



3703792021

The Reward, Discipline, and
Installation of Church Leaders:
An Examination of
1 Timothy 5:17-22

Waldemar Kowalski

A thesis submitted to
the University of Gloucestershire
in accordance with the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Theology

October 2005

ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the practices of reward, discipline, and installation of leaders in the church as portrayed in 1 Timothy 5:17-22. The text itself is examined, finding that well-governing congregational leaders were to be honoured for their labour and provided with tangible support, that leaders were to be protected from unsubstantiated accusations, that a leader whose misconduct was established was to be disciplined publicly, and that care was to be taken to put only worthy persons into positions of leadership.

These practices are compared to those seen in the disputed and undisputed Pauline texts, the remainder of the New Testament, and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, establishing significant similarities as well as differences, some of these reflecting the development from itinerant to resident leaders in the churches. The practices of cognate groups such as synagogues, the Essenes, and voluntary associations, seen in Jewish and Græco-Roman literature and inscriptions of the contemporary period (ending with the Apostolic Fathers), are investigated for similarities and differences. The study finds that, although there are some similarities to Jewish practices, these groups substantially differed from the instructions of 1 Timothy 5:17-22 in their practices of reward, discipline and installation of leaders. In the Græco-Roman context, in particular, leaders in these cognate groups were essentially immune from accusations made by group members and any resulting discipline. Similarly, the idea that leaders were to receive financial support from those below them was foreign to normal practice in these groups and was deemed not 'honourable'.

The conclusion reached is that these congregational practices regarding leaders, while conceptually quite similar to principles given regarding itinerant Christian workers in the undisputed Paulines, are quite distinct from practices employed in the cultural milieu of the Pastoral Epistles. Some of these differences appear problematic, given the Pastoral Epistles' concerns about maintaining a good reputation among outsiders and not hindering the spread of the gospel.

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of the University of Gloucestershire and is original except where indicated by specific reference in the text. No part of the thesis has been submitted as part of any other academic award. The thesis has not been presented to any other education institution in the United Kingdom or overseas.

Any views expressed in the thesis are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University./

Signed

Date 25/10/2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	7
ABBREVIATIONS	8
CHAPTER ONE –	
INTRODUCTION TO THE REWARD, DISCIPLINE, AND INSTALLATION OF CHURCH LEADERS ACCORDING TO 1 TIMOTHY 5:17-22	13
1.1 – Debate about Authorship, Unity, and Dating of the Pastoral Epistles	13
1.2 – The Place of the Present Study.....	17
1.3 – The Procedures Employed in the Present Study	19
CHAPTER TWO –	
THE REWARD OF THE LEADER: 1 TIMOTHY 5:17-18.....	25
2.1 – Text, Variants, and Translation of 1 Timothy 5:17-18	25
2.2 – Exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:17-18	27
2.2.1 – Οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι	27
2.2.2 – διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν.....	33
2.2.3 – μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλία	37
2.2.4 – λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή.....	40
2.2.5 – βούν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις.....	41
2.2.6 – καί· ἄξιός ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ	42
2.2.7 – Leadership and Reward in the Remainder of the Pastoral Epistles.....	44
2.3 –Reward of Leaders in the Pauline Corpus.....	47
2.3.1 – Reward of Leaders in the Undisputed Pauline Texts	47
2.3.2 – Reward of Leaders in the Disputed Pauline Texts	57
2.4 – Reward of Leaders in the Other NT Writings.....	58
2.5 – Reward of Leaders in the Apostolic Fathers	61
2.5.1 – 1 Clement	61
2.5.2 – Ignatius	63
2.5.3 – <i>Didache</i>	64
2.5.4 – <i>Shepherd</i> of Hermas.....	68
2.5.5 – Further Apostolic Fathers.....	70
2.6 – Contemporary Approaches to Reward of Leaders	70
2.6.1 – Reward of Leaders in Jewish Literature: pre-70 C.E.	71
2.6.1.1 – The Jewish Scriptures	71
2.6.1.2 – Qumran Literature.....	78
2.6.2 – Reward of Leaders in Jewish Literature: post-70 C.E.	85
2.6.3 – Reward of Leaders in Græco-Roman Civic Life	88
2.6.4 – Reward of Leaders in the Inscriptions of Voluntary Associations/Collegia.....	98
2.7 –Reward of Leaders: Summary.....	102
CHAPTER THREE –	
THE DISCIPLINE OF THE LEADER: 1 TIMOTHY 5:19-21	108
3.1 – Text, Variants, and Translation of 1 Timothy 5:19-21	108
3.2 – Exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:19-21	111

3.2.1 – κατὰ πρεσβύτεροι κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου	111
3.2.2 – ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων	114
3.2.3 – τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγε	116
3.2.4 – ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσιν	120
3.2.5 – διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων	122
3.2.6 – ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξης χωρὶς προκρίματος	125
3.2.7 – μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν	126
3.2.8 – Disciplinary Practice in the Remainder of the Pastoral Epistles	127
3.3 – Discipline of Leaders in the Pauline Corpus	131
3.3.1 – Discipline of Leaders in the Undisputed Pauline Texts	132
3.3.2 – Discipline of Leaders in the Disputed Pauline Texts	142
3.4 – Discipline of Leaders in the Other NT Writings	144
3.5 – Discipline of Leaders in the Apostolic Fathers	148
3.5.1 – 1 Clement	149
3.5.2 – Ignatius	151
3.5.3 – <i>Didache</i>	154
3.5.4 – 2 Clement	157
3.5.5 – <i>Shepherd</i> of Hermas	157
3.5.6 – Polycarp	159
3.6 – Contemporary Approaches to Discipline of Leaders	159
3.6.1 – Discipline of Leaders in Jewish Literature: pre-70 C.E.	160
3.6.1.1 – The Jewish Scriptures	160
3.6.1.2 – Qumran Literature	165
3.6.2 – Discipline of Leaders in Jewish Literature: post-70 C.E.	171
3.6.3 – Discipline of Leaders in Græco-Roman Civil Life	174
3.6.4 – Discipline of Leaders in the Inscriptions of Voluntary Associations/Collegia	177
3.7 – Discipline of Leaders: Summary	194
 CHAPTER FOUR –	
THE INSTALLATION OF THE LEADER: 1 TIMOTHY 5:22	198
4.1 – Text, Variants, and Translation of 1 Timothy 5:22	198
4.2 – Exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:22	199
4.2.1 – χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθε	199
4.2.2 – μηδὲ κοινώνει ἀμαρτίαις ἄλλοτρίαις	204
4.2.3 – σεαυτὸν ἀγνὸν τήρει	207
4.2.4 – Installation of Leaders in the Remainder of the Pastoral Epistles	207
4.3 – Installation of Leaders in the Pauline Corpus	213
4.3.1 – Installation of Leaders in the Undisputed Pauline Texts	213
4.3.2 – Installation of Leaders in the Disputed Pauline Texts	217
4.4 – Installation of Leaders in the Other NT Writings	217
4.5 – Installation of Leaders in the Apostolic Fathers	224
4.5.1 – Ignatius	224
4.5.2 – <i>Didache</i>	225
4.5.3 – <i>Shepherd</i> of Hermas	226
4.6 – Contemporary Approaches to Installation of Leaders	227
4.6.1 – Installation of Leaders in Jewish Literature: pre-70 C.E.	227
4.6.1.1 – The Jewish Scriptures	228
4.6.1.2 – Qumran Literature	238
4.6.2 – Installation of Leaders in Jewish Literature: post-70 C.E.	239
4.6.3 – Installation of Leaders in Græco-Roman Civil Life	248

4.6.4 – Installation of Leaders in the Inscriptions of Voluntary Associations/Collegia.....	251
4.7 – Installation of Leaders: Summary	252
CHAPTER FIVE –	
CONCLUSION	258
5.1 – The Reward, Discipline, and Installation of Church Leaders	258
5.2 – The Place of these Practices in the Developing Christian Movement	259
5.3 – The Relation of these Practices to Quasi-Cognate Groups	262
BIBLIOGRAPHY	267

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to a number of people for their assistance. My supervisors, Professor Andrew Lincoln and Dr. David Horrell, have given regular guidance and encouragement. Their accessibility, meticulous comments, balanced scholarship, and insights have been invaluable. Their friendship and concern has been refreshing.

The support of my colleagues at Northwest University has been uplifting. I especially wish to thank the library staff, my fellows in the Biblical Literature faculty, Blaine Charette for his introduction to Professor Lincoln, and my good friend LeRoy Johnson. The provisions of time and financial resources made by the administration and board of Northwest have in large part made this endeavour possible.

Access to the resources of Tyndale House and its library has been crucial to locating much of the information contained in this work. Dr. Bruce Winter, the staff of Tyndale House, and all the scholars I encountered, both resident and ‘readers’, have been uniformly helpful and delightful.

Other friends and family have offered encouragement and support in the process, and I would like to name Richard Knoph and Terry and Debbie Jensen expressly. Conversations with Terry were always provocative and exciting. Will and Miriam Daher were excellent hosts and chauffeurs whilst in London. My parents and parents-in-law were models of caring concern and support. Thanks to you all! I regret that my father was not able to see the end of the process.

My greatest thanks, however, is reserved for my wife, Rosemarie. Her patience for my absences, her provision of a loving place to which to come home, her assistance in proofreading, her interest in me and my work, and the intellectual stimulation she provided were of inestimable value. Our children, Jeremy, Kirsten, Timothy, and Jonathan, have likewise been stalwart and loving supporters – I’m proud of you!

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are drawn primarily from *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999). Where no abbreviation was available in this source, it was taken from *IATG*² and this is indicated in the following table by *. In cases where this search also failed an abbreviation was assigned by the author after verifying that this was not already in use in either of these reference works and this is indicated by **.

AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACSt	American Classical Studies *
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AGRL	Aspects of Greek and Roman Life *
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
<i>ANF</i>	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–)
ANZSTR	Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion *
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
ARGU	Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums **
<i>ASP</i>	<i>American Studies in Papyrology</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
BAFCS	Book of Acts in its First Century Setting **
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000)
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BGd	Bible Guides **
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BiH	Biblische Handbibliothek
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BSC	Bible Student's Commentary
BSHJ	Baltimore Studies in the History of Judaism **
<i>BTalmSP</i>	<i>Babylonian Talmud</i> (Soncino Press) **
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CCGG</i>	<i>Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz</i> **

<i>Chm</i>	<i>Churchman</i>
CiD	Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes **
COL	Christian Origins Library **
<i>Comm</i>	<i>Communio</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CQSc	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls **
CSJH	Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism
CSJH.TLI	Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism: The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Explanation **
DMOA	Documenta et monumenta Orientis antiqui *
DSBS	Daily Study Bible Series **
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary **
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EPRO	Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain
<i>ERT</i>	<i>Evangelical Review of Theology</i> *
<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios biblicos</i>
<i>EuroJTh</i>	<i>European Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FCGRW	First-century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World **
FCNT	Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings **
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCP	Græcitas Christianorum primæva: Studia ad sermonem Græcum pertinentia *
<i>GNS</i>	<i>Good News Studies</i>
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament
HerBS	Herders Biblische Studien *
Hermeneia	Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible *
Hermeneia.FF	Hermeneia – Foundations and Facets **
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>IATG²</i>	Schwertner, Siegfried M. <i>Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete</i> . 2nd edn (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992)
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>ID</i>	<i>Inscriptions de Délos</i> .
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i> , H. Dessau
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>Interch</i>	<i>Interchange</i>
IVPNTC	InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series **
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JPHRL	Jewish People: History, Religion, Literature **
JPSTC	JPS Torah Commentary *

<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Kairos</i>	<i>Kairos (Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft und Theologie)</i>
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament *
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHD	Library of History and Doctrine *
<i>LTP</i>	<i>Laval Théologique et Philosophique</i>
MAPS	Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society **
MFC	Message of the Fathers of the Church *
MishAS	ArtScroll Mishnah Series **
<i>MishJP</i>	<i>Mishnayoth: Pointed Hebrew Text, English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Supplement, Appendix, Indexes, Addenda, Corrigenda (Judaica Press) **</i>
MTB	Münchener theologische Beiträge **
NA ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . E. Nestle et al. 27th corr. edn (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001)
NAC	New American Commentary
NBZJ	Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert **
NCB	New Century Bible Commentary
NCB.NT	New Clarendon Bible (New Testament)
<i>NCE</i>	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i> . Edited by W. J. McDonald et al. 15 vols. New York, 1967
<i>NIB</i>	<i>New Interpreter's Bible</i>
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NIBCOT	New International Biblical Commentary: Old Testament Series **
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NPNF¹</i>	<i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 1</i>
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTCo	New Testament Commentary **
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus / Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTh	New Testament Theology **
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
NZSTh	Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie *
ÖBS	Österreichische biblische Studien
OTL	Old Testament Library
OxBS	Oxford Bible Series **
PiNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
PTE	Pentateuch Translated and Explained **
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
QM	Qumranica mogilanensia **

<i>RE</i>	<i>Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RIG</i>	<i>Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d'Alexandrie impériale (Ier-IIIe s. apr. J.-C.).</i> Kayser, François (Cairo: Institut Francais D'archéologie Orientale, 1994) **
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
RoC	Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies
<i>RSJB</i>	<i>Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'Histoire Comparative des Institutions</i> *
SA	Studia anselmiana
SB	Sources bibliques
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLit	Studies in Biblical Literature **
SBLSBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCJud	Studies in Christianity and Judaism *
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature **
<i>SecCent</i>	<i>Second Century</i>
SECh	Studies in Early Christianity **
SGRR	Studies in Greek and Roman Religion *
<i>SIG</i>	<i>Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum.</i> ed. W. Dittenberger, 4 vols. Leipzig, 1915-1924. (<i>SIG</i> ³ = 3rd edn; <i>Syll</i> ³ in some sources)
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJTh.OP	Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers *
SKKNT	Stuttgarter kleiner Kommentar, Neues Testament
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek **
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World **
SP	Sacra pagina
SRHEC	Studies in the Religion and History of Early Christianity **
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StHu	Studies in the Humanities *
<i>StLi</i>	<i>Studia liturgica</i> *
StPatr	Studia patristica
StPB	Studia post-biblica
Str-B	Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck. <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.</i> 6 vols. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922-1961)
STRT	Studia Theologica Rheno-Traiectina *
<i>STDJ</i>	<i>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</i>
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative **
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.</i> ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964-1976
ThA	Theologische Arbeiten *
ThDiss	Theologischen Dissertationen **
<i>Theol.</i>	<i>Theology</i> *
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries

<i>TQ</i>	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
TRENT	Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UBS.HS	United Bible Societies Handbook Series **
UBS.HT	United Bible Societies Helps for Translators Series **
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WSB	Wuppertaler Studienbibel **
WSGNT	Word Studies in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader **
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE REWARD, DISCIPLINE, AND INSTALLATION OF CHURCH LEADERS ACCORDING TO 1 TIMOTHY 5:17-22

The history of the Church's use of and attention to 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, commonly known as the Pastoral Epistles, is varied. Sharply polarized opinions exist on overarching questions of authorship and intended audience, as well as on numerous specific issues of interpretation. These include submission to authority, gender issues, differentiation within the leadership, marital status of church leaders, appropriate care of widows and the elderly, and questions of familial and household relationships. One passage which has not received sustained treatment outside of commentaries in recent scholarship is 1 Tim 5:17-22. It deals with the significant issues of the reward, discipline, and installation of leaders of the young Christian community. These seem worthy of further study.

