speech use of the Pastoral Epistles and un-Pauline: προσέχειν occurs 24 times in the NT, never in Paul outside the Pastoral Epistles, and in these Epistles 5 times. ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν occurs only here and in 1 Tim 6,3; γενεαλογία is found besides our v. 4 only in Tit 3,9; μῦθος occurs 5 times in the NT, except 2 Pet 1,16 always in the Pastoral Epistles. ἀπέραντος is a hapax legomenon in the whole of the NT.

The question which kind of “myths” and “pedigrees” might be the object of Paul’s criticism is strongly debated. Those who – like Johnson – want to attribute the letter to Paul himself try to play down the “gnostic” ring of the aberrations described and see in them gossip without meaning or point to the “Jewish myths” in Tit 1,14. The connection with Judaism is underlined also in 1 Tim 1,7 ff, but this does not exclude a gnostic ring given the connection between Judaism and the rise of Gnosticism which is generally recognized. It is not easy to see which sense would have speculations about pedigrees in Judaism or under Jewish Christians. More convincing seems to be a link with upcoming gnostic ideas where the importance of genealogies and “syzygia” was paramount and served as a basis for the underlying dualism. For the writer, these speculations cause rather strife (ἐκζητήσεις, hapax in the NT) in the communities instead of serving God’s dispensation of salvation in faith.

- Love as the synthesis of Paul’s command (vv. 5-7)

Whereas speculations about myths and genealogies cause division and strife, love unites. This love should come from a “pure heart” – as it had been claimed by Jesus himself in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5,8), on the basis of Ps 24,4. This is equal to a “good conscience”, a rather Hellenistic expression: it is never found in Paul (although he knows and uses the noun), but occurs in Acts 23,1; 1 Tim 1,19; 1 Pet 3,16.21. The equivalent would be “pure conscience” (1 Tim 3,9; 2 Tim 1,3) or “καλή συνείδησις” (Hebr 13,18). To this attitude is associated “authentic faith”, almost as an additional virtue, as predominantly in the Pastoral Epistles. In the emphasis on love as the central commandment, on the other side, our author stands close to the teaching of Jesus (Mk 12,28-34 parr.) as well as Paul (Gal 5,14; Rom 13,8-10).

That the exhortation of “Paul” has got a real background in the situation of the communities becomes clear from vv. 6-7: some members of these communities have deviated (the verb still in 6,21 and 2 Tim 2,18) from love and the path of good conscience and have turned to idle talk (μᾶταιολογία only here in the NT). They wanted to be teachers of the law without knowing what they said or what they had given witness to (the verb still in Tit 3,8). The great question is of course what is meant by “teachers of the law”. Those who see the Pastoral Letters close to Paul or even think them to be genuinely Pauline would stress the connection of the adversaries with Judaism as in the genuinely Pauline Letters. The problem remains how to see the connection with the genealogies and myths mentioned above. In our concrete context, the diversity seems to be more in moral teaching than in dogmatic speculations. This results from the following context where our author does not deal with theoretical matters, but with moral life. Deviations from right conduct might have been ascribed to early Gnostics as well as to hazardous interpreters of the Law.

- The usefulness of the Law (vv. 8-11)

Apparently, the importance of the Law as such was disputed between our author and his adversaries. They may have taught the Law theoretically, but without living up to its standards. Or they might have denied the relevance of the Law altogether. Both possible positions are rejected by our author with the firm and simple thesis that “the Law is good”, upon the condition that someone makes a use of it which corresponds to its purpose (the rare adverb νομίμως is still found in 2 Tim 2,5). This position does not contradict Pauline theology, since in the middle of the debate about the Law in Rom 1-3, Paul could emphasize: “Do we mean that faith makes the Law pointless? Not at all: we are giving the Law its true value” (3,31). In 7,12, Paul affirms explicitly: “The Law is sacred, and what it commands is sacred, just and good.”

Also in the following argument, our author is not far from Paul. The Law helps to find the will of God. As far as a person is guided by faith and love, the commandments of the Law become superfluous. This is expressed in vv. 9-11 – very shortly for the “just” who do not need the Law, very strongly developed in detail for the unjust with all their vices. For the synthesis of the Law in love see above, for v. 5. The long series of vices which are opposed the attitude of the “just” has its parallels in other Pauline Letters (cf. Rom 1,29-31; Gal 5,19-21). The first series of vices may be determined by alliteration (five groups of persons, starting with ἀ, mostly privativum). After the transitional βεβήλοις (wicked) comes a series of crimes which follows more or less the decalogue. At the beginning stand two kinds of criminals of particularly perverse attitude: the murderers of father or mother (the Greek nouns πατρολῶας and μητρολῶας occur only here in the NT) and seem to combine crimes against the fourth and the fifth commandment. The fifth commandment comes next with ἀνδροφόνους, followed by deviations from the sixth commandment: πόρνοις, ἀρσενῶ κοίταις (pederasty was repudiated by the Law of Israel, but accepted practice in Hellenism; cf. Rom 1,26f where Paul sees in this behaviour God’s chastisement for having changed God for his creatures). The hijacking of human persons is part of the acts forbidden by the seventh commandment, “lying” corresponds to the eight one, perjury contradicts the second one, but is also a form of lie. It has been remarked that in the series of the Ten Commandments, our author follows the Hebrew canon of Scripture rather than the LXX, where adultery precedes murder. All these vices (or rather categories of evildoers) contradict “sound doctrine”, as it has been entrusted to the writer in the form of the gospel of the glory of the Blessed Divinity.

Again, the vocabulary is striking. Paul, as we know him from his undisputed letters, would never call his gospel a “sound” or “healthy doctrine”, and he would never speak of a “μακάριος θεός” which sounds rather like Byzantine language (but see also 1 Tim 6,15). That the gospel has been “entrusted” to him, is on the other hand attested in his authentic letters (cf. Gal 2,7; 1 Thess 2,4).

5th Lecture: 1 Tim 1,12-17 Paul's Thanksgiving

1. Context and literary genre

At this point, Paul interrupts his initial instruction for Timothy with a kind of thanksgiving. These thanksgivings belong to the form of Paul's letters with the exception of the Letter to the Galatians, but they normally refer to the good news Paul had received about the good state of spiritual "health" of his addressees, of which he had heard recently, according to the letter format of friendship letters in antiquity (cf. in this sense also 2 Tim 1,3-5). In our case, the thanksgiving refers to the grace Paul had received in his call to conversion and faith.

2. Text and translation

The text of the little unit does not present particular difficulties. An initial *καί* in v. 12 or *τόν* in v. 13 do not alter the meaning. The concluding doxology in v. 17 knows a number of variants, certainly due to liturgical use of the time.

For the translation, the most controversial concept is *ὑποτύπωσις* in v. 16. It means "sample" or "example", but also "prototype". Apparently, this latter sense is found in v. 16. For the discussion, see below, 4.

3. Sentence structure

We can distinguish five sentences in our section:

Vv. 12-13: a verbal clause in the present

v. 14: a verbal clause in the past (aorist)

v. 15: a nominal clause in the present

v. 16: a verbal clause in the past (aorist)

v. 17: a nominal clause in the present.

As we see, there is a shift between verbal and nominal clauses, past and present. Paul reflects God's action in him in the past in its consequences for the present and for the future, and thanks him. The nominal clause in the centre places God's action into a timeless frame. The final doxology transcends time and space and praises God not only for his deeds, but also for his eternal being.

Characteristic for our section are the oppositions and adversative particles like *ἀλλά* in v. 13, *δέ* in v. 14 and again *ἀλλά* in v. 16, followed by another *δέ* in v. 17 (without real adversative meaning).

The oppositions concern the contrast between “then” and “now” in the biography of Paul in vv. 12-15. The ἀλλά in v. 16 prepares already the ground for the future and points to the purpose of Paul’s call to salvation: the faith of the coming generations.

4. Interpretation on the semantic level

Vv. 12-13: The main opposition in this sentence is given between Paul’s previous conduct and Christ’s saving action in him. That Paul was called to belief in Christ from a former existence far from Christ is part and parcel of Paul’s own reports about his conversion. The main texts of the Pauline corpus are 1 Cor 15,8-10; Gal 1,13-16 and Phil 3,5-7. In all these texts appears clearly that Paul was not converted from a sinful life to immaculate moral conduct. As particularly Phil 3,5-7 shows, Paul was proud of having been a Jew of strict observance. The only reproach which could have been made against him was that he persecuted the church of Christ. This picture given in the authentic Pauline letters starts changing already in early documents of the Pauline school. In Eph 3,8 Paul declares himself the “least of all saints”. This is probably not just an expression of humility or modesty, but the beginning of a “topos” (cf. Barn 5,9 for apostles): Paul, the greatest of the sinners, was converted to Christian belief and life. The Acts of the Apostles stand somewhere between the witness of the authentic Paul and this later picture given in Ephesians. When they describe Paul’s conversion from his former conduct to a new life in the service of Christ in the Damascus incident, the decisive point is that he who had persecuted the church of the Lord was called to proclaim Christ (cf. Acts 8,3 after the execution of Stephen in which Paul had taken part; 9,1f; 9,3-8; 22,3-8 where Paul’s education in the Law is underlined; 26,4-17 with a similar remark). That Paul was a blasphemer and that he injured the faith is not directly covered by authentic Pauline traditions but seems to have become an oral tradition under Hellenistic influence where Paul started to be an example of the Christian who was called to Christian faith from the wicked life of the pagans. For the existence of a tradition about Paul the persecutor and the converted sinner cf. among other authors KARL LÖNING, *Die Saulustradition in der Apostelgeschichte* (NTA NF 9). Münster: Aschendorf 1973. Paul would never have affirmed that he had acted out of ἀπιστία, that is unbelief. He only lacked faith in Christ. Also the affirmation that Paul acted out of ignorance is absent from his letters. This element is typical for the excuse of the sins of the pagans since OT times. It is applied to the sins of the Jews in Acts 3,17, but to the sins of the Gentiles in Acts 17,30; Eph 4,18; 1 Pet 1,14. In introducing this term, our author prepares the ground for the idea of Paul being an example of the Gentiles called to faith in the communities entrusted to Timothy in the Greek speaking diaspora of the era.

V. 14: To the “unbelief” of Paul in the time before his conversion is opposed Christ’s abounding grace. The wording resembles Rom 5,20 although the context is different. “Faith” and “love” form a connection in the Pastoral Epistles, in a sense similar to “faith”, “hope” and “love” in Paul (cf. 1 Cor 13,13): cf. 1 Tim 1,5; 2,15; 4,12; 6,11; 2 Tim 1,13; 2,22; 3,10; Tit 2,2. Sometimes πίστις and ἀγάπη occur in series of virtues like in 2 Tim 2,22; 3,10. Commentators conclude from this fact that both virtues have lost in the Pastoral Epistles of the power which they had in Paul and became virtues besides others.

V. 15: There is a discussion whether the initial formula in this verse is one of quotation or of assurance. The latter seems to be the case as has been demonstrated among others by J. M. Bover, quoted by M. DIBELIUS – H. CONZELMANN, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (HNT 13), Tübingen: Mohr ⁴1966, 23f. In Tit 3,8, the formula refers clearly back to the preceding text which seems to be traditional. In 1 Tim 3,1 on the other side the formula, still referring back, seems rather to corroborate the instructions given. The content of the confession of 1 Tim 1,15 is prepared in Mt 9,13; Lk 19,10. There is a vivid discussion about the meaning of the affirmation that Paul is “the first of the sinners”. Two positions can be distinguished. According to the traditional opinion Paul sees in himself a primary example of the sinner. This is in line with the observation made previously concerning vv. 12-13. Paul converted not just from unbelief in Christ, but from evildoing, thus becoming “the least of the saints”. He becomes the model of all Christians called from paganism who had to convert, but enjoyed also God’s mercy since they acted out of “ignorance”. This position is found in the commentary of Dibelius-Conzelmann (see above), but also NORBERT BROX, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT), Regensburg ⁵1989; OTTO KNOCH, *1. und 2. Timotheusbrief. Titusbrief* (NEB), Würzburg: Echter ²1990; HELMUT MERKEL, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (NTD 9/1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht ¹³1991; LUKE TIMOTHY JOHNSON, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AncB 35A), New York etc. 2001.

The opposite position maintains that Paul is speaking of himself being the “first of the sinners” also in a temporal sense. As he has become the point of reference for the communities of the Eastern Mediterranean in their belief in Christ, he had also been the first convert. In the first of the sinners, the faithful of his communities should also find the prototype and source of their belief (cf. v. 16). Paul assumes here a similar role as Peter in the communities depending from Antioch who saw in Peter their warrant of authentic faith or as John, the “Beloved Disciple”, in the communities of Johannine inspiration in and around Ephesus. This is the thesis of MICHAEL WOLTER, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (FRLANT 146), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1988, taken up by JÜRGEN ROLOFF, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK), Zürich-Neukirchen 1988.

V. 16: That the second interpretation given above is the more convincing one becomes evident from v. 16. For the meaning of ὑποτύπωσις see above, 2. Paul takes up from v. 14 the statement that he has “found mercy” (ἠλεήθην). The διὰ τοῦτο points forward to the ἵνα: Paul has found mercy so that all future sinners should see the abundant mercy of Christ. It is noteworthy that the Pastoral Paul speaks of his conversion and call to faith as an act of Christ and his saving action rather than of God himself. This stands in contrast to the descriptions given by Paul himself of his experience of conversion quoted above. Paul was converted in his encounter with Christ in a scene which might be called the “last Easter appearance” (cf. 1 Cor 15,8-10) – an element missing in the later records from Acts to the Pastoral Letters. But the origin of Paul’s conversion and call to faith lies clearly in God’s activity as appears from Gal 1,15: “The God, who had specially chosen me while I was still in my mother’s womb, called me through his grace and chose to reveal his Son in me, so that I might preach the Good News about him to the pagans”. There a reference seems to be found to Isa 49,1 (the calling of the Servant).

Of course, the importance of Paul being also in a temporal sense the first of the sinners and the converts has to be seen in the context of the Pastoral Epistles as a whole. Paul is not only the literary author of these Epistles, but he also remains in them the undisputed authority. He sends Timothy and Titus as his envoys and Apostolic Delegates, the teaching coming from him is normative, he organizes the communities, and it is his gospel which has to be maintained intact as “sound doctrine”. This goes far beyond just an exemplary role of Paul for the belief of the faithful in the communities of the Pastoral Epistles.

V. 17: That the final doxology speaks the language of the Greek-speaking Jewish diaspora is commonly recognized. God as “king of the ages” is found already in Tob 13,7.11. The predicates with α privativum (imperishable, invisible) characterize God’s essence not only according to Hellenistic Judaism (and Christianity), but also according to Greek thought. With the emphasis on God being the “only” God our author of course deviates from Greek religion with its pantheon and is faithful to the biblical tradition and the belief of Israel (cf. Dtn 6,4). That glory may be given to God “for ever (and ever)” is attested repeatedly in the Pauline Letters (cf. Rom 11,36; 16,27; Gal 1,5; Eph 3,21; Phil 4,20; Hebr 13,21). The Jewish origin of the formula is beyond doubt.

V. 17 does not indicate necessarily the end of a section of our Letter. This becomes clear from the context where the author continues the instructions given to Timothy, initiated in vv. 3-11. This way, also the Paul of the undisputed letters can interrupt his text with such doxologies as the examples from Rom 11,36 or Gal 1,5 show.

6th Lecture: 1 Tim 1,18-20 Continued instruction for Timothy

1. Context

J. Roloff recognizes in our text a decisive turning point in the First Letter to Timothy. It brings to an end the “prooemium” of vv. 1-20 or 3-20 respectively and prepares for the body of the letter from 2,1 onwards. The chiasmic construction by which the autobiographical section vv. 12-17 has been “sandwiched” between 3-11 and 18-20 had already been noted. By connecting the conclusion of his instruction for Timothy with his very personal report about God’s saving action in him, the author makes his appeal more urgent and more convincing.

There are good reasons to see another inclusion between 1,18-20 and 6,20f, the end of the letter before the final formula of blessing (see again Roloff). In both sections, the author addresses Timothy directly by name, and in both sections he refers to the deposit committed to him (παρατίθεμαι, παραθήκη) which has to be preserved untouched, in spite of the example of persons who deviated from it and lost their original faith. This would allow to see in 2,1 – 6,19 the letter body, framed by the verses mentioned previously.

2. Syntactical and linguistic analysis

The three verses form one single sentence, artistically structured: The main verb is found at the beginning in the indicative “παρατίθεμαί σοι”. It is followed by a final clause, indicating the goal of the commission made to Timothy, with a participial construction (ἔχων), which indicates its presupposition. The concepts of πίστις and καλή συνείδησις which occur in the participial construction lead to three successive relative clauses which depend on each other, the last one of them leading to another final clause. By the concept of “παραγγελία” the author points back to this key concept in vv. 3-11, in particular to παραγγέλλω in v. 3 and παραγγελία in v. 5. The “shipwrecking” (ναυαγέω) in faith of v. 19 corresponds in a sense to the concept of “deviating” (ἀστοχέω) from “good conscience” and “faith” in v. 6. When the author addresses Timothy as his “child”, he points back to 1,2 in the prescript, rounding up the whole introductory section of vv. 1-20.

3. Interpretation on the semantic level

V. 18: The author starts with a reminder of Timothy about the commission entrusted to him. Because of its vocabulary and the connections with vv. 3-11, the demonstrative pronoun ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν seems to point back to the opening section of vv. 3-11. This goes well along with the content of the commission, to watch over the orthodoxy of the flock entrusted to Timothy. On the other hand, the reminder of Timothy's commission in vv. 18-20 points also forward to the body of the letter with its instructions about community life and church order, starting with 2,1.

By addressing Timothy again as his "child", the author takes up the γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει of v. 2. Here as there, the title given to Timothy goes beyond personal friendship and paternity and expresses the institutional bond which links "Paul" to Timothy. This is strongly underlined and possibly overstated by L. Oberlinner who sees in Timothy the representative of ministry in Paul's absence.

Paul's reminder has an objective and a subjective aspect. From the objective side, Timothy is reminded of the deposit of faith and morals entrusted to him. On the subjective side, Paul reminds him of words of prophecy which previously (προαγούσας) had been spoken on his behalf. There is no consensus of which prophecies the author might have thought.

Most authors agree that Paul thinks here of the moment of Timothy's ordination as it is mentioned in 1 Tim 4,14; cf. 2 Tim 1,6. Only conservative Lutherans like A. Schlatter would hesitate to speak of an ordination of Timothy at all since according to him the early church did not know ordination. One might think of prophets in the early communities who spoke inspired words on the occasion of ordinations, but J. Roloff reminds us with good reason that nowhere in the Pastoral Epistles such prophets are mentioned. Apparently there was no room for them besides ordained ministry. One text quoted often in this context is Acts 13,1-2 where prophets in the community claim to single out missionaries for the proclamation of the gospel outside Antioch. But here again the existence of a group of prophets seems to be supposed. For this reason it appears reasonable to think of prophetic words spoken by members of the community, probably Elders, on the occasion of the ordination of Timothy (J. Roloff). Less probable appears the opinion of L. Oberlinner that Paul thought here of his own prophetic words spoken on the occasion of Timothy's commissioning. The reason for this view lies in the fact that Oberlinner under the influence of Dibelius-Conzelmann and not unlike Brox sees in Timothy the "minister" commissioned by Paul in his absence, who in his turn commissions other ministers in the communities according to his model. One text upon which this hypothesis might be based is 2 Tim 1,6 where Paul speaks of the commission of Timothy by the imposition of his, Paul's, hands. But 1 Tim 4,14 speaks clearly of the hands of the Elders.

The imagery of “competition” / “match” and “fighting in war” is accepted in Greco-Roman antiquity. In texts outside the biblical tradition it is used for the combat which a human person has to fight against vices and temptations. In Paul, the imagery seems to have been used exclusively for Paul’s efforts to overcome resistance against his apostolic ministry. The three main texts in this regard are 1 Cor 9,7 (στρατεύειν) and 9,25 (ἀγωνίζεσθαι), 2 Cor 10,3f (στρατεύομαι, στρατεία) and Phil 1,30 (ἀγών). The Pastoral Letters seem to stand in this Pauline tradition as far as the imagery of “competition” and “warfare” are applied as well to the apostolic ministry of Paul and his delegate Timothy and not to human fight for virtue in general (see still 1 Tim 4,10; 6,12; 2 Tim 4,7 for ἀγωνίζεσθαι / ἀγών and 2 Tim 2,3f for στρατιώτης / στρατεύομαι).

V. 19: The connection of “faith” (πίστις) and “good conscience” (ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις) is rather un-Pauline, but accepted language of our author (see 1 Tim 1,5; 3,9: καθαρὰ συνείδησις). On the one side, faith tends to become one virtue among others as has already been noted, on the other side faith is still a basic attitude regulating human conduct and this way closely connected with conscience. We remember the section 1,3-11 where faith was intimately connected with living according to the Law at its best and with a clear conscience.

If in the remainder of the verse the author turns to persons who have deviated from faith, this is probably to be understood in the sense of vv. 3-11 where deviation from faith is equal to misinterpreting the Law and falling into various capital sins contradicting the Decalogue. Those persons had once belonged to the community. They only “pushed back” authentic faith and clear conscience and then experienced shipwrecking. At this point it is not yet clear whom our author has in mind. The only clear insight is that the persons of whom he speaks once belonged to the community – they are not heretics found outside the church, and their false doctrine implies wrong moral teaching which will lead to immoral conduct.

V. 20: In the following verse, Paul becomes more explicit. He can give names: Hymenaeus and Alexander. They stand for others who deserted from the faith of their community. Of course, we look for further information about these two persons. Hymenaeus occurs again in 2 Tim 2,17, here together with a certain Philetus, in a formula similar to the one used in our v. 20: ὧν ἔστιν. These two former members of the community are accused of having deserted from revealed truth by affirming that the resurrection had already taken place, distorting also the faith of others (v. 18). There are several possible explanations of the label received by Hymenaeus and Philetus by our author. Those who tend to ascribe the Pastoral Letters to the historical Paul would see the reproach in connection with 1 Cor 15 where Paul insists on the resurrection as the hope of the Christians.

The problem is that Paul seems to defend resurrection here against deniers and not against Christians who affirm that it had already taken place. This opinion seems to go better along with early Gnostic tendencies in the milieu of the Pastoral Letters such as some encratism: Timothy is exhorted to take some wine together with the water he takes (1 Tim 5,23). He is warned against people who forbid to marry and who restrict the consumption of food which has been created by God for human benefit (1 Tim 4,3). These warnings seem to go beyond warnings over against Judaism since there is no restriction of marrying in Judaism. For this reason it seems wiser to think of upcoming Gnosticism in this context in the sense of 1 Tim 6,20. What we know about Alexander should be seen in this light, since in 2 Tim 4,14 it is only said that he caused much trouble for “Paul”, without further details than the one that the Lord would pay him recompense for his deeds.

In our text, 1 Tim 1,20, it is Paul himself who declares that he committed Hymenaeus and Alexander to Satan so that they might be educated not to blaspheme. Authors of course point to 1 Cor 5,5 as the literary model of this passage. Here the incestuous member of the community is also delivered to Satan. But the differences between the two texts should also be observed:

- in Paul, the community should take the decision, together with the spirit of the absent Paul, in 1 Tim it is Paul himself alone who takes the decision and the measure
- in Paul, the sinner is delivered to Satan so that his flesh may perish and his spirit possibly be saved, in 1 Tim the sinners shall be removed from the community only for a time so that they may have the opportunity for education and improvement.

4. Pragmatic reflection

Our text leads us into a time when upcoming heresy menaces the very existence of the community. Under such circumstances, clear decisions from the side of the persons responsible for the unity of the community are necessary. On the one side, the authority of Paul comes out clearly. He gives instructions how to deal with heresy, and he takes disciplinary measures. Ministry becomes important in order to safeguard the future of belief and of the community of the faithful. But ministry is not the only means of assuring church unity. Timothy is reminded not simply of his ordination, but of the prophetic words spoken over him on the occasion of his ordination. This means that a purely formal appeal to ministry and authority does not warrant the future of belief, but a reminder of ministerial authority in connection with a spirit of prophecy. This seems to be important in times when later heresies menace the existence of the church and its communities. Purely formal appeal to the magisterium might not suffice to maintain the goal of unity, but only a reminder of church authority under the spirit who speaks in the prophets.