1.1 – Debate about Authorship, Unity, and Dating of the Pastoral Epistles

1 and 2 Timothy and Titus have come to be known collectively as the Pastoral Epistles. In contrast to the other letters of the New Testament canon either written by or ascribed to Paul and addressed to communities of believers, these letters appear to have been written to fellow workers, giving instruction for pastoral duties. In the eighteenth century the designation of Pastoral Letters or Epistles was first applied to them, and this has since become the predominant way of referring to this body of writing.¹

The attestation of the author is that these letters were written by Paul (1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; Titus 1:1).² With very little exception, the early church knew of these

¹ G. W. Knight, III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), p. 3.

² The author of the Pastoral Epistles will be referred to in this work as the author or the Pastor, and use of masculine pronouns will prevail, in view of 1 Tim 2:11-15. The Pastoral Epistles (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus) will be referred to as the PE. The addressee will be referred to as Timothy, in keeping with the most common practice, notwithstanding the position of those who would see Timothy as a literary construction. Cf. W. Stenger, 'Timotheus und Titus als literarische Gestalten', *Kairos*, 16 (1974), 252-67. All Greek text, as well as abbreviations for Greek mss., will be taken

writings and regarded them as authentically Pauline.³ Scholars differ on the earliest use of the PE. The earliest plausible use of 1 Timothy is most likely in Polycarp of Smyrna's *Letter to the Philippians*, dated between 110 and 135 C.E.⁴ There is considerable discussion regarding this use by Polycarp, but there is essentially no doubt that the PE were known and used later in the second century C.E. by Theophilus, Justin, and Irenaeus, as well as being included in the Muratorian List.⁵ Johnson adds Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian to this list. These references are particularly of interest as both writers give reasons for the rejection of the PE by earlier figures such as Marcion.⁶ Beyond reasonable dispute, these writings were known and used by the early church from about 180 C.E. on.⁷

Starting in 1807 with Schleiermacher,⁸ more recent scholarship has expressed significant doubt regarding the authentic Pauline authorship of this group of letters. The current consensus view is that the PE are pseudepigrapha, written by an unknown author passing himself off as Paul. Issues raised include the difficulty of reconciling the events of the PE with those of the Acts account, differences in style, language, and theology, the difficulty of correlating the apparent opponents in the PE with those known in the undisputed Pauline works, and the problem that the ecclesiastical

from NA²⁷. English translations from the Greek text will be those of the author of this work, except for those otherwise identified. OT citations will be from the NRSV.

- ³ The exceptions include Marcion, Basilides, and Tatian. Cf. Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 13-14, for a summary of the evidence for this.
- ⁴ L. T. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 35A (New York: Doubleday, 2001), pp. 20, 298-300, and I. H. Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), pp. 3-5, agree on this dating, while W. A. Richards, *Difference and Distance in Post-Pauline Christianity: An Epistolary Analysis of the Pastorals*, SBLit 44 (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2002), pp. 12-14, differs, seeing the letter as originating under Polycarp's 'watchful eye' but not from him directly. This would still place it early, during Polycarp's lifetime.
- ⁵ On the general issue of the use of the PE in the second century C.E. cf. C. Looks, *Das Anvertraute bewahren: Die Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe im 2. Jahrhundert*, MTB (Munich: H. Utz, 1999). A summary can also be found in Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 3-8. There is discussion among scholars on the dating of the Muratorian List, but it seems likely that the traditional view on its provenance is correct. In any case its elimination from the list leaves other solid witnesses.
- ⁶ Johnson, *Timothy*, pp. 21-22.
- ⁷ Johnson, *Timothy*, pp. 20-54, offers a history of the use of the PE through the centuries.
- ⁸ According to M. Harding, *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*, SBLit 3 (New York: Peter Lang, 1998), pp. 8, 55 n. 9, Schleiermacher held to the authenticity of Titus and 2 Timothy, and though he is often credited as the first to argue against the authenticity of 1 Timothy, he does indicate that J. E. C. Schmidt had raised doubts regarding this in 1804. Cf. Schleiermacher's *Über den ersten Brief Pauli an Timotheus* (Braunschweig: Gerhard Reuter, 1897), p. 11.

organization presupposed by the PE appears to be too advanced to have taken place in the lifetime of Paul.⁹

This consensus is not unanimous. A number of scholars contend for the genuineness of the PE. The story of the Christian movement as given in Acts clearly does not include Paul's death and the proponents of genuineness point out that equating silence with absence (of the Pauline events and opponents) is risky. Other issues which cause the authorship of the PE to be disputed are also countered by those holding to genuineness of Pauline authorship.¹⁰ It is clear that the authorship of the PE has not been resolved to the satisfaction of all. This issue of the authorship of the PE is not, however, within the purview of this present study.

The unity of the PE is also a matter of some dispute. Although there is a 'certain homogeneity throughout the small corpus',¹¹ others argue that these are in fact composite documents.¹² Within the large group of scholars who hold the consensus view of pseudonymous origin for the PE, the unity of the PE is quite strongly held.¹³ This study will take the approach that the PE originate with one writer who cannot be identified with certitude, and who consciously and deliberately writes in, and with the purpose of furthering, the Pauline tradition.¹⁴

Another significant issue being raised in recent scholarship involves not only the genuineness of the PE but the validity of pseudonymous writings in general and

⁹ A brief list of more recent scholars who hold that the PE are pseudonymous and may or may not contain fragments of genuine Pauline material include C. K. Barrett, N. Brox, M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, L. Donelson, F. D. Gealy, A. T. Hanson, P. N. Harrison, J. L. Houlden, I. H. Marshall, H. Merkel, U. Müller, J. Quinn, W. Richards, J. Roloff, A. Strobel, and S. G. Wilson.

¹⁰ Similarly, more recent scholars who hold that the PE were written by Paul himself or under his direction by an amanuensis or secretary include J. H. Bernard, E. E. Ellis, G. Fee, D. Guthrie, W. Hendriksen, D. E. Hiebert, G. Holtz, J. Jeremias, L. T. Johnson, J. N. D. Kelly, G. W. Knight, T. Lea, W. Lock, W. Metzger, C. F. D. Moule, W. Mounce, B. Reicke, O. Roller, C. Spicq, and P. Towner.

¹¹ J. D. Quinn and W. C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*, ECC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 3-4.

¹² Cf. J. D. Miller, *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

¹³ Cf. J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*, EKKNT 15 (Zürich: Benziger, 1988), pp. 43-45. Several scholars take another tack and argue that 2 Timothy is distinctive and more likely to be authentic than are 1 Timothy and Titus. Cf. J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*, GNS 41 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), pp. 61, 130; M. Prior, *Paul the Letter-writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (JSOT Press, 1989), pp. 168-70.

¹⁴ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 1 n. 2.

their inclusion in the canon. Many holding to pseudonymity have suggested that it was done from the best of motives, and furthermore, was an accepted practice in the milieu of the early church.¹⁵ Some recent writers suggest the contrary: pseudepigrapha were not considered acceptable by the early church, and anyone setting out to write pseudonymously was doing so with deliberate intent to deceive and with every reason to conceal such deception.¹⁶ Verhoef (who considers the PE pseudonymous) as well as Ellis and Porter (who consider them genuine) discuss the implications of pseudonymous origin for the canonicity of the PE. However, as Verhoef indicates, ‘authenticity and canonicity are two separate concepts. Authenticity is a historical issue: canonicity is an ecclesiastical concern.’¹⁷

For the purposes of this work, too firm presuppositions regarding dating and authorship would be inappropriate. A significant component of the task at hand involves investigation of the relationship of the practices indicated in 1 Tim 5:17-22 to those seen, for instance, in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.¹⁸ Deciding beforehand on an early (Pauline) or later (pseudepigraphic) date would undermine the validity of the process.

¹⁵ N. Brox, *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*, SBS 79 (Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1975), pp. 49-67; A. T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles: Based on the Revised Standard Version*, NCB (London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1982), pp. 11, 23-28, 49; D. G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Early Christian Tradition*, WUNT 39 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1986), pp. 116-39, 160-61, 190-93; H. Merkel, *Die Pastoralbriefe: Übersetzt und erklärt*, 13th edn, NTD 9/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), pp. 9-10.

¹⁶ L. R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*, HUT 22 (Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986), who considers the PE pseudonymous, defends pseudepigraphy on motive (‘the good lie’: p. 20) while acknowledging that known forgeries were rejected (p. 55). Ellis, Knight, Lea, and Porter argue that pseudepigrapha were in no way countenanced and that ‘the noble lie is still a lie’ (Porter, p. 122). E. E. Ellis, ‘Paul and his Co-Workers’, *NTS*, 17 (1970-71), 437-52; Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*; T. D. Lea and H. P. Griffin, Jr., *1, 2 Timothy, Titus*, NAC 34 (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), pp. 38-39; S. E. Porter, ‘Pauline Authorship and the Pastoral Epistles: Implications for Canon’, *BBR*, 5 (1995), 105-123; E. Verhoef, ‘Pseudepigraphic Paulines in the New Testament’, (Unpublished Paper given at SBL International Conference, Cambridge: 2003). Cf. also Prior, *Paul the Letter-writer*, pp. 21-22.

¹⁷ Verhoef, ‘Pseudepigraphic Paulines’, (p. 10).

¹⁸ A. Lindemann, ‘Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers’, in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W. S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), pp. 25-45 (p. 25), points out that the PE ‘were considered as fully genuine as Romans or 1 and 2 Corinthians’ by the so-called Apostolic Fathers and that ‘the Paul of Acts was naturally taken to be the “real” Paul’.

1.2 – The Place of the Present Study

A significant amount of the research on the PE deals with the issues of authenticity and of church order. The scholar's presuppositions regarding the state of the Christian community at the time of writing connect these issues to a considerable degree. Given the great amount of attention paid by scholars to 1 Timothy 3 on issues of church order and leadership (bishops and deacons),¹⁹ what might be added by a study of 1 Tim 5:17-22? This passage stresses behaviour more than ecclesiastical/legal order,²⁰ and the investigation of behaviour and practice may offer a good framework for a better understanding of the community and for a comparative analysis with the surrounding culture. The Pastor stated that one of the reasons, and maybe the major motive, for writing this epistle was 'in order that you might know how people should behave in the household of God' (1 Tim 3:15).²¹ 1 Tim 5:17-22 implies a structure that is to be imposed on the Pauline community in which the recipient of the letter appears to have a leading role. The specific areas of practice listed in this passage, encompassing the reward/remuneration of leaders, the handling of accusations against and discipline of leaders, and the installing of leaders, are highly significant for structuring and constituting any community. Such practices, when regulated within a group, become known as rites, and 'become an end in themselves through the strict

¹⁹ Studies attempting to identify the origins and function of the *πρεσβύτερος* and the *ἐπίσκοπος* comprise a good deal of this scholarly output. Such matters are not the primary concern of this study, which focuses on specific practices related to community leaders. Contributors to the discussion on order include Burtchaell, Campbell, Eno, Fuller, Hainz, Haraguchi, Harvey, Holmberg, Jay, Lips, Merkle, Meier, Munro, Schwarz, Sullivan, and Ysebaert.

²⁰ J. M. Holmes, *Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, JSNTSup 196; SNTG 7 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), p. 100, talks about the entire letter as a behavioural rather than ecclesiastical/legal piece, pointing out that it lacks clear definitions of offices and fails to describe in detail the roles played by the office-holders. G. Holtz, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, THKNT 13 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965), p. 53, sees the focus as being liturgical-sacramental rather than legal church order. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM Press, 1983), p. 288, understands 1 Timothy as a set of instructions on how to behave rather than a clear delineation of offices and functions.

²¹ W. D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, WBC 46 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), p. 214, labels 1 Tim 3:14-16 'the heart of the Pastoral corpus'. P. Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, IVPNTC 14 (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994), p. 93, considers vv. 14 and 15 'the reason Paul wrote'. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 498, states that 'the theology of the church given in 3.15 is central to the instruction of the letter'. Cf. also Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 231; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 189; C. Spicq, *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 4th edn, 2 vols, 1 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969), p. 465.

observance of rules'.²² Rituals are thus 'consecrated behaviour' which models what is believed, reinforces the belief, and helps build group solidarity.²³ Rituals and practices typically are significant in defining and differentiating one group from another. A significant portion of the Torah was dedicated to framing the boundaries of proper activity. Much of what is known about groups contemporary to the early Christian communities indicates that they were concerned with similar boundary-setting. Studying these rituals and practices as given in the PE and contemporaneous literature will assist in defining and differentiating these communities.

An area of recent growth in Pauline studies explores the social setting of the Pauline communities.²⁴ A number of attempts have been made to find genealogical or analogical connection between the Pauline churches and the synagogues, mystery religions, philosophical schools, and the Græco-Roman voluntary associations that were a part of the cultural milieu of the nascent Christian movement.²⁵ There is considerable variety in and dispute about the methodologies employed as well as the interpreted results.²⁶ No one specific cognate group, whether the synagogues, mystery religions, philosophical schools, or the Græco-Roman voluntary associations, has yet proved convincing as the dominant source for the concepts, structures, or practice of the Pauline communities.²⁷ Although this research has looked at analogous

²² G. Theissen, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM, 1999), p. 121.

²³ M. Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*, SNTSMS 60 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 62-65.

²⁴ Scholars in this area include Ascough, Burtchaell, Campbell, Downing, Engberg-Pedersen, Horrell, Judge, Kee, Kloppenborg, MacDonald, Malherbe, Meeks, Osiek, Smith, Theissen, and Thiessen.

²⁵ J. T. Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); R. A. Campbell, *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994); MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*; T. Seland, 'Philo and the Clubs and Associations of Alexandria', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 110-27.

²⁶ Works which attempt to bring order to the discussion include R. S. Ascough, *What Are They Saying About the Formation of Pauline Churches?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998); M. Harding, *What Are They Saying About the Pastoral Epistles?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2001); G. Lüdemann, *Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals*, trans. J. Bowden (London: T & T Clark, 2003); C. Osiek, *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* rev. edn (New York: Paulist Press, 1992).

²⁷ Ascough, *Pauline Churches*, p. 95.

characteristics between Pauline churches and various cognate groups, it has not specifically done so in the areas of behaviour outlined in 1 Tim 5:17-22: the reward, the discipline, and the installation of leaders. This study will pay attention to these practices. Where a clear organic connection between Christian concepts, structures, or practice and the surrounding cultural milieu can be determined, this will be done. In general the intent is to show analogy rather than genealogy.

This pericope, long overshadowed by investigation of the Household Code and church order passages in the PE, deserves this extended treatment. Without minimizing the importance of the other high-profile passages in the PE, issues related to a community's installing, rewarding, and disciplining of its leaders have been of continuing significance to the Church from the time of the crafting of the *Didache* to the scandals and issues of various denominations today. The objective of this study, however, is not to develop rules and regulations from the instructions of the author for today's communities of believers, although an improved understanding of the situation and its solutions in the early Christian community might be suggestive for dealing with analogous issues today. Rather, various methods will be used to clarify how 1 Tim 5:17-22 is to be understood within its context in the PE, as reflecting a developing segment of practice in the early Christian communities, and in relation to its surrounding cultural milieu.