7th Lecture: 1 Tim 2,1-7 Prayer for all human persons and those in power

1. Context

With 2,1, our author moves to the specific exhortations of his letter. We may see here the beginning of the body of the letter. As results from the general analysis of the structure of our letter (see above, 2nd lecture, p. 5), instructions about the obligations of the various groups in the family and in the community form the main bulk of the exhortations and instructions of “Paul”. In 2,8, the author will move to the particular obligations of men and women. Before he treats this subject, he asks for prayers for the kings and rulers. This topic is not unusual at this very point. We may think of 1 Pet 2,13 where “Peter” starts his “household code” with the instruction to submit to all human creature, in particular to the king / Cesar as holding authority and to his procurators who have been installed by him and who share his authority. For further details about this passage see our lectures.

“The First Letter of Peter” (second semester 2001/2002). I quote from pp. 38f:

»With 2,13 begins a kind of “household code” which extends until 3,7. Right conduct in society is explained by three characteristic examples: right conduct as citizens, right conduct of slaves and right conduct of wives and husbands. That the list is not complete but rather serves as a series of examples results from the fact that for instance the relation parents – children is not reflected about. The author seems to choose examples where Christian conduct was in particular exposed to pagan criticism. This fits into the general orientation of the letter and the body middle in particular.

“Household codes” appear in NT letters in post-Pauline times. Other examples are Eph 5,21 – 6,9; Col 3,18 – 4,1; Tit 2,9f in the context. The origin of such codes will be treated later in the context of “Hellenistic ethics in 1 Pet” (lecture 14). The subject seems to come from Hellenistic-Roman popular philosophy, particularly from stoicism, the linguistic form of the imperatives seems to reflect more apodictic law as documented in the OT tradition: Goppelt. For the discussion about “household codes” cf. now JOHANNES WOYKE, *Die neutestamentlichen Haustafeln. Ein kritischer und konstruktiver Forschungsbericht* (SBS 184), Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk 2000.

In NT letters, exhortations concerning right conduct towards civil authorities are rarely connected with obligations in the “house” proper. Our “Petrine” author seems to have selected these obligations as examples for right conduct in the society since they were of primary importance for the apology of the Christians in non-Christian society of the Roman Empire. Parallel passages are Rom 13,1-7; 1 Tim 2,1-3. At the basis of such reflections seems to stand Jesus tradition as documented in the pericope about paying taxes to Cesar (Mk 12,13-17 par.; Matth 17,24-27).«

2. Grammatical structure

We can distinguish in our little unit four sentences. At the beginning stands the exhortation to pray for all humans and in particular for those in power. In vv. 3-4 is explained that such behaviour is pleasing before God our saviour who wants all humans to be saved. This leads to the third sentence: a kind of formula of faith in the one God and the one mediator Jesus Christ (vv. 5-6). In v. 7, “Paul” declares himself to be an apostle and herald of this saviour, teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth. The initial exhortation to pray for all humans and those in authority is expressed by an indicative: παρακαλῶ with following infinitive. The person to whom the exhortation is directed is not expressed – one would expect an accusative. But it is clear from the context that all members of the communities of Timothy are addressed. In the following verses, nominal clauses dominate the text: v. 3 is such a clause, followed by a relative clause, and again the formula of v. 5, followed by a participial construction. The verbal clause at the end (v. 7) expresses also rather a state than an action: Paul has been made apostle and herald of the good news. From these observations follows that the text is strongly argumentative and not narrative.

3. Interpretation on the semantic level

a) Vv. 1-2 Prayer for all humans and for the political authorities

We may distinguish three elements after the initial παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων:

- the naming of four different kinds of prayers
- the naming of those to whose benefits such prayers should be said
- the purpose of these prayers.

The four different kinds of prayer appear somewhat pleonastic. They mean petition, prayer, intercession and thanksgiving. From the Greco-Roman point of view, the petitions and intercessions seem to be the most important aspect (see below). For the oriental and Jewish background see the references in Nestle-Aland ad locum (Es 6,10; Bar 1,11s; Jer 29,7, always prayers and sacrifices for non-Jewish kings).

As to the persons for whom the prayers should be said, it is interesting to see that our author does not start right away with the political authorities, but with “all humans”. A similar procedure can be seen in 1 Pet 3,13 where submission is required first to all human creature for the sake of the Lord and only then to the king / Cesar and the procurators. Here in 1 Tim as in 1 Pet the reason seems to be that the worldly rulers are part of creation and humanity and not divine on their own.

For this reason, submission to them and prayer for them make part of the general submission to given authority and of prayer for all humankind.

The purpose of the prayers for all humans and particularly those in power has again a Hellenistic ring: a withdrawn and peaceful life in all godliness and holiness. ἡσύχιος occurs also in 1 Pet 3,4 in the context of instructions for women, ἥρεμος is a hapax in the NT, but well attested in Greek literature, for εὐσέβεια see 3,16; 4,7s.; 6,3.5.6.11; 2 Tim 3,5; Tit 1,1, for σεμνότης 3,4; Tit 2,7 – only occurrences in the NT!

b) Vv. 3-4 The universal salvific will of God

The initial τοῦτο can be referred either to the prayers of the Christians or to their quiet life in godliness and holiness. Perhaps also both is intended. In any case the result of successful prayers for the state and its authorities meets God's wish of salvation for humankind. For God as "Saviour" see 1,1. His universal wish of salvation of all humankind is unique in this form in the NT and therefore often quoted. Closest comes 2 Pet 3,9: God does not want anybody to perish. For coming to the knowledge of truth see 2 Tim 3,7. Of course, the conviction of the author that God wants the salvation of all humans is deeply rooted in the Gospel tradition (think of the parables of Luke 15) and Paul (it is the quintessence of Rom 1-3). That God's σωτήριοιον is destined not only for Israel but for all nations frames the double work of Luke (Lk 2,31s.; Acts 28,28: J. Dupont).

c) Vv. 5-6 Salvation from one God and one mediator, Jesus Christ

The thought goes on from salvation for all to the one God and one mediator of salvation, Jesus Christ. The unicity of God and of the mediator of salvation seem to correspond to universal salvation. It is debated whether vv. 5-6 form a traditional unit (as suggested by the indenting in Aland's edition) or are rather formed by our author from traditional material. The closest parallel is 1 Cor 8,6 where Paul, apparently in a traditional formula, confesses One God and One Lord Jesus Christ. The text of 1 Tim 2,5-6 shows less influence of liturgical praxis and may go back to our author under the influence of (catechetical or liturgical) tradition. No need to say that the confession of One God is the hard core of Israel's belief (cf. Dtn 6,4). That Jesus is the mediator of the New Covenant is expressed in Hebr 9,15, cf. 8,6. His mediation is made possible by the fact that he stands not only on the side of God, but also of the humans: ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς. For the idea of "atonement for all" (ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων) see Mc 10,45; Mt 10,28 (λύτρον), both texts certainly under the influence of the Fourth Song of the Servant Isa 52,13 – 53,12.

God's saving action in Christ was a "witness", probably in view of the world of the Gentiles, "in propitious time", that means in the time of eschatological fulfilment for the benefit of the nations longing for salvation.

d) V. 7 Paul the apostle and herald of this salvation

The movement of thought went from prayer for the civil authorities to universal salvation and the One God and One Mediator of salvation. Now Paul comes in, the "herald" and "apostle" of this message of salvation. Apparently, our author considers the term "herald" (κηρυξ) to be more appropriate than the strongly biblical term "apostle". He uses it in a similar context in 2 Tim 1,11. 2 Pet 2,5, where the word is used for Noah, shows its acceptance in the church of the diaspora at the end of the NT era. Paul is conscious of the fact that the message of salvation has been entrusted to him, the apostle of the Gentiles (cf. Gal 2,7). He underlines the authenticity of this mission with a formula already found in Rom 9,1 (ἀλήθειαν λέγω ... οὐ ψεύδομαι). As he truly is the herald and apostle of the Gentiles, he is also their teacher "in faith and truth". "Faith" is understood here not in the Pauline sense, but in the sense of "trustworthiness", synonymous with "truth". Again, "πίστις" becomes a human virtue, as predominantly in the Pastoral Epistles.

4. Outlook

Cf. HANS-ULRICH INSTINSKY, *Die alte Kirche und das Heil des Staates* (München: Kösel 1963).

The exhortation of Paul to Timothy to have said prayers for Cesar and the civil authorities is not self-understanding. It must be remembered that at this given period occasional persecutions of Christians had already taken place. We think of first arrests and executions under Nero after the fire of Rome in 64 A.D. We may think also of the situation of conflict and persecution in the times of Domitian (81 – 96 A.D.) which seem to be reflected in the Book of Revelation. Here, Rome appears as the whore stained with blood – the blood of the martyrs. We may think also of the systematic questioning and execution of Christians of which Pliny the Younger informs the Emperor Trajan and for which he requests the Emperor's advice (Ep. X 96f). It is in this situation that "Paul" asks for prayers for the Emperor and all political authorities. How can this exhortation be understood?

It would not suffice to say that these prayers are requested for predominantly apologetic reasons. This tendency may be found in the Book of Acts where Luke seems to give a positive picture of

the Christians in their attitude towards the Roman state in order to appear as a “*religio licita*”, only a wing of Judaism, which was recognized by the state, and loyal to the civil authorities. Probably, the “Paul” of our Letter has more in mind. We see him indebted to Hellenistic ethics, which request “peaceful” behaviour in the house and loyalty towards the civil authorities. To the civil obligations belongs in the Roman Empire also prayer for the Emperor as the warrant of justice, peace and common welfare. Apparently, the first Christians did not have a problem with such prayers as such, but rather with the godheads to which their prayers should be directed. The Romans prayed for their Emperor to the Gods of Greco-Roman religion, and this of course was forbidden to the Christians, as also sacrifices on the altars of the Roman gods. The conflicts about which Pliny reports to Trajan, reflect precisely this problem.

Nevertheless, early Christian authors exhorted their faithful to pray for the Emperor. Instinsky, a professor of Ancient History at Mainz University in the post-war period, lists a number of such texts. The oldest text is a prayer found in the First Letter of Clement (around 97 A.D.): 1 Clem 61,1s. Here, Clement recognizes Roman state authority as given by God, and prays for the welfare of the authorities and of the commonwealth. Instinsky (43) sees this prayer in continuity with Jewish prayers for non-Jewish civil authorities which we mentioned earlier. Later, the early Christian apologists would reflect this practice of the Christian communities. Particularly noteworthy is Tertullian in his *Apologeticum* (chapter 10 and *passim*), where he rejects the reproach made against Christians that they were not loyal citizens and that they did not pray for his majesty, the Emperor. The contrary, Tertullian writes, is the case. The Christians only refuse to pray and make sacrifice to the Gods of the Romans who are not really gods. But they pray to the real God: “*Nos enim pro salute imperatorum deum invocamus aeternum, deum verum, deum vivum, quem et ipsi imperatores propitium sibi praeter ceteros malunt*” (Ap. 29,5, quoted Instinsky p. 48). Later on, Tertullian refers explicitly to 1 Tim 2,1f (Ap. 31,3). Tertullian’s position is taken up by Origen, including the reference to 1 Tim 2,1f (*Contra Celsum* 8,73).

It was only at the beginning of the fourth century, that the Roman authority recognized the legitimacy of the prayer of the Christians for the Emperor to their God. The decisive turning point was the so-called “edict of tolerance” of the Roman Emperor Galerius towards the end of his reign (311 A.D.) after years of pitiless persecution which he, the son-in-law and adopted son of Diocletian, had waged against the Christians. In this edict, Galerius allows the Christians to direct their prayers for the Emperor to their God. It has been recorded by Lactantius, *De morte persecutorum*, 34. It would pave the way to the edict of Constantine, two years later in Milan.

8th Lecture: 1 Tim 2,8-15 Instruction for men and women



*“Praying young man” (by Theisicrates, ca. 300 BC,
Berlin, Altes Museum)*

1. Text and translation

From prayer for all humankind and for the civil authorities our author moves on to the particular responsibilities of men and women: prayers to be said by men, decency to be observed by women. The text of the little unit does not present particular problems. Most variants occur in v. 9 with the various rules for conduct and outfit of women. Here, we have also some *hapax legomena* of the NT: καταστολή = bearing, deportment, also expressed in clothing; πλέγμα = braid, plait of hair. In v. 12 ἀθροῦν with gen. means: to rule over somebody. τεκνογονία in v. 15 = childbearing (also *hapax* in the NT).

2. Syntactical observations

As noticed by J. ROLOFF (whom we follow strongly in the following investigations), the literary unit vv. 8-15 is not homogeneous. After v. 8 about men, which runs smoothly, follow vv. 9-15 with strong literary tensions. There is a shift from “women” in vv. 9-10 to “woman” in vv. 11-15a and then back to “women” in 15b. The infinitive of vv. 9-10 is still depending on the “βούλομαι” of v. 8. In v. 11 follows an imperative in the 3rd person sg., in v. 12 “Paul” speaks in the indicative: he “does not allow”. In vv. 13-14 events of the past are recorded in the aorist, in 15a a promise is given for the future. From this patchwork of constructions and arguments may be concluded that our author makes use of various traditions which shall back up his position.

3. Structure

The lack of balance between the rules for men and those for women is striking. There is only one verse dedicated to the obligations of men, and seven are dedicated to the obligations of women. The main interest of the author seems to be to hand on a message about women, with an only superficial balance by instructions given about men. For the grammatical structure, see above, 2. Vv. 9-10 treat the external appearance of women in the community, vv. 11-15 the denial of their right to speak in the community with various arguments given from creation (vv. 13f) and a positive outlook at the end (v. 15a).

4. Interpretation

a) Instruction for men (v. 8)

After the instruction for all members of the community concerning prayers for all humans and particularly those in authority with the given reason of God's wish of salvation for all human persons (vv. 1-7), our author takes up the idea of praying and applies it to the men in the congregation, without going any longer into details for whom these men should pray. Roloff sees the origin of our author's request in Mal 1,11, but he may be equally inspired by the Hellenistic thoughts of vv. 1-3. Raising the hands to God in prayer is biblical as well as ancient usage (cf. Ps 28,2; 63,5; 77,3 etc., for Greek usage "Lexikon der Alten Welt", Zürich: Artemis 1965, 1029, and the "Praying young man", above; for Roman antiquity Horatius, Carmina 3,23,1-4, *ibid.*, 1030). The incompatibility of prayer / sacrifice with strife is attested in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5,23-25), polemic debates (διαλογισμοί) are also excluded by Paul (Phil 2,14).

b) instruction for women: dress and behaviour (vv. 9-10)

The construction of this sentence is not quite easy to grasp. Apparently, the βούλομαι of v. 8 seems to have been taken up. From it depends the infinitive κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς in v. 9 with its alternative with a positive, then a negative, and then again (in v. 10) a positive description how women should dress.

The first positive description recommends a "decent" outfit as a sign of a "responsible" attitude; the opposite would be styled hair, jewellery in the form of gold and pearls and precious garments. This opposition was not unknown in classical antiquity, particularly in the time of the early imperial time, and is attested also in 1 Pet 3,3-4, as authors do not fail to underline. All three elements of the

warning of 1 Tim 2,9f are occurring here (hairdressing, jewellery and garments). The difference is that the author of 1 Pet seems to think of the way women dress and look at home, while the author of 1 Tim seems to think of the way women dress and look like in the gatherings of the community. This latter idea seems to prepare the next section about the role of women in community gatherings. The positive alternative should be that women dress what is befitting persons who proclaim godliness by doing good works. Apparently, our author has no problems asking from his reading community “good works”, in difference with Paul, who never speaks of such “good works” because of his controversy about the relevance of such works for justification. It can be reasonably assumed that at the time 1 Tim was written, the Pauline debate had lost its force, and so a positive role of such “good works” would not have caused any apprehension.

c) instruction for women: silence in community gatherings (vv. 11-15)

The concept ἡσυχίος had already been used in 2,2, where it was required that all members of the community lead a “peaceful” life in this world. In the following verses, the substantive ἡσυχία recurs and becomes fundamental. Here, the meaning seems to be rather “silence” (cf. W. Bauer, Dict. sub voce, with examples from Greek antiquity). Initially, the “silence” required from women in the community is connected with the idea of submission (which Judaism as well as parts of early Christianity inferred from Gen 2: the women created after man, and 3,16, the man would rule over the woman). In v. 12, “Paul” explicitly uses his authority and forbids women to teach in the congregation or to rule over men, with a possible reference to the verse from Gen just quoted. In vv. 13 and 14, two explicit reasons are given from Genesis: the fact that first Adam was created, and that Eve, and not Adam was deceived (by the snake) and so transgressed the commandment of the Lord.

Probably on the basis of Gen 2-3 again seems to be based the positive outlook for women in v. 15a. As far as the woman in the tradition of the first woman who sinned gives birth to children under pain, she lives God’s punishment, but will also experience his mercy, when she accepts her fate. What this means positively, is developed by our author in 15b: faith (again understood as virtue), love and holiness together with a considered mind.

This section has of course caused much irritation, particularly in recent times, and this with good reason. In order to understand them correctly, it is highly recommended to see the preceding verses in the light of history. A first observation consists in the fact that Greco-Roman antiquity generally did not allow women to speak in public. The picture is not always and everywhere the same, but particularly in the first decades of the Empire such a tendency was strong.

It seems that Hellenistic Judaism maintained such a conservative perspective also in imperial times. Authors would refer for this fact in particular to Philo of Alexandria. That Eve had a particular role in primordial sin became accepted opinion in the Second Temple Period. A text always quoted on this behalf is Sir 25,24: "Sin began with a woman, and thanks to her we all must die". The Rabbis would see an erotic element in the "seduction" of Eve by the snake, and this idea was taken up by church Fathers and medieval theologians who on this basis excluded women from any active role in liturgy (see Roloff ad locum). It must be recorded, that Paul never accepted such a perspective. In Rom 5,12-21 it is clearly Adam who became the forefather of all sinners and brought death into the world, making necessary the atonement brought by Jesus Christ, the second Adam.

On the other side, a dependence of the rule that woman should remain silent in community in 1 Tim 2,11-15 on a Pauline text: 1 Cor 14,33b-36, is probable. This "mulier taceat"-text is highly debated. It rather interrupts the flow of thought in the context and does not seem to go along well with the principle of basic equality of men and women in Gal 3,28. Various solutions have been proposed: some authors maintain the authenticity of this passage, but try to soften it: Paul only wants to exclude women from speaking in community gatherings, not in liturgy (N. Baumert), or: only speaking of women in the form of prophecy or glossolalia could be declared forbidden (J. Kremer, RNT of 1 Cor), or: only teaching of women which violates the obligation of submission is forbidden (O. Michel, quoted by J. Kremer). Other authors doubt the authenticity of the passage (G. Dautzenberg). This opinion is not unfounded. One reason for doubting its authenticity is 1 Cor 11,5 where Paul supposes that women speak as prophets in the liturgy of the community, besides the principle of Gal 3,28.

A comparison between 1 Cor 14,33b-36 and 1 Tim 2,11-15 shows some differences (cf. Roloff):

- in 1 Cor the subject remains uncertain (ἐπιτρέπεται), in 1 Tim it is Paul who does not allow
- in 1 Cor there is only an unspecified reference to the law, in 1 Tim it is made explicit
- in 1 Cor the woman should learn at home, in 1 Tim she should rather learn in the community
- 1 Cor argues more strongly from the situation of the readers (v. 36), 1 Tim more from principles
- 1 Cor only forbids women to speak in the community, 1 Tim also blames arrogance (αὐθεντεῖν)
- in 1 Cor there is no outlook to salvation for women by what they do or experience, in 1 Tim yes.

Altogether, there is a movement towards more general discrimination of women in 1 Tim than in 1 Cor. This does not prove that 1 Cor 14 itself is a genuinely Pauline text.

The main reason for the instruction of 1 Tim 2,11-15 seems to lie in the situation of the community at the end of the first cent. Apparently, the role of women in gnostic communities of which we hear from the church fathers was seen as a menace to the existence of the Christian communities. Our author uses all his rhetoric in order to block the influence of upcoming Gnosticism.

9th Lecture: The role of women in early Christian communities

The section about women in 1 Tim 2,9-15 (with an echo in Tit 2,2-5) raises the question about the role of women in early Christian communities. We have to distinguish between Paul and his communities and communities outside direct Pauline influence.

1. The role of women in Pauline communities

a) The basic principle

It may be taken for granted that for Paul the “*articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*” is his doctrine that the human person is justified and saved by faith alone and not by the fulfilment of the Law and its prescribed works. All have been saved by God’s grace alone (Rom 3,21-24). The church and Christian communities are conceived by Paul as the body of Christ where every member has its own task and dignity. This idea is developed particularly in Rom 12,3-8 and 1 Cor 12. Here, the idea that God has bestowed different “charisms” upon his faithful is developed. One of these “gifts of the grace of God” is prophecy (Rom 12,6; 1 Cor 12,20.28f). That Paul supposes this gift of prophecy to be given also to women and to be listened to in liturgy appears from 1 Cor 11,5. The basic principle of equality of men and women is expressed by Paul in Gal 3,28, where Paul reminds his readers that in Christ there is no longer (the structuring and classifying difference of) Jew and Greek, slave and free man, man and woman. These classifications seem to serve as an example, since in 1 Cor 12,13 Paul only speaks of Jew and Greek, slave and free man (cf. Col 3,11).

b) Women as collaborators of Paul and as persons responsible for communities

In an astonishing degree, women take part in Paul’s apostolic activity or appear as persons responsible or co-responsible for Pauline communities. Of particular importance is the case of Prisca and Aquilas, a married couple who apparently came from Rome to the east at the time of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius (cf. Acts 18,2). They are greeted in Rom 16,3-5, what has caused debates about the original setting of the list of greetings in Rom 16. They are named explicitly collaborators of Paul who assisted him in his moments of affliction, and the community in their house is mentioned, as again in 1 Cor 16,19. Other collaborators are Maria (Rom 16,6), Tryphaina and Tryphosa as well as Persis (16,12).

In Rom 16,1f, Phoebe heads the list of persons mentioned by Paul. She is called the “deacon” or “servant” of the community at Cenchraeae. We shall come back later (12th lecture) to the question

whether this designation should be understood as the title of a “deacon” or be taken rather in an open and non-technical sense. Equally debated is the question whether in Rom 16,7 we should read “Andronicus and Junias” as normally accepted or rather “Andronicus and Junia”. This later opinion which is gaining acceptance today is based on the fact that a male name “Junias” is hardly attested in antiquity (it would be the short form of Iunianus), while “Junia” is an accepted name. Since the accusative “Ἰουνιανῶν” could be understood as accusative of Iunias or Iunia, it cannot be decided what was read and understood in the earliest communities. It is certain, that from early on, a female “apostle” would have appeared impossible, and for this reason, the minuscule manuscripts of course opt for the male version. D. Zeller, in his recent commentary (La lettera ai Romani, Brescia: Morcelliana, 1998), leaves the question open. If “apostle” is taken in a functional sense as “emissary”, the title might have been more easily acceptable also for a woman (Zeller). Further women as deserving mentioning in the Pauline communities are Julia and the sister of Nereus in Rom 16,15, the “people of *Chloe*” in 1 Cor 1,11 (seen in a negative light), Euodia and Syntyche in Phil 4,2 who are admonished to remain united, and Apphia who is co-addressee in the letter to Philemon (Phlm 2, his wife?).

c) Limits of the Pauline conception

That Paul is indebted to his original Jewish-Hellenistic background appears in particular in 1 Cor 11. As we saw, Paul, supposes here the possibility that women speak prophetically in the community. From the context in 1 Cor 12-14 appears that Paul thinks of the setting of liturgy. For the case that a woman takes the word in service, Paul gives the instruction that she should wear a veil “for the sake of the angels”. Some magic ideas may stay behind this precept, perhaps under the influence of myths about the sins of the “Sons of God” with the daughters of mankind as attested in apocalyptic literature. In this context, Paul shows some dependence upon Jewish ideas of the period about the inferiority of women (cf. 8th lecture): man “is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man” (1 Cor 11,7) – in contradiction to Gen 1,28: “God created human beings in his own image; in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them”. From the fact that the woman was created from man (Adam’s rib!) and that she is created for the man’s sake is concluded in 1 Cor 11,8f that he, being the original splendour, does not have to cover his head, while she has to cover it. We also mentioned the problematic passage in 1 Cor 14,33b-36 about the command that the woman should remain silent in the community. Is it Pauline?

2. The role of women in post-Pauline and non-Pauline communities

Close to Paul are still the Letters to the Colossians and to the Ephesians. In Eph 2,20 and 3,5 it is affirmed that the church is founded upon “the apostles and the prophets”. It is generally accepted that these “prophets” are prophets of the earliest Christian communities and do not have anything to do with the prophets of the OT. But these prophets appear now as a reality of the past. As there are no longer living apostles, there are no longer living and active prophets as well, and this way the gift of prophecy seems to belong rather to the foundational period of the church than to its basic structures. The same impression is generated by Eph 4,11 where the author places “apostles and prophets” on top of the list of the “gifts of grace” given to the church, but possibly belonging to the past, and the “evangelists, pastors and teachers” who are named afterwards and who seem to belong rather to the present of the communities. Of women having responsibility in the communities of Col-Eph there is only the testimony of Col 4,15 where “Paul” greets “Nympha and the church in her house”. This witness is of course important. It may be seen as a parallel to the story Luke tells us about the origins of the community at Philippi in the house of Lydia, “the seller of purple good”, in Acts 16,14-16. She received Paul in her house which seems to have become the cradle of the community of Philippi.

Of course, prominent are in the post-Pauline and non-Pauline letters the so-called “domestic codes” (“Haustafeln”) which describe the role of men and women, parents and children, lords and slaves according to Hellenistic standards with some kind of Christian reinterpretation. None of these texts is found in the undisputedly Pauline letters. They occur in Col 3,18-19; Eph 5,22-33; 1 Pet 3,1-7 besides the two texts in the Pastoral Epistles: 1 Tim 2,8-15 and Tit 2,1-8 (as far as men and women are concerned). We may recall at this moment what was said in the context of the interpretation of 1 Pet 3,1-7 last year (The First Letter of Peter) in the 14th lecture.

Hellenistic Ethics in 1 Peter

Literature:

- ADINOLFI, MARCO, *La prima lettera di Pietro nel mondo greco-romano* (BPAA 26), Rome 1988;
- BALCH, DAVID L., *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in I Peter* (SBL.MS 65), Chico, CA: Scholars Press 1988;
- BEUTLER, JOHANNES, ed., *Der neue Mensch in Christus. Hellenistische Anthropologie und Ethik im Neuen Testament* (QD 190), Freiburg etc. 2001;
- BOSETTI, ELENA, *Codici familiari. Storia della ricerca e prospettive: RivBib 35* (1987) 129-179;
- KRENTZ, EDGAR, *Order in the 'House' of God: the Haustafel in 1 Peter 2:11 – 3:12*, in: Julian V. Hills, ed., *Common Life in the Early Church* (FS G. F. Snyder), Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International 1998, 279-285;
- NEUER WETTSTEIN. *Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechenland und Hellenismus; Band II. Texte zur Briefliteratur und zur Johannesapokalypse*, hrsg. v. Georg Strecker und Udo Schnelle unter Mitarbeit von Gerald Seelig, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1996;
- WAGENER, ULRIKE, *Die Ordnung des "Hauses Gottes". Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe* (WUNT 2. Reihe 65), Tübingen: Mohr / Siebeck 1994.

a) The Hellenistic background of ethics in New Testament letters

For 1 Peter is valid what can be said of New Testament letters in general: that the ethics is influenced by Hellenistic popular philosophy rather than by the schools of philosophers. This aspect is developed among other authors by DIETER ZELLER, *Konkrete Ethik im hellenistischen Kontext*, in BEUTLER, ed., *Der neue Mensch in Christus*, pp. 82-98. Z. comes to the result: "The contacts of epistolary ethics with cynic-stoic popular philosophy which have been affirmed since a long time ago are weaker than previously presumed; they did not materialize on a technical level. New Testament letter literature adopts only 'degraded philosophoumena', and this happens not in the paraenetic sections, but in longer, argumentative paragraphs like 1 Cor 6,12 – 7,31. We had the impression that vulgar ethics which is also formally different (not diatribe, but proverbs) merits more attention. Thus, the specific Christian message is mediated by 'common sense'." (98)

WOLFGANG SPEYER underlines in his contribution "Hellenistisch-römische Voraussetzungen der Verbreitung des Christentums" in the same volume (11-38) the Roman element in the background of New Testament ethics. The specific interest of the Romans in morals finds here its equivalent.

b) The domestic codes (Haustafeln)

ELENA BOSETTI gives a good survey of research done till 1987. Over against earlier contributions which saw these NT texts under the particular influence of some contemporaneous schools like the Stoics, a broader approach has been chosen by more recent authors. Among these authors is found the book of David L. Balch, with which E. Bosetti agrees substantially, and this all the more, since his findings are corroborated by the studies of D. Lührmann. Thus, we may be allowed to sketch briefly the results of D. L. Balch.

Balch traces back the earliest origins of NT household codes to classical Greek philosophy. Already for Platon, human society is based on order and this means also on authority. In his *Republic* as well as in his *Laws*, Platon supposes a structured society with a subordinated position of slaves, wives and children. The Middle Platonists continue this tradition, and the ideas are taken up as late as the fragments of Stobaeus in the context of household management.

Of great importance for the development of the household codes are Aristotle, the Peripatetics and some later independent writers (Philodemus, Areius Didymus and Cicero). In his *Politics*, Aristotle distinguishes between civil and domestic obligations, but sees a link between both. Cities are made up by villages, and villages by families. The investigation of the rules of conduct in society has to start with the smallest unit: the family. Here, three kinds of relations are given: “master and slave, husband and wife, father and children”. A fourth element may be added: the administration of wealth (Pol. 1253a, 37). This division seems to have become very influential. The closest parallel in the NT is Col 3,18 – 4,1. For Aristotle, there is no doubt that the master rules the slave, the husband the wife and the father the children (1260a). Slaves, wives and children is denied the full capability of taking free decisions. In the *Nicomachean Ethic*, the authority of the master over against the slave is regal in type, the authority of the husband towards the wife is aristocratic (VIII 1160f). The obligations of the stronger side (master, husband, father) do not fall directly under the virtue of justice, since the corresponding subjects enjoy their rights only in a limited way (V 1134b). If in a state the role of women is insufficiently or defectively circumscribed as in Sparta, the whole commonwealth can be endangered. An echo of Aristotle’s ideas is found in the Peripatetic school in the *Great Ethics* and in Theophrastus (2nd half of 2nd Cent. B. C.), possible author of the Ps.-Aristotelian work *Concerning Household Management (Oeconomicus)*. The Epicurean Philodemus takes a distance from the Peripatetic school and thinks that only the question of wealth is relevant for the wise man. Family life may disturb a person in following his economic advantage. Areius stands much more in the tradition of Aristotle in his development of household ethics, and

so does Cicero, who refers himself to Plato and Aristotle alike and takes a distance towards the Stoics, since they, according to him, are contradictory in questions of virtue (practised in the search for one's own perfection or also the one for the benefit of society).

The topic of "household management" is taken up in later schools which bring us nearer to NT times: Eclectic Stoics, Hellenistic Jews and Neopythagoreans. Of particular interest are of course Philo and Josephus. Different from opinions held in earlier times, Philo does not seem to be original in the development of household codes but depends on Greek philosophical thought. This becomes particularly apparent in his comment on the Decalogue where he interprets the command to honour one's parents fully along the lines of Greek philosophical tradition, in particular Platonic ideas where a unity is seen between civic and domestic obligations (cf. *Spec. Leg.* II.225-227). Fl. Josephus gives in his *Contra Apionem* an apology of Jewish belief in the form of an encomium which includes the appraisal of the role of slaves, wives and children in Jewish society according to the standards of the time. Also the Neopythagoreans reflect earlier philosophical convictions about the role of slaves, women and children and integrate these ideas into the larger framework of civil order. (Cf. *Callicratidas*, *On the Happiness of Households*).

Balch attributes great importance to "Greco-Roman Criticism of Eastern Religions", to which he dedicates a whole chapter (V). He sees a connection between such a criticism and the opposition which Judaism as well as Early Christianity found in Greco-Roman society. This may be the most debatable aspect of his study (cf. E. Bosetti). According to him, Oriental cults as the one of Dionysos or of Isis raised suspicion particularly in Roman society and the Senate. Since Judaism and Christianity were rather unknown entities, they could easily be subject to the suspicion of illicit practices like sexual aberrations or murder.

This is the reason why Balch thinks that we find in 1 Peter repeated exhortations to avoid slander and to meet questioning by the presentation of good works and immaculate conduct. This holds true in a particular way for those persons who deviated from common convictions by becoming Christians like slaves belonging to pagan owners or wives of non-Christians. This, according to Balch, explains, why such emphasis is given to correct conduct of such slaves even towards wicked masters and of Christian wives towards pagan husbands. The question remains how far the tendency of 1 Peter in this regard is apologetic. Other authors see a more missionary orientation. From a systematic point of view it should be said that ethics can never be a means for a purpose.

One final word about linguistic parallels to the idea of "submission" so prominent in our texts. The concept does not seem to come from the Greek Bible since the LXX never uses ὑποτάσσομαι in the

10th Lecture: 1 Tim 3,1-7 Instruction about bishops

1. Context

Our author remains with the basic topic of groups in the community. After having dealt with men and women, he now moves to two kinds of persons in the community who have a particular responsibility: bishops (1-7) and deacons (8-13). The fact that the whole section ends with a liturgical hymn (16) suggests that also the groups or categories of persons who have a responsibility in the community are seen in the context of liturgy as the expression of community life (Roloff).

2. Text and translation

D* plays down a bit the “trustworthy” word at the beginning of v. 1 and makes it a “human” word (ἀνθρώπινος). Only a few Latin mss. followed this proposal. In v. 3 is required from the bishop in a few minuscule mss. not to be αἰσχροκερδής – apparently on the basis of Tit 1,7. The requirement is met also with the ἀφιλάργυρον in the same v. 3. The addition of αὐτόν in v. 7 by D and the Majority text is only stylistic.

The words ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπισκοπή in vv. 1 and 2 can be translated as “bishop”, “dignity of bishop”, but it must be reminded that at this given moment the introduction of such a ministry in the communities is not yet fully established. This shows the presence of single “bishops” in texts like ours (cf. Tit 1,7-9) and the presence of a group of “overseers” in a community as in Phil 1,1 or Acts 20,28 (there identified with the “Elders” in 20,17).

Some of the adjectives used for the description of the requirements of a “bishop” remain rare in the NT such as νηφάλιος = of a sober mind in v. 3, κόσμιος *ibid.* = “ordinary”, διδακτικός *ibid.* = capable of teaching, πλήκτης v. 4 = aggressive and ἐπιεικής *ibid.* = gentle. A νεόφυτος in v. 6 would be someone who has grown only lately, that means a neo-convert. The word survived in the history of Christianity and was used in particular of Jews who just had converted from Judaism (cf. the Codex Neofiti from the Casa dei Neofiti in the centre of Rome at the time of S. Ignatius). The verb τυφώω in the same verse, used in the passive, can mean either being proud or being deceived. The former use is well attested, but also the latter is found, and this may be the case in v. 6. The ὀνειδισμός which the “bishop” should avoid is (founded) reproach from persons outside the community. The reason for this may be interpreted in religious terms as the “snares of the devil” of which such a person might have become a victim.

3. Structure and form

The section is characterized by the long series of requirements for the bishop in vv. 2-7 after the initial principle of v. 1. At the beginning stand mostly adjectives. The occurrence of a different construction “μιας γυναικὸς ἄνδρα” in v. 2 which interrupts the series of adjectives may go back to redactional activity. The adjectives are followed by two participles and a prepositional construction in v. 4 (backed up by the conditional clause of v. 5) and then taken up again in v. 6. Here and in v. 7 final clauses shall back up the argument.

The series of adjectives describing the requirements for the holder of a public position seems to be traditional in form and in part also in content as we shall see later on. The subordinate clauses and constructions seem to betray redactional work. This is the case particularly in vv. 5-7.

4. Interpretation on the semantic level

- The principle of v. 1

The majority of the authors links the initial πιστὸς ὁ λόγος of v. 1 with the following context (against Dibelius-Conzelmann and Hanson). It would be rather awkward to link the principle “the word is trustworthy” with the rather unique or exceptional teaching that women are saved by childbearing. That striving for a ministry in the community is a good thing might be much more easily accepted. Where the formula is used in the Pastoral Letters (cf. also 1,15; 4,9; 2 Tim 2,11; Tit 3,8) it often remains uncertain whether it refers back or forward. The context has to decide (Oberlinner).

That striving for the ministry of a bishop means striving for a “beautiful” work seems to be an accepted opinion in the communities of the author and of the readers. Apparently, the idea of ambition does not seem to come up here. “Paul” shows his appreciation not only for the role of the bishop but also for persons who to want take over this ministry. The Greek verb ὀρέγομαι can have a negative overtone (as in 6,10), but must not have it (as in Hebr 11,16).

- The virtues of a bishop in general (vv. 2-3)

The long series of adjectives seems to go back to tradition. At the beginning stands a general concept which comprehends all virtues: the bishop should be “irreprehensible”. The perspective is apologetic: Given the weakness of Christian community in society, it cannot afford having a person at its head who is subject to reasonable reproach.

Still before the series of adjectives a rule is given which seems to be a particular requirement for a Christian minister (cf. v. 12 for the deacons): that such ministers should be the “husbands of one

wife”. Four interpretations have been given for this rule (cf. Roloff): it prescribes marriage for the bishop over against devaluation of marriage in Gnostic circles; it forbids a second marriage after the death of the first wife; it forbids a second marriage after divorce; it forbids all kinds of simultaneous bigamy or polygamy. The latter position seems to be the most accepted one today. The first proposal does not correspond to the wording of the text; the second seems to move towards celibacy, not yet accepted at the time of the Pastoral Epistles (cf. 4,3; 5,14); the third one is correct but in the cultural context of the Pastoral Letters (where forms of polygamy were accepted) not sufficient; thus remains number four (Roloff). The following ten adjectives are relatively homogeneous. Before we analyse them one by one, it may be useful to pay attention to an example of a catalogue of the requirements for a public official (a military commander) as given by the author Onasander (referred to by Roloff): Strat. 1,1: Φημὶ τοίνυν αἰρεῖσθαι τὸν στρατηγὸν οὐ κατὰ γένη κρίνοντας, ὡσπερ τοὺς ἱερέας, οὐ δὲ κατ’ οὐσίας, ὡς τοὺς γυμνασιάρχας, ἀλλὰ σώφρονα, ἐγκρατῆ, νήπτην, λιτόν, διάπονον, νοερόν, ἀφιλάργυρον, μήτε νέον μήτε πρεσβύτερον, ἂν τύχη καὶ πατέρα παίδων, ἱκανὸν λέγειν, ἔνδοξον. The army commander should be taken according to this text not according to a caste as is the case with priests, nor according to wealth, as it is the case with the presidents of gymnastic halls, but according to his virtues. The list is astonishingly close to the one found in 1 Tim. Good judgment and soberness stand at the beginning of the catalogue. λιτός points to simplicity. Instead of the “love of work” we find the readiness for hospitality in 1 Tim, a characteristic Christian virtue which was particularly necessary given the situation of the Christian communities with messengers and travellers coming and going. The διδακτός in 1 Tim corresponds strikingly to the ἱκανὸν λέγειν in Onasander. Persons in public responsibility have to be able to speak in public. The request to be ἀφιλάργυρον free from greed is found literally in both texts. It is interesting to notice that the correct education of one’s children belongs as well to the requirements of both texts. Behind this claim stands the conviction of antiquity that nobody is capable of public service who is not capable of governing a family. To the ἐγκρατής of Onasander corresponds the μὴ πάροινον μὴ πλήκτην in 1 Tim (drunkenness is often the cause for strife). There is a certain correspondence between the μὴ νεόφυτον of 1 Tim and the μήτε νέον of Onasander, although the sense and context differ (see below). Another element which both texts have finally in common is the request that the position holder should have a good reputation: cf. the μαρτυρία καλή in 1 Tim 3,7, to which corresponds the ἔνδοξον at the end of the text in Onasander. That such series of virtues qualifying a position holder are not unique is shown by the fact that similar examples can be given from antiquity, for instance for midwives (Ps.-Isocrates) or professional dancers (Plutarchus). That the list of prerequisites for a bishop in 1 Tim 3,2-7 is traditional results also from a comparison inside the Pastoral Letters. The virtues a bishop should have are repeated when the candidates for

the ministry of a deacon are described in 3,8-13: the σεμνούς there (8) corresponds to the σεμνότης in v. 4, the claim that they should not be addicted to wine is repeated as well as the ban of greed. It is repeated for deacons that they should be husbands of only one wife and be good fathers of their children and good lords of the other members of the household. Even the rules for women deacons (see next lectures) in v. 11 correspond to the catalogue; being σεμνάς, considered in speech, sober (νηφαλίους) and trustworthy in everything. The most striking parallels with 1 Tim 3,1-7 are found in Tit 1,7-9. After the rules for Presbyters, who in their turn should be only one wife's husbands and good fathers of their children (v. 6), the author moves to the candidates for the ministry of a bishop. The initial ἀνέγκλητος corresponds to the ἀνεπίλημπτος in 1 Tim, the exclusion of wrath (μὴ ὀργιλον) corresponds to the meekness required in 1 Tim, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην is repeated verbally, the exclusion of αἰσχροκερδῆ (cf. 1 Tim 3,8 for deacons) corresponds to the ἀφιλάργυρον in 1 Tim, among the following adjectives in Tit, three correspond literally to 1 Tim: φιλόξεινον, σόφρονα, ἐγκρατῆ. These coincidences do not seem to be given by chance. Mutual interdependence is as probable as common dependence upon similar lists of virtues of position holders in antiquity as we saw.

- The virtues of a bishop as father of a family (vv. 4-5)

To a good administrator in public life belongs, as we saw, that the person has shown his or her capability of being able to run the own household. Behind this idea stands the conviction of classical antiquity that the state or commonwealth reflects the families and villages out of which it is composed: see above, 9th lecture, 2, about ancient “domestic codes”. In the first millennium, this idea was still widespread, and it survived in the Orthodox and Western churches, at least for priests, as well as in the Oriental branches of the Catholic Church.

- No neo-convert (v. 6)

The exclusion of neo-converts from the ministry of bishops is based on the assumption that they may be led more easily astray by wrong doctrine (understanding τυφόομαι in this sense, see above, 2). Who falls short of this requirement will fall into the hands (verbally: “judgment”!?) of the devil.

- A person of good reputation (v. 7)

As we saw (for vv. 2-4), also this requirement is traditional. Of course, it is of even greater importance for a community which has to face hostility in surrounding society (see above as well).

5. Final reflection

The exigencies for a bishop reflect in a high degree the ideals of classical antiquity. It has been noticed by virtually all commentaries that specific Christian virtues are almost absent in the list given by our author. At one point comes in that he should be no neo-convert, but even this has some parallel in ancient lists of requirements for position holders, as we saw (“not too young, not too old”). A more Christian picture is given in 2 Tim, where our “Paul” describes the virtues of a disciple of an apostle along the lines of his own options and experiences. From there we might go back to Paul himself where he describes his apostleship (in particular in 2 Cor). Parallel runs John 21 where Christ requires from Peter that he loves him, and John 6,60-69, where faith is required and confessed by Peter. The exigencies for the followers of Christ and future pastors of the church are found in the Synoptics. Precious is Mk 10,35-45 par. where to the striving for the first position in the coming Kingdom is opposed the readiness to serve, suffer and die with Christ.

The catalogue of our text may have two advantages: it roots the virtues of leaders in the church in commonly accepted moral standards, and it approves and strengthens in the same time these standards. In a moment of history where the moral qualifications for leadership have become subject to debate, the text from 1 Tim 3,1-7 may do a service to the church as well as to civil society.

11th Lecture: 1 Tim 3,8-13 Instruction about deacons

The section about bishops is followed by one about deacons. This is the only section in the Pastoral Epistles which deals with this group. One would possibly expect a similar section in Titus, but it is not found there. The reason may be that in 1 Tm as well as in Titus there is an overlap of teaching about the constituents of a “household” and about the basic structure of a community. We noticed that in 1 Tim 2 “Paul” started with exhortations about correct conduct towards civil authority and moved from there to obligations of men and women. The framework there was nevertheless not the house but the community. From this perspective, 1 Tim 2 is less a “domestic code” than a community rule specified for men and women.

In 1 Tim 3,1-7 “Paul” remains in this perspective of community order. First, bishops are treated, then deacons (and deaconesses). The “family perspective” comes up only in 5,1-6, but even here strongly from the viewpoint of community life. Timothy is admonished how to behave correctly towards elder and younger men as well as women. The question of the widows (5,3-16) is again treated under the aspect of their role in the community. This is why the section about the “Elders” in 5,17 follows smoothly. They are no longer seen as a group which is specified by age or gender, but by position and by their active part in community life. That the domestic context is not completely forgotten results from the fact that the “Pastoral Paul” in 6,1f moves back to slaves and lords after a section about the particular duties of Timothy as the envoy and deputy of Paul (5,21-25, in part referring to the obligations of Timothy with regard to Elders).

A similar impression is generated when we read the Letter to Titus. At the beginning, obligations of Elders and bishops are described, and it seems, that our author identifies both groups (Tit 1,5-9). In ch. 2, the author seems to move to groups of the community characterized by gender and age: in 2,2 elderly men, in 2,3 elderly women, in 2,4 to younger women and in 2,6 to younger men. It is not completely clear, whether the obligations transmitted by our author concern rather domestic or community life. Both perspectives may be given here. That the household seems to stand behind the section is recommended by the passage about slaves in 2,9f.

The general impression is thus confirmed that the “Pastoral Paul” is strongly interested in community life and structures and perhaps only secondarily in domestic order and ethics. The traditional framework of the “domestic codes” accepted since early antiquity is in part taken up and used for Christian purposes, in part also modified and applied to a new paradigm: the one of Christian community. We remember that the historical Paul hardly ever goes into details about family life if not in the context of concrete questions of the community of Corinth about marriage, celibacy and virgins (1 Cor 7). His main concern seems to be community life (Rom 12; 1 Cor 12).

1. Text and translation

The text of our unit does not present any serious problem. The only variant mentioned by Nestle-Aland is the omission of *σεμνούς* in **8*** and a few other mss. The omission seems to be a scribal error, corrected later in the ms. itself. For the translation there may be a problem with *διάκονος*. The word has the general sense of “servant”, and in the majority of the NT texts it should be translated this way. Cf. also the double use of the verb *διακονεῖν* in our section (vv. 10 and 13). In this particular section, *διάκονος* should be translated nevertheless with “deacon”, since it is used in a technical sense as expression for a Christian ministry which is already established. See below!

2. Syntax and structure

Instead of assuming again an anacoluthic construction it seems advisable to see in vv. 8-9.11 a construction depending still on the initial *δεῖ οὖν ... εἶναι* in v. 2, cf. the *δεῖ ... ἔχειν* in v. 7. The consequence is that the series of claims for bishops and deacons since v. 3 forms a coherent whole, probably already given in tradition. The acc. cum inf.-construction is interrupted by the command in v. 10, similar to the construction in v. 12. Here we may recognize the hand of our author, although he is still drawing on tradition. More independent from this tradition appears v. 13, the promise connected with the faithful exercise of the dignity of a deacon. Here we also have the most “Christian” ideas of our section, besides the participial construction in v. 9.

3. Semantic and pragmatic analysis

a) The virtues of a deacon and the conditions for his admission, vv. 8-10

We may distinguish again between the general rules for a deacon, expressed in the acc. cum inf.-construction in vv. 8-9 and the additional clause in v. 10 about the admission of deacons, connected with the preceding instructions by the participle in the accusative *ἔχοντας*.

The *deacons*: In a technical sense, the word occurs only here (vv. 8 and 12) in the NT besides Phil 1,1 (*ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι*) and Rom 16,1 Phoebe whom Paul calls *διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς* (see for this verse the next lecture!). In the more general sense the word can be applied to Christ (Rom 15,8), to the apostles (2 Cor 3,6; 6,4 etc.), to the disciples of Christ (Mk 9,35; 10,43 par.; John 12,24) or to Paul’s co-workers (Eph 6,21). The noun is missing, but the idea and the verb are found in Acts 6,1-7, a passage which became very influential for the establishment of the Christian ministry of deacons in the future.

Cf. now for this development the recent document of the International Theological Commission: “Il diaconato: evoluzione e prospettive”, *CivCatt* 154, vol. 1, n° 3663, 1 febbraio 2003, 253-336.

It is noteworthy that the term “deacon” makes its first appearance in the NT in Phil 1,1 together with “ἐπίσκοποι”. While the translation “deacons” may be justified, the rendering of ἐπίσκοποι by “bishops” appears more debatable. We may just speak of “overseers” (see for 1 Tim 3,1 and 2). The origin of the double function of “overseers” (Senior Staff) and “servants” (Junior Staff) seems to go back to the organization of Greek associations. For this reason it is no wonder that it is found particularly in communities with a strong Gentile influence, over against the institution of “Elders” which has more strongly Jewish antecedents (see James 5,14). The Pastoral Epistles show a clear preference for the double structure of “bishops” and “deacons”, as we saw. Only secondarily they try to show the identity of the “Elders” with the “ἐπίσκοποι” in Tit 1,5-9. The same procedure can be observed in Acts 20, where Paul summons the “Elders” of the church of Ephesus to Miletus (v. 17) and calls them in his speech “ἐπίσκοποι” (v. 28). Further witnesses for the double function of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι are Clement of Rome (1 Cl 42,1-5) and the Didache (15,1). Polycarp in his Letter to the Philippians knows the function of the bishop (6,1; 8,3), of deacons (5,2) and of Elders (Prescr.). In Ignatius of Antioch is attested already the threefold ministry of bishops, Elders (priests) and deacons (passim).