1.3 – The Procedures Employed in the Present Study

The study will begin with a detailed exegesis of 1 Tim 5:17-22. Some scholars would argue that 1 Tim 5:17-25 forms a coherent passage, choosing to include vv. 23-25,²⁸ while others view this latter passage as a separate section.²⁹ Indeed, as Roloff

²⁸ Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 608. Cf. also J. P. Meier, 'Presbyters in the Pastoral Epistles', *CBQ*, 35 (1973), 323-45, p. 336; R. Van Neste, *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*, *JSNTSup*, 280 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), pp. 60-66. Like Meier, Van Neste argues for the literary unity of vv. 17-25, citing a chiasmic arrangement (pp. 65-66) and 'other smaller linking devices' (p. 66). However, while there may be literary unity to vv. 17-25, only vv. 17-22 comprise instructions given by the Pastor regarding the treatment of leaders.

points out, vv. 17-25 comprise four instructions, but the fourth one shifts from the preceding exhortations about leaders to a more personal exhortation (v. 23).³⁰ There follows a general observation regarding sins and good deeds (vv. 24-25), but this is not in the form of an instruction. The concern in this dissertation is to understand instructions given by the author to guide his reader(s) in issues related to leadership, focusing on the leaders rather than the general health of the recipient. For this reason vv. 23-25 will be excluded.

Key issues in the passage that require investigation are the meaning of the διπλή τιμή ('double honour') of v. 17, what constitutes the proper testimony of a μάρτυς ('witness') in v. 19, the nature of the discipline of congregational leaders, and the significance of the instructions given regarding the laying on of hands in v. 22. In order to place the passage within its context in the emerging Christian movement, the study will look at structures and practices related to the reward, discipline, and installation of leaders in the undisputed and disputed Pauline letters, the other NT writings, as well as the Christian literature of the second century (the Apostolic Fathers).³¹ Existing research will be used to develop a nuanced comparative approach of the relationship of these practices in the developing Pauline communities to those reflected in other NT writings and to practices with similar functions in organizations in the surrounding culture.

The study will reinvestigate the primary literature relevant for this comparison. In view of the difficulty of determining the precise practices of some Jewish and Hellenistic groups, the present work will use the extant literature of various groups within Græco-Roman/Mediterranean society and attempt from this body of writing to

²⁹ L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe: Kommentar zum zweiten Timotheusbrief*, HTKNT 11/2 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1995), pp. 260-61.

³⁰ Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 305.

³¹ The framework employed will be that of current scholarly consensus. Study of the undisputed Paulines (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon) will be followed by an investigation of Colossians and Ephesians together with 2 Thessalonians, ending with the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers and other Christian writings of the period before circa 150 C.E. Cf. MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, pp. 2-4; J. T. South, *Disciplinary Practices in Pauline Texts* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical, 1992).

determine rituals and practices related to reward, discipline, and installation of community leaders.³² Extensive reading in the available translated materials will be followed by searches of the available databases of the relevant literature, both Græco-Roman and Jewish, searching for words which suggest similarity or difference of practice. The passages containing such terms are to be investigated further to establish whether the words are being used in a context of reward, discipline, and installation of community leaders.

Some specific issues arise in interpreting the primary literature of various of these groups. In the Jewish context, there is a good deal of dispute regarding the synagogues themselves. Whether the correct designation for all or most Jewish gathering places prior to 70 C.E. was προσευχή or συναγωγή is not crucial to the discussion of what these groups practised, unless it can be determined that these terms had radically different meaning in their original setting or designated discrete groups which employed significantly different practices.³³ A distinction will be made between Jewish literature prior to and following the events of 70 C.E.³⁴

The body of literature generally referred to as Qumran literature, Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts (QSM), or the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) also presents challenges for the scholar. Besides the uncertainty regarding the identification of the community or

³² D. A. DeSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), pp. 19-20 n. 4, argues that Judaism is significantly affected by surrounding cultures in the period immediately prior to the writing of the Christian Scriptures, so that the culture of the New Testament documents should be considered Mediterranean rather than Semitic as such. Whether this can be stated dogmatically or still needs qualification, the point is well taken that the surrounding cultures formed a rich brew with mutual infusion, affecting each other to varying degrees. L. I. Levine, 'Synagogue Leadership: The Case of the Archisynagogue', in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 93-111 (pp. 3-4), differs somewhat and argues for continuing distinctiveness and recognizability as well as similarities between Jewish groups and their non-Jewish neighbours. Accordingly, aspects which can clearly be considered common to the majority of these cultures will be referred to simply as Mediterranean, taken to refer to the Greek, Roman, and Jewish backgrounds which are generally suggested as having influenced Paul and the early Christian communities, including here the Pauline communities of the PE.

³³ For a discussion on the difficulties of determining the history and existence of synagogues before 70 C.E., cf. R. Riesner, 'Synagogues in Jerusalem', in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. R. Bauckham, BAFCS 4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), pp. 179-211.

³⁴ D. Instone-Brewer, *Prayer and Agriculture*, TRENT 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), pp. 1-2, argues for the importance of 70 C.E. for both Jewish and Christian sources and sets out in his work to analyze the rabbinic materials to see which of these faithfully reflect ideas and practices prior to 70 C.E.

communities responsible for either producing or collecting the Qumran literature,³⁵ there are differences within the literature itself. While the Damascus Document (also called CD or Zadokite Fragments), the Manual of Discipline (or Community Rule, including 1QS and 4Q255-64), the Temple Scroll (11QT), and works of the Torah (4QMMT) are generally classified as ‘legal’ or ‘sectarian texts’ of the Qumran community,³⁶ there are nuances of development within these.³⁷ These ‘sectarian texts’ will be the main source for insight into practices related to reward, discipline, and installation of leaders as reflected in the Qumran literature, and nuances between the documents will be highlighted in the presented analysis.

Rabbinic literature offers its own challenges. It is not at all certain how trustworthy this material from ca. 200-600 C.E. is in its statements regarding earlier events, such as those contemporaneous with the Pauline communities.³⁸ Neusner

³⁵ G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 4th, rev. and extended edn (London: Penguin, 2004), pp. 46-48, argues strongly for identification of the Qumran community with the Essenes and considers this ‘the likeliest of all proposed solutions’ (p. 48). Cf. also J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), pp. 39-43.

³⁶ J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), pp. 55-60. Cf. also F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd edn (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), p. 44; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 7-8; L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*, 1st edn (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), p. 90.

³⁷ P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline, STDJ*, 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), pp. 15-16, argues for a close connection between 1QS and CD, with differences between them due to the documents being written at different stages of the community’s development. J. H. Charlesworth and L. Novakovic, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), p. 65, argue for a nuance not of development but rather of a similar but not identical community, stating that the CD ‘seems to describe the life of non-Qumran Essenes and explains the customs and rules of Essenes who married’. However, cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 90, who puts the CD firmly in the sectarian camp, commenting on the extensive quoting and excerpting from it in the other sectarian texts. Schiffman concludes that ‘it indeed was a document central to the thought of the Qumran sect’ (p. 90). The Temple Scroll (11QT) also seems to belong in the ‘nuanced sectarian’ category. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 257-58, considers it to originate with a ‘related group either contemporary with or earlier than the Qumran sect (p. 258). Charlesworth and Novakovic, *Pesharim*, p. 56, put 11QT into an ‘earlier parent group of the Essenes’. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, p. 36, calls it ‘non-sectarian’ but acknowledges that ‘the Qumran community apparently considered it authoritative’. Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*, 1st edn (New York: Random House, 1985), p. 229, is more emphatic, arguing that 11QT ‘was in fact the basic “Torah” of the Essenes. Whether these documents originated in the Qumran community or predate it, they clearly were considered authoritative and were extensively used within that community.

³⁸ H. Anderson, ‘Jesus: Aspects of the Question of His Authority’, in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*, ed. J. Neusner et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 290-310 (p. 299), observes that ‘The rabbinic sources on which we have largely to depend for knowledge of the pre-70 C.E. scribes and Pharisees consistently

observes, 'The facticity of the documents is beyond question; the reliability of attributions is not.'³⁹ Thus it becomes necessary to analyze the accounts to see if a desire to set a precedent for a later practice has been introduced into a citation of supposedly earlier material, contaminating it.⁴⁰ An attempt will be made to identify the reliable materials.

In regard to the laws of Rome as recorded in the major extant documents (primarily the *Codex justinianus*, the *Codex theodosianus*, and Justinian's *Digestum*) it is to be expected that these laws will be more likely to be applicable to the wealthy empowered oligarchs than to the masses.⁴¹ These materials, many of which reflect second and third century C.E. jurisprudence, were assembled significantly later and must be viewed as subject to interpolation and revision.⁴² Additionally, proscriptive legislation typically seeks to preserve that which is a part of normal practice without usually identifying which element(s) of normal practice are being preserved and why. The survey of what can be determined regarding 'normal' Mediterranean (Græco-Roman) civil life in relationship to reward, discipline, and installation procedures for community leaders will need to penetrate these barriers and present a realistic reconstruction of practices in the early Christian era.

Rather than seeking a single analogical group or association, the study will compare individually the various elements reflected in the 1 Timothy 5 passage with the known practices of selected cognate or quasi-cognate groups.⁴³ A method proposed

project back into the earlier period the well-established institutions of their own day. Consequently, it is notoriously difficult to determine scribal-Pharisaic attitudes, teaching and training methods, and practices and procedures in the time of Jesus and the early Christian movement.'

³⁹ Cf. J. Neusner, *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*, 1st edn, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1994), pp. 14-17. Citation from p. 15.

⁴⁰ Cf. A. A. Ehrhardt, *The Framework of the New Testament Stories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964), p. 135.

⁴¹ J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life (London: Thames & Hudson, 1967), p. 10.

⁴² Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, pp. 13-16.

⁴³ While insight regarding practices related to reward, discipline, and installation of leaders can be found in the literature of the voluntary associations, these documents and inscriptions are not truly cognate, as they either significantly predate (the Code of the Labyadai c. third century B.C.E., the inscription of the Poseidoniastai 153/4 B.C.E., and the Zeus inscription late second/early first century B.C.E.) or almost certainly are later than the PE (the Lanuvium burial association c. 136 C.E., the

by Smith suggests a promising approach. This method does not simply compare the Pauline communities as a whole to various analogous organizations, but would study the individual practices and data from the aspect of ‘y is more similar to z rather than x in respect to...’⁴⁴ Individual elements of that code of practice and behaviour will be examined, re-evaluating existing research for valid cognates reflected in the literature of the groups in existence at the time of the Pauline communities and those who carried on their traditions. This allows a more nuanced approach to 1 Tim 5:17-22 and permits the scholar to see elements of practice in their correct place in a diverse and complex milieu, rather than seeking to find comparisons and distinctions in just one dominant cognate group.

association for Asclepius and Hygieia c. 153 C.E., and the inscription of the Iobacchoi c. 178 C.E.). Even though these groups can only be considered quasi-cognate, the presence or absence of related practices is nonetheless useful information.

⁴⁴ J. Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, 14)*, CSJH (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), p. 51.

CHAPTER TWO

THE REWARD OF THE LEADER: 1 TIMOTHY 5:17-18

In 1 Tim 5:17-18 the Pastor seems to change topics abruptly from the care of widows and takes up the issue of reward for community leaders who have served well. Who are these leaders? How is it determined that they have served well? What sort of reward is in view? Is there a basis other than largesse or justice which demands such a reward?

2.1 – Text, Variants, and Translation of 1 Timothy 5:17-18

- ¹⁷ Οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν, μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ.
¹⁸ λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· βούν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις, καί· ἄξιός ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.⁴⁵

The passage may be translated as follows:

The elders who rule well are to be considered worthy of double honour, especially those who labour at preaching and teaching.

For the Scripture says, ‘Do not muzzle the threshing ox’, and ‘The worker deserves his wages’.

1 Tim 5:17 has one textual variant of moderate significance in the manuscripts.⁴⁶ While most of the manuscripts read διδασκαλία, P omits the καί and reads διδασκαλίας. The net effect is to change the meaning from ‘word and teaching’ to ‘word of teaching’, bringing a somewhat neater and therefore suspect construction.⁴⁷ Two other manuscripts offer replacements for διδασκαλία: I substitutes ἀλήθεια, which is ‘probably an interpretative variant’, and 1739 substitutes διδαχή, which could be

⁴⁵ Text according to NA²⁷.

⁴⁶ J. K. Elliott, *The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1968), pp. 81, 208, and 214, also lists the following minor or poorly attested variations: the addition of δέ after οἱ, found in 69, was ‘added to remove the asyndeton’ (pp. 81, 214); the omission of ἐν, as found in F, G, and syr^h, is due to the tendency of scribes ‘to reduce the incidence of prepositions governing the dative case’ (p. 81); and the omission of καί in P ‘is due to the changed construction in this ms.’ (p. 208).

⁴⁷ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 81.

virtually synonymous here, and therefore the reading offered by the overwhelming majority of the manuscripts seems correct.⁴⁸

There are several variant readings of some significance for 1 Tim 5:18.⁴⁹ A number of manuscripts (A, C, I, P, 048, 33, 81, 104, 365, 1175, (lat), Or Ambst, Pel., among others) change the order from βούν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις to οὐ φιμώσεις βούν ἀλοῶντα, thus agreeing with the LXX in its translation of Deut 25:4, while the reading offered here is supported by P⁴⁶, κ, A, B², C, D¹, Ψ, TR, Or Epiph, and others.⁵⁰ D* and 1739 substitute κλημώσεις for φιμώσεις but otherwise keep the order as given by NA²⁷, and this reading is preferred by Elliott.⁵¹ It is probable that D partially assimilated 1 Tim 5:18 to 1 Cor 9:9, which uses κλημώσεις but also changes the order (οὐ κλημώσεις βούν ἀλοῶντα). The reading chosen by the NA²⁷, which differs from the LXX (changed order with φιμώσεις) as well as 1 Cor 9:9 (changed order with κλημώσεις), is most likely correct.⁵²

The other variant reading is the substitution of τῆς τροφῆς for τοῦ μισθοῦ, as found in κ*, (it^{ar}), and Clement. This would put the saying in agreement with Matt 10:10 rather than Luke 10:7.⁵³ While both nouns are frequently used in the LXX as

⁴⁸ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 81, points out that within the PE both διδασκαλία and διδαχή can refer to the substance as well as the activity of teaching, and this ambiguity is present in 1 Tim 5:17.

⁴⁹ The following minor variants also exist: Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 43, 81, 82, 237, points out that γάρ is omitted by 226* and 1960, and claims that this variant is original, the conjunction added to remove asyndeton. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 609, disagrees, correctly pointing out that the manuscript evidence is too weak. Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 82, considers the omission of ὁ by 1319 to be a careless mistake, as the citations in Luke 10:7 and Matt 10:10 include the ὁ. A γάρ is added after ἄξιος by F, G, Pacian, and it^{fg}, which Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 82, suggests may be an ‘assimilation to the quotation in the gospels, or because it often occurs with ἄξιος in the N. T. It is incorrect here as καί joins two quotations’.