It is interesting to notice that Clement (1 Cl 42,5) tries to base the double institution of bishops and deacons on Scripture. He quotes Isa 60,17, but modifies the text: the original reads in the LXX: καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. This becomes in Clement: Καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει. Apparently our author had no problem in changing ἄρχοντας for διακόνους in order to find the pre-established church order already announced in the OT. (Cf. Joseph A. Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter I*, Darmstadt 1986, 79, with a reference to A. v. Harnack).

The *virtues* of the deacons correspond largely to the ones required from the ἐπίσκοποι (see last lecture). As the most general concept appears here that they have to be σεμνούς (cf. the noun σεμνότης required from bishops in v. 4): “decent”. Here we are again in Hellenistic ethics. Next is underlined their trustworthiness (μὴ διλόγους). This may already have to do with the role of the deacons in the material welfare in the community. The concept is not used for the “bishops”. The exclusion of drunkards and persons attached to greed corresponds to the requirements we already know (v. 3, for the word αἰσχροκερδής remember Tit 1,7). Even in the following verse 9, Greek influence is to be noticed: the “clear conscience” goes beyond the Pauline usage, as we saw, and reflects Hellenistic language (see above, p. 17, for 1 Tim 1,5). The most Christian element in the catalogue of requirements is the claim that deacons should “hold the mystery of the faith in clear

conscience” (RSV). The concept of μυστήριον occurs 28 times in the NT, with a clear concentration in Paul. In the Synoptics is noteworthy Mk 4,11 “the mystery of the Kingdom”, which in Mt 13,11; Lk 8,10 becomes “the mysteries of the Kingdom” (probably already under the influence of a tendency which makes out of the secret of God’s decree of salvation a system of truths). For the Pastoral Epistles see v. 16 later in this chapter (now the “mystery of piety” instead of Jesus’ “mystery of the Kingdom”).

That according to v. 10 the candidates for the dignity of a deacon should be proved seems to correspond to standard rules, but has for instance a parallel in the instructions given for the admission of new members as well as for the promotion of dignitaries in Qumran (cf. 1 QS 5-6).

The result of the scrutiny should be that the candidates are “ἀνεγκλητοι” – again a general concept which corresponds to the initial ἀνεπίλημπτοι for bishops in v. 2. For the word see Tit 1,6f.

b) The virtues of deaconesses (v. 11)

It seems to be recommended to see in the γυναῖκας of this verse not the wives of the deacons but women deacons. See next lecture! The virtues required by them are similar to the ones required by deacons (and bishops): that they have to be σεμνός, “sober” and “faithful in everything”. The warning that they should not cause slandering (μὴ διαβόλους) must not be specific for women, since the command occurs for elderly women in Ti 2,3, but for “humans” in general in 2 Tim 3,3.

c) Further requirements for deacons (vv. 12-13)

The principle that deacons should be the husbands of only one wife and be good fathers of their children is already known (see above comment on v. 4). Again, the principle is established that there is a correspondence between being a good administrator of the own family and a good steward of public welfare. In our case, the requirement is connected with a promise: to the “beautiful” service will correspond a “beautiful” recognition (βαθμός means “step” or “rank”) and great confidence in the faith in Jesus Christ. The latter idea may point forward to the eternal reward candidates who have been found worthy may expect on the day of judgment.

d) Final remarks

Again, the long litany of moral qualifications for the candidates of Christian ministry appears at the same time somewhat boring and commonplace. Readers will appreciate the Christian elements interspersed within the Hellenistic ones coming from contemporaneous culture. Twice, “faith” is brought in: in v. 9, where the “mystery of faith” is mentioned, and in v. 13, where faith is presented as the basis of confidence. Here, original Pauline message can be heard and listened to.

12th Lecture: Women deacons in the New Testament

Bibliogr.: COMMISSIONE TEOLOGICA INTERNAZIONALE, “Il diaconato: evoluzione e prospettive”, *CivCatt* 154, n°. 3663, primo vol. 2003, 1 febbraio, pp. 253-336; REININGER, DOROTHEA, *Diakonat der Frau in der einen Kirche. Mit einem Geleitwort von Bischof Karl Lehmann, Ostfildern: Schwabenverlag* 1999; STIEFEL, JENNIFER H., “Women Deacons in 1 Timothy: A Linguistic and Literary Look at ‘Women likewise ...’”, *NTS* 41 (1995) 442-457.

1. Women deacons in the New Testament and in early Christianity

A preliminary remark may not be out of place: We cannot suppose in the NT and in NT times the terminology and church structure of later periods and of the present. From this perspective, whether there have been “women deacons” in the sense of contemporary post-Vatican II theology and church structure seems to be an anachronistic question. What we can ask is what is the meaning of NT passages which speak about women as “διάκονος” of a community or in the context of instructions given for deacons. This is what we want to do on the following pages.

a) Phoebe, διάκονος of the church at Cenchreae (Rom 16,1-2)

In Rom 16, Paul adds a long series of greetings to his doctrinal exposition. The original place of this list is debated, since Paul also greets persons who live outside Rome. But this is rather irrelevant for our context. The list is headed by a wish of Paul to greet Phoebe, “our sister and διάκονος of the church at Cenchreae”. Phoebe might have been in Rome for a visit, as commentators propose who prefer to maintain Rom 16 in its present position (always preferable). The problems of interpreting this passage are already reflected in the various translations: “a deaconess of the church at Cenchreae” (JB, RSV), “a minister in the church of Cenchreae” (REB), “Dienerin der Gemeinde in Kenchreä” (Zeller, RNT), “Diakonisse der Gemeinde in Kenchreä” (Schlier, HThK). There are serious reasons for seeing in the expression διάκονος more than just a handmaid or a helpful person. She is seen in close connection to Paul. She is named on top of the list as “our sister”, which may refer to the community as well as to Paul himself (literary plural). That she was close to Paul results from the fact that Paul recalls her being an “advocate” for him. The word προστάτις is probably not to be seen in the context of the verb προϊστάναι, which can mean in Paul to be in charge of a community (1 Thess 5,12), but rather to be understood in a wider sense as “assistance” – but this does not exclude that Phoebe had a leading role in the community of Cenchreae. This is insinuated in particular by the genitive-construction διάκονου τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς. The vaguer

expression “deaconess” chosen by some translation given above (over against “deacon”) makes clear that we may not yet have to do with a clearly sacramental form of church ministry. Open to debate is as well whether we should translate “a deaconess” or “the deaconess”, which would underline the leading role of Phoebe. Both translations seem to be possible. It has to be reminded however that Paul in his almost contemporary Letter to the Philippians (about 56 A.D.) directs his initial greeting to “all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in Philippi, with the bishops and the deacons” (RSV), verbally *σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις*. Most authors think that we have to do here already with two groups of church ministers, “overseers” (rather than “bishops”) and “ministers” (deacons). Looking back to Rom 16,1-2 the question rises whether possibly the *διάκονοι* of Phil 1,1 may refer to men and women alike. This possibility cannot be ruled out.

b) “Women” in 1 Tim 3,11

Most authors agree nowadays that the “women” about whom “Paul” speaks in 1 Tim 3,11 are not just women in general or the wives of the deacons mentioned before but rather women to be seen in the context of the diaconate. A good analysis of the section is given by Jennifer H. Stiefel. She starts with syntactic and linguistic analyses which we have already anticipated, emphasising in particular the dependence of v. 11 on v. 2, cf. 8. Thus, the claims of “Paul” for these “women” are to be seen in the context of his admonitions concerning other position holders as the bishops (vv. 2-4) or deacons (vv. 8-9). As we saw, the requirements for the bishops, the deacons and the “women” of v. 11 are either identical or very similar. The only original element in v. 11 may be that they should not be inclined to slander (*μὴ διαβόλους*, cf. 2 Tim 3,3; Tit 2,3) and “trustworthy in everything”, but this remains very general. That the “women” in v. 11 are not just the wives of the deacons is confirmed by the fact that no comparable rules are given for the wives of bishops and that v. 11 is inserted in a section which deals with deacons. This fact strongly suggests that we should have to do with “women deacons” in some large sense.

Authors who want to remain cautious with the assumption of “women deacons” in the New Testament would think also here of “deaconesses”, that means women dedicated to an institutional service in the community (perhaps mainly in the service for women), others rather think of an early form of a diaconate of women (D. Reininger seems to tend into this direction).

c) A witness from outside the church in apostolic times

Given the scarce attestation of female deacons (or deaconesses) in the second century, a witness from outside the church from the year 112 A.D. merits our attention. It comes from C. Q. Plinius the Younger in his letter to the Emperor Trajan (X 96). Pliny, being Roman Procurator in Bithynia near the Black Sea asks the Emperor what to do with Christians who refuse to sacrifice to the

Roman Gods. In this context he mentions two “ministrae” (probably Latin translation of the Greek δίακονοι) who were slaves and confessed the Christian faith. He subjected them to torture in order to find out more about their belief and their community. It seems that these women had a “ministry” in their community, since Pliny says that “they were called ministrae”, apparently in the sense of a title or a designation given to these women by their companions of faith.

2. Further development in history

In the first millennium, women deacons (or deaconesses) seem to have been an established institution particularly in the church of the East. The texts are quoted and commented by the International Theological Commission as well as by other authors as for example D. Reininger. In the second century there is little witness, but the institution of “widows” is recognized (see later in this semester about 1 Tim 5,3-16). For the 3rd and 4th century, the document of the International Theological Commission (p. 270) mentions in particular the churches of Syria and of Constantinople. For the Syrian church cf. the so-called “Didascalia Apostolorum” (about 240 A.D.) and the “Apostolic Constitutions” (about 380 A.D.). The latter know a rite of the imposition of hands for the instalment of deaconesses. In the 4th century as well, the deaconess Olympia seems to have been a well-known figure in Constantinople, abbess of a monastery of women in the time of S. John Chrysostom. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. speaks in its can. 15 about women deacons. I quote from the document of the Int. Theol. Comm. (p. 273): “Il can. 15 di Calcedonia (451) sembra confermare il fatto che le diaconesse sono veramente ‘ordinate’ con l’imposizione delle mani (*cheirotonia*). Il loro ministero è detto *leitourgia*, e ad esse non è più permesso di contrarre matrimonio dopo l’ordinazione”. In Byzance, the deaconesses receive on the occasion of their ordination a chalice and a stole. They are not allowed, nevertheless, to have access to the altar but seem to have served predominantly in monasteries of women.

In the West, the institution of female deacons is less accepted. The Ambrosiaster (end of fourth cent.) is clearly against them and knows them only for communities of the heretics, but they seem to have existed in a number of communities. Apparently, the nomenclature was not fixed, and so it is said: “*Diaconissae* erano pure chiamate badesse o spose di diaconi, per analogia alle *presbyterissae* e perfino alle *episcopissae*” (loc. cit., 274).

In the second millennium, women deacons seem to have merged with abbesses. The institution of women deacons as such has disappeared at least in the Western church as well as a permanent diaconate of men as demonstrated by the document quoted above.

3. The question of a revival of the institution of women deacons

There has been a strong movement in the second half of the last century and in particular in the period following the Second Vatican Council to revive the ancient Christian institution of women deacons. It has found its expression in particular in scientific contributions and in documents of regional churches, particularly in Northern Europe and North America. Particularly noteworthy is the request to the Holy See formulated by the Synod of the German Roman Catholic dioceses 1971-1975 that the question of a diaconate of women may be studied and eventually be solved. Bishop, now Cardinal Lehmann was always in favour of such a project. This is why he also backed up the dissertation of Dorothea Reininger. For North America see “The Canonical Implications of Ordaining Women to the Permanent Diaconate: Report of an Ad Hoc Committee of the Canon Law Society of America”, Washington DC 1995. In Germany, there was in 1997 a major Congress about female deacons in Tübingen, published under the title: “Diakonat: ein Amt für Frauen in der Kirche – Ein frauengerechtes Amt?”, ed. by P. Hünemann, A. Biesinger, M. Heimbach-Steins, A. Jensen, Ostfildern 1997 (see Reininger, 54f.). One reason for promoting a diaconate for women seems to be that for women priests the situation is less propitious after the Vatican declarations „Inter Insigniores“ (1976) and „Ordinatio Sacerdotalis“ (1994).

Apparently, the Holy See has left open the question of possible women deacons explicitly. This comes out clearly from the study of the two documents quoted above as well as from the document of the International Theological Commission in the paragraph before the final one (336):

“Per quel che riguarda l’ordinazione delle donne al diaconato, conviene notare due indicazioni importanti che emergono da quanto è stato sin qui esposto: 1) le diaconesse di cui si fa menzione nella Tradizione della Chiesa primitiva – secondo ciò che suggeriscono il rito di istituzione e le funzioni esercitate – non sono puramente e semplicemente assimilabili ai diaconi; 2) l’unità del sacramento dell’ordine, nella chiara distinzione tra i ministeri del vescovo e dei presbiteri da una parte, e il ministero diaconale dall’altra, è fortemente sottolineata dalla Tradizione ecclesiale, soprattutto nella dottrina del Concilio Vaticano II e nell’insegnamento postconciliare del Magistero. Alla luce di tali elementi posti in evidenza dalla presente ricerca storico-teologica, spetterà al ministero di discernimento che il Signore ha stabilito nella sua Chiesa pronunciarsi con autorità sulla questione”.

This word does not seem to be final as such. For point 1) cf. what has been said about the Council of Chalcedon, for point 2) it must be remembered that the Commission itself underlines strongly the tendency of post-Vatican II and CIC 1983 (1008f) to consider the diaconate as a sacrament.

13th Lecture: 1 Tim 3,14-16 Personal conclusion of instruction about ministry. A Christological Hymn.

Since 2,1, “Paul” has instructed Timothy about various social obligations to be observed in his community: towards all humans and towards civil authorities (2,1-3, with the ensuing reflection about God’s universal wish of salvation, 2,4-7), obligations of men (2,8) and women (2,9-15), of bishops (3,1-7) and deacons (3,8-13). The time has come for some concluding words directed immediately to Timothy (3,14-16). Apparently, our author wants to re-establish at this particular point his personal link with Timothy, the addressee of the letter. It may not be out of place to recall here what we said in our first lecture concerning the addressee of 1 Timothy (above, p. 3):

“1 Tim is meant to be a letter to Timothy and not just a kind of ‘community rule’. This position is defended with good reasons against M. Dibelius, H. Conzelmann by JEFFREY T. REED, *To Timothy or not? A Discourse Analysis of 1 Timothy*, in: Stanley E. Porter – D. E. Carson (ed.), *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics. Open Questions in Current Research (JSNT.S 80)*, Sheffield: JSOT Press 1993, 90-118. According to linguistic analysis, Timothy appears to be the only recognizable addressee of the letter. All groups mentioned in the letter are referred to him. In the event structure, the letter tries to instruct Timothy for various needs of the community and asks him to pass on these admonitions to others. In particular, 1 Tim 3,14-15 is an instruction for Timothy how he (and not just someone) has to behave in the house of God. From these observations follows that 1 Tim cannot be regarded a rule for establishing church order or to fight heresy, but a personal instruction for Paul’s deputy how he has to meet these challenges of his community.”

1. Grammar and structure

The section can be divided roughly into two halves: Vv. 14-15: the verbal clause (ταῦτα σοι γράφω) with the following constructions: the participle in v. 14 and the conditional clause in v. 15, leading to a final, a comparative and a relative clause in v. 15; the second half introduced by a nominal clause (μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον) with the six fold formula in v. 16, introduced by a relative pronoun. The six elements of the formula are strictly parallel: a verb in the aorist (3rd person sg.), followed by an attribute, in five cases introduced by ἐν (with the exception of ἀγγέλοις, dat., without the preposition).

The initial construction in vv. 14-15 presents a problem as far as it is not clear from which main clause the conditional clause of v. 15 depends. There is no finite verb to which the sentence leads. Thus it may be advised to make at least the ἵνα εἰδῆς depend on ταῦτά σοι γράφω in v. 14.

2. Paul's wish concerning Timothy (vv. 14-15)

a) The wish to see Timothy (v. 14)

In the discussion about the authenticity of 1 Timothy (and the Pastoral Letters in general), such personal remarks play of course an important role. They may be interpreted as an argument for the “personal” ring of these “Pauline” Letters. But they may be considered also as a conventional element of letters easily to be imitated by pseudepigraphic authors. The wish and the intention of Paul to come and see Timothy recurs in 4,13. In 2 Timothy, it becomes the general wish of seeing Timothy (1,4) or the wish that Timothy might come soon to Paul who is now in prison (4,9.21). In Tit 3,12 is expressed again the wish that Titus may come and meet Paul in Nicopolis. Behind these expressions stands the idea in Classical Epistolography that letters represent absent persons. In NT Letters, in particular in Pauline Letters, authors speak of the “Apostolic Parousia” which is part and parcel of such letters (cf. R. W. FUNK, “The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance”, in: W. R. FARMER, AL., eds., *Christian History and Interpretation* [FS J. Knox], Cambridge 1967, 249-268).

b) The wish for Timothy (v. 15)

As we saw earlier, it may be assumed that the missing accusative for the acc. cum inf.-construction with εἶναι seems to be Timothy himself: he shall know how to walk in the “house of God”. For the case that Paul will be late in coming (βραδύνω is found only here in the NT), Timothy should know how to live in “God’s house”. οἶκος (οἰκία) τοῦ θεοῦ for the church or the community is not found in Paul’s undisputed letters. οἰκία occurs in a metaphorical sense only in 2 Cor 5,1 (twice) where it is used for Paul’s body. Used as a metaphor for the church it is found nevertheless in Hebr 3,6. Cf. also the comparison between one’s own house and the community in 1 Tim 3,5. Such NT texts reflect the growing gap between the church and the Synagogue. The emphasis of our author on “truth” has already been noticed. “Knowledge of truth” belongs to his favourite expressions (cf. first lecture, p. 1): see 1 Tim 2,4; 2 Tim 2,25; 3,7; Tit 1,1. The church being “column and fundament of truth” is a unique expression, but rooted in traditional ideas. στῦλος can be used in the NT in the traditional sense of “column” as in Rev 10,1, but it can also have the meaning of “support” (in a physical sense). W. Bauer, Dict., refers for this use to Sir 24,4; 36,24. ἐδραίωμα means “fundament” and is hapax in the NT. That “truth” is synonymous with revelation, God’s word about and for the world, is a usage found also elsewhere in the NT, in particular in the Johannine Writings (cf. I. DE LA POTTERIE, *La Vérité dans Saint Jean*, I-II [AnBib 73.74, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press 1977]). Such usage is rooted in Paul, as a look into the concordance shows (cf. in Romans 1,18.25; 2,8.20; 3,7; 15,8 etc.).

3. The great mystery of godliness (v. 16)

a) The introduction

As we noticed before (see above, p. 51), μυστήριον is used in the Synoptic Tradition for the “Mystery” (Mk 4,11) or the “Mysteries” (Mt 13,11; Lk 8,10) “of the Kingdom” and in Paul for God’s decree of salvation. It is interesting to notice that in our letter the word is used for the “mystery of godliness”. The emphasis shifts from God’s decree of salvation to human response which nevertheless is enabled by God’s wish of salvation for all humans (cf. above for 1 Tim 2,4). For the connection of the idea of “godliness” (εὐσέβεια) with the adverb ὁμολογουμένως Nestle-Aland²⁷ refers to 4 Macc 6,31; 7,16. There is no reason to assume literary dependence. But common ideas and language are found. In 4 Macc, Eleazarus takes for granted that a “godly mind” is a master of the passions (6,31). The same idea recurs again (7,16), with the expansion that Eleazarus despised all pains until death “for the sake of godliness”. “Godliness” appears here as the basic virtue of the pious Jew. As far as this piety is rooted in God’s word, the idea goes beyond Hellenistic commonplace and prepares the ground for the Christian conception.

b) The formula of confession

With the adverb ὁμολογουμένως our author underlines the fact that the following formula of belief and confession is traditional. This is confirmed by form and content of the six lines which follow. For the grammatical structure see above, 1. The initial relative noun ὅς is not congruent with the preceding neuter τὸ μυστήριον and refers to Christ. As such, the relative noun seems to make part of a traditional form of introduction for Early Christian formulas of confession or hymns. The best known examples are Phil 2,6; Col 1,15.18. In all these cases, authors agree about the traditional character of the material which is introduced by this formula. It remains disputed whether the fragments which use to follow can be considered early Christian “hymns” (as part of the school of “Formgeschichte” assumed) or rather liturgical fragments in a wider sense which seems to be preferable (it remains difficult to assume the existence of a hymn which begins with a relative pronoun): “Let us praise Christ, who ...”. In our case, some such introduction must be reconstructed for the sake of a coherent text, for instance: “Undisputedly great is the mystery of godliness: [to confess Christ] who appeared in the flesh etc.”

In the Pauline hymnic fragment in Phil 2,6-11 there is a clear opposition between Christ’s humiliation and exaltation. His career goes from abasement to exaltation. In the text in Col 1,12-20 is celebrated already Christ’s instalment as the head of creation and of the church with a reference to his work of atonement.

Our text stands somewhere between these two conceptions and shows some parallels with Rom 1,3f. In 1 Tim 3 as in Rom 1 we find the opposition of “flesh” and “spirit” applied to Christ’s two modes of existence. In Paul, Christ “became existent” in the flesh, in 1 Tim he “appears”. The emphasis seems to be more on the impact which Christ made than on his existence. This tendency can be observed also in the remainder of the fragment of 1 Tim. Christ coming in the “flesh” is attested in John 1,14. This text is closer to Paul than to 1 Tim, in spite of the following “appearance” of his glory in John 1,14. That Christ was “justified” according to the Spirit is not found elsewhere. 1 Cor 6,11 speaks about the justification of the Christians of Corinth through Christ and in the Spirit. In Paul’s eyes, Christ did not need in any way to be justified. Our author may think of the rehabilitation of Christ over against human authorities who tried to humble him. In this case, the existence in the “flesh” retains an element of humiliation.

The following two lines oppose Christ’s relation towards the angels to his relation towards humans. No reference to different modes of Christ’s existence is given. The interest of the author is more in the fact that Christ was made known to the Gentiles (or nations). As reference for this idea is given Col 1,23, but the idea is of course much more widespread (since Mk 14,9). For Paul see Gal 2,2. The last two lines begin with the acceptance of Christ in faith by the nations, even by “the world”. One may be reminded of Joh 12,19 where it is stated (ironically) that “the whole world runs after him”. This is precisely what is going to happen by virtue of Christ’s atoning death according to John 12,20-36, when “Greeks come to See Jesus” (see our article in *Biblica* 71, 1990, 333-347). Only the last line of the fragment shows again a Christological interest. Christ has been “elevated in glory”. The idea seems to be a hybrid of various early Christian traditions: Christ’s glorification, developed in particular in John (see above again), his ascension as reported in Lk 24,51; Acts 1,2.11 and some connection of both elements in Mk 16,19.

4. Final reflection

It is not so easy to determine the function of the Christological formula of v. 16 in the context. From the literary point of view, it brings to an end the section about various groups and ministers in the community since 2,1. It forms a kind of inclusion with the hymnic fragment of 2,5-6. In the former text, the atoning work and destiny of Christ is underlined more strongly, in the latter more his glorification and his importance for the salvation of the world. Both texts have in common a universalistic perspective: God wants the salvation of all humankind – he has found belief in the whole world. For Roloff, there is an additional element in 3,16: liturgy. Since liturgy is the heart of Christian ministry, also the instructions about ministry find their natural framework in the liturgical hymn.

14th Lecture: 1 Tim 4,1-5 Announcement of false teachers

1. Context

Forthcoming heresy was already announced at the beginning of the letter (1,6f). In our section (4,1-5) it is treated again, and a stern warning is pronounced. It is noteworthy to see that such warnings are connected in the Pastoral Letters with personal exhortations of the addressees: in our case Timothy: 4,6-10, cf. 11-16. In ch. 1 the same is the case. We shall find the same connection in 6,20f, continuously in 2 Tim and in Tit 1,10-16 with 2,1. This connection is seen by Roloff who nevertheless sees the emphasis in the Pastoral Letters on the establishment of church ministry in order to fight heresy (228f). This position is shared with Dibelius and Conzelmann as well as with Brox. But see the differing position of M. Wolter who sees the emphasis of the Pastoral Letters much more on the strengthening of Paul's delegate – Timothy or Titus.