⁵⁰ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 278, states that ‘the citation from LXX Deut 25:4 has generated a number of textual variants. Some scribes (e.g., Alexandrinus and Ephraemi) were concerned to bring the citation into line with the Septuagint, and thus altered the word order’.

⁵¹ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 82.

⁵² Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 609. Two other minor variants are given by Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 82: the substitution of μή for οὐ by 440, 203, 506, and 823, and the addition of μή after οὐ by 69. The weak manuscript evidence and general rarity of double negatives suggests the reading in the text is correct.

⁵³ Most texts of 1 Tim 5:18 follow Luke 10:7 with τοῦ μισθοῦ, although as Metzger notes, ‘The original hand of codex Sinaiticus reads τῆς τροφῆς, no doubt from having recollected Mt. 10.10.’ B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*, 2nd edn (London: United Bible Societies, 1994), p. 575. Cf. T. Haraguchi, ‘Das Unterhaltsrecht des frühchristlichen Verkündigers: Eine Untersuchung zur Bezeichnung ἐργάτης im Neuen Testament’, *ZNW*, 84

well as the NT, the weak manuscript evidence and the greater overall affinity between the PE and Luke's gospel rather than with that of Matthew suggest that the reading chosen in the text is correct.⁵⁴

2.2 – Exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:17-18

The theme of community care and responsibility is continued. 1 Tim 5:3-16 deals with widows, especially those without families to care for them and who were therefore in need of congregational support. Attention shifts now to individuals with a leading role in the congregation and addresses appropriate recognition of their work, using the same term for honour and support as that used for the widows, namely τιμή.

2.2.1 – Οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι

The author's attention shifts to individuals who lead or govern the congregation. The word used here is πρεσβύτεροι, typically rendered 'elders'. This term is used in a non-technical sense, that of 'older man', in 1 Tim 5:1 and Titus 2:2.⁵⁵ The same root is used in the PE with an apparent technical sense (somehow connected with leadership) in 1 Tim 4:14, twice in this passage (vv. 17 and 19), and also in Titus 1:5. That connection is made explicit in this passage, in that the individuals being referred to have the attribute that they 'rule well'. Scholars are by no means united regarding the precise connection between the term/title (πρεσβύτερος) and the function (προΐστημι).

(1993), 178-95, p. 186, who considers the Lukan form closer to Q than the Matthean form (pp. 186, 189).

⁵⁴ Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 82-83; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 609; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 575; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 303. In keeping with normal practice, and in the absence of absolute proof of authorship, 'Matthew' will be understood to refer to whoever wrote the work now identified as 'The Gospel According to Matthew'. The same will prevail for the other NT gospel accounts.

⁵⁵ C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles in the New English Bible*, NCB.NT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 78; J. L. Houlden, *The Pastoral Epistles: I and II Timothy, Titus* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976), p. 92; Oberlinner, 2. *Timotheusbrief*, p. 248. A cognate term, referring to 'older woman', is used in 1 Tim 5:2 and Titus 2:3.

Were all elders expected to govern, or only some? In this case, should πρεσβύτερος be understood in terms of position, of function, or of office?⁵⁶

Bratcher suggests that ‘it may be possible to translate the term by the phrase “the (older) men in charge of the congregation”’.⁵⁷ Jeremias is more decisive, opining that this word designates age rather than office.⁵⁸ This is coupled with the ‘double honour’ reference to argue that this passage is a continuation of the regulations for support of the aged and widows, and calls for twice as much payment to the old men who preach and teach as to the other old men and widows.⁵⁹ Houlden states that ‘no doubt the body of elders was made up of the senior members of the church’.⁶⁰ Houlden goes on to draw analogies between the roles, duties, and privileges of widows and elders in the church and those of the households of both pagan and Jewish circles.⁶¹

⁵⁶ Henceforth, ‘position’ will be used to refer to the inherent place held by the individual in the community, thus the age of the ‘elder’ qualifies him/her to be an elder in the sense used by the Pastor in 1 Tim 5:1. (Other involuntary determinants of position include gender, ethnicity, and status in terms of slave or free.) ‘Function’ will be used to refer to the role played by that individual in the community, thus the ‘preaching and teaching’ elder of 1 Tim 5:17 is distinguished from the elder who is simply old (1 Tim 5:1). ‘Office’ will be used to refer to the community-given status of the individual, typically with an accompanying title. ‘Office’ therefore is the recognition and codification by the community of an original function. Once a term (such as ‘overseer’ or ἐπίσκοπος) becomes used as a title, the tendency is to view all similar terms (such as ‘oversight’) as related to that title or office, blurring the distinction between function and office. At this point in the discussion, this definition of ‘presbyter’ is not intended to state that all positional (old) elders have specified functions, or that they are official (have a title of ‘presbyter’), nor is it intended to preclude that these are quite distinct groups, identified with one word but differentiated within their context. That point of clarification is to be reached in our discussion.

⁵⁷ R. G. Bratcher, *A Translator’s Guide to Paul’s Letters to Timothy and to Titus*, UBS.HT (London: United Bible Societies, 1983), p. 51.

⁵⁸ J. Jeremias and H. Strathmann, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus: Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 8th edn, NTD 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 36. Jeremias argues for this on the basis that this removes the awkwardness of a differentiated presbytery, in which some preach and teach and others do not, therefore not deserving the double honour.

⁵⁹ Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 36. cf. M. Karrer, ‘Das urchristliche Ältestenamnt’, *NovT*, 32 (1990), 152-88, p. 178. For a discussion of the differing systems of support of widows in Jewish and early Christian practice (Acts 6), cf. B. Capper, ‘The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods’, in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. R. Bauckham, BAFCS 4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), pp. 323-56 (pp. 350-51).

⁶⁰ Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 92, sees ‘a blurring of the distinction between grades in the Church hierarchy and age-groups or social groups in the congregation. In the former category we can clearly place the bishop and the deacons (ch. 3), and in the latter the widows and slaves... But *presbuteros* may belong to both.’

⁶¹ Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 78, argues that ‘the idea that household management is the starting-point and model for wider responsibilities is a common-place of Greek thought; for its classical exposition, see Aristotle’s *Politics*’. For discussion of and an argument against seeing these references in 1 Tim 5:3-16 as presupposing an ecclesiastical order of widows, cf. B. W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*, FCGRW (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), pp. 62-78, esp. p. 76.

Others see πρεσβύτερος as a reference to office, hence a title.⁶² Barrett, noting that Paul (in the undisputed Paulines) does not mention elders, sees elders with a recognized place in church order by the time of Clement (c. 96 C.E.) and finds the beginnings of this development in the New Testament. Rejecting a more elaborate structure with four categories of elders,⁶³ he holds that the present verse refers to older men who have a position of leadership.⁶⁴ Oberlinner generally agrees, arguing that this position has its origins in the synagogue but has by the time of the PE become a functional designation, although the issue of the age of the individual was still significant.⁶⁵ 1 Tim 4:14 uses πρεσβυτέριον, usually translated as ‘body’ or ‘council of elders’.⁶⁶ This refers to a bounded group, constructed of official presbyters with specific functions in the congregation.⁶⁷ Bornkamm considers it a ‘terminus technicus’ for holders of the position of congregation leader, distinguishing the regular usage in the PE from that of 1 Tim 5:1.⁶⁸

The relation and differences between the πρεσβύτερος and the ἐπίσκοπος are problematic.⁶⁹ The statement that the presbyters are a ‘gemeindeleitendes

⁶² ‘Clearly they occupy a leading role in the Church; at least some of them “preside”, and some of them preside well. Some but not all “labour at preaching and teaching.” They resemble the governing body of a synagogue. It is disputed whether the word *bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος) describes the same persons as presbyter (elder), but this seems to be clearly implied by Tit. 1:5 ff. The office of “leadership” (I Tim. 3:1; for the qualifications sought in leaders, or bishops, see 3:2-7; Tit. 1:7 ff.) is probably equivalent to that of presiding (I Tim. 5:17). It is, however, proper to see in this verse signs of that process by which some presbyters came to an eminence beyond that of their fellows.’ Barrett, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 32.

⁶³ Elders; elders who preside; elders who preside well; and elders who preach and teach.

⁶⁴ Barrett, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 78-79.

⁶⁵ Oberlinner, *2. Timotheusbrief*, p. 248, is emphatic in seeing an origin for πρεσβύτερος in Judaism, ‘aufgrund der Herkunft aus dem Bereich der Presbyterialverfassung der jüdischen Synagogengemeinde’. Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 95, disagrees. He considers the evidence for such a derivation from the synagogue as ‘surprisingly sparse’ and sees it as having a wider community usage in Palestine at the time of Christ. He also sees little connection to the use of the term in Egypt for councils of various sorts, and offers no other source for the use of ‘presbyter’ as a title.

⁶⁶ BDAG renders this ‘council of elders’, used in Luke 22:66 and Acts 22:5 of the Sanhedrin, and in 1 Tim 4:14 ‘a council in connection with administration of Christian congregations, including all the πρεσβύτεροι’ (p. 861).

⁶⁷ Oberlinner, *2. Timotheusbrief*, p. 248.

⁶⁸ G. Bornkamm, ‘πρέσβυς, πρεσβύτερος, πρεσβύτης, συμπρεσβύτερος, πρεσβυτέριον, πρεσβεύω’, trans. G. W. Bromiley, in *TDNT*, ed. G. Kittel, G. Friedrich, and G. W. Bromiley, 10 vols (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1968), 6, pp. 651-83 (p. 666).

⁶⁹ Cf. N. Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe: Übersetzt und erklärt*, 4th edn, RNT 7/2 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969), pp. 149-51. and Bornkamm, ‘πρέσβυς’ (pp. 666-68).

Kollegium...aus dem auch einige in der Verkündigung tätig sind'⁷⁰ blurs the boundary between the tasks of πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος.⁷¹ Bornkamm therefore takes the position that these two offices are identical in the PE.⁷² Oberlinner points out that the two differing ecclesial leadership structures—the ἐπίσκοπος assisted by deacons, and the collective πρεσβυτέριον—may have had identical functions and tasks, but originated in differing mission fields. The PE represent the blending of the two congregational forms.⁷³ According to Oberlinner, the Pastor apparently desires to promulgate a structure led by the ἐπίσκοπος with the assistance of the deacons (1 Tim 3:1-7, cf. 8-13).⁷⁴ This necessitates an integration of the πρεσβύτερος into this structure. Oberlinner argues that this integration was facilitated by the laying on of hands by the πρεσβυτέριον in 1 Tim 4:14, with the resulting impartation of a χάρισμα to the ἐπίσκοπος.⁷⁵ Brox similarly claims that all bishops were also presbyters, but not all presbyters were bishops,⁷⁶ which allows the general rule to be deduced that the bishop was one of the presbyters who was assigned to the role of congregational leader.⁷⁷ Oberlinner argues (with some hedging) that these references are to an individual who governs, preaches, and teaches. Thus, v. 17 refers to the ἐπίσκοπος, although this presents difficulties in that this passage refers to a group rather than an individual.⁷⁸

⁷⁰ So H. von Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt: Zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralenbriefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), p. 111.

⁷¹ Oberlinner, 2. *Timotheusbrief*, p. 249.

⁷² Bornkamm, 'πρέσβυς' (p. 667), TDNT 6, pp. 651-83.

⁷³ Oberlinner, 2. *Timotheusbrief*, p. 249. Hanson suggests that the πρεσβύτερος developed within the framework of Judaism while the ἐπίσκοπος had an extensive secular Greek usage. A. T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Letters: Commentary on the First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 40; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 31-38, esp. p. 32.

⁷⁴ Oberlinner, 2. *Timotheusbrief*, p. 249. Roloff, 1. *Timotheus*, p. 175, states, 'so ist zunächst eindeutig, daß der Verf. die Episkopen/Diakonen-Ordnung favorisiert'.

⁷⁵ L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe: Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief*, Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; 11/2 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994), pp. 249-50. Karrer, 'Ältestenamt', p. 177, sees a connection with the 'ordination' of Joshua by Moses (Deut 34:9; Num 27:15-23), with the prophetic utterance of 1 Tim 4:14 being similar to the proclamation in Num 11:25. In Karrer's opinion, this suggests an essentially charismatic nature of the office.

⁷⁶ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 151.

⁷⁷ Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 250.

⁷⁸ Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 250. 'In der Funktionsbeschreibung ist somit zusammen mit der Tätigkeit der Gemeindeverwaltung auch die Verkündigung als eine wesentliche Aufgabe der

Campbell presents yet another view, and suggests that the situation in the PE is a more developed form of the structure found in the churches reflected by the undisputed Pauline writings.⁷⁹ The emergence of the Pauline churches within the context of households would tend to encourage the gathering of power under a single leader, the *μονεπίσκοπος*, cognate to the head of the household. The increasing complexity of the church situation and even Paul's fatherly approach to 'his' churches would make such a development a natural progression rather than a foreign intrusion. Campbell believes that '*...the Pastoral Epistles are written, not to effect an amalgamation of overseers and elders, but to legitimate the authority of the new overseer*'.⁸⁰ There is, however, a lack of evidence to support the identification of the house-church leader as *ἐπίσκοπος*, so that this middle stage has no verifiable basis.

This confusion over the difference between *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* cannot be resolved unequivocally in this passage, nor even in the PE as a whole. 1 Tim 5:17-22 refers explicitly to *πρεσβυτέρου* who lead the congregation, minister in the word, are worthy of increased respect and perhaps financial support, are liable to discipline before the entire congregation, and whose installation involves a ritual practice. It appears that the Pastor did not care to delineate the situation to any greater extent: although issues of leadership are addressed, it is function and procedure which are in focus, rather than either the institution or the confirmation of specific structures and offices.⁸¹ It appears very likely that the view held with variants by Kelly, Fee,

Presbyter zu benennen, wobei letztere vom Verfasser her gesehen *möglicherweise stärker auf die Person des Episkopos hin ausgerichtet werden sollte*' (emphasis added). But see also the comments on p. 251, where he argues that 'es ist dabei nicht zu denken an eine strenge Aufgabenteilung, etwa zwischen Verwaltungsaufgaben und Verkündigung; beides gehört vielmehr zum Aufgabenbereich der Presbyter'.

⁷⁹ Campbell, *Elders*, pp. 194-204.

⁸⁰ Campbell, *Elders*, p. 196. Emphasis in the original.

⁸¹ R. Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum im Neuen Testament? Eine Studie zu Ethik, Amt und Recht in den Pastoralbriefen*, ÖBS, 4 (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), pp. 124-26.