2. Text and translation

1 ῥητῶς means “explicitly”, “clearly”. It is hapax in the NT. ἀφιστάναι τινός means “defect from” and is understood from apostasy from faith. It is also used with the preposition ἀπό. πλάνος as an adjective is unusual and therefore replaced in a number of mss. (P Ψ 104 etc.) with the more usual πλάνης.

2 ψευδολόγος is a liar and ὑπόκρισις “hypocrisy”, false teaching under the disguise of the correct one. καυ(σ)τηριάζω means to place a brand, a stigma on a body. The expression is used for civil prisoners, prisoners of war or slaves. Here, the word is used with the acc. graecus: “having the conscience seared (RSV)”. The word is hapax in the NT again.

4 ἀπόβλητον means “to be rejected”,

5 ἔντευξις means “prayer” (cf. 2,1 where it is distinguished from εὐχαριστία), in our case probably in a more general sense and not in the narrower sense of “intercession”.

3. Structure

The little section is composed by the long sentence in vv. 1-3 and two main clauses in vv. 4 and 5, connected with their preceding context by causal conjunctions (ὅτι, γάρ). The main verb in v. 1 leads immediately to the ὅτι-clause of the same verse, enlarged by a participle (προσέχοντες). V. 2 explains how the heresies can spread: through “the hypocrisy of liars”. These liars are specified in

the remainder of v. 2 and in v. 3: two doctrines are attributed to them: that they forbid marriage and that they order to abstain from certain food. The verb “to order” must be added mentally since it is not in the text (cf. the proposal in the apparatus: *κελεύόντων*, without textual basis). This second element is expanded strongly in the following context: first by the relative clause of v. 3 and then by the two causal main clauses in vv. 4 and 5. The idea that God’s creation is good is thus underlined strongly. Of course, this idea applies also to marriage and not only to food.

4. Detailed interpretation

a) The announcement of upcoming false teaching (vv. 1-2)

By the introduction “The Spirit teaches clearly”, the author gives his warning divine authority. The context may be liturgy, where inspired prophets take the word, but we saw that such prophets seem to be missing in the communities envisaged by our author (one reason for his prohibiting women to speak in the community, see 2,11-15). Thus the introduction may be some kind of apocalyptic commonplace, cf. Rev 2,7.17 and *passim*.

The “end times” belong as well to such commonplace. The comparative ὕστερος can be used in the sense of “last” (cf. Roloff, referring to TDNT). This terminology does not mean that we are confronted with apocalyptic ideas. There is no reference to any kind of “eschatological” adversary, an Antichrist or Beliar as there is no reference to Christian expectation of the parousia of the Lord. No final judgment for the wicked or reward for the just is mentioned. The main interest of the author lies in the warning concerning heresy. This heresy is however seen in personal terms: “spirits of deceit and teaching of demons” are to be expected, and they take a more concrete shape in the “hypocrisy of liars” (v. 2).

So far, there is no clear characterization of the heresy to be expected and feared. In fact, the attributes of the wrong teachers appear again somewhat commonplace. As Roloff remarks, the dark image of adversaries as liars and people of mean character with low motives for their teaching seems to be inspired by philosophical polemics found in the Hellenistic literary context of the NT, particularly in anti-sophistic controversy (see again the excursus in Roloff, 229). Our author uses such cliché also in other instances: immoral conduct of the adversaries (1 Tim 1,9f; 2 Tim 3,2ff); subjective lack of truth (1 Tim 1,19; 2 Tim 3,5; Tit 1,16, 3,8f); the motif of greed (1 Tim 6,5; 2 Tim 3,2; Tit 1,11); tendency of fruitless discussions (1 Tim 1,4ff; 6,4; 2 Tim 2,14ff; Tit 1,10; 3,9) and generally the intention of deceit (2 Tim 3,13). By this general characterization, the adversaries are disqualified even before any discussion of their positions. The strongest predicate seems to be in our textual unit that their teachings are “teachings of demons”. This is perfect “demonizing”.

b) The forbidding of marriage (v. 3a)

This rule of the adversaries has caused much debate. Some authors see a connection with Jewish purity laws, since the author reproaches the adversaries of a wrong interpretation of the Law (cf. 1,7; Tit 1,10). But the subject of purity is not mentioned in the context. The reason given for the positive view of marriage is – in the context – the Goodness of creation. One may also think of early Christian celibacy as suggested in Mt 19,10-12 and lived by Paul, 1 Cor 7,7. Here as in Rev 14,4 renouncing to marriage has its reason in eschatology, even apocalypticism. This reason again is absent from our text in 1 Tim. Therefore most contemporary authors connect the prohibition of marriage in 1 Tim 4,3 with upcoming Gnosticism. Marriage was seen by the Gnostics as a concession to matter, unworthy of a spiritual person. In a strictly dualistic view, it could not be permitted. If our author gives certain rules for married persons with a special status in the community (that bishops or deacons should be married only once: cf. 3,2.12, or that older widows recognized as such should not marry again: cf. 5,9, but 5,11-14 for the younger ones), this has to do with rules of decency in Greco-Roman society and less with any kind of disdain for marriage.

c) Dietary laws (v. 3b-5)

It is not clear from the text which kind of dietary laws may have been prescribed by the adversaries. One example occurs repeatedly in the Pastoral Epistles: the use of wine. On the one hand, it is said repeatedly that the ministers of the community should not be addicted to wine (see above 3,3.8; Tit 1,7). On the other hand, our author recommends to Timothy no to drink pure water but to mix it with some wine for the sake of his health (1 Tim 5,23). Most commentators agree that this counsel has less to do with Timothy's health than with tendencies in the communities of the Pastoral Letters to forbid wine for the sake of despise of matter and joys based on the consumption of earthly goods. Again, a reference to Judaism, Jesus and Early Christianity does not help very far. We may think of the discrepancy between John the Baptist and Jesus (Mt 11,19; Lk 7,34). Here we rather have to do with the opposition between eschatology announced and eschatology fulfilled. The story about the wedding of Cana points into the same direction (John 2,1-11). This eschatological perspective is absent from our context of 1 Tim.

Another context quoted on behalf of 1 Tim 4,3 is the treatment of the question of meat offered to the Gods ("idols") in 1 Cor 10. Even a literary dependence of the Pastoral Paul from Paul in 1 Cor 10,30 is suggested (Roloff). The principle for Paul (repeated in Rom 14) is that there are no idols and everything created by God is good and clean. From this follows that everything can be consumed with thanksgiving without harm (1 Cor 10,30; cf. Rom 14,6). Precisely this idea recurs in 1 Tim 4,3. It is underlined that this food is given for the service of the believing and of those "who know the truth". We have met this expression before (2,4; cf. 2 Tim 2,25; 3,7; Tit 1,1). It expresses

the identification of Christian belief with “truth” as revealed reality. In our present context of 1 Tim 4,3 the opposition between heretical error and the “knowledge of truth” attributed to the faithful may be noteworthy. It may be due to the connection of the adversaries with the upcoming heresy of Gnosticism or “Gnosis” which is mentioned explicitly at the end of our letter (6,20f).

The basic principle for judging the value of created things is given in v. 4 on the basis of the Book of Genesis (1,1 – 2,4a). The basic goodness of creation is connected in our text with the idea taken from Paul in 1 Cor 10 and Rom 14 that food should be consumed with thanksgiving. This idea is strongly rooted in Judaism and has been taken over by Christianity. We may think here of some kind of *b^erakhah* which may have opened also Christian meals.

Such kind of prayer may also be intended in the statement of “Paul” in v. 5 that created things are “sanctified by the word of God and by prayers”. Some kind of liturgy may stand behind this statement in which the “Word of God” is read or recited. Seen in this perspective, creation is not simply good by itself but by the word of grace expressed by the human persons called to faith.

5. Final reflection

In the present context, marriage as the life-long established partnership of a man and a woman is rarely questioned as such. Questions arise concerning the juridical framework of this partnership or about the question whether it must be limited to bi-sexual partnerships. Such a question does not seem to have a place in the perspective of our author.

Dietary rules debated today are rarely discussed as questions of principle. The question is rather whether some kinds of food are good for health or whether they are compatible among each other. There may be an exception however with Vegetarianism. Some persons observe it for reasons of health. Other persons are Vegetarians because the consumption of meat supposes large areas of farming land used for cattle instead of grain, particularly in countries like Argentina, the main supplier of steaks. This seems to be a serious argument to be fully respected. But there is a third category of Vegetarians who reject the consumption of meat by reasons of religion or philosophy. Apparently, Hinduism has influenced this revival of Vegetarianism in modern Western society. As far as this perspective stands behind modern Vegetarianism, it may be worth while considering the principles given by our author in 1 Tim 4,3-5: all God’s creation is good, and it has been given to humankind for use in the attitude of praise and thanksgiving. Of course, the human person is not simply the Lord or creation, but makes part of it. This conscience is growing and may alter also the habits of food in the long run.

15th Lecture: 1 Tim 4,6-10 Rules for Timothy in this regard

1. Context

As already pointed out in the preceding lecture, the personal words directed to Timothy in vv. 6-10 are closely linked with the warning over against heretical doctrines in vv. 1-5. In particular, there is a connection between the warning over against Gnostic contempt of marriage and certain foods and the example of physical exercises taken up in v. 7b and 8. This is why Johnson in his commentary (Anchor Bible) takes vv. 1-7a together. We do not follow this proposal since we see a shift in style from the general warning against Gnostic doctrines to the personal exhortation of Timothy, beginning in v. 6.

A problem is posed also in the attribution of v. 11 to the preceding or the following context. Some authors as Dibelius-Conzelmann or Nestle-Aland see the divider after v. 10, others (Brox, Merk, Merkel, Johnson) see it after v. 11. In fact, the exhortation of v. 11 can be connected as well with the preceding as with the following context. See below (next lecture) for this verse.

2. Text and translation

There are only a few textual variants in our section.

6 ἦς instead of ἦ is not too well attested (only A 365 and *pc*); the dative is found again in 2 Tim 3,10. Not much better is the situation for *παρηκολούθηκας* in the same verse.

10 *καί* has won the confidence of *M* together with F G 1881 but has the older tradition against it. The same holds true for *ὀνειδιζόμεθα* in the same verse. (For the lacunae of C in 1 Tim see Aland²⁷ p. 690).

Some more difficult words occur in vv. 6-7:

6 ὑποτίθεμαί τι τινί means to counsel something to somebody, to recommend it to him or her, to teach a person something; ἐντρέφω (ἐντρέφομαι) means nurturing, forming.

παρακολουθέω is “following” a person or a thing, studying, understanding, grasping (in our case).

7 γραῶδης is talk of old women (from *γραῦς* “old woman”). *παραιτέομαι* is refusing something.

3. Structure and grammar

Although the whole little section can be entitled words of admonishment of Timothy, imperatives are found only in v. 7. V. 6 builds a bridge from the preceding context, offering a promise to Timothy if he advises his community in the sense Paul had desired. V. 8 gives reasons for the second imperative of v. 7. Verse 9, in the 3rd person singular of a nominal clause, stands between v. 8 and 10. V. 10 is connected with this preceding verse with a causal γάρ. The verse brings in Paul (and his companions) in a verbal clause which leaves open whether Paul speaks of himself or together with his fellow workers. As the result of this analysis we may be entitled to say that the imperatives of v. 7 form indeed the centre of the paragraph. The verse also serves as a link between vv. 1-6 and 8-10 since in its first half it points back to the question of erroneous doctrines, while in the second half it prepares v. 8 (and possibly also 9 and 10). This is why Johnson even sees a break between 7a and 7b, leading to a new section. We may at least divide our section into the two halves of vv. 6-7a and 7b-10.

4. Semantic analysis

a) Reminder and reward of Timothy (vv. 6-7a)

A first question may be asked: to whom are the words of Paul directed – to Timothy or to Christian ministers? Practically all recent German commentaries speak here of Timothy as the model of a Christian minister (“Amtsträger”): Dibelius-Conzelmann, Brox, Merkel, Merz and Roloff. We remember nevertheless the position of M. Wolter and Jeffrey T. Reed (above, p. 56) who insist on Timothy as the addressee of this Pastoral Letter. In fact, our author does not show any intention of seeing in Timothy only a foil for a Christian minister. Timothy is and remains his delegate. He shares Paul’s service and responsibility and seems to stand much closer to Paul than to the communities of later periods. For this reason, we consider the exhortations of our section as being directed to Timothy personally and not to a kind of abstract model figure.

The vocabulary of v. 6 strengthens this interpretation: when Timothy teaches the doctrine of vv. 1-5 to his “brothers (and sisters)”, he will be a good servant of Christ. ἀδελφός stands here for “brothers and sisters” as members of the community – cf. my article sub voce in EDNT. By the expression of “brother / sister” Paul emphasizes precisely the common membership of Timothy and his fellow Christians in the community. He is not taken out of them or opposed to them (as “Amtsträger”), but shares their faith and vocation.

For Paul being the “servant” of Christ and his message as for other ideas occurring in our text, Roloff and some other commentators refer to Col 1,25-29. In Col 1,25, Paul appears as “servant”

of the Church of Christ, here in 1 Tim as “servant” of Jesus Christ himself. The adjective *καλός* belongs to the typical style of our Pastoral Paul, as does the use of *πίστις* not as a basic virtue but rather as a summary of truths of belief, equivalent to the “teaching” which in its turn is qualified as *καλή*. For “being faithful” to these teachings see 2 Tim 3,10, quoted above.

As Timothy has to remain faithful to sound doctrine, he also has to flee profane old women’s stories. *βέβηλος* means mean, but also profane in the sense of void of religious aspects. The attribution of idle talk to elderly women is traditional in Hellenistic culture. *μῦθος* should not be understood in the modern sense of “myth” = legend about the distant past as an hermeneutical key to the life situation in the present, but in the original sense of “fairy tale”, “fable”. In this sense, the word is used five times in the NT: 2 Pet 2,16 (where such myths are called *σεσοφισμένοι*) and four times in the Pastoral Epistles – besides our text 1 Tim 1,4 (see above); 2 Tim 4,4 and Tit 1,14 (where these stories are connected with Jewish – or Jewish Gnostic – speculations). In every instance, such “fables” are opposed to the sound doctrine of Christian and Pauline faith.

b) Encouragement to Christian combat (vv. 7b-10)

As Timothy has to flee unfounded doctrines, he has to train for godly conduct. The verb *γυμνάζω* occurs 4 times in the NT, always in a metaphorical sense: 2 Pet 2,14 for a heart “trained for greed”, in Heb 5,14 for the interior senses of the faithful trained for the discernment of good and evil and in Heb 12,11 in the context of Greek “*παιδεία*” which trains for justice. Already this survey shows the importance of the concept for Hellenistic Christian writers.

Authors refer in this context to the history of the metaphor of “training” and “fight” for the process of learning how to live up to moral standards. A very detailed outline is found in Roloff, 243-245. This author reminds us of the internal connection of physical and moral / intellectual exercise according to the classical ideal of *καλοκάγαθία*. The image of *ἀγών* is already used by Platon and Aristotle for the striving for moral perfection. The idea has been taken up by the Stoics who use the image for the human person’s combat against the passions and adverse destiny. Epictetus is quoted who says: “Enter now into combat, show us what you have learned, how you have fought” (Diss. IV 3,30). The original idea of competition is abandoned for the sake of the fight against oneself and before the divinity who is one’s arbiter. These ideas are reflected as well in Hellenistic Judaism. Besides Wisd 10,12 (Jacob’s fight with the angel interpreted as fight for *εὐσέβεια*) the 4th Book of Maccabees is quoted: the martyrs of the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes are witnesses of the victory of *εὐσέβεια* against the forces of evil (cf. 4 Macc 9,23; also 1,1; 12,11.14; 13,1 – 14,10 etc.).

Turning back to our author, we can notice (with the recent commentaries) congruence and discordance over against these classical ideas of “fight”. Apparently, our author is not interested in physical exercise. It only serves him as a foil or metaphor for the fight for godliness. For this reasons he speaks of fight only in metaphorical terms.

His critical stand becomes even more apparent in v. 8 where he says explicitly that physical exercise is of little value in comparison with striving for virtue and godliness. The motif given is the reward which is inherent the struggle for virtue and godliness: “eternal life”. Once again, we may turn to Col 1,24-29. Here the combat of the apostle and “servant” Paul is connected with the appearance of God’s mystery of salvation in the present time among the Christians. Our author, the “Pastoral Paul”, is rather reluctant to speak of present eschatology and promises his readers life for now and for the world to come (v. 8). The author of Colossians seems still to stand near Paul and agrees for “realized eschatology” with John and at least part of the Synoptic tradition.

That “the word is reliable and worthy of acceptance” (v. 9) may be connected with the preceding promise or with the following “testimony” of Paul. If the decision remains difficult, the possibility cannot be ruled out that our author uses a commonplace in order to grade up his affirmations.

In any case, our author returns to the paradigm of Paul in v. 10. He (and his fellow preachers) labour and fight, inspired by the hope in the living God, who is the Saviour of all humans, in particular of the faithful. Here, the contact with Col 1,29 is particularly strong: εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

Besides the striking coincidences, there are some differences: in Col, “Paul” experiences the power of Christ in himself, who enables him to fight and to endure. In 1 Tim, the trust is in the living God. In Col, the perspective remains more personal. In 1 Tim, the horizon broadens and all humans are envisaged with their call to salvation. The restriction “mainly of the faithful” does not limit the universal will of God to save all humans, as a reminder of 1 Tim 2,4 tells us. The intention seems to be rather that salvation starts from those who already have heard and accepted God’s call for salvation.

5. Final reflection

Again, we are struck by the deep immersion of our document into the cultural context of the NT. More than in other writings of the NT, Hellenistic imagery and thought have been taken over. Again, Hellenistic Judaism seems to have played an important role in this process of “translation” and “inculturation”. From this observation results a double consequence: “Inculturation” does not have to fear to introduce into Christian preaching new concepts and imageries, even value systems. But all these concepts and value systems have to stand up for the requirements and promises of

Christian faith. The “piety” which stands at the centre of our section, is basically oriented towards the response of faith to God’s revelation in Christ. Judaism has played an important part in this process of translation and redefinition of Greek concepts. It stands between secular culture and the world of the Bible, which culminates in the mission and message of Christ.

16th Lecture: 1 Tim 4,11-16 Further rules for Timothy

1. Context

As mentioned before (last lecture, 1, p. 64), authors disagree about the question where v. 11 is to be placed: at the end of the preceding section, or at the beginning of the present one. J. Roloff for instance sees in v. 11 the end of the section 1-11. Timothy is exhorted to announce and teach “these things”, that means the warnings concerning upcoming heresy in vv. 1-10, particularly those concerning a wrong doctrine about creation as contained in v. 3. The problem is that these warnings find themselves at a distance of some verses, and verses 6-10 contain rather teaching of Paul for Timothy than of Timothy for the community. That is why it may be equally suggested to link v. 11 with the following context.

Another problem is posed at the end of our section. Roloff includes also vv. 5,1-2 into the present section. This is not a very frequent division, since the instructions concerning elder men and women fit better together with those about the widows, beginning in 5,3. But it appears more recommended to connect 5,1-2 with the following context, beginning with the instructions concerning widows from 5,3. This division appears to be more generally accepted.

2. Text and translation

In v. 12, the Majority text (*M*) inserts ἐν πνεύματι between ἐν ἀγάπῃ and ἐν πίστει. Since no document preceding this minuscule tradition attests this reading, it is to be rejected. In v. 14, the first version of *Σ* and of 69 as well as the corrector of 1881 read πρεσβυτέρου instead of the unusual πρεσβυτερίου. This reading is too poorly attested for being accepted. It is probably caused by the lack of frequency of the alternative. The insertion of ἐν in v. 15 before πᾶσι, which alters the text considerably, is accepted as well by the Majority text, but based in antiquity only on the second correction of D, Ψ and some manuscripts of the Vulgate and can be ruled out. Thus, the progress of Timothy has to be manifest “to” all and not “in all things”. The translation does not offer particular difficulties. For the “imposition of hands” and πρεσβυτέριον “the group of the presbyters” see v. 14.

3. Formal structure

The whole section is strongly characterized by the imperatives in the second person singular. They are interrupted by the imperative in the third person singular in v. 12a: “Let no one despise your youth”. If we see this exhortation in its context, it is relevant for Timothy himself: he should not be embarrassed by the fact that he is still a young minister. The imperatives are backed up or explained by some subordinate sentences or clauses: the relative clause in v. 14, the final clause in v. 15 and the participial construction of v. 16. The temporal clause of v. 13 ἕως ἔρχομαι limits the instructions to the time until Paul comes, but underlines at the same time the personal link between the author and the addressee. He remains Paul’s “Apostolic Delegate”.

For the division of the unit, the shift between instructions concerning Timothy’s conduct and his teaching seems to be relevant. The initial v. 11 concerns Timothy’s teaching. In v. 12, the subject is Timothy’s personal conduct, in v. 13 again his teaching and ministry. It is rooted in his ordination which is treated in v. 14. Vv. 15-16 link both aspects together: Timothy’s task and life of faith. They are introduced by a root taken from v. 14 (μελ) and end with a promise concerning Timothy himself and his audience (another aspect of the close connection of Timothy’s life and work as a teacher).

4. Interpretation on the semantic level

V. 11: Timothy’s task is twofold: “announcing” and “teaching”. In this perspective, he stands between Paul, the apostle and herald of the Good News, and the teachers of early Christian community. This intermediary position will be manifest also throughout the remainder of the section (and of the Letter). It excludes a reading of 1 Timothy as an instruction for “Christian ministers” as proposed by part of German exegesis.

V. 12: The exhortation that nobody should despise Timothy’s youth is directed to Timothy, as we saw (cf. also Tit 2,15). He should not be embarrassed by the fact that he is still a young preacher of the Gospel and minister of a community (cf. Jer 1,6-8!). The purpose of the exhortation for the “implied readers” seems to be that persons in charge of Christian message and community should not be judged according to their age but according to their authenticity. Authors see in this exhortation a reflection of the institution of Elders as reflected also in our immediate context (v. 14) and later on in our Epistle (5,17-20) as well as in Tit 1,5, where such “Elders” seem to be identified with “ἐπίσκοποι” (1,7). For the rest, there is a basis for the recommendation that nobody should despise Timothy in 1 Cor 16,11. This verse may stand behind our verse on the literary level.

Timothy is to show his competence not by appealing to formal authority, but by a life worthy of a minister and messenger of Christ. The series of fields in which Timothy has to show his worthiness starts again with responsibilities in teaching before moving to personal conduct: Timothy has to prove faithful “in the word” of his preaching and teaching and then in his general conduct. Only at this moment personal conduct comes in and the roots of this behaviour are named: love, faith and purity. Love and faith had appeared as basic Christian virtues since 1,5. Two differences in comparison with Paul are manifest: “hope” is missing (cf. 1 Cor 13,13), and the basic role of faith seems to have faded. It has become one virtue besides others. If we compare this verse again with Paul, we see some roots of the idea of the messenger of Christ being the “model” for his community in Phil 3,17. For the series of virtues of which Timothy is reminded, Gal 5,22 is quoted. Here again, “love” stands at the beginning and “faith” follows somewhere later. But it has to be noticed that in Gal 5,22, Paul depends on an earlier tradition attested in Rom 14,17. Here, the “Kingdom of God” is defined by “justice, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit”. As I have tried to show elsewhere (*Habt keine Angst*, Stuttgart 1984, chapter 4), these elements of the “Kingdom” go back to Old Testament and Ancient Oriental tradition in connection with the enthronement of a king. (Justice), peace and joy together with the Spirit are attested in John 14,26ff, 16,4b-33 and 20,19-33 and appear as the eschatological gifts of Christ. “Justice” is replaced by “love” in Gal 5,22, but the traditional character of the list of eschatological gifts allows also for the insertion of “faith” in Gal 5,22 after other virtues. The textual variant in 1 Tim 4,12 still remembers the connection of those virtues with the “Spirit”. “Purity” or “decency” occurs again in 1 Tim 5,2 and seems to be typical for our author.

V. 13: The initial “until I come” (cf. 3,14) shows again that Timothy has been appointed as Paul’s Delegate at Ephesus only for a limited time. From the formal point of view, the remark underlines the relation of author and addressee, as underlined by M. Wolter and Jeffrey T. Reed (*JSNT.S* 80, 90-118). The task of Timothy is “reading”, “exhorting” and “teaching”. The element of “reading” is new in this context. It may refer to the reading of OT texts as part of early Christian liturgy, but also to the reading of Paul’s letters (cf. Col 4,16!).