Spicq, Dibelius and Conzelmann, and Mounce, that ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος are to be understood interchangeably, is the best one.⁸²

The word translated ‘rule’ is προεστῶτες, used in the PE for the governing or supervising of a household (1 Tim 3:4-5, 12), and with the quite different meaning of maintaining, engaging in, or devoting oneself to good works in Titus 3:8, 14. The use of the perfect tense here probably indicates a pattern of good governance rather than a simple act of having governed well once.⁸³ J. P Meier⁸⁴ and A. Sand⁸⁵ hold that προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι here refers to those who lead in the local congregation, as this term is used by Paul with this sense in other passages.⁸⁶ Justin uses this verb to refer to the individual who presides at the Eucharist.⁸⁷ Barrett holds that the activity of leader ‘would probably consist in general direction of the Church’s affairs, the administration of discipline, pastoral oversight, and presidency at meetings and services, including presumably the Eucharist, though this is not mentioned’.⁸⁸

In other passages, such as Rom 16:1-2, the term seems to refer to a benefactor who has rendered aid to the church. As Green observes, in the society of that time leadership and assistance ‘were not neatly separated ideas. Those who exercised

⁸² Cf. also M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, trans. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), pp. 54-57; G. D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, rev. edn, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), p. 84; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 152-55, 306-7; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, pp. 450-55. A standard objection is that ἐπίσκοπος is in the singular in the PE, while πρεσβύτερος is typically in the plural. This is usually explained by making one or the other term generic. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 128, sees ‘elders’ as the comprehensive term while J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles; I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 13, sees the two as identical. Cf. especially the recent work by B. L. Merkle, *The Elder and Overseer: One Office in the Early Church*, SBLit 57 (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003), in support of the view that no real distinction can be made between ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος at the time of the PE.

⁸³ Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 124 n.

⁸⁴ Meier, ‘Presbyteros’, p. 327.

⁸⁵ A. Sand, ‘Anfänge einer Koordinierung verschiedener Gemeindeordnungen’, in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), pp. 215-37 (p. 225).

⁸⁶ 1 Thess 5:12; Rom 12:8. In Romans it is one of the *charisms* given to the congregation.

⁸⁷ 1 Apol. 65:3, 5; 67:5. The phrase τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν, used by Justin in 65:3, is translated ‘President of the brethren’ in several English versions of Justin Martyr’s *Apologia I*, but as noted in *ANF*, ‘this expression may quite legitimately be translated, “to that one of the brethren who was presiding”’. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, and A. C. Coxe, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, American reprint of the Edinburgh edn, ANF 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), p. 185 n. 4. Schwarz opines that it is unclear whether leading in the Eucharist is meant here. ‘Es ist eher an die Verkündigung im Wortgottesdienst zu denken’. Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum*, p. 126 n. 14. cf. Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, p. 149.

⁸⁸ Barrett, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 32, 78-79. He is followed by Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 101.

leadership within the towns and villages, as well as in the empire itself, were those who served the population as benefactors'.⁸⁹ Although πρεσβύτερος may refer elsewhere to elderly men, the addition of προεστῶτες clearly indicates that what is in view here is not mere age but functional oversight and active leadership.⁹⁰ It is unclear whether all presbyters rule but only some rule well, whether only some rule, and those who do it well are being singled out. The former position may be preferred if this passage is indeed a set of guidelines for church leaders. It is clear, however, that only some preach and teach.

In contrast to elders who sin (v. 20) and contaminate those who have commissioned them in their task (v. 22), these elders not only govern but they do so well (καλῶς). This word and its cognates occur often in the PE: examples include the good fight (1 Tim 1:18; 6:12; 2 Tim 4:7), good teaching (1 Tim 4:6; Titus 2:3), and governing well (1 Tim 3:4, 12).⁹¹ The designation of 'good' or 'right' teaching, fighting, and governing is used in distinction to the false teaching and improper behaviour of others.

2.2.2 – διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν

The 'honour' (τιμῆ) can refer to respect or to more tangible reward. Here such honour is to be applied to the elders who labour in the congregation, with the specific context of that labour defined in their governing as well as preaching and teaching. The term τιμῆ is used one time in the NT as 'office in the sense of a position of dignity'

⁸⁹ G. L. Green, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, PiNTC (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), p. 249.

⁹⁰ Cf. L. M. White, 'Rhetoric and Reality in Galatians: Framing the Social Demands of Friendship', in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. A. J. Malherbe et al., NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 307-49 (p. 335 n. 103), who discusses the similar linkage of κοπιᾶω and προϊστέμι in 1 Thess 5:12. He points out that this term can mean to 'stand before' or 'preside over' and that the use of the cognate term in Rom 12:8 occurs in a context of other financial services to the congregation, which could mean that patronage is involved.

⁹¹ F. Bovon, *Studies in Early Christianity*, WUNT 161 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), p. 117.

(Heb 5:4).⁹² This passage in the PE does not use the word as a title, but expressly states that some individuals who are leaders in the congregation are worthy of some form of honour.

Many modern commentators agree that financial reward is intended.⁹³ In 1 Tim 5:3 a cognate verb, τιμάω, is used to discuss the paying of respect and honour to the widows. In the case of the widows, it is clear that ‘honour’ includes tangible support (cf. 1 Tim 5:16).⁹⁴

In 1 Cor 9:9-15, Paul discusses the issue of payment for Church work. He appeals to the same text (Deut 25:4) used by the Pastor here and argues that while he himself has the right to payment, he prefers and insists on his financial independence. This is not to say that Paul contended that others should do the same: he acknowledged the appropriateness of their remuneration. Houlden sees the recommendation of pay for the presbyters as an attempt by the Pastor to counteract the implications of the Corinthian passage. At the same time, he acknowledges that Paul did not reject the right to payment for church work: he simply ‘preferred to retain independence’.⁹⁵

In extra-biblical Greek usage τιμή is used to refer to gifts given to express respect (Homer, *Il.* 9.155; *Od.* 20.129; Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.9.14; Plato, *Resp.* 347A; 361C) as well as for ‘compensation’ (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*

⁹² E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*, trans. F. Clarke, SBT 32 (London: SCM Press, 1961), p. 171. Cf. also A. D. Clarke, *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers*, FCGRW (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), p. 233.

⁹³ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 101, suggests that, since it was unlikely that church leaders were being paid in Paul’s day, those who argue for Pauline authorship (including Jeremias and Holtz) also render this ‘honour’ rather than ‘recompense’. J. Rohde, *Urchristliche und frühkatholische Ämter: Eine Untersuchung zur frühchristlichen Amtsentwicklung im Neuen Testament und bei den apostolischen Vätern*, 1st edn, ThA 33 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1976), pp. 90-91, retains both meanings, while Meier, ‘*Presbyteros*’, p. 326, argues for financial reward, and Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 199; J. A. Kirk, ‘Did “Officials” in the New Testament Church receive a Salary?’ *ExpTim*, 84 (1973), 105-8, suggest that an honorarium rather than a fixed salary is in view. Cf. Haraguchi, ‘*Unterhaltsrecht*’, pp. 185-86; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 285; Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, p. 109 n. 86. Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 95, sees this as a stipend with the sense of an honorarium.

⁹⁴ Winter, *Welfare of the City*, p. 77. When this same term is used in 1 Tim 6:1 it seems doubtful that the believing slave would be asked to offer his or her master remuneration.

⁹⁵ Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 95.

5:72; Sir. 38:1).⁹⁶ It was also used to express the less tangible forms of honour given to patrons by their clients in Mediterranean life.⁹⁷

Schöllgen proposes that ‘double honour’ is a reference to a doubled portion of food at ceremonial feasts. He cites minimal support before 200 C.E. for τιμή as ‘living wage’ and points to the custom in antiquity of providing a double or even triple portion at feast meals to patrons, priests, and other functionaries.⁹⁸ In view of the choice of ‘wages’ (μισθός - cf. Luke 10:7) over another possibility, ‘food’ (τροφή - cf. Matt 10:10), in 1 Tim 5:18, this suggestion seems unlikely.

Johnson goes on to argue that ‘the scriptural citations adduced in favor of this proposition leave no alternative: they speak of payment, not of prestige.’⁹⁹ Mounce resolves the issue by stating that two different meanings of ‘honour’ are combined here, in that the elders who do their work well are not only worthy of their congregation’s respect but should also be paid for their work. Thus the reference to ‘double honour’ is not a reference to doubled financial support or increased respect, but rather the offering of both respect and pay.¹⁰⁰ This appears to be a tidy solution, but is problematic in that διπλή does not seem to be used elsewhere in the NT to express the addition of different elements, as a double entendre, in the sense of ‘a+b’. Whenever it appears, it is in a context of proportion, in the sense of ‘2a’.¹⁰¹ Later discussion regarding honour in the surrounding society will give reason to explore this further, however.

A similar linkage of honour and financial support can be found in Mark 7:9-13, albeit of one’s parents rather than of congregational leaders. Here Jesus is recorded as interpreting the commandment to children to honour (τιμάω) their parents

⁹⁶ Cf. Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 277. See also G. Schöllgen, ‘Die διπλή τιμή von 1Tim 5,17’, *ZNW*, 80 (1989), 232-39. The use of τιμή as compensation in Diogenes Laertius is in the context of a will, which stipulates that a physician is to be compensated, so that this is not akin to wages. Sir 38:1 instructs ‘honour physicians for their services’, which may have the idea of payment of a fee, but this would be a fee rather than an ongoing wage.

⁹⁷ The affinities between use of τιμή here in the PE to its use in the surrounding Mediterranean cultures will be explored in a following section.

⁹⁸ Schöllgen, ‘διπλή τιμή’, pp. 234-38. Cf. Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 45.

⁹⁹ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 278.

¹⁰⁰ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 306. Cf. also Rohde, *Ämter*, pp. 90-91.

¹⁰¹ Matt 23:15; Rev 18:6.

(Exod 20:12) to include appropriate financial provision.¹⁰² Apparently, some individuals chose to declare some or all of the material support which would have gone to their parents ‘corban’ or dedicated to God. This did not necessitate actually giving it to God or to the temple but did preclude it being used to support one’s parents.¹⁰³ The later rabbis stated that vows made for unworthy purposes (including the forgoing of support for one’s parents) were not binding, and in the third century the Mishnah explicitly forbade such a vow, stating that the command to honour one’s parents took precedence over any vow (*m. Ned.* 9:1).¹⁰⁴ This interchange is of interest because it connects honour with support, as also occurs in 1 Tim 5:3-16 in relation to the widows and then in vv. 17-18, speaking of those elders who govern well and also preach and teach.

The context of the support of the widows, as well as the specific wording used in the following arguments, makes it clear that some tangible form of ongoing support of its leaders by the congregation is in view.¹⁰⁵ No precise amount is stated as appropriate, suggesting that this was left up to the congregation. Houlden argues that the reference here is to payment of all elders at an unspecified (but apparently known) rate, to be double for the elders ‘who presided (well)’.¹⁰⁶ That the reward was to be proportionally a greater amount, honouring the labour of the leaders, is suggested by

¹⁰² P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), p. 585 n. 10. This idea of honour including the material support of one’s parents is also found in *b. Qidd.* 31b; *Sir* 3:3, 8, 12-16; and *Philo Decalogue* 113-18. Cf. J. Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edn, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 444.

¹⁰³ Further material on this expression may be found in R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002), pp. 286-87; W. L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 249-52. Lane offers a list of useful sources on p. 249 n. 24.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, p. 445. Three possibilities are suggested by J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*, trans. H. Danby (New York: Macmillan, 1925), p. 290, for the statement cited as made by Jesus: that the situation in Jesus’ time was different than it was later (i.e., the later practice was to forbid depriving one’s parents), that Jesus was bringing an ‘unjustifiable charge’ against the Pharisees, or that the author ‘had heard something about the rules concerning vows among contemporary *Tannaim* (R. Eliezer lived immediately after the Destruction), and confused permission with prohibition’. Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, pp. 445-46, considers the first of these to be the case: that ‘Pharisaic stringency on vows was subsequently relaxed by the rabbis’, but this is only ‘most likely’, not certain.

¹⁰⁵ Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 115, sees support for the widows as well as the elders in terms of the fourth commandment, honouring one’s parents. As to the meaning of honour, he states decisively ‘τιμή kommt in der Bedeutung von Ehrensold, Honorar vor’.

¹⁰⁶ Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 95.

the ‘double honour’ statement. That a specific amount (or its double) was intended is not supportable.

The instruction of the Pastor seems to be one of encouraging generous support of congregational leaders, suggesting voluntary rather than prescribed levels of giving and support. In any case, the Pastor’s choice of supporting citations (v. 18) makes it clear that tangible financial support is in view here.

2.2.3 – μάλιστα οί κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλία

The word μάλιστα¹⁰⁷ is understood by some scholars to single out only ‘those who labour at preaching and teaching’ as the recipients of the double honour. Richards finds linkage between support for the widows and the elders, but believes that the author is limiting an established practice in the case of support for the widows, while ‘support for the presbyters, on the other hand, is to double (διπλή τιμή) for those who are preaching and teaching’.¹⁰⁸ Guthrie generally concurs, stating that ‘special consideration is due to those whose *work is preaching and teaching*, which may point to a particular class within the presbyterate’.¹⁰⁹

Schwarz suggests that the stress should be laid here on ‘labour’ rather than ‘teach and preach’, to parallel ‘good’ as in to ‘govern well’.¹¹⁰ The contrast is not centred on what is done, but on how it is done. In other words, the comparison suggested by μάλιστα is not between those who preach and teach and those who do not, but rather between those who work hard at preaching and teaching (and perhaps those interested only in gain – cf. 1 Tim 6:5), further suggesting a comparison between those who govern well and those who do not (perhaps referring to those who deserve

¹⁰⁷ Cf. 1 Tim 4:10; 5:8; Gal 6:10; Phil 4:22; Phlm 16.

¹⁰⁸ Richards, *Difference and Distance*, p. 158.

¹⁰⁹ D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*, 2nd. edn, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990), p. 117.

¹¹⁰ Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum*, p. 43. Schwarz does not interpret μάλιστα in 1 Tim 5:17 as distinguishing between those elders who preach (as if they were like the ἐπίσκοπος) and those who do not (as if they were a different type of elder). He finds in this passage an argument for the synonymous understanding of πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος, as one of the prime functions of the ἐπίσκοπος was preaching (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:9). In fact, even though the offices are still formative, ‘Ihre wichtigste Aufgabe ist die autoritative Verkündigung’ (p. 125).

discipline – 1 Tim 5:20-21). This approach also divides the elders into two groups, in essence translating *μάλιστα* as ‘specifically’ rather than ‘especially’.

This reading of *μάλιστα* as ‘I mean’ or ‘namely’ (following Skeat and Campbell) is unconvincing, especially in light of recent scholarship.¹¹¹ The phrase *τοῦτ’ ἔστιν* was a commonly used and unambiguous method of saying ‘that is’ or ‘namely’ in Greek.¹¹² As Poythress asks regarding the writer’s choice of *μάλιστα* rather than *τοῦτ’ ἔστιν*, ‘why would any native speaker of Greek avoid it [that is, *τοῦτ’ ἔστιν*] and use another expression [*μάλιστα*] that most commonly has another meaning?’¹¹³ Thus, ‘ruling well’ and being worthy of double honour should not be understood as restricted only to those who preach and teach. Hanson concurs, seeing this as not being intended to suggest the existence of two groups, with presiding elders in the majority and preaching and teaching elders in the minority. Likewise, Oberlinner argues that this does not refer to two groups of congregational leaders but rather states that those who perform their duty well are to be honoured.¹¹⁴ Johnson renders *μάλιστα* as ‘above all’ or ‘especially’, with teaching and preaching being viewed as an adjunct to governing well.¹¹⁵ Rather than indicating that to rule well one must preach and teach, *μάλιστα* should be understood in the sense of ‘especially’ and refers to those who add teaching and preaching to the broader range of duties shared by all presbyters. Like the usage in 1 Tim 5:8, where the author commands support for one’s relatives and especially for the immediate family, so here support for the elders is being commanded, especially for those who labour in preaching and teaching.¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ H. B. Kim, ‘The Interpretation of *μάλιστα* in 1 Tim. 5:17’, *NovT*, 46 (2004), 360-68; V. S. Poythress, ‘The Meaning of *μάλιστα* in 2 Timothy 4:13 and Related Verses’, *JTS*, 53 (2002), 523-32.

¹¹² Cf. Matt 27:46; Mark 7:2; Acts 1:19; 19:4; Rom 7:18; 9:8; 10:6-7; Phlm 1:12; Heb 2:14; 7:5; 9:11; 10:20; 11:16; 13:15; 1 Pet 3:20.

¹¹³ Poythress, ‘*μάλιστα*’, p. 524. Editorial comments in square brackets added for clarity.

¹¹⁴ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 101; Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 251-52.

¹¹⁵ Johnson, *Timothy*, pp. 277-78.

¹¹⁶ If *μάλιστα* in 1 Tim 5:8 were to be translated with a sense of ‘namely’ then the author would be limiting the responsibility of support to only one’s immediate family, but this is quite clearly not the intent in v. 8, nor is it likely to have been the intent in v. 17.

The use of the word ‘toil’ or ‘labour’ by Paul implies more than mere work.¹¹⁷ While it can express ‘weariness as though one had been beaten’ and ‘severe labour’, in the NT it is used for ‘Christian work in and for the community’ and is used by Paul to refer to his own work (1 Cor 15:10) as well as that of others (1 Cor 15:58; 2 Cor 10:15; 1 Thess 5:12-13).¹¹⁸ This distinctive Pauline usage is also found in the PE (1 Tim 4:10; 5:17).¹¹⁹

Another suggestion, proposed by Barrett (and agreeing with Jeremias), is that the previous reference to ‘double honour’ (together with the use of μάλιστα) is not intended to separate the elders into two categories, one of which is paid more. Rather, the proposal is that ‘good ministers are worthy of greater honour and reward than widows’ (vv. 3-16).¹²⁰ Just as the worthy widows are dedicated to the service of the congregation (1 Tim 5:9-10) and are therefore deserving of congregational support, so also should be the elders who serve, presumably at a level which is twice that of the money paid to the widows. Thus the doubling of honour is not in relation to other elders, but rather a comparison between the elders and the widows, fixing the elders’ recompense (whether monetary or otherwise) at twice that of the widows.¹²¹ This doubling of the stipend for the widows is possible but does not seem likely. This is particularly so for the situation with the widows, where the support is only to be offered to those who are truly in need. No precise amount of financial support is specified and

¹¹⁷ A. Plummer, *A Commentary on St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Thessalonians* (London: R. Scott, 1918), p. 8.

¹¹⁸ F. Hauck, ‘κόπος, κοπιάω’, trans. G. W. Bromiley, in *TDNT*, ed. G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, and G. Friedrich, 10 vols (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1965), pp. 827-30. Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 176, argues that this verb, κοπιάω, is ‘almost a technical term in Paul’s vocabulary for ministerial work’, citing 2 Tim 4:10; Rom 16:12; 1 Cor 15:10; Gal 4:11; Phil 2:16; Col 1:29; and 1 Thess 5:12 (cf. Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 124). Cf. also A. J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 311)

¹¹⁹ Hauck, ‘κόπος’, (p. 829). Hauck points out that this word is ‘less prominent’ in the second century, suggesting that perhaps the sense of manual work was not considered fitting, given ‘increased esteem for the officers of the Church’ (p. 830).

¹²⁰ Barrett, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 79. A further argument for this increased support over that offered the widows is that the leader will normally (cf. 1 Tim 3:2) be a married man and in need of such increased support.

¹²¹ Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 44-45, contends that the financial resources of early congregations would not have been sufficient to permit twice as much monetary pay for the elders as for the widows, and holds to double-sized portions of food at feasts as the recompense in view. Cf. Schöllgen, ‘διπλή τιμή’, p. 235.

this might reasonably be presumed to be proportionate to the particular need. How then would one fix the support of the leaders as double the non-specified support for the widows?

Johnson cautions that ἐν λόγῳ should not be rendered ‘preaching’ without good reason, since the activities in which the elders engaged are not known with certitude.¹²² However, although 1 Tim 4:12 indicates that a rendering of ‘in speech’ might be appropriate, 2 Tim 4:2 strongly suggests that ‘preaching’ is an acceptable and recognized rendering. Paul typically uses κοπιᾶν to refer to work in the ministry.¹²³ The Pastor uses it in a very similar sense in 1 Tim 4:10. Knight is less hesitant in identifying the activity in view: although the meaning of ἐν λόγῳ is indeed dependent on the context, the reference to διδασκαλία argues for preaching and teaching as the activities in view.¹²⁴

The intent of v. 17 seems clear: those elders who governed well and laboured hard in the ministry were to be honoured and supported, as v. 18 will make clear. This was especially (but not exclusively) so for those who preached and taught, suggesting that this was seen as a heightened responsibility. The similarities of function between the πρεσβύτερος in v. 17 and the ἐπίσκοπος in 1 Tim 3:2, 5 (governing, teaching) suggest that these labels were not distinct but at the very least interchangeable. The situation seems to have been fluid rather than strictly defined.

2.2.4 – λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή

The author uses a connective γὰρ and calls on the Jewish Scriptures to support the payment of elders, on the basis of Deut 25:4 (used by Paul in 1 Cor 9:9).¹²⁵ The

¹²² Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 278.

¹²³ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 278. Cf. Rom 16:6, 12; 1 Cor 15:10; 16:16; Gal 4:11; Phil 2:16; Col 1:29; 1 Thess 5:12.

¹²⁴ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 232-33.

¹²⁵ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 278.

identical introductory formula is used in Rom 9:17 and 10:11. Quotations and allusions to the Scripture, quite rare in the PE, are somewhat concentrated in this passage.¹²⁶

2.2.5 – βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις

While 1 Cor 9:9 uses this phrase in the context of support for itinerant ministers, here the argument is used to urge payment of congregational leaders who are resident in that congregation.¹²⁷ The reasoning is that if cattle are to benefit directly from their labour, how much more do those who preach and teach have a right to support from those whom they serve? The oxen labour on behalf of the family, and the leaders labour on behalf of the community.¹²⁸ According to Hanson, this argument is often used allegorically by the rabbis as it also was by Paul.¹²⁹ As Hanson puts it, ‘By the time the author of the PE came to use it, it had become a stock proof-text to show that the ordained ministry is entitled to some financial reward.’¹³⁰ This supposes a late date for the PE, and it must be noted that it was in fact Paul’s general rule that the worker was to be paid (1 Cor 9:4-6; cf. Rom 13:7). Paul himself may have forgone this, earning his own living, but that was by his own choice (cf. 1 Cor 4:12; 2 Cor 11:7-9; 1 Thess 2:9; cf. 2 Thess 3:7-9; Acts 18:3).¹³¹ This concept therefore was not something foreign to the understanding of the Pauline circle, whatever the identity of the author of the PE.

¹²⁶ 1 Tim 5:18 cites Deut 25:4 and 1 Tim 5:19 clearly alludes to Deut 19:15.

¹²⁷ Paul asserts his and Barnabas’ right to support as itinerant missionaries. Paul also refers to the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord, and Peter, who apparently receive support while traveling and are accompanied by a spouse who is also supported (1 Cor 9:5). While the reference to being ‘accompanied by a wife’ suggests travel, there is no indication that this support was restricted to itinerant ministry. See the later discussion regarding James in 2.3.1.

¹²⁸ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 278.

¹²⁹ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 101. See also A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul’s Technique and Theology* (London: S.P.C.K., 1974), p. 166. Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 96, calls this ‘a typical example of scribal exegetical method’ but offers no sources or other examples.

¹³⁰ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 102.

¹³¹ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 306. For extensive discussion on Paul’s social status and that of other early Christians, cf. L. Aejmelaeus, ‘The Question of Salary in the Conflict Between Paul and the “Super Apostles” in Corinth’, in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*, ed. I. Dunderberg, C. M. Tuckett, and K. Syreeni, NovTSup103 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 343-76; Haraguchi, ‘Unterhaltsrecht’; A. E. Harvey, ‘“The Workman is Worthy of His Hire”’: Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church’, *NovT*, 24 (1982), 209-21; R. F. Hock, ‘Paul’s Tentmaking and the Problem of his Social Class’, *JBL*, 97 (1978), 555-64; G.

2.2.6 – καί· ἄξιός ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ

Although the saying is very similar to Matt 10:10 and Luke 10:7, the word chosen by the Pastor is the word used in Luke 10:7, namely μισθός (wage or reward), while Matt 10:10 uses τροφή (food). This term, μισθός, is often used in the NT with the sense of reward, temporal as well as eschatological.¹³² The same root is found in several words referring to hired labourers or the act of hiring.¹³³ This word is also used to refer to wages, with the clearest reference to wages as monetary pay found in Matt 20:8, where a fixed wage of one denarius per day (Matt 20:2, 9-10, 13) is to be issued to the workers (ἐργάτης) as their wage (μισθός).¹³⁴ Haraguchi considers ἐργάτης a *terminus technicus* for early missionaries, indicating a lifestyle of wandering evangelism. He considers the label to point simultaneously to ‘die Pflicht zum schutzlosen Wanderleben als auch auf das Recht auf Unterhalt’.¹³⁵

The Pastor’s source for this citation is not known. A.T. Hanson considers this ‘a logion from Jesus himself, which the author treats as being just as authoritative as the scriptural quotation. It is to be found in Mt. 10.10 and Lk. 10.7. It is therefore from the source known as Q’.¹³⁶ Oberlinner argues that the author may have been familiar with

Theissen, ‘Legitimation und Lebensunterhalt: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie urchristlicher Missionare’, *NTS*, 21 (1975), 192-221; G. Theissen, ‘The Social Structure of Pauline Communities: Some Critical Remarks on J. J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival’, *JSNT*, 84 (2001), 65-84; G. Theissen, ‘Social Conflicts in the Corinthian Community: Further Remarks on J. J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival’, *JSNT*, 25 (2003), 371-91.

¹³² Cf. Matt 5:12, 46; 6:1-2, 5, 16; 10:41, 42; Mark 9:41; Luke 6:23, 35; 1 Cor 9:17-18; Heb 2:2 (negative sense, of penalty); 10:35, 11:6, 26; 2 Peter 2:13 (penalty); 2 John 1:8; Rev 11:18; and 22:12. BDAG also lists Rom 4:4 and 1 Cor 3:8, 14 as examples of μισθός in the sense of reward rather than wages, but surely the explicit connection of workman to recompense argues for the nuance of wages rather than reward, particularly in Rom 4:4, where Paul’s argument is that for the one working (ἐργάζομαι), the wages (μισθός) are not a gift or favour (χάρις) but rather something owed.

¹³³ Cf. Matt 20:1, 7 (μισθώω); Luke 15:17, 19 (μισθίος); and Mark 1:20 and John 10:12, 13 (μισθωτός).

¹³⁴ Cf. Luke 10:7; John 4:36; Acts 1:18; Rom 4:4; 2 Pet 2:15; and Jude 11. The original context of this command was that day-labourers were to be paid on the day of work, thus protecting the disenfranchised worker from abuse (cf. Tob 4:14; Sir 34:27). Cf. Haraguchi, ‘Unterhaltsrecht’, p. 190.

¹³⁵ Haraguchi, ‘Unterhaltsrecht’, p. 178.

¹³⁶ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 102, goes on to state, ‘This is not to suggest that our author used this source, nor even that he necessarily found this logion in Luke’s Gospel, though he may have done so, since he appears to know Acts. Spicq asks us to believe that Paul is quoting Luke! In fact the author’s version of the logion is identical with Luke’s version of it’. N. Brox, ‘Lukas als Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe?’ *JAC*, 13 (1970), 62-77, p. 66 n. 23, concurs that this is an example of a Q-saying.

this passage in the oral transmission.¹³⁷ Certainly, Paul knew of Jesus' command 'that those who preach the gospel should live out of [receive their pay from] the gospel' (1 Cor 9:14). Whatever the immediate source, it is evident that this idea was known and used as a Jesus-saying in the Pauline circle relatively early. Its use here in 1 Tim 5:18 (and similarity to Luke's Gospel) does not establish a late date for the PE.

As Barrett points out, the saying is not here ascribed to Jesus¹³⁸ and may have been a proverb.¹³⁹ At the same time, whatever the mediate source of the author's citation,¹⁴⁰ that the author is placing this Jesus-saying on an even footing with the cited Jewish Scripture is a conclusion accepted by several scholars.¹⁴¹ There is dissent, however: the author may be referring only to the Deut 25:4 passage (and not the Jesus-saying) as 'Scripture',¹⁴² although this differs from normal usage.¹⁴³ It is also possible, according to Oberlinner, that while the author has no written source (Q or Luke's Gospel) for the Jesus-saying, he nonetheless considers it Scripture on the basis of oral transmission. Oberlinner sees both of these options as more likely than that the Pastor quotes a known and written Jesus-saying, thus consciously placing it as an authoritative γραφή as part of a Christian 'Scripture'. Oberlinner considers such usage to be anachronistic.¹⁴⁴ Against this perspective it should be noted that in the undisputed writings Paul has earlier referred to (though not cited) what appears to be a similar dominical saying as authoritative, placing it next to the same appeal to the law of Moses which is used by the Pastor (1 Cor 9:14, cf. v. 9).

¹³⁷ Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 255.

¹³⁸ Barrett, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 79.

¹³⁹ So also Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 96.

¹⁴⁰ Scholars who favour Pauline authorship for the PE tend to favor a *logion* collection as the source of the author's statement, since it is difficult to fit the writing of Luke's Gospel into Paul's lifetime. Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 255 n. 32. Cf. also Lea and Griffin, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 156.

¹⁴¹ So Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 309. Cf. Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 234, who is more cautious.

¹⁴² Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 126. Kelly's supposition, though not substantiated, is cited by others: cf. Oberlinner, p. 255 n. 34. Kelly states: 'The words **For Scripture says** may well refer strictly to only the former citation, the Lord's saying being loosely appended by way of explanation of [sic] confirmation.' Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 79, also suggest that only the first saying is viewed as Scripture, with the second one 'loosely connected'.

¹⁴³ Cf. Rom 3:10-18, introduced by 'As it is written' and followed in v. 19 with a reference to the law speaking to those under the law, referring to the entirety of vv. 10-18, even though the cited passages are not from the Torah.

¹⁴⁴ Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 255. Oberlinner follows Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 199-200, in this.