V. 14: The grace given to Timothy in view of his ministry is called *χάρισμα*, another Pauline term (cf. 1 Cor 12, Rom 12). In difference with Paul, the term applies now exclusively to the Christian minister and no longer to a vast variety of divine gifts for the communities. Here is one of the main developments in post-Pauline Christianity leading into “early Catholicism”. Timothy has received this grace of ordination in connection with prophetic words spoken at this occasion (cf. 1,18) and by the imposition of hands of the “presbytery”. The same rite is mentioned again in 5,22. We find it already in Acts 6,6; 13,2 where it means the instalment for a mission or task in early community, here again in connection with prophetic words concerning the choice of the candidates. The ordination of ministers by the imposition of hands seems to come from Judaism. The word *πρεσβυτέριον*

as designating Christian presbyters occurs only here in the NT but is found for the Council of the Jewish Elders in Jerusalem in Luke 22,66. The Christian use is attested particularly in Ignatius of Antioch.

A problem is posed by the fact that in our verse 1 Tim 4,14, Timothy is considered to have been ordained by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery, whereas in 2 Tim 1,6 is affirmed that he received his “charism” by the imposition of the hands of Paul. This fact shows again the “intermediary” position of Timothy between Paul and later Christian presbyters and forbids to insert him without restriction into the group of the latter.

V. 15: As mentioned before, the section ends with exhortations concerning as well Timothy’s personal conduct as his responsible activity as a preacher and pastor. The emphasis shifts again to Timothy’s personal life and existence: his “concern” is rooted in his “being” from which action only follows. This “being” is seen not statically but in a dynamic perspective with the concept of “progress” (προκοπή), a term adopted again from Paul (cf. Phil 1,25; cf. 1,12). This progress is now the one of Timothy, Paul’s Delegate, and no longer of the community as in Phil 1,25, but it is referred to the community and even the public: “all” should see Timothy’s progress!

V. 16: The final exhortation “take heed to yourself” starts again with Timothy in person before moving to “teaching”. Here, “teaching” may rather mean the content than the action of teaching. It then takes up the reminder of sound doctrine and the warning concerning upcoming heresy in vv. 1-5. If Timothy remains faithful to this doctrine he will save himself and others.

5. Final reflection

Our texts reflects developments in early Christianity from Paul to his school and the third generation. Ministers become more important. The multiplicity of charisms seems to be narrowed down to the one charism of Paul’s deputy and the Christian minister. Positive elements are in particular the remaining role of the spirit, also expressed in prophecy, and the primate of life before action. This aspect is connected with the role of the minister and delegate as an example for his community. He has to show his authenticity and competence not by appealing to formal jurisdiction but by the example he gives to his faithful (v. 12).

17th Lecture: 1 Tim 5,1-8 Instruction about behaviour towards men, married women, and widows

1. Context

The way in which instructions concerning various groups and ministries in the community are given in 1 Tim is somewhat confusing. It may help to see in the arrangement of these texts a chiasmic order: texts containing instructions for human persons and groups according to ancient “domestic codes” seem to frame others which speak about various ministries or ranks in the community:

Men and women (2,8-15)

“bishops” (3,1-7)

deacons (3,8-13)

widows (5,9-16)

presbyters (5,17-20)

slaves (6,1-2).

Our text (5,1-8) is more connected with the sections treating various ministries or ranks in the community than with “household order”. In 5,1-2, Timothy receives instructions about his behaviour towards elder and younger men and women, in 5,3-8 towards widows. The instructions are given directly to Timothy and only indirectly to the widows themselves. In 5,9-16, the interest is in the widows as candidates for a particular social position in the communities. Under this respect, they range among position holders and not among members of the household. As far as 5,1-8 speaks about widows in general and 5,9-16 predominantly about widows as elected members of a group having a special role in the community, it appears justified to treat the two sections separately.

Three observations may be made in this context:

- Our “Paul” is more interested in community than in family life
- Instructions about children are missing
- All instructions are mediated through Timothy, Paul’s Delegate

In fact, even in the section 5,9-16 prevail instructions for the community leaders or Timothy himself regarding widows: at the beginning stands the imperative 3rd pers. sing. pass. of v. 9, which supposes a body of persons who are able to elect a widow, in v. 11, Timothy is advised not to consent to a young “widow”, and in v. 14, Paul expresses clearly his personal wish for younger widows.

2. Text and translation

The text of the literary unit does not present serious problems. In v. 4 the sing. *μανθανέτω* instead of the plural is attested only late and tries to coordinate the subject in the sing. and the verb in the plural. Also the insertion of *καλὸν καί* before *ἀπόδεκτον* in the same verse seems to be secondary under the influence of 2,3. In v. 5, *θεόν* is better attested than *κύριον*. It would be understandable that the basis of the hope of the widows becomes Christ instead of God, rather than the other way round. The two variants of v. 8 are meaningless for the interpretation of the passage.

It is important to translate *πρεσβυτέρω* in v. 1 not as “an Elder” but as an “older man”. At this point, the classification is not according to rank in the community, but according to age and gender. This becomes evident also by the parallel with *πρεσβυτέρας*, “older women” in the community and later on younger men and women. *ἐπιπλήσσω* means attacking verbally, reproaching. In the section about widows occur a few hapax legomena: *ἀμοιβή* means “thanks, gratitude”, *μονόομαι* means “remaining alone”. *σπαταλάω* means being “self-indulgent” (RSV). For *τιμάω* in v. 3 see below!

3. Linguistic observations and structure

The whole section is dominated by the imperatives. Vv. 1-2 treat Timothy’s behaviour towards elder and younger men and women with one verb applied only to the older men and another verb applying to the four categories: *παρακάλει*. The next subsection, vv. 3-8, starts again with an imperative: Timothy should honour true widows. The remainder of the subsection clarifies who such “true widows” are. Vv. 4-5 describe in positive terms the virtues of such persons, v. 6 opposes to these virtues the vices of widows not deserving such a name in the Christian community. In v. 7 Timothy is exhorted to claim immaculate conduct from Christian widows. The verb used (*παράγγελε*) stands in a way parallel to *παρακάλει* in v. 1, rounding up the paragraph. The final v. 8 gives a theological reason why Christian widows should be irreprehensible: neglect of the persons entrusted to somebody is equal to neglect of faith.

4. Interpretation on the semantic level

a) Respect for older and younger men and women in the community (vv. 1-2)

The little section lacks originality. Respect towards the older generation is common heritage of antiquity. In Christian perspective, the idea of the community being the “household of god” comes in (3,15). Timothy, belonging to the younger generation (4,12) should see in the older man his

father and in the older woman his mother and not be harsh to older men. In the same way he should see in the younger man his brother and in the younger woman his sister, with some reservation: “in all purity”. Relations based on the ministry of Timothy should be ruled by self-control. It may be noticed that our text does not speak of a “paternal” attitude towards anybody. This remains relevant for the question of “patriarchal structures” in the communities of the Pastoral Epistles.

b) Respect and attention for widows (vv. 3-8)

- The general principle (v. 3)

The meaning of *Χήρας τίμα* is much debated. The accepted translation would be “Honour widows”. This translation is found in most modern translations and the majority of the commentaries. The reasons are the use of *τιμάω / τιμή* in most NT texts and the context: respect for the older men and the other groups in the community (Timothy should treat them as members of his family). Since in the following verses is treated in particular the question of the sustenance of the widows, a number of authors translate the verb *τίμα* with “pay” (more recently Roloff and Johnson). This usage is attested in extra-biblical literature (cf. Bauer, Dictionary) and may be supposed in 1 Tim 5,17. Already in the Fourth Commandment “Honour your father and your mother” seems to have an economic ring: “think of them in their old days and support them”. That is why the Italian New Testament of the LDC translates: “Abbi cura e rispetto per le vedove”. Perhaps the best solution to the problem of translation is such a combination of aspects, but with emphasis on “honour” for the reasons given above. The expression “honorarium” used for contributions based on the appreciation of an art rather than on the compensation for a work may help to understand the double sense of the expression. Cf. in this sense also Roloff and Johnson. If our author speaks here of “true widows”, he already prepares the reflections about the economic situation of the widows in the strict sense.

- Care for true widows (v. 4-5)

From the beginning, our author shows concern not to impose burdens onto the communities if they are not necessary. As far as the sustentation of the widows is concerned, the family has the first responsibility: the children and grandchildren. It is recommended to see in them the subject of the Greek verb *μανθανέτωσαν* (and not the widows themselves, as opines Roloff). They shall show gratefulness to their mothers or grandmothers bereaved from the husband.

V. 5 describes at the same time the situation of the “real widow” and her life of faith. She has remained “alone”: she probably was not only bereaved of her husband, but has also nobody to rely on. So her only hope is God. In him she trusts and to him she directs her prayers by day and night.

Luke 2,37 comes into mind where the same is said about Hannah, the widow (for prayer by day and by night see also Luke 18,7).

- The unworthy widow (v. 6)

The unworthy widow (even in the economic sense) is committed to self-indulgence and for this reason dead even as long as she is physically alive. The distinction is accepted biblical language.

- The command for Timothy in this regard (v. 7)

Timothy should admonish widows to behave according to their status. The instruction shows that Paul is interested not only in the economic question of the sustenance of the widows, but also and before all in their life of faith.

- The principle of solidarity (v. 8)

The final principle seems to apply to the widows themselves who have to show social responsibility as well as to their families. Abandoning the members of the family is equivalent to apostasy from faith, given the Christian basis of solidarity in the “household of God” (3,15).

5. The biblical and early Christian background

Given the precarious situation of widows in the Ancient Orient, care for widows and orphans is recommended by Law (Ex 22,21ff; Dtn 10,18 etc.) and prophets (Isa 1,17; Jer 7,6; Zech 7,10). Elijah takes care of the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings 17), Elisha of another widow (2 Kings 4). Remaining a widow is a decision of Judith which is appreciated by the Bible (Judith 8,4f; cf. Lk 2,36f; 1 Cor 7,39f). Care for the widows is mentioned as a responsibility of the community (Acts 6,1-7). To visit widows in their affliction is a deed pleasing to God (James 1,27). The Acts of the Apostles describe Peter’s miracle raising a widow from the dead (9,36-42). In the Gospel of Mark (and par.), the poor widow giving her whole sustenance to the Temple is praised by Christ (12,41-44). In NT Letters, 1 Tim 5,3-16 is the only text dealing expressly and at length with widows. As will appear from the next verses, a “rank” of widows appears which was continued in the early church. The main witnesses are among the Apostolic Fathers Ignatius of Antioch (Smyrn 13,1; Pol 4,1) and Polycarp (ep. 4,3) and later the Didascalia. Here the widows emerge as group consecrated to a God and to a life of prayer and probably also to the service of the community, although theirs is not directly a “ministry”. Cf. the commentaries and for the biblical tradition also H. Haag, ed., *Bibellexikon* (Einsiedeln 1968), s. v. Witwe.

18th Lecture: 1 Tim 5,9-16: Instruction about widows

1. Context

This section is closely linked to the preceding one (vv. 3-8). Most authors even treat both paragraphs together. The common subject are the widows, more precisely “real widows” (vv. 3 and 16: inclusion). If we separate vv. 3-8 and 9-16 (with Aland²⁷) it is for the new element of the “enrolling” of “widows” treated from v. 9.

2. Text and translation

Aland²⁷ gives only few variants. In v. 13, *μανθάνουσιν* creates difficulties of translation and understanding. That is why one author (Mangey) proposed to replace the initial *μ* by a *λ*: “they hide”. Since no manuscript evidence supports this suggestion, it can be disregarded. The insertion of *πιστὸς ἢ* before *πιστή* in v. 16, which is widely attested, but among the majuscule mss. only by D and Ψ (9th to 10th cent.), certainly goes back to the tendency of avoiding the idea of a faithful woman being the head of a household (see below, 4, for the interpretation). The difference between the Active *ἐπαρκέτω* and the Medium *ἐπαρκείσθω* “she may assist” in the same verse is merely stylistic.

As for the translation: *καταλέγω* in v. 9 occurs only here in the NT. It can have different meanings. The most appropriate one is “enrolling in a list” by the competent authority of the community. For examples see Bauer, Dictionary, s. v. Two other hapax legomena are found in v. 10: *τεκνοτροφέω* “bringing up of children” and *ξενοδοχέω* “hosting visitors”. For *ἐπαρκέω* “to assist” see above, textual criticism. In v. 11, the meaning of *παραιτέομαι* is debated. It can mean “disregarding” in the enrolment of widows, or it could mean “avoiding” (a person). This seems to be a problem of interpretation. Another hapax is *καταστρηνιάω* in the same verse. It means following lust. Finally, some more difficult words are found in v. 13: *ἀργός* derives from *ἐργο-* with *α* privativum: “idle”. The word *μανθάνουσιν* which had led to a conjecture means that a person becomes accustomed to doing something. *φλύαρος* means “slandering” and *περίεργος* being a “busybody” resp. a “curious” person, putting his or her nose into other people’s affairs.

3. Structure

Recent authors recognize the importance of the imperatives or expressions of Paul's wish for the structuring of our paragraph. On this basis we may recognize:

Vv. 9-10: The "enrolment" of authentic widows

Vv. 11-13: The exclusion of young "widows"

Vv. 14-15: Paul's wish for the younger widows

V. 16: An instruction for the sustenance of widows in a household.

4. Interpretation at the semantic level

- Vv. 9-10 The "enrolment" of authentic widows

It is important to translate the term "καταλεγέσθω" correctly. The question is not whether a widow should be "elected", for instance as a person worthy of a ministry, but whether she is worthy to be assisted by the community as a member of a distinguished group of older women who are taken care of by the community but at the same time also take care of the community by their prayers (cf. v. 5). The tendency of our author to restrict the number of such women is obvious, probably due to the limits which were imposed to social welfare of the community. The limit of 60 years of age has a double advantage: the number of persons entitled to community assistance is reduced, and the danger that these women cease to be widows is no longer given because of their advanced age. From the point of view of their age they do not have an alternative any longer.

That these widows in the strict sense should be wives of only one husband is to be interpreted in the sense of similar prescriptions for "overseers" (3,2) and deacons (3,12) – see there. The rule means that any kind of simultaneous marriage should be excluded, not necessarily successive marriages.

The "good works" in which these women should be recommended correspond to the "good works" required from women in general according to 2,10. These "good works" are specified in the following five conditional clauses: bringing up of children, practising hospitality, washing the feet of the Saints, assistance to the afflicted (and needy) and whatever good work they might have practised.

Since after "bringing up of children" all examples are taken from community life, it appears recommended to understand this "upbringing of children" in a wider sense and not only referred to the upbringing of the own children. As care for widows and orphans in biblical tradition belong together, and here the widows appear as the subject, their care for orphans may well be the perspective. "Washing the feet" is an accepted symbol of hospitality (Johnson refers to texts from Gen

18,4; 19,2 etc., long before John 13,1-17; Luke 7,36-50). Doing well to others in general is the best basis for receiving recompense from the community.

The long series of virtues a beneficiary of community welfare should have shown makes sure that the question of the assistance for widows is not merely an economic problem. Our author has in mind the material as well as the spiritual welfare of the members of the community.

- Vv. 11-13 The exclusion of young “widows”

It seems to be recommended to translate the Imperative *παραιτοῦ* in v. 11 with “disregard”. To widows eligible to the position of a “widow” in the strict sense are opposed other women who have lost their husband but who are not yet automatically “widows” in the terminology of the community. In the perspective of the author, a “widow” in the strict sense has renounced to remarriage, whereas the women who have not yet reached the age of 60 years may still hope for a second marriage. The commitment of the real “widows” seems to be a kind of vow of chastity which is linked with the declared readiness to consecrate the rest of one’s life to prayer for the community (cf. v. 5). This readiness may be lacking in younger widows. Thus they rather follow their lust than their dedication to Christ in the wish to be married again (v. 11). As far as a person had renounced to marriage, this attitude merits a harsh judgment from our author: They will be judged, since they gave up their first faith (v. 12). Instead of staying home, such women start strolling around, are idle, spread slander, put their nose into other people’s business and tell unedifying stories. It is unclear from where our author has such a completely negative picture of young widows. Certainly he shares prejudice of the era towards women in general and does not allow them in any way to speak in public (see above, 2,11-15). For a reflection about this attitude see below, 5.

- Vv. 14-15 Paul’s wish for the younger widows

According to our “Paul”, younger widows should try to be remarried, have children, be in charge of a household and avoid giving occasion to slander from the side of the “adversary”. It is not clear whether a human adversary or the Adversary, Satan, is meant. The article speaks in favour of the latter alternative (v. 14). Satan is mentioned in the following verse (15) and makes this hypothesis more probable.

All commentators remark the discrepancy between the advice our author gives for young widows and the one the Paul of the First Letter to the Corinthians had given (1 Cor 7,9.39f). According to the Paul of 1 Cor, unmarried persons should rather remain unmarried for the sake of the Lord (expected to come soon), but they may marry if there is a conflict between their good intention and the desire of their flesh. Otherwise they may try to follow Paul’s example. The difference is obvi-

ous: the eschatological expectation of 1 Cor has vanished in 1 Tim, Christ's final coming has become an article of faith (1 Tim 6,14), and Hellenistic ethics has become the most important factor of Christian behaviour.

- V. 16 An instruction for the sustenance of widows in a household

The final verse of the paragraph regulates a case where one or more widows live in the house of a faithful woman who takes care of them. In such a case, these widows should not be a burden to the budget of the community. This regulation shows again that the care for the widows follows the principle of subsidiarity: the community steps in where the bonds of family or private care prove insufficient. We had already seen that also faithful women could be the heads of a household, and so there is no need for adding (with some later mss): “πιστός ἦ”. See also οἰκοδεσποτεῖν in v. 15.

5. 1 Tim 5,3-16 in contemporary debate

The regulations of our section about widows in the community find different interpretations. On the one hand, the concern of our author and of the communities entrusted to him for widows is generally appreciated. It follows best biblical tradition where concern for “widows and orphans” as the poorest sectors of society is recommended. Some tendency to limit the cases where assistance from the side of the community is offered is fully understandable.

The picture of young widows who want to remarry in spite of an initial readiness to remain unmarried remains very dark and somewhat “macho”. Feminist authors see in it a sign of male predominance in a “patriarchal” society. Two examples of such a feminist reading of our text may be given. The “*Women's Bible Commentary*”, ed. by CAROL A. NEWSOM and SHARON H. RINGE (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press 1992, 1998), 448f, supposes a ministry of widows in the early church: groups of women who lived celibacy (perhaps even separated from their husbands) and had a role in teaching in the communities. Such women would be forbidden to act or even to live together according to the “Paul” of our letter and were not allowed to speak in public. The evidence for this interpretation of our text comes in part from the Apocryphal Gospels and seems to be rather far-fetched. V. 16 does not seem to be a sufficient basis for this construction.

ELISABETH SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. Tenth Anniversary Edition (New York, NY: Crossroad 1994), pp. 288-291, does not count with a ministry of widows, but of female presbyters (in part on the basis of 1 Tim 5,1f). Her criticism of the “patriarchal” perspective of our text seems to be justified, but the hypothesis of male and female presbyters does not seem to be founded. For female deacons see 1 Tim 3,11.

19th Lecture 1 Tim 5,17-22.23-25 Instruction about presbyters. Personal instruction for Timothy

1. Where are we?

It appears more or less reasonable, that our author continues after the section about the widows with one dealing with presbyters. Interpreters disagree about the question where the instructions about presbyters end. Do they still include the general principle of v. 21 and the instruction of v. 22 about not easily imposing the hands on a person? And what about the rule of v. 23 about having some wine for meal? Finally the connection of vv. 24-25 with the preceding context creates problems. We shall try to see some coherence in the sequence of thought, but in some cases the connection may be rather loose.

2. Textual variants

Not all variants of our section merit the same attention. The word order of the first quotation in v. 18 is rather irrelevant. The wording of the second one merits more attention: the text preferred by Aland follows Lk 10,7, while the variant attested by \aleph^* ^{vid} a^{vid} follows Mt 10,10. The Lucan version is the better attested one and may be the one found in Q. The variant $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ in v. 21 does not make much sense and may result from itacism. The rest of the variants are of little importance for the interpretation of the text.

3. Some structure based on syntax

Again, the imperatives or equivalent forms seem to structure our textual unit. At the beginning stands the exhortation, given in the Imperative 3rd pers. pl., in v. 17, for which a reason is given in v. 18. The next two imperatives occur in vv. 19 and 20. V. 21 depends on the introductory formula with which “Paul” implores Timothy to follow his instructions. V. 22 starts again with an imperative, although the content is connected only loosely with the preceding verses. At the end stand the two phrases in the Indicative of vv. 24 and 25, with two parts each: one as a nominal clause, one as a verbal one. The person to whom the Imperatives are directed from v. 19 onwards is clearly Timothy. It is more difficult to find out who is the addressee of the Imperative 3 pers. pl. Passive in v. 17. Who are the persons who are exhorted to “honour” the well-merited presbyters? Some commentators think of the bishop. But also the communities as such may be addressed.

4. Interpretation of the various subunits

- Recognition of the work of well-merited presbyters (vv. 17f)

V. 17 gives the basic principle, v. 18 the reason. Commentators agree that *πρεσβύτεροι* is to be taken here in a more technical sense as “presbyters” and not just as “older men” as in 5,1. Among the group of older men in the community there seems to be a smaller circle of persons who have become involved in dedication to the benefit of the community. They even seem to have been entrusted with the community, as becomes evident from the term *προιστάμενοι*, used previously by Paul for persons in charge of the communities (1 Thess 5,12; Rom 12,8). The service of the more prominent group of these men consists mainly in preaching and teaching as appears from the definition given successively: *κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ*. The verb *κοπιᾶν* used in this context is a technical term for pastoral work (cf. again 1 Thess 5,12; 1 Cor 16,16). But what does it mean that such persons should receive “double honour”? Again, authors are divided whether the term *τιμὴ* retains the general sense of “honour” or has the narrower meaning of “honorarium”, “payment”. The latter alternative is chosen again by Roloff and Johnson. With the other recent commentators I should like to remain with the traditional translation (preferred also by almost all text editions) “honour”. Of course, the “double honour” includes also a financial recognition. From the point of view of modern semantics it should be avoided to narrow down too strictly the richness of a semantic cluster to just one meaning and aspect. Thus, recognizing the involvement of the community leaders includes also the readiness to show this recognition also in same kind of “honorarium”. To see in the “double honour” just a double recompense would mean to overlook the semantic richness of the concept chosen by our “Paul”. A confirmation of our perspective can be found in the subject of respect toward older men in 5,1 and of slaves towards their masters (*τιμὴ!*) in 6,1. The material aspect is further developed in v. 18. Already the historical Paul used (or abused) the principle of Dtn 25,4, originally valid for animals, for the right of sustentation of church ministers like himself in 1 Cor 9,9. Our text follows the version of the LXX more closely. While this quotation comes from “Scripture”, the same cannot be said easily of the second quotation. It appears in Luke 10,7; the text of the variant corresponds, as mentioned above, more to the version of Mt 10,10. Our author may depend here on Q. Modern interpreters disagree about the question whether our author may have dared to quote from early Christian tradition as “Scripture”. The more detailed contemporary commentaries (like the one by Roloff) show some openness to such a usage. The word of Christ begins to find its place in the Holy Writings of the Christian communities. If we place the composition of the Pastoral Letters towards the end of the first Christian century or the beginning of the second, such usage may be defensible. Cf. the similar development in St. John (2,22; 5,47).

- How to handle accusations against a presbyter (vv. 19f)

Given the position of prestige held by the presbyters (which goes beyond their salary), charges against members of this group should not be easily accepted. Our author subjects them to a law valid for all citizens of Israel (Dtn 19,6 par.). Thus, some kind of immunity seems to have been reserved for the presbyters. What the Gospel of Matthew foresees for accusations inside the community no matter who is accused (Mt 18,16), is now applied to a particular group. The person in charge of the law suit is Paul's Deputy, Timothy, probably acting as the "bishop" of the community. He is admonished as well to reprimand those presbyters who have been found guilty. It may be that this reprimand is thought to take place within the group of the presbyters. This understanding is suggested by the reference to the "others" who should have fear while taking part in the disciplinary action of Timothy.

- A general clause referring to Timothy's activity as a judge (v. 21)

With a solemn formula which our author uses again in 2 Tim 4,1 he admonishes Timothy not to follow any prejudice or personal inclination. The whole "celestial court" is invoked – we may be reminded of a similar scenario in the Exercises of St. Ignatius. In this "Trinity", the angels have the place of the Holy Spirit (or Our Lady in Ignatius).

- An exhortation to Timothy not to impose his hands too easily on others (v. 22)

Given the loose connection between the different subjects, the interpretation of this verse remains debated. Some authors (as Dibelius-Conzelmann) think of the imposition of hands for the rite of reconciliation. But this rite is not attested before the 3rd century A.D. (cf. the reference to the Synod of Carthage A.D. 256 in Roloff). The context of our textual unit speaks for the understanding of the majority of contemporary commentators who see in the imposition of hands a rite of ordination (cf. 4,14; 2 Tim 1,6; similar texts are Acts 6,6; 13,3 where at least a commissioning is intended). The meaning of the exhortation of "Paul" in our text is then that Timothy should not easily impose his hands for ordination upon the head of a candidate. It must be assured that they are worthy (cf. the conditions for "overseers" and deacons in 3,1-13; for presbyters Tit 1,5-9). In being premature in such a decision, Timothy may take part either in the sins the candidate already committed or in those he would be on the way of committing in the future.

The final exhortation to remain "pure" summarizes in a way the various admonishments given to Timothy. The concept had occurred before (cf. the substantive in 4,12; 5,2; the adjective in Tit 2,5). It has no longer a cultic ring in our literature but corresponds to Hellenistic ethics in the sense of an irreproachable conduct.

- Personal instruction for Timothy (vv. 23-25)

It is not easy to see the connection of the advice of taking some wine as a beverage with the preceding context. Most authors see the link in the idea of “cleanness”, “purity” of the preceding verse, which might have been interpreted in a “Puritan” way. There is some agreement that our author has not just the health of Timothy in mind, but something more fundamental. It is reasonable to see in the advice of “Paul” a reflection of his overall strategy of warning Timothy over against different forms of upcoming Gnostic heresy: idle talk (1,6), wrong moral teaching (1,7), forbidding of marriage or certain food (4,3) or just Gnosticism as such (6,20). Over against such encratic ideas the invitation to take wine would be quite appropriate. For the ascetic ideal of not drinking wine see for the OT and Jewish tradition Dan 1,12; Pirqa Aboth 6,4; for contemporary Hellenism Epictetus Diss. III 13,21 (Roloff 315f, who mixes up the two traditions, and Johnson). Again, our author presents a very balanced view according to his tendency to integrate Christianity into contemporary mainstream culture.

It may be allowed to see in v. 23 a kind of digression and in vv. 24-25 some continuation of the section about presbyters and moral problems linked with their ministry and their appointment. In fact, the principle of v. 24 points back to the subject of abuse of ministry dealt with in vv. 19-20 and of unworthy candidates for the ministry of presbyters in v. 22. The concept of ἀμαρτία in v. 24 takes up directly the one of ἀμαρτάνειν in v. 20. Thus, obvious sins will lead to judgment (in this case divine judgment) or will be connected to the sinning persons in a way that they will not escape from their evil works. On the other side also good works will become manifest and will not remain hidden in the long run.

The wisdom behind these statements may be of very general nature. But readers may also think of the end of the Sermon on the Mount (in the Plain) where already the idea of recognizing persons from their fruits is linked with the finding out of false teachers or prophets: “Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves. You will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? So, every sound tree bears good fruits, but the bad tree bears evil fruit. A sound tree cannot bear evil fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Thus you will know them by their fruits.” (Mt 7,15-20)

20th Lecture: Ministry in the Pastoral Epistles

Cf. LOHFINK, G., “Die Normativität der Amtsvorstellungen in den Pastoralbriefen“, *ThQ* 157 (1977) 93-106; ID., „Weibliche Diakone im Neuen Testament“, *Diak.* 11 (1980) 385-400; ROLOFF, J., *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XV), Zürich-Neukirchen/Vluyn: Benziger, Neukirchener 1988, 169-189, 263-281.

1. The various ministries

As recent authors observe, two rivalling models of Church ministry seem to converge slowly at the time of the Pastoral Epistles. The older form of ministry in the communities seems to have been adopted from Judaism and Palestinian Jewish Christianity. It is the Presbyterial form of church ministry. In analogy to the Council of Elders in Jerusalem, the Primitive Church in Jerusalem seems to have adopted a similar way of organizing itself. The Acts of the Apostles suppose a group of “Elders” besides the Apostles as sharing the responsibility for the Jerusalem community but also for the communities on the way of being founded abroad (cf. Acts 15,2.4.6.22f; 16,4). Where communities are founded in the Jewish diaspora and in Hellenistic towns, Elders are to be installed as the persons in charge of the newly founded communities (Acts 14,23). Once such a ministry has been established in a church, this church can be considered fully founded and autonomous. Cf. BUETUBELA BALEMBO, L’autonomie des jeunes églises et les Actes, in: W. AMEWOWO, al., *Les Actes des Apôtres et les jeunes Églises. Actes du Deuxième Congrès des Biblistes Africains*, Ibadan, 31 juillet – 3 août 1984, Kinshasa 1990, 77-104: 96. Paul does not mention Elders at all, but they are mentioned in 1 Pet 5,1-5, James 5,14 and in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 5,17.19; Tit 1,5). In the Pauline churches, another model seems to have established itself. It is most clearly expressed in Phil 1,1, where Paul greets the community at Philippi “σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνους”. They seem to have formed a kind of governing body of the community. We had seen that deacons might have been women in Pauline communities like Phoebe, the deaconess of the community at Cenchreae (Rom 16,1-2). According to J. Roloff, the ἐπίσκοποι probably were the men in charge of a house community, with deacons as their assistants. The precise function of such “overseers” and “servants” is not quite clear, but they are not explicitly linked to liturgy or the celebration of the Eucharist.

In a later phase, we can observe a tendency in the communities of the diaspora to merge the two systems of community ministry and to replace gradually the presbyters by the “bishops”, finally the monarchical bishop responsible for the church of a whole town.

Witnesses of this development are Acts, the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Peter. In Acts 20,17f, Paul summons the “Elders” of Ephesus to Miletus for a farewell speech. In 20,28 they are reminded that they have been installed as “bishops” of their flock, with elements of the pastoral metaphorical world. The tendency seems to be that Luke wants to identify both functions and to replace gradually the “presbyters” by the “bishops”. The same tendency can be observed in the Pastoral Epistles. Our “Pastoral Paul” speaks about Elders in 1 Tim 5,17-22 and takes up the subject of Elders in Tit 1,5ff. In vv. 8-9, these “Elders” transform themselves into the “bishop”. It is not probable that Paul speaks here of two different functions or ministries of the community at Crete.

The third text showing the same tendency is chapter 5 of 1 Pet. Here, in vv. 1-5, “Peter” exhorts the Elders of the community of the addressees to “pasture the flock of God entrusted to them”, and to do this as good “overseers” (ἐπισκοποῦντες) not out of coercion but freely and according to God. Again, the two terminologies are brought together.

In later times, different models will be proposed to bring the two functions together. In 1 Cl 40-44 presbyters and bishops are simply identified. Ignatius of Antioch develops his model of a threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons and sees in it a hierarchy established by God himself. Polycarp knows in his Second Letter to the Philippians only Deacons and Presbyters (2 Phil 5-6). The reason for the tendency towards the monarchical bishop (presbyter) towards the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A.D. seems to have been upcoming heresy which was difficult to control in the various house churches. A strong central ministry was required in the various towns which was able to face new heretical doctrines and to take disciplinary measures if necessary.

2. From Paul to “Paul”

The organization of communities with “bishops” and “deacons” as leaders is only a late phase in the order of Pauline churches. At the beginning stands a model where Paul himself is still in charge of these communities, but can rely on a multiplicity of charisms given to each community. Such divine gifts are described in 1 Cor 12 and Rom 12,3-8. At the head of the lists stand always gifts which have to do with the preaching and the teaching of the word.

For Paul, the well-being and the future of the church depend on the faithfulness of God’s People to the word of God, to the Gospel. That is why his call as an apostle remains the basis for all growth of the church. Seen from a different perspective, church organization and church ministry cannot assure the well-being and the future of the church. Surprisingly this is an element which Paul has in common with the Pastoral Letters and “Paul”, their author.

As has been elaborated by Roloff, Lohfink and others (we still remember Martin Wolter), the faithfulness to the gospel once preached and taught is the basis also for the future of the communities of the Pastoral Epistles. There are two schools which seem to see in ministry the tool of protecting the church in the era of upcoming heresy: traditional Catholic theology and critical Protestant Exegesis. According to the traditional Catholic school, Jesus has celebrated his First Holy Mass at the cenacle, and on this occasion he has ordained the first priests (all male, of course). This conception is anachronistic since it supposes the existence of sacraments before the death and the resurrection of Christ and the birth of the church. On the other side, radical Protestant exegesis (represented among other authors by Ernst Käsemann) sees attested in the Pastoral Epistles the development of the early church towards “Early Catholicism” (“Frühkatholizismus”). The church is no longer based on the word of God, but on ministry and the sacraments. More recent authors as we have quoted them at the beginning of this lecture doubt these perspectives.

The basic concept for the Pastoral Epistles is not ministry, but “tradition”. Cf. for this aspect the article by G. Lohfink, “Die Normativität ...”. The Greek word for normative tradition in the Pastoral Epistles is παραθήκη – “deposited good”. The word does not play any role in NT literature before the Pastoral Epistles. In antiquity it is used for entrusted objects or values. For the author of the Pastoral Epistles, the word stands for the integrity of the Gospel which has to be defended against the menaces of upcoming (Gnostic) heresy: “O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the godless chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge” (1 Tim 6,20). In 2 Tim, the exhortation of Paul for Timothy to guard the deposit entrusted to him stands at the beginning of the Letter (2 Tim 1,14). If we ask ourselves what is the content of this deposit, we are referred to the whole section 2 Tim 1,10-14 in its context: it is the Gospel.

A second normative concept of the Pastoral Epistles is “teaching” (διδασκαλία). As Lohfink points out, this concept corresponds in a way to the Pauline διδαχή. But this Pauline concept is oriented towards the content of teaching, whereas διδασκαλία derives from διδάσκαλος “teacher” and has more strongly in view the teaching person. By this way the continuity of the teaching from Christ and the apostles to the delegate of the apostle and then to Christian teachers is more strongly underlined. It is this sequence of transmission of the word which is at the focus of the interest of our author. Not the institution as such. The relevant authority is for the Pastoral Epistles Paul as a, or rather: as *the* teacher. Cf. 2 Tim 1,11 where Paul says “For this gospel I was appointed a preacher and apostle and teacher”, with the title of “teacher” standing at the end as a kind of climax. The same series appears in 1 Tim 2,7: Paul is “a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth”. The content of the teaching is everything which Paul and consequently his delegate have preached and taught: the gospel with its applications to the different life situations of the communities.

As far as this deposit has to be defended against falsifications and errors, the “teaching” is called “sound doctrine” (1 Tim 1,10; 2 Tim 4,3; Tit 1,9; 2,1), “good doctrine” (1 Tim 4,6) or “doctrine corresponding to godliness” (1 Tim 6,3). As we saw, all these expressions are typical for the Pastoral Epistles.

3. Consequences for church ministry

If the instructions of the Pastoral Epistles do not concern directly church ministry but ministry as faithfulness to the entrusted treasure of the gospel, this has consequences for the question how far the community structure of the Pastoral Epistles can be regarded as normative. Often the existence of a ministry of “bishops”, “presbyters” and “deacons” as attested in the Pastoral Epistles as part of the Bible is considered sufficient for the conclusion that such ministries should be normative for the church for all times and places. Our recent authors warn against such a conclusion.

First, our author (the “Pastoral Paul”) does not show anywhere the intention of imposing on the communities a certain structure. He supposes certain ministries in the communities and gives rules for finding the right candidates and for the correct conduct of the ministers.

Timothy and Titus are never addressed as ministers. It is impossible to insert them into the threefold ministry mentioned above. What is important for them is to be Paul’s faithful delegates and envoys who take care of the communities, remaining always faithful to the deposit of the gospel entrusted to them.

A further problem consists in the vague and fluent character of the ministries we can observe in the Pastoral Epistles. In particular, a clear distinction between “overseers” (ἐπίσκοποι) and “presbyters” cannot be drawn. We saw, that also in the following decades such a distinction is only emerging. If Ignatius of Antioch as the first Christian author attests the existence of the threefold ecclesiastical ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, he is by no means representative for the church of the beginning second century.

It is also for this reason that in opposition to the Lima document on church Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (1982), other contemporary ecumenical documents are more cautious about the binding character of this threefold ministry (cf. the reference to a common Roman Catholic – Lutheran text of the ecumenical institutes of Münster and Mainz, Lohfink, *Normativität ...*, 106). According to this opinion, shared by Lohfink, Roloff and other contemporary authors of both churches, Christ did not found the threefold ministry of the church as such, nor did the apostles, but the church took its liberty in creating at given times the concrete forms of ministry which it needed. If this principle is accepted, more liberty would be given to the church of later generations in adapting its ministry.

21st Lecture: 1 Tim 6,1-2.3-5 Instruction about slaves. Instruction about heretics

1. Context

The exhortations of the final chapter of 1 Tim are somewhat loosely connected. As we saw, the instruction about slaves in vv. 1-2 takes up the themes of domestic codes, treated earlier with the question of men and women in the community (2,8.9-15). The sequence of exhortations about such groups in the “house” was interrupted by instructions about various kinds of ministry or ranks in the community (3,1-13; 5,1-22) which in their turn were interrupted by instructions about upcoming heresy and how to deal with it (4,1-10). Our text (6,1-2.3-5) takes up first the instruction about domestic order and then the subject of heresy. Thus, the text as a whole is also carefully “woven”.

2. Text and translation

While there are no significant variants in vv. 1-2, there is one in v. 3, where instead of προσέχεται of the majority of mss. is read προσέχεται in the original version of the Sinaiticus and a few Latin mss. This may be more in line with general usage in the Pastoral Epistles (5 times, always in the Active), but is to be rejected because of the scarce attestation and the Medium used here. The expression γεινῶνται in v. 4, proposed by D^{*c} and some Latin mss. looks like a stylistic improvement (typical for D). To this Plural would correspond φθόνου and ἔριδος in the Plural. The rather unusual ἀπεστερημένων in v. 5 has found again an alternative proposal in D and one in 365. The final exhortation ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τοιούτων finds hardly support in reliable majuscule tradition and may be disregarded for this reason.

For the translation, v. 2 may offer two difficulties. In fact, as the object of καταφρονείτωσαν should be added mentally αὐτούς, and in the same way after δουλεύετωσαν should be added mentally αὐτοῖς. πιστοί in this context means “members of the community of the faithful”, and for ἀγαπητοί should be added “by God”. The following expression οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι indicates then the subject of εἰσίν, but serves at the same time as a kind of causal clause. The difficult νοσῶν in v. 4 is best understood as a Participle, parallel to ἐπιστάμενος: “he is sick for controversies and disputes about words”, or – as the RSV puts it – “he has a morbid craving for ...”. ὑπόνοιαι in the same verse are suspicions (hapax in the NT), διαπατριβαί in v. 5 (equally hapax) means quarrelling. The term πορισμός which occurs at the end means “a basis of business”. It occurs again in v. 6, creating by this way some loose connection of our paragraph with the ensuing section about godliness and self-sufficiency.

3. Some grammatical observations

Two grammatical observations may help to understand our paragraph better. The first one concerns the form of Imperative chosen in the instruction about slaves in vv. 1-2. It is an Imperative 3rd person Plural. Different from other sections in the NT dealing with the obligations of slaves (see below, 5), our author gives his advice indirectly, apparently by mediation of Timothy. This is typical for the Pastoral Letters. Cf. the similar procedure in Tit 2,9f, probably depending on the παρακάλει in v. 6, and the continuation of the advice for slaves in 1 Tim 6,2: ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει.

The second observation concerns the tense of some verb forms in vv. 4 and 5. To the Perfect form τετύφωται in v. 4 correspond the Participles Perfect διεφθαρμένων and ἀπεστερημένων in v. 5. The choice of this tense means that the situation of the adversaries is considered as stable on the basis of a former wrong decision. This leaves little room for discussion and improvement: a clear black-white painting.

4. Interpretation at the semantic level

a) The instruction about slaves (vv. 1-2d)

Our author recognizes that the slaves in the Christian community have to live under a “yoke”. But he does not show any intention of raising the question of the legitimacy of slavery. He considers two cases: a Christian is a slave in the house of a non-Christian or he belongs to a Christian master. In the first case, simple subordination is required. The slave should pay “honour” to his master (cf. for this term 5,3 and 5,17). No particular moral or religious motive is named except the one of the good reputation the community should enjoy in its social context: the name of God and the (Christian) doctrine should not be reviled. Apparently the community found itself in a situation of hostility which made it highly recommended not to give occasion for criticism. The problem was acute since Christian communities from early on had a high number of members from the lower social classes (cf. 1 Cor 1,26-28). Pliny in his Letter to Trajan (Ep. X 96) mentions, as we saw, to “ministers” of the community in Bithynia who were slaves. Such Christians might have been considered a danger for Roman-Hellenistic society as the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan shows. The second case envisaged by our author (in v. 2) concerns a Christian slave of a Christian master. Our “Paul” does not show any tendency of underlining the common faith of slave and master as a basis for a more egalitarian relation (as “brothers”). On the contrary, he uses the common faith for

calling the slave for an even more dedicated service to the Christian master precisely because he is a Christian, loved by God, and shows benevolence towards the subject entrusted to him.

b) The instruction about heretics (vv. 2e-5)

The initial order ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει stands between vv. 1-2d and 3-5. It resumes the teaching about slaves and initiates the one about sound doctrine. We know a similar formula of transition from 4,11. In any case, the Imperative δίδασκε prepares the subject of ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν and διδασκαλία in v. 3. Initially, the doctrine of the community is identified without further ado with the “sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ”, and these words with “teaching according to godliness”. We see that our author does not make here any theological distinctions (v. 3). Whoever deviates from this teaching, has become blind, does not understand anything and shows this “morbid craving for” controversies and strife about words which are the root of envy, wrath, slander, suspicions etc. (v. 4). Commentators point to the common place character of such characterizations in Greco-Roman Antiquity. In the Pauline corpus ἕρις makes often part of a list of vices as in Rom 1,29; 13,13; 1 Cor 3,3; 2 Cor 12,20; Gal 5,20; Phil 1,15.

In v. 5, our author becomes slightly more concrete: the “quarrelling” of persons whose mind has been spoiled and who have been alienated from truth may have to do with greed: the wish to make out of godliness a business. This subject will be expanded in the subsequent verses. Also this reproach has its parallels in contemporary polemics against pseudo-prophets and pseudo-teachers.

The question remains whether there is any connection between the rules given for slaves and the warning against heretics. One might have the idea that possibly Paulinism might have been considered by our author as a root for strife, also in the question of social groups in the community. For women, the tendency of reducing Pauline influence seems to be obvious in 1 Tim 2,9-15. No female prophets are foreseen any longer, and women have to remain silent in the community. The question remains whether some “liberationist” ideas concerning slaves might have been found in the communities of our author. Of course, he would have considered them also a danger for the community, be it only for the good reputation of Christian faith.

5. Slaves in New Testament Letters

In Paul, no paraenetic passage is dealing with slaves. In fact, Paul has no domestic code as such. The conviction that in Christ all Christians have the same dignity is expressed most clearly in Gal

3,28; cf. 1 Cor 12,13. In the Letter to Philemon, Paul invites his addressee to free his slave Onesimus and to gain him as a brother in Christ. A similar thought appears in 1 Cor 7,21. Of this perspective, very little seems to have survived in the later letters.

The difference appears already in Col 3,22-25. Slaves should be obedient to their masters and this for the Lord. A sincerity of heart is required beyond purely external obedience. The service done to the earthly masters is done to the Lord himself who will also reward them. Nevertheless there is found also an exhortation for Christian owners of slaves to treat these slaves with respect since the lords themselves have a Lord in Christ (4,1).

These ideas are taken up in Eph 6,5-8. Again, the service of the slaves is required to be a service done to the Lord. All, the slaves and the free persons, will receive their reward. Also in Ephesians (6,9) an exhortation of the masters is added. They should remember that they as the slaves have a master in heaven and that before him there is no distinction of persons (προσωποληψία).

Not very far from the perspective of the Deutero-Pauline Letters is 1 Pet 2,18-25. It is true that the slaves are not called by their designation δούλοι, but with the word οἰκέται which emphasizes more the belonging to a household. But the advice given to these “domestics” is clearly that they should be “submitted” to their masters – not only the friendly, but also the unfriendly ones. If such a slave suffers unjustly this is a grace from the Lord. This vision is backed up with recourse to the theology of the Servant of Isa. 52-53. (Cf. our manuscript on The First Letter of Peter, 2002, 46ff).

In 1 Tim 6,1f the case of slaves of Christian masters is addressed expressly. Again, the institution of slavery is not put into question. In general, slaves should respect their masters, so that Christianity is respected. If the master is a Christian, he should be respected as a brother in Christ and someone loved by God. In this perspective, no change of the situation of slaves is envisaged any longer.

The same holds true for the section about slaves in the Letter to Titus (2,9f). The framework is here the advice for various groups in the community: elders and elderly women, and then also slaves. Their status is not questioned. They should be submissive in order to gain respect for the teaching of the Saviour Jesus Christ.

Modern readers will question such texts on the basis of the idea of all human persons being children of the same Father in heaven, an idea spelled out more concretely by Paul, but seen only insufficiently by the later authors of the New Testament.

22nd Lecture: 1 Tim 6,6-10 Godliness and self-sufficiency

1. Context

For the last chapter of 1 Tim, there is little agreement among commentators about the division of the text. Most contemporary interpreters would treat vv. 2e or 3 – 10 together under various headings, generally dealing with advice for Timothy. We may be allowed to divide as proposed because the rules given in vv. 2e-5 seem to be more general than the principles of vv. 6-10, with πορισμός being a hook-word between the two sections which links them together. The connection of godliness and self-sufficiency seems to be the particular subject of these five verses, not treated before.

2. Text and translation

The construction at the beginning of the second line of v. 7 seems to have created difficulties for the copyists. Some word seemed to be missing, and so some mss. add ἀληθές before the ὅτι, others δῆλον, still others delete the ὅτι. We remain with the *lectio difficilior*, attested also by the older mss. The unusual διατροφάς in v. 8 is replaced by the singular in a number of mss., but two of the oldest mss. stand against it. That the snares in v. 9 are those of the devil may come from 3,7, as suggested by Aland. Besides two mss. of the 9th cent., this reading is only attested by the majuscule D*.

The two key concepts of the paragraph are εὐσέβεια and ἀυτάρκεια (v.6). We rendered the former regularly with “godliness”, the latter means “self-sufficiency”. The word is also used in modern languages as “autarchy”, with the whole spectrum of possible meanings. The root of ἀρκ- recurs in the verb ἀρκεῖσθαι in v. 8. βυθίζω in v. 9 means to drown or (here) being drowned, περιπέιρω in v. 10 means piercing or plunging oneself (into pains).

3. Form and structure

One of the features which characterize our section is the shift of grammatical person. The section starts with a definition given in the 3rd person singular in a nominal clause. This sentence is followed by two sentences in the first person plural: the first one gives the reason for the sentence of v. 6 (γάρ), the second one draws a conclusion from the two preceding phrases (in the future). The negative alternative is given in v. 9 in the third person plural. V. 10 contains again a principle in

the third person singular (as v. 6), with an example of persons who did not observe it and had to bear the consequences of their option.

4. Content and message

a) The principle of godliness and autarchy (v. 6)

That our author draws her upon Hellenistic language is commonly accepted. Although the definition of real “profit” (πορισμός, in the NT only here and in v. 5) as “godliness together with self-sufficiency” seems to be his, the two concepts belong to Hellenistic vocabulary and thought. In comparison with the Paul of the authentic (or undisputed) letters it may be said that the ideal of self-sufficiency is better attested in the commonly accepted Pauline letters than the idea of “godliness” (εὐσέβεια). Paul never uses the latter concept in his undisputed letters, but knows αὐτάρκεια in 2 Cor 9,8 and αὐταρκής in Phil 4,11. In 2 Cor 9,8 Paul recommends generosity in contributing to the collect for the community of Jerusalem: who gives away freely, will find all he or she needs from God. The use does not seem to be technical or philosophical in this case. In Phil 4,11 Paul praises the generosity of the Philippians towards himself: not that he was really in need – he would be self-sufficient. Again, the context is not speculative, but very practical. The principle of 1 Tim 6,6 differs from such Pauline statements by its philosophical (or theological) ring and by the combination of “piety” and “self-sufficiency”, never found in the Paul of the earlier letters.