These uncertainties regarding the source of this dominical saying and its status as ‘Scripture’ do not change the essential content of v. 18: the Pastor commands that some form of tangible support and sustenance be provided for elders in these Pauline communities. Congregational leaders deserve support no less than do oxen and day-labourers. The statements made by the Pastor in 1 Tim 5:17-18 find their most natural context in the idea of financial support. While neither a fixed sum nor a regular pay interval are defined here (or for the widows earlier in 1 Tim 5), interpreting ‘honour’ simply in terms of respect or enhanced portions at feasts does not adequately reflect the evident intent of the author. It should also be noted that the instructions regarding support of widows in 1 Tim 5:3-16 restrict such support to those who really needed it and were without other means of support.¹⁴⁵ The lack of any similar restriction in the instruction in vv. 17-18 suggests that all leaders were to receive support, regardless of need.

2.2.7 – Leadership and Reward in the Remainder of the Pastoral Epistles

The question of titles and functions for congregational leadership in the PE is by no means resolved nor is it the primary focus of this work. Passages which make clear reference to congregational leaders in the PE and the titles used include 1 Tim 3:1-13 (ἐπίσκοπος, διάκονος); 5:17-22 (πρεσβύτερος); and Titus 1:5-9 (πρεσβύτερος, ἐπίσκοπος). It appears that these terms are used without rigid classification, and in particular those who are in charge of the congregation seem to be referred to sometimes as ἐπίσκοπος, other times as πρεσβύτερος, and sometimes both (Titus 1:5-6 compared to v.7).¹⁴⁶

Passages which link leadership with reward, ill-gotten gains as well as legitimate support, include 1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:5-11; 2 Tim 2:1-7; 3:2; and Titus 1:7, 11. Of

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 62-78. The standard was that congregants were to take care of those they could, not burdening the church. The church would then step in and help where no source of support existed, or where support was not adequate (p. 75).

¹⁴⁶ Both the ἐπίσκοπος and the πρεσβύτερος had leading roles, both were expected to preach and teach, and the terms are most likely interchangeable in the usage here.

these, 2 Tim 2:1-7 is the closest parallel, with the others having a more cautionary function.

2 Tim 2:1-7 has elements which are similar to the concerns of 1 Tim 5:17-18 as well as to 1 Cor 9:4-18. Timothy is instructed to entrust what he has heard from Paul to reliable persons who have the ability to teach others (v. 2), echoing the interest in teaching in 1 Tim 5:17.¹⁴⁷ The Pastor uses the analogies of soldier, athlete, and farmer in 2 Tim 2:3-6, all of whom have in common the concept of working hard (κοπιάω), explicitly expressed of the farmer in v. 6. This same word is used in 1 Tim 5:17 to refer to the hardworking elder, labouring in teaching and preaching. Although the metaphors used here in 2 Tim 2:3-6 are the same as those in 1 Cor 9:7, 24, the issue of reward is tangential in this passage in the PE, seen most in v. 6 ('the hardworking farmer ought to have first share of the crop') and less in v. 4 ('no serving soldier becomes entangled in civilian affairs (lit. "affairs of livelihood")') and v. 5 (the crowning of the athlete who abides by the rules).¹⁴⁸ In 1 Cor 9 these same exemplars are used to argue for reward: the soldier and farmer for temporal support of church leaders (v. 7) and the athlete for an eschatological prize (vv. 24-25). The question of support, though certainly implied in 2 Tim 2:3-6, is clearly secondary to the Pastor's primary purpose for use of these analogies: the encouragement of fortitude in suffering.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Commentators are generally united in rejecting any instituting of an apostolic succession here. Cf. Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 174, who states that 'there is no suggestion of apostles as such passing on the faith to bishops and deacons, but we simply have Paul himself charging Timothy, and his interest is in the reliability rather than the status of the men Timothy will select'. Cf. also Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 727; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 504. Contrary opinions can be found in Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 241; Oberlinner, *2. Timotheusbrief*, pp. 67-68.

¹⁴⁸ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 507, argues that the soldier's suffering is in 'being forced to ignore civilian affairs' and his reward is 'to please the one who enlists him', but surely there is more than this implicit in the Pastor's statement. The ignoring of affairs of livelihood argues that support of some sort is provided, and the explicit statement regarding the farmer's share of the crops reinforces this. Mounce is correct, however, to point out that the issue of reward, though present, is secondary to the theme of sharing in suffering and that 'there is nothing incompatible between the metaphors and the concept of remuneration, but this does not appear to be the teaching of these metaphors in this context' (p. 508).

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 507-10. Mounce states that 'while the metaphor of a farmer receiving his own crop as a return on his labor is consistent with the idea of a minister being paid for his work, this is not the emphasis of the metaphor in this context' (p. 510). By contrast, Paul's use of these examples in 1 Cor 9 is specific to issues of reward. Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 176, agrees that endurance of hardship is at the core of the passage, but stresses that the author has 'in mind, no less

That some form of financial stipend for leaders was provided is further suggested by the stress laid on selecting leaders who are not eager for money (1 Tim 3:3, 8; 2 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:7). The Pastor also expresses strong disapproval of any who would see the ministry as a means of gain (1 Tim 6:5-11).¹⁵⁰ While the seeking of gain might be interpreted in the context of misappropriation of funds under the control of the leader (such as those for the widows in 1 Tim 5:3-16), it is unlikely that any warning would have been needed against selection of leaders who were known to be dishonest and could be expected to steal.

Another possible context would be that of individuals who minister for gain, demanding some form of payment for their ministry. Titus 1:11 refers with strong disfavour to those who seek ‘sordid gain’ within a guise of ministry. This appears to be disapproval of their heretical message and their greed (Titus 1:7), which renders any gain, financial or otherwise, dishonest.¹⁵¹ The question was not one of whether it was appropriate to pay those who teach, but rather which teachers should be paid.¹⁵² Titus is to appoint leaders who will be able to refute these deceivers. Clearly there was some mechanism by which congregational leaders could expect to receive (or gain access to) monetary reward, while at the same time the congregation was commanded to select leaders who were not primarily motivated by such support. The members were then commanded to make provision for their leaders’ financial needs. This would serve as a prophylaxis against the leaders subsequently developing a poverty-driven

than in 1 Cor. ix. 10f., the material support which the apostolic leader is entitled to expect from the community in which he has laboured (cf. 1 Tim. v. 17 f.)’.

¹⁵⁰ These strong statements are not necessarily restricted to leaders, but a natural context for ‘godliness as a means of gain’ would be those who somehow are using position or ministry to become wealthy. Timothy, clearly a leader in the context of the PE, is told to shun such things (1 Tim 6:11).

¹⁵¹ Cf. the discussion of standard methods of polemic in L. Pietersen, *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity*, JSNTSup 264 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 11, 15-17, 31-33. Pietersen points out that it was not unusual to levy stock charges of greed against those with whom one disagreed, whether these were actually guilty of greed. While the possibility of the exaggeration of polemic rhetoric should be borne in mind, the caution in 1 Tim 3:3 regarding choosing a leader who is not greedy seems to indicate a real rather than contrived concern with appropriate use of money.

¹⁵² Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 395-97. Cf. also Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 198, who comments on diversion of support meant for legitimate and authorized ministries as well as the accepting of gifts from pupils.

preoccupation with money, perhaps resulting in financial malfeasance requiring discipline (1 Tim 5:19-21).

2.3 –Reward of Leaders in the Pauline Corpus

A significant amount of the discussion objecting to 1 Tim 5:17-18 as a command regarding tangible reward for church leaders is based on the absence of evidence for the provision of a ‘living wage’ to church leaders prior to 200 C.E.¹⁵³ There can be no doubt, however, that the churches of Paul’s time knew of support for itinerant apostles and that acceptance of such support was the norm for at least some of the apostles and in certain circumstances for Paul himself. A study of relevant passages in the Pauline corpus will reveal that such support was considered the norm, and therefore that the instructions given in the PE are not a radical innovation. While the concept of support for a settled ministry is only hinted at in the undisputed Pauline texts, there is nothing to suggest that established congregations were not expected to make provision for their leaders.

2.3.1 – Reward of Leaders in the Undisputed Pauline Texts

The passages of primary interest here are Gal 6:6; 1 Cor 9:4-18; 2 Cor 11:7-12; and 12:13-18. Of secondary importance are 1 Thess 2:9-12, which confirms Paul’s practice of self-support; 1 Thess 5:12-13 and Phil 2:29-30, which urge congregational honour and respect toward leaders, albeit without defining any material maintenance; and Phil 4:10-20, where Paul expresses his appreciation for the support of the Philippians.

In what is one of the earliest recorded Pauline instructions regarding support for those who minister, Gal 6:6 places the responsibility for providing support on those

¹⁵³ Cf. Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 44-45; Schöllgen, ‘διπλή τιμή’, p. 235.

who are being instructed: they are to share all good things with the one who instructs.¹⁵⁴ These good things may include spiritual benefits, but seem also to comprise physical goods and probably direct financial support. Longenecker suggests that this Pauline command is one which directs that the instructors be properly paid, which may imply that these were not being adequately compensated.¹⁵⁵ Longenecker further observes that the present substantival participles ὁ κατηχούμενος ('the one who receives instruction') and τῷ κατηχοῦντι ('the one who instructs') are singular, signalling a class of persons rather than particular individuals, and suggests that a formal teaching relationship existed in Galatia.¹⁵⁶ Fung argues that 'even if the teacher was not a full-time instructor in the faith, his work of teaching and preparation for teaching must have taken enough of his time that the community had to be responsible for his material support' and that this is most likely 'the earliest extant evidence for a form of full-time or nearly full-time ministry supported by the congregation in the early Church'.¹⁵⁷ It is at least possible that teachers received some form of support from those they taught. That these teachers had a settled rather than itinerant ministry is not clearly stated and may be anachronistic. At the same time, it is clear that teaching (and therefore teachers) played an important role in the earliest Christian communities (cf.

¹⁵⁴ F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), p. 263.

¹⁵⁵ R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), pp. 278-79. Cf. the comments on tariffs rather than voluntary support in W. M. Ramsay, *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965), pp. 457-61. The contrast between Pauline practice and that of the surrounding non-Christian society will be explored in a following section.

¹⁵⁶ Longenecker, *Galatians*, pp. 278-79. Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, pp. 263-64. H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), pp. 305-6, concurs, claiming that Paul's use of the maxim regarding sharing 'may indicate some kind of educational institution as part of the life of the Galatian churches'. According to H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* III: 638-39, this term used for 'instructor' is used exclusively in the sense of giving instruction concerning the content of faith elsewhere in Paul (1 Cor 14:19). Beyer observes that this 'establishes the claim of the teacher to support, and therewith confirms the validity and necessity of a professional teaching ministry in the congregation' (p. 689). Beyer equates the κατηχοῦντι (one who instructs) of Gal 6:6 with the διδάσκαλος (teachers, in the plural, also clearly a category) of 1 Cor 12:28 and Eph 4:11, as does J. L. Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edn (New York: Doubleday, 1997), p. 551.

¹⁵⁷ R. Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), p. 293. Cf. also Bruce, *Galatians*, pp. 263-64; Martyn, *Galatians*, pp. 551-52. Martyn argues that Gal 6:6-10 refers to support of specific gospel instructors, catechists. This contrasts with the situation of the rabbis, who were not to be paid for their teaching. Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, p. 263, who cites Hillel, m. Ab. 1:13; 4:7; and Zadok, Ab. 4:7.

e.g., Acts 13:1; Rom 12:7; 1 Cor 12: 28) and this is in keeping with the need in any new group to instruct its members 'in the founding traditions which gave them their identity'.¹⁵⁸ It is not out of the question that some form of resident ministry is in view in Gal 6:6, and in any case this passage does not preclude support for later resident leaders.

1 Thess 2:9-12, while lacking the detailed argument found in the later Corinthian correspondence regarding maintenance and support of leaders, makes reference to Paul's refusal of local support while proclaiming the gospel among the Thessalonians.¹⁵⁹ In the Thessalonian case this practice is brought forward as evidence of Paul's purity of conduct rather than defended, as it would be in the later situation in Corinth. A parent-child relationship is expressly mentioned in the context of Paul's statements regarding his labour and honourable conduct (1 Thess 2:7b, 11), and this may presage the core of Paul's arguments, more fully developed in the Corinthian correspondence, regarding his right to refuse support.¹⁶⁰

1 Thess 5:12-13 urges congregational honour and respect toward those who were probably leaders, without specifying a specific form which such honour should take.¹⁶¹ 1 Thess 5:12 refers to individuals having charge over or caring for (προΐστημι)

¹⁵⁸ J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (London: A & C Black, 1993), p. 328. Dunn goes on to state, 'This text provides the earliest evidence of what we might call a "professional" Christian ministry, although we should note that it was dependent on the sense of obligation (and ability to pay) of the one taught, rather than on a more formal organization.' Cf. also Betz, *Galatians*, pp. 305-6, who considers the teaching relationship to have been institutionalized and states that 'we do not know how many teachers they employed because Paul uses the exemplaric singular'.

¹⁵⁹ Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, pp. 148-51. Phil 4:16 makes it clear that Paul received support from Philippi while in Thessalonica, but this may have needed augmentation, or Paul wished not to embarrass the Thessalonians by referring to support from others, or perhaps Paul's desire to give an example took precedence over his comfort. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, WBC 45 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982), p. 35, for discussion of the first two suggestions. 1 Thessalonians may predate Galatians, but this is in dispute. There is, however, good reason to see 1 Thessalonians as written before the Corinthian correspondence. Cf. Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, pp. 13, 71-74.

¹⁶⁰ In 1 Thess 2:7b, the ministry of Paul and his associates is likened to the care of a wet-nurse for her own children rather than those she is contracted to suckle. In v. 11 he speaks as a father regarding his own children. Cf. Green, *PNTC: Thessalonians*, pp. 126-28, 134. For more on family language and structures in Thessalonica, cf. K. P. Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), pp. 154-56.

¹⁶¹ Cf. K. P. Donfried and I. H. Marshall, *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*, NTTh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 61-62, who argue that 'it is apparent that there was leadership in this Thessalonian church, whatever form it may have taken, and that it is a

the congregation and labouring (κοπιᾶω) among them, terminology which is also found in 1 Tim 5:17.¹⁶² Malherbe rejects the notion that church officers in a formal sense are addressed here, considering it unlikely that such a small group (‘not more than a couple of dozen in number’) would need a formal structure, and sees προΐστημι as referring to psychagogic care rather than governing.¹⁶³ While the Thessalonian group may indeed have been relatively unstructured in this early phase of its development, the Pauline admonition does urge the paying of respect and esteem, does this on the basis of activity expended for the congregation, and speaks of these individuals as admonishing (νουθετέω) the congregation.¹⁶⁴ Some level of differentiation is clearly being made. Even if Paul does not use terms such as πρεσβύτερος or ἐπίσκοπος, the individuals being referred to are most likely ministering to the congregation in some way.¹⁶⁵ However, while the Pastor’s instructions are quite concrete, Paul’s command in 1 Thess 5:12-13 is for general respect and esteem rather than explicit support.¹⁶⁶

The interactions with the Corinthian believers offer a greatly expanded and somewhat refocused instruction on support for apostles. Instead of stressing the obligation of those instructed to support their instructors as in Gal 6:6, Paul discusses the right of the apostles to be supported by those to whom they minister. Paul affirms the right of those who proclaim the gospel to derive their living from that gospel,

leadership “in the Lord” (p. 61). Further, ‘that the *proistamenoι* are more than helpers is strongly suggested by the inclusion of the function of “warning” or “exhorting” (*nouthetountas*) among their responsibilities’ (pp. 61-62).