The ideal of “self-sufficiency” is old Greek tradition. Cf. the article “Autarkeia” by Olof Gigon in: *Lexikon der alten Welt*, Zürich-Stuttgart 1965, 414: Autarkeia appears in ethical contexts since the late 5th cent. B. C. The first context is physical autarkeia. It consists in the effort of becoming independent from physical and material resources which one needs or thinks to need for life. The ideal person in this regard is Socrates, the most radical representative of this attitude Diogenes. The concept occurs also in the political context as the self-sufficiency of a political entity or in the spiritual sense as independence of a person from others. In the times of the Stoa it was disputed whether a person should rely on friends (as the Stoics affirmed) or rather remain independent from them. A final context is the one of the body: a person should remain independent from the well-being of his or her body. For Aristotle, a person should remain self-sufficient in all three dimensions (independence from material resources, from human support and from the well-being of the body) and thus find happiness, for orthodox Stoicism virtue is self-sufficient and independent from everything else (Diog. Laert. 5,30; 7,127f). In our context prevails of course the physical understanding: Timothy should remain modest in his recourse to material resources (in the line of the Greek wise man).

A more detailed background for the Greek ideal of “self-sufficiency” (αὐτάρκεια) is given by:

FREDERICK E. BRENK, „Old Wineskins Recycled: *AUTARKEIA* in I Timothy 6.5-10“, *Filologia neotestamentaria* 3 (1990) 39-51.

b) A wisdom argument for self-sufficiency (vv. 7-8)

As has been pointed out already under the heading of textual criticism (see above, 1), at the beginning of v. 7 an expression like “it is clear that” should be mentally added.

Since we could not bring anything into this world, it is obvious that we shall not be able either to carry anything out from it at the end. Commentators use to refer here with the margin of Nestle-Aland to Job 1,21 and Qo 5,14. Job 1,21 contains the famous phrase of Job after having had the news of having lost everything he had: “Naked I came from my mother’s womb, naked I shall return. Yahweh gave, Yahweh has taken back. Blessed be the name of Yahweh.” Almost verbally the same is affirmed in Qo 5,14. Dibelius-Conzelmann refer to late Greek parallels, to Sap 7,6 and Philo, *De spec. leg.* I 294f, but also to Seneca *Ep.* 102,24f. For the parallel in Polycarp see below, 5.

In v. 8, our author becomes more concrete: self-sufficiency consists in particular in the independence from care for food and clothing. Also for this idea parallels can be found in antiquity. Cf. the reference to (the Stoic) Musonius *περὶ τροφῆς* and *περὶ σκέπης* in Dibelius-Conzelmann, 65. *Ibid.* to Diog. Laert., *Lives of the Philosophers* VI 104 (not 105 as in Dib.-Konz.) about the Cynics: ἀρέσκει δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ λιτῶς βιοῦν, αὐτάρκεσιν χρωμένους σιτίοις καὶ τρίβωσι μόνοις – “They also hold that we should live frugally, eating food for nourishment only and wearing a single garment” (Hicks in Loeb Classical Library, 1930).

In applying this ideal to the envoy of the apostle, Paul recommends to him the virtues of the Greek wise and educated man. As such he will be trustworthy and heeded as is the case with Paul himself.

c) The consequences of greed (vv. 9-10)

In the following verses, our author tries to deepen his argument. The wish to be rich leads into temptation, into a snare and into senseless and hurtful desires which plunge the human person into ruin and destruction (cf. RSV). Again, biblical and extra-biblical parallels abound. We may think of the woes in the NT about the rich in Luke 6,24f par. James 5,1. Aland refers in the margin to Mt 13,22: the longing for material goods suffocates the plant sown by the farmer and leaves it without fruit.

That greed is the root of all vices (v. 10) seems to be an accepted principle of Greek thought. Dibelius-Conzelmann refer to Stobaeus *Ecl* III p. 417 Hense and Diog. Laert., *Lives of the Philosophers* VI 50 τὴν φιλαγυρίαν εἶπε μητρόπολι πάντων τῶν κακῶν about Diogenes.

Thus, there is nothing particularly Christian or Pauline in our text. Christian message is embedded into its Hellenistic context. This must not contradict its origins: “Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head” (Lk 9,58 par. Mt 8,20). The only difference is the motivation for self-sufficiency: in Jesus it is the coming Kingdom, not the independence of the wise men from shelter and resources. The same may be supposed in Paul, although this question is more controversial since he preaches and lives the Christian ideal in the Hellenistic world.

5. The call for self-sufficiency in Polycarp, 2nd Letter to the Philippians 4,1f

A striking parallel to our text is found in Polycarp’s Second Letter to the Philippians, 4,1f: Ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. Εἰδότες οὖν, ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν ... As we saw, the two affirmations are rather commonplace. Since they occur together, a dependence of Polycarp from 1 Tim is possible. Some commentators think of common authorship of Polycarp and 1 Tim, but the basis for such an assumption would be much too narrow. Timothy Johnson sees in the parallel an argument for his thesis of Pauline origin of 1 Tim. He argues that Polycarp shortly before (in 3,2) had invited his readers to follow the example and advice of the blessed and famous Paul. Other exhortations of the context of PolPhil 4,1f can be traced back to Paul as well. But the text we are dealing with remains so general and has so many roots in antiquity that a direct literary dependence from 1 Tim remains uncertain. Even if it is assumed and if Polycarp considered 1 Tim to be a Pauline document (as the rest of the tradition from the second cent. onwards), this is not yet a historical proof for the Pauline origin of 1 Tim. We had seen that for the subject of “self-sufficiency” there was a notable difference between the undisputed letters of Paul and 1 Tim. Thus, let Paul be Paul (as J. Dunn would say for John) and “Paul” be “Paul”.

23rd Lecture: 1 Tim 6,11-16 Final instructions for Timothy

1. Context

The instructions for Timothy at the end of our Letter are not too clearly structured. After the rules concerning slaves (6,1-2) we could recognize instructions concerning heresy (6,2e-5) and about godliness and self-sufficiency (6,6-10). Both may be qualified as warnings against an orientation and a conduct not befitting a Christian leader. In vv. 11-16, positive rules for Timothy are formulated. He is to remember his original vocation as a minister and to live accordingly. The section ends with a solemn liturgical formula, concluded with “Amen”, in v. 16. What follows, may be regarded as a new subsection: warning against wealth and again against upcoming heresy (17-19.20f). These sections in a more negative tone echo in a sense the warnings in vv. 2e-5 and 6-10 respectively in inverted order, thus forming a kind of chiasm. The reminder of Timothy’s ordination (vv. 11-16) would then stand in the middle. In any case it appears as the climax of the last chapter:

A Warning against heresy 6,3-5

B Warning against greed 6,6-10

C Reminder of the vocation of Timothy 6,11-16

B’ Instruction about wealth 6,17-19

A’ Warning against heresy 6,20f

2. Text and translation

In v. 11, the reading θεοῦ without article is the shorter and the better attested one. The replacement of *πραῦπάθειαν* (hardly attested outside our text and once in Philo, vol. 2, 31 Cohn-Wendland according to Liddell-Scott-Jones) by the more usual *πρα(ό)τητα* in the same verse in later mss. seems to be secondary. The same holds true for the additional *καί* in v. 12. Somewhat uncertain remains the *σοι* at the beginning of v. 13, but the meaning is clear from the context. The rare *ζωογονοῦντος*, still in v. 13, is replaced by the more usual *ζωοποιῶντος* in **N** and **M**, but without sufficient support. The word order of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is without meaning. The same holds true for the additional *καί* in v. 16 (only D* and some late mss.)

πραῦπάθεια is translated by the dictionary quoted above with “gentleness of temper”. The imperatives of the first two verses mean “flee”, “follow”, “fight” and “lay hold of” (with gen.). In v. 13, the verb *ζωογονεῖν* means literally engendering living creatures, but can have the broader meaning of making alive (again Liddell-Scott-Jones). The use seems to be metaphorical in our context.

The word μαρτυρεῖν in the same verse refers to an oral witness proclaimed before a court, here before Pontius Pilate as a judge. The word does not yet have a “martyrological” meaning in NT times (cf. my article μαρτυρέω κτλ. in EDNT II, referred to also by J. Roloff in his commentary). ἐπί means then: “before”. There is a debate about the precise meaning of ἐντολήν in v. 14. It seems to depend on the interpretation given for the context: does our author speak of baptismal instruction? Then ἐντολήν could mean either doctrinal or moral instruction given on that occasion. Or does the word refer to the particular mission which has been entrusted to Timothy? Then the word would mean “commission”. We shall opt for this latter possibility. The meaning of ἐπιφάνεια in the same verse is not a philological but a theological problem. For this as for the liturgical vocabulary of vv. 15-16 see below, 4.

3. Grammar and structure

Two main sections may be distinguished in our paragraph: vv. 11-12 with their fourfold imperative, and vv. 13-16, introduced by the authoritative παραγγέλλω (σοι), equivalent to a new imperative. For vv. 13-16 Roloff points to another chiasmic structure: the movement goes from God to Jesus Christ, repeats Jesus Christ and returns to God:

A God v. 13 a.b
 B Jesus Christ v. 13 c
 B' Jesus Christ v. 14
 A' God vv. 15-16.

4. Interpretation

a) Timothy's life (vv. 11-12)

The first two verses of our section seem to be concerned with Timothy's life. The wording suggests that not just his life as a Christian is at stake, but his worthy life as a Christian minister. Such a life has two dimensions: breaking with the past and everything which could menace the seriousness of the decision of faith, and the dimension of positive identification with the call Timothy has received. At the beginning, “Paul” underlines the personal relation towards Timothy by the direct address: σὺ δέ (cf. 2 Tim 1,18; 2,1; 3,10.14; 4,5.15; Tit 2,1). The title “man of God” does not refer simply to a Christian as such, but to a man called to a mission in the people of God. This becomes clear from the use of the expression in the OT.

Roloff (345) refers to the following texts: Moses as Man of God Deut 33,1; Josh 14,6; Samuel 1 Sam 9,6f; Elijah 1 Kings 17,18; Elisha 2 Kings 4,7; David Neh 12,24. A somewhat larger sense seems to be supposed in 2 Tim 3,17.

What Timothy has to flee (ταῦτα) results from the preceding context. Probably not only keeping clear from greed is intended, but also from the dangers of heresy. The subsequent catalogue of virtues Timothy should “follow” is at least in part traditional. Roloff sees a nucleus of such virtues in “faith, love and endurance”, where “endurance” takes the place of “hope” attested in similar contexts in early Christian, mainly Pauline literature (cf. 1 Cor 13,13). The shift is probably due to the fading of eschatological-apocalyptic expectation. “Righteousness” is a biblical key term which stands with good reasons at the beginning (cf. the similar text 2 Tim 2,22), followed by the typical ἐυσέβεια as key term of the Pastoral Epistles (see last lecture for 6,6). The πραῦπάθεια recommended at the end sums up the gentle behaviour towards fellow human beings and Christians in particular, not too far away from the third beatitude of Mt 5,5.

The exhortation to “fight the good fight of faith” takes up ideas found in Paul as well (1 Cor 9,25; 1 Thess 2,2; in the sense of “finding resistance” Phil 1,30) as in other texts of the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 2,8.10; 4,10; 2 Tim 4,7). The image is of course traditional in the Greek world. Original is only the application to the life of faith as “combat”.

There is a discussion whether the exhortation to take hold of eternal life to which Timothy has been called should refer exclusively or predominantly to baptism or rather to the specific call Timothy has received as Paul’s and finally God’s envoy. The latter interpretation seems to be the preferable one since Timothy is reminded of the confession which he delivered in the presence of many witnesses. Of course, the situation of baptism cannot be excluded here, but in view of the two following verses it appears preferable to see in the reminder an allusion to the moment of the ordination of Timothy. Cf. the similar reminders of this ordination in 1,18 and 4,14.

b) Timothy’s commission (vv. 13-16)

In general, παραγγέλλω is used in our letter for the instructions Timothy should give to others. Here, the verb is used for Paul ordering Timothy to do something. The scenery is solemn: Timothy is exhorted in the presence of God himself and of Jesus Christ. The two orders of creation and of redemption are named. We saw that the verb ζωογονεῖν is hapax in the NT and rather unexpected since it rather means “generating”. The parallel ζωοποιεῖν found in some mss. is used in the NT only for the gift of new life in the eschatological order. Here, in 1 Tim 6,13 ζωογονεῖν seems to be used in the sense of calling into being: God the creator of all beings is the witness of Paul, as is

Jesus Christ, the model witness of the Christians. As has been pointed out (see above, 2), the witness of Christ before Pontius Pilate is not his martyrdom under Pontius Pilate, but his faithfulness to his mission demonstrated in the trial before Pilate. It is this example which Timothy should follow and thus keep immaculate his commission until the Epiphany of the Lord Jesus Christ. The concept of “Epiphany” seems to evoke less the “appearance” of the kings and emperors of the period than a manifestation of the Lord in order to help and rescue his people (see Roloff). The eschatological-apocalyptic expectation seems to have faded at the time our letter was written. What was left was the expectation of the coming of the Lord for the rescue of his people and of course the hope that he would come when the time would be ready (v. 15!)

From Christ the emphasis shifts back to God in the final verses in a long doxological formula (15-16). The first three elements emphasize God’s rule over the kings and powers of this world, in sharp contrast to the human power entrusted to Pontius Pilate (cf. John 19,11). The language resembles the one of the Apocalypse of John (cf. Rev 17,14). The following predicates emphasize more strongly God’s transcendence in more Hellenistic language: God’s “immortality” (cf. 1 Cor 15, 53f), his dwelling in inaccessible light (hapax in the NT) and his invisibility (for this idea also Ex 33,20). The whole concluding formula resembles strongly the one of 1 Tim 1,17, but as in that case the occurrence of the formula must not signal the end of an original document or part of the letter. It is recommended nevertheless to see in the formula of vv. 15-16 a quotation from the liturgy in which Timothy had once been ordained. The quotation would then remind Timothy of the hour of his commissioning and thus give relevance to the words of exhortation in the preceding context.

5. Final reflection

As already earlier, commentators like Brox and Roloff, use the term of “minister” applied to Timothy in our context. They see in Timothy a kind of foil for Christian ministers (“Amtsträger”), a term not used by our author. It may be recommended to maintain the line of interpretation we chose earlier to take Timothy serious as Paul’s envoy and deputy. As such he would have an immediate importance for the reading community. The emphasis would remain with the “entrusted good”, the gospel which has to be retained and confessed, also in adverse circumstances. This seems to be the main focus of our author, more than the establishment of a certain church order or structure.

For the connection between faith and confession see my recent article: “Faith and confession: The purpose of John”, in: J. PAINTER, R. A. CULPEPPER AND F. F. SEGOVIA, eds., *Word, Theology, and Community in John* (FS R. Kysar), St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice Press 2002, 19-31.

24th Lecture: 1 Tim 6,17-19.20-21 Instructions about the rich. Warning against the so-called “Gnosis”. Final blessing. – Summary

1. Context

The final verses of 1 Tim appear again only loosely connected with their preceding context. After the climax of 6,15f they seem to be almost anticlimactic. There may be some reason why our author did not end his letter with 6,15f, but with our group of verses. One first observation was the chiasmic structure of 6,3-21, which we had noticed previously (see above, p. 97). To this observation may be added the inclusion between the warning over against heresy at the beginning of the letter in 1,3-7 and the closing verses 6,20f. By framing the letter with these warnings and placing a section with further warnings in the centre of his document (4,1-11), our author gives them particular emphasis.

As will come out from the analysis of vv. 17-19, the trust in wealth is closely connected with the subject of heresy or even loss of faith. This connects the last five verses of our letter. To the praise of the one almighty God in vv. 15f corresponds then the resistance against all kinds of idolatry as expressed in vv.17-19.20f.

2. Text and translation

The text of our unit is relatively well attested. The alternative of ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν instead of the verb ὑψηλοφρονεῖν in v. 17 is not sufficiently attested. The article before θεῶ in the same verse is missing in \aleph D* F G and Origen and remains thus doubtful. The same holds true for the reference to the “living” God in the same verse. The addition seems to come from 4,10. The unusual θεμέλιον in v. 19 has led to some variants or conjectures of which none seems to be convincing. “Eternal” life for the “real” life in the same verse has only D² in its favour among the majuscule mss. and should be rejected, although it is read in the majority text. The unusual word κενοφωνίας in v. 20 has been corrected into καινοφωνίας in the 9th cent. majuscule mss. F and G and the Latin tradition. As Aland opines this may be due to “itacism”. Finally the unexpected Ἡ χάρις μετὰ ὑμῶν in v. 21 at the end of a letter which is directed consequently to a single person has caused suspicion among early copyists and replaced by Ἡ χάρις μετὰ σου in D Ψ 048 and part of the later tradition, including the majority text. From external and internal attestation this reading (as *lectio facilior*) should be rejected. The same holds true for the final “Amen” with a similar attestation (\aleph^2 D¹ Ψ and part of the minuscule mss. and translations). It may be an expression of liturgical use.

Some help for the translation may be appropriate. The verb ὑψηλοφρονεῖν “to consider oneself superior” in v. 17 is not that unknown in Antiquity as Bauer’s Dictionary shows. A second attestation in the NT is found in a variant of Rom 11,20. ἀδηλότης in the same verse means “uncertainty”, ἀπόλαυσις is “enjoyment”. The various good works of v. 18 are not difficult to translate, except perhaps εὐμετάδοτος which could be unknown. It means being generous in sharing, almost as the following κοινωνικούς. ἀποθησαυρίζω in v. 19 means “saving”, and θεμέλιον later on a “basis”. The κενοφωνία in v. 20 mean (as in 2 Tim 2,16) “idle talk”, void of sense. ἀντιθέσεις in this context would then be contradictions of the “wrongly called gnosis”. The verb ἀστοχέω had been used already in 1,6 and means “going astray”.

3. Form and structure

The section may be roughly divided into vv. 17-19, v. 20-21a and 21 b. In vv. 17-19, Paul gives advice for the rich. From παράγγελε depends a number of infinitives and a participle. In vv. 20-21a, Timothy is exhorted directly with an imperative (φύλαξον). The final greeting in 20b is a nominal clause.

4. Interpretation

a) The instructions about the rich (vv. 17-19)

Whereas the instruction about godliness and self-sufficiency in vv. 6-10 had a strongly sapiential ring, arguing from arguments of reason, our section is based more strongly on apocalyptic arguments. Basic is the distinction between goods “of this era” and those of the coming one. Treasuring wealth for this life is opposed semantically to treasures “in the real life” (19). This “real life” belongs to the world of the future (τὸ μέλλον).

For the rest, trust in God and his goodness with which he takes care of his creatures, is opposed to trust in these creatures themselves. They cannot give real certainty. Trust in them makes proud. Who trusts in God tries to be generous as he is generous: he shares his wealth with others, does works of charity and treasures riches in such good works.

It is characteristic for our author that he does not reflect about social order as such. Sharing wealth with others is not a question of justice, but of charity. This perspective goes along with the rather patriarchal position our author also showed in questions of household order, in the question of women and of slaves (see above for 2,9-15 and 6,1-2).

b) Warning against the so-called “Gnosis”. Final blessing

The warning of our author against the “Gnosis” is subordinated to the one of remaining faithful to the “entrusted truth” (παραθήκη) in vv. 20f. This is in line with his general tendency. Apparently, at this moment a heresy with a clear physiognomy has become discernable which would merit such a label. The essence of this movement seems to have been the belief in redemption through knowledge. We have observed other elements of this upcoming heresy as a dualism which denies the value of food or marital relationships (see 4,3), an emphasis on myths and genealogies (1,4) and a new interpretation of the Law (1,7). There are only a few hints in the NT to this heresy as such. W. Schmithals in his article γινώσκω κτλ. in EDNT (EWNT) refers to Rev 2,24 and perhaps 3,9. His opinion that “Gnosis” is already found at Corinth has remained debated. During the past decades a distinction has been accepted which distinguishes a “gnosis” in a wider sense which may be contemporary with the NT and the various systems of “Gnosticism” which are not attested before the middle of the Second Cent. A. D.

For our author, the Gnostic speculations are “idle talk” and “contradictions” to the revealed truth entrusted to the community and its leaders. Who spreads them is on the way of giving up Christian faith as this already has been the case with some former Christians (v. 21). On other occasions, our author has also given names: Hymenaeus and Alexander in 1 Tim 1,20 and again Hymenaeus and Philetus in 2 Tim 2,17. In this second text, also the verb ἀστοχεῖν is used.

The final greeting may be conventional and for this reason not in accordance with the singular constantly used in our letter. The closest parallels are 2 Tim 4,22 with the same problem of congruence and Col 4,18. The use of the plural in our Pastoral Letters may be due as well to the orientation of the documents to the members of the Pauline communities as audience of the text.

c) The connection of the closing subunits

At the end of 1 John (5,21), unexpectedly appears the warning: “Children, keep yourselves from idols”. The rather strange closing of 1 John may help us to understand better the connection of subjects in the last five verses of 1 Tim. The warning expressed for the rich in vv. 17-19 saw in the trust in wealth an opposition to trust in God. In this sense, material goods become idols. It is precisely this which Martin Luther expresses in his interpretation of the First Commandment in the Great Catechism from 1529 (I quote from the Weimar edition of *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, vol. 30/1, 132-139, from where also the picture has been taken: 133). According to Luther, having a God means having something or somebody in which or whom a person places his or her whole

trust. As an example, wealth is explicitly mentioned. As the Israelites had to choose between Yahweh and the idols, also the Christians have to make that choice. Concretely this may be the choice between the God from Sinai and self-made Golden Calf.



Jon Sobrino SJ takes up the idea in his various publications. I quote from the French translation of his book *Jesús en América Latina* (1982) with the title *Jésus en Amérique Latine* (Paris 1988), accessible in the Reading Room of the Gregorian University. There, in chapter 4,2 he speaks of Jesus' combat against the Divinities of Death ("La lutte de Jésus contre les divinités de la mort"). He affirms explicitly about Jesus: "Ainsi une bonne partie de son activité fut-elle consacrée à démasquer les fausses divinités" (169).

Thus, warnings against trust in created values like wealth come close to warnings against idols and remain in the area of the First Commandment. From Jon Sobrino we may learn that the idols are not innocent but opposed to the God of the Living.

The deficiency of the Gnostic heresies may lie in the opposite direction: the devaluation of material values. But at the end, again a created reality becomes the supreme value: the human person with his or her intellectual and moral capacities as the ultimate source of salvation. Here, the human person becomes the idol.

5. Summary

At the end of this course, some concluding remarks may not be out of place. Even if our letter did not have an authentic Pauline ring, the basic intention of Paul and his letters seems to have survived and transmitted in a revised form: the transmission of the Gospel.

Nowhere in 1 Tim appeared as basic intention of our author to establish a certain church order and a determinate ministry. In this regard we disagreed from Dibelius-Conzelmann and partly also J. Roloff on the Protestant side and N. Brox on the Catholic one. With M. Wolter, J. T. Reed, G. Lohfink we saw in the transmission of the παραθήκη the central issue of the letter. This perspective is confirmed by the very last verses of our letter (6,20f) which seem to sum up the letter as a whole: “O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the godless chatter ...”. Again and for a last time, faithfulness to the entrusted treasure of the Gospel seems to be the central issue of Paul’s exhortations. With this emphasis, our “Pastoral Paul” is not very far from Paul.

Contents

1) 1 Timothy – a Witness of Pauline tradition	1
2) Division and Literary Form of the letter	6
3) The text and the reception of 1 Timothy. 1 Tim 1,1-2 The prescript	10
4) 1 Tim 1,3-11 First warnings for Timothy concerning false teachings	15
5) 1 Tim 1,12-17 Paul’s Thanksgiving	19
6) 1 Tim 1,18-20 Continued instruction for Timothy	23
7) 1 Tim 2,1-7 Prayer for all humans persons and those in power	27
8) 1 Tim 2,8-15 Instruction for men and women	32
9) The role of women in early Christian communities	36
10) 1 Tim 3,1-7 Instruction about bishops	43
11) 1 Tim 3,8-13 Instruction about deacons	48
12) Women deacons in the New Testament	52
13) 1 Tim 3,14-16 Personal conclusion of instruction about ministry. A Christological Hymn.	56
14) 1 Tim 4,1-5 Announcement of false teachers	60
15) 1 Tim 4,6-10 Rules for Timothy in this regard	64
16) 1 Tim 4,11-16 Further rules for Timothy	69
17) 1 Tim 5,1-8 Instruction about behaviour towards men, married women, and widows	73
18) 1 Tim 5,9-16 Instruction about widows	77
19) 1 Tim 5,17-22.23-25 Instruction about presbyters. Personal instruction for Timothy	81
20) Ministry in the Pastoral Epistles	85
21) 1 Tim 6,1-2.3-5 Instruction about slaves. Instruction about heretics	89
22) 1 Tim 6,6-10 Godliness and self-sufficiency	93
23) 1 Tim 6,11-16 Final instructions for Timothy	97
24) 1 Tim 6,17-19.20-21 Instructions about the rich. Warning against the so-called “gnosis”. Final blessing. – Summary.	101