¹⁶² Given 1 Thess 1:3 and 3:5, κοπιᾶω here probably refers to ministry of the word rather than physical labour, similar to 1 Tim 5:17. (Cf. Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, p. 311)

¹⁶³ Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, pp. 312-14.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Bruce, *Thessalonians*, pp. 118-19, who sees the participial use of προΐστημι not as a reference to an official designation. Bruce considers these terms (work, care, admonish) references to functions of leaders rather than the titles identifying discrete groups of leaders. As Bruce points out, ‘in Christian ministry generally status depends on function and not *vice versa*’ (p. 119). Cf. also Green, *PNTC: Thessalonians*, pp. 249-50, who points out analogies with leader/patron usage of this term in the surrounding society.

¹⁶⁵ Green, *PNTC: Thessalonians*, pp. 247-48, suggests that these were individuals who had most likely not formally been appointed, had however emerged (by function) as leaders in the absence of the founders of the congregation, and were now being affirmed in this emerging role by Paul. There is no clear context of either exclusively itinerant workers or of a developing settled leadership, however. Cf. Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, pp. 94, 155-56.

¹⁶⁶ Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, p. 310, considers the instruction regarding honour to be interchangeable (in Pauline usage) with passages which explicitly employ τίμη, and considers similar ideas to be found in 1 Cor 16:18 and Phil 2:29. Malherbe states, however, that ‘1 Tim 5:17 is not quite the same’ without defining the difference(s).

stating this to be a command of the Lord (1 Cor 9:14). At the same time, Paul insisted on his right to forego such support as a sort of reward in itself (1 Cor 9:18), using the word μισθός (wage or reward) in vv. 17 and 18. When it was discovered that Paul received support from other congregations while not accepting it from them, the Corinthians were apparently outraged at what was perceived as a slight (2 Cor 12:13). Paul argues that as their spiritual parent he has a right to provide for them, doing without their provision for him (2 Cor 12:14).¹⁶⁷

The specific details of such support are not spelled out, but some useful hints are given. Apostles are entitled to food and drink, such sustenance being provided by the congregation (1 Cor 9:4).¹⁶⁸ Apostles are entitled to travel with their Christian wife, also at the expense of the congregation (1 Cor 9:5).¹⁶⁹ Here the ‘brothers of the Lord’ are mentioned as well as Peter, who is well-known as having been married (cf. Mark 1:30). Paul asks whether only he and Barnabas lack the right to stop working for their living (1 Cor 9:6), suggesting that the support provided was sufficient to obviate the need to labour or toil at all, other than in the gospel. Three images are then chosen as analogies: the soldier is provided his rations and pay (ὀψώνιον), the planter of the vineyard shares in its produce, while the one tending the flock shares in the result of the milk produced.¹⁷⁰

If these examples drawn from practice are not sufficient, the law itself is brought into the argument. Deut 25:4 is cited, with its prohibition against muzzling the

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Aejmelaeus, ‘The Question of Salary’ (p. 374).

¹⁶⁸ Most commentators see this as a reference to meals at the expense of the congregations, although Barrett considers the possibility that food sacrificed to idols could be at issue, concluding however that the right to support at the expense of the community is included in Paul’s argument. Cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1st edn, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 202.

¹⁶⁹ Some commentators of antiquity, among them Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Jerome, interpreted this as referring to a female assistant rather than a wife. Clement suggests that this could be the apostle’s wife, but he would treat her ‘as a sister’ in foregoing marital relations with her. The precise identity of these accompanying women is irrelevant to the theme of provision for the apostle and a traveling companion. Cf. A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 679-682, for support for apostles’ wives.

¹⁷⁰ The word used for the soldier’s provisions, ὀψώνιον, is most likely primarily a reference to rations but also has a monetary component. The shepherd is said to eat the milk of his flock, which is probably a reference to dairy produce, including cheese. Cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 683-84.

threshing ox, depriving it of eating the grain it is treading out. Paul states that God's concern in giving this commandment is not the ox itself, but this is rather to be understood as concern for humans: the workman should share in the result of the labour (1 Cor 9:8-10).¹⁷¹ As observed by Thiselton, 'no labor should be mere drudgery without any "recognition" or incentive, whether this be financial or in kind'.¹⁷² Having sown spiritual things among them, Paul and Barnabas should therefore have a right to reap material benefits, such as the financial aid received by the other apostles (1 Cor 9:6, 12a).¹⁷³ Rather than risking harm to the gospel, Paul and Barnabas did not use this right to accept aid, even though there was a clear analogy to be found in the provision of the needs of those in temple service from the sacrifices to the temple (1 Cor 9:13).¹⁷⁴ Paul's focus throughout is not power or his own benefit, but rather the gospel and his commission to offer the good news.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ For an overview of the discussion regarding Paul's use of the OT here, cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 685-88. Thiselton argues that 'Paul sees Deuteronomy 25 as being written *more* for humankind than for animals (but not exclusively so)', finding value for the present 'which transcends the immediate context' (p. 687). Arguing for a literal rather than allegorical or metaphorical interpretation in 1 Cor 9:9-11, Instone-Brewer offers examples of references in traditional Jewish literature to human servants as oxen. Cf. D. Instone-Brewer, 'Paul's Literal Interpretation of "Do Not Muzzle the Ox"', in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture*, ed. P. Helm and C. R. Trueman (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), pp. 139-53. Cf. also W. C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985), p. 218, who states, 'The textual connection is simple: Moses spoke primarily for the benefit of the rational beings who owned the oxen. The whole immediate context of Deuteronomy 24-25 and its larger setting was but a series of precedent-setting examples in the realm of civil law that illustrated the rightful divine demands that the moral law made on men. While it is remarkable that Paul did not appeal directly to Deuteronomy 24:15 – "You shall give the hired servant his wages on the day he earns them" – nevertheless, the wisdom of embarrassing God's reluctant people to give to preachers who served them well what they would have given to dumb animals is apparent.'

¹⁷² Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, p. 688.

¹⁷³ J. K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSOT, 1992), pp. 106-7. In his analysis of contemporary (pre-70 C.E.) rabbinic exegesis, Instone-Brewer, 'Muzzle' (p. 147), concludes that if a labourer is permitted to partake of a valuable crop, then he or she may also partake of a less valuable crop. The spiritual crop is the valuable one, while the material crop is of lesser worth. 'In this exegesis, Paul has derived from the law the right of a Christian worker to wages.'

¹⁷⁴ Paul's reference to temple precedent for priestly provision via sacrifices does not demand an OT context (Lev 6:9-11), but was also familiar in contemporary Jewish practice as well as Greco-Roman religious practice. Cf. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 207-8; DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 252; G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 411.

¹⁷⁵ Clarke, *Community*, p. 232.

Paul then states as a command of the Lord that those who preach the gospel should receive their living from that gospel (1 Cor 9:14).¹⁷⁶ This assertion is not offered in the form of a citation, so the exact wording of the original command is not known. Matt 10:10 and Luke 10:7 refer to a similar instruction, as does the general context of these passages, where the Twelve (Matt 10:9-10) and Seventy (Luke 10:4) are instructed to travel without ‘purse and bag and sandals’, not provisioning themselves but rather relying for sustenance on those to whom they are going.¹⁷⁷ Paul has chosen as his reward, however, the right to eschew such support. He gave up his own rights as an offering to God and for the sake of love.¹⁷⁸

Paul’s use of his rights, his insistence on financial independence from the Corinthians, apparently caused offence to the congregation, to the extent that Paul asked whether it was a sin for him to have preached the gospel to them free of charge (2 Cor 11:7). Paul may have been speaking ironically to illustrate the lack of justification for offence. On the other hand, refusal of an offered benefaction was an insult to the benefactor, if indeed the Corinthians saw themselves as a patron congregation. Paul counters that he has spiritually enriched them, whether or not this would have been sufficient to compensate for a perceived lessening of patron status.¹⁷⁹ Paul admits that he has, in fact, received support from other churches, but this was done to benefit the Corinthians rather than offend them (2 Cor 11:8). While among them, he worked for his

¹⁷⁶ Kaiser, *Old Testament in the New*, pp. 217-18, observes that Paul has argued for pastoral support on four levels: 1) ‘illustration from experience’ – the soldier, vinegrower, and herdsman (1 Cor 9:7); 2) ‘authority of Scripture’ – 1 Cor 9:8-11; Deut 25:4; 3) ‘illustration from current practice in the church and in pagan religions’ – 1 Cor 9:12-13; and 4) ‘the authoritative teachings of Jesus’ – 1 Cor 9:14.

¹⁷⁷ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 692-93. It seems more likely that Paul and Luke draw on a common source than that Paul was familiar with Matthean sources. Had Paul been familiar with the material ascribed to Matthew, the statement in Matt 10:8b (‘you received without payment, give without payment’) could have been offered as a dominical saying supporting his right to refuse to accept support from the Corinthians.

¹⁷⁸ Clarke, *Community*, p. 215; M. L. Soards, *1 Corinthians*, NIBC 7 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999), p. 187.

¹⁷⁹ M. E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), pp. 682-84.

own support (Acts 18:3, 1 Cor 4:12) and also received support (ὄψώνιον - wages or compensation) from the 'brothers from Macedonia'.¹⁸⁰

Paul insisted on his right to continue to refuse maintenance support from the Corinthians, explaining that this was in no way due to a lack of love on his part (2 Cor 11:10-11). Rather, he wished to keep a distinction between himself and the rivals who wish to usurp his rightful place as the apostle to/of the Corinthians, and he was unwilling to have anyone deprive him of that boast. Although it was apparently already the norm for the apostles and other leaders to be supported by congregations, Paul claims for himself a special status in relation to the Corinthians, most likely that of the parent, the founding father (cf. 1 Cor 4:14-16).¹⁸¹

This child-parent (rather than client-patron) relationship is explicitly stated in 2 Cor 12:13-18.¹⁸² With heavy irony Paul asks for forgiveness for not having burdened them by requesting financial support, having scolded them for not offering moral support in the face of the accusations offered by the 'super-apostles' (2 Cor 12:11, 13). He intends to visit them a third time, and fully plans to retain his policy of refusing maintenance from the Corinthians: he desires them, not their possessions (2 Cor

¹⁸⁰ It is unlikely that a newly arrived artisan could adequately support himself or herself, and in addition, Paul's purpose for being in Corinth was to preach the gospel, not to engage in business pursuits. This explains the need for additional support beyond what Paul himself could earn, which was duly supplied by unnamed brothers from Macedonia. Cf. Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 686-87.

¹⁸¹ For an overview on current discussion regarding the intent of the rival missionaries and Paul's response of independence, cf. Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 690-93. Regarding support of leaders, Thrall states that 'by the time Paul writes the present letter it would seem that it is the opponents' conception of the apostolic lifestyle that has become dominant and Paul's which is under threat' (p. 692). This designation of 'lifestyle' may overstate the reality. Paul clearly did accept support from congregations, but not from the Corinthians, most likely because of his relation to them as their spiritual parent. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 689-90, cites P. Marshall and suggests that the difference is that in Corinth support is offered by some 'leading people of influence', while in Philippi it is the church as a whole which offered its patronage. This would indeed be a good reason for refusing to accept the specific offer of support (without rejecting the propriety of support in general), but the text offers no clear indication that this was the situation in Corinth. Cf. P. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*, WUNT 2/23 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987), p. 232.

¹⁸² Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, pp. 585-86.

12:14).¹⁸³ Paul bases his deviation from the norm on his special relationship with the Corinthians as their parent.¹⁸⁴

It is possible that some in Corinth believed that Paul had, in fact, financially exploited them by agency of his fellow-workers, sent as his envoys (2 Cor 12:17-18). Paul denies exploitation on the part of Titus and ‘our brother’. The suggestion may well be that Titus had received support from other congregations to fund the travel for the Jerusalem collection, and then also received support for the same travel from the Corinthians, or that Paul received support through Titus.¹⁸⁵ In any case, the accusations of impropriety through rejection of support together with the suggestion of fraudulent acceptance of the support are denied and rejected.

Several important observations regarding the Corinthian interactions can be made. Paul thoroughly affirms the right of apostles to claim support, while decrying those who ‘peddle’ the gospel (2 Cor 2:17). This support is undefined, but is certainly broader than merely food at feasts. In fact, Paul himself accepts such support, although he and Barnabas do not accept it from the Corinthian congregation. The scriptural basis for the right to such maintenance is offered as Deut 25:4, and a dominical saying is

¹⁸³ 2 Cor 12:16 may hint that some in Corinth suspected Paul of being after their money behind his guise of benevolence, perhaps suggesting impropriety with the collection for Jerusalem. Cf. Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 843-44, 849-52.

¹⁸⁴ In 1 Cor 9 he has argued that common practice among the apostles (vv. 4-5), common practice in everyday life (v. 7), an applied regulation of Scripture (vv. 8-10), temple practice (v. 13), as well as the direct command of Christ (v. 14) support the custom of congregational support of leaders in various contexts. Nothing in Paul’s arguments suggests that this was intended to exclude any particular type of Christian worker, such as resident leaders. It is likely that the lack of clear reference to such settled leaders is a reflection of the early stage of development of the congregations. G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, trans. J. H. Schütz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), pp. 27-67, draws a strong contrast between Paul’s initial evangelism (with rejection of support) and acceptance of support from established congregations. The ‘command of Christ’ seems, however, to have been given in a context of initial evangelism. For a discussion of apostolic maintenance and the apparent inconsistency of accepting support from the Macedonian ‘children’ but not the Corinthians, cf. Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 699-708. Although D. G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), p. 212, points out that Paul stated that he would never burden the Corinthians with his support (2 Cor 11:9-12; 12:14), Thrall cites Rom 16:23 as a possible later acceptance of long-term hospitality and perhaps support from the Corinthians (p. 708). Perhaps the parent-child analogy of 2 Cor 12:14 should be extended: while the child is young, the parent is to bear the burden of supporting that child. As the child grows up, this maintenance relationship would normally change.

¹⁸⁵ Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 852-57. Cf. R. P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986), p. 445.

further adduced as reason for those who minister to expect that congregations will take care of their needs.

The comparability of the Corinthian context to that of the Pastorals is a significant issue. Certainly, the itinerant nature of Paul's ministry is not directly analogous to the apparently settled ministry of the elders in 1 Tim 5:17-22.¹⁸⁶ James, perhaps one of those referred to as 'the Lord's brothers' in 1 Cor 9:5, is considered to have had a localised basis to his ministry and thus may be more akin to the elders of the Pastorals in terms of a settled ministry, but this remains conjecture.¹⁸⁷ Certainly, the hugely different size of the Jerusalem church would also be a factor here, and would argue for the likelihood that resident leaders were present there.

Phil 2:29-30 refers to Epaphroditus as one to be honoured (ἐντιμος) for his service.¹⁸⁸ Paul's silence as to how those who minister (both Epaphroditus and the earlier directive regarding the Thessalonian leaders) are to be honoured is both frustrating and enticing: frustrating in that the modern reader is deprived of details of practice, enticing in that the ancient reader was evidently expected to know how this was to be done, suggesting existing norms.¹⁸⁹

Phil 4:10-20, while not giving specific instruction regarding reward, is an extended expression of gratitude on the part of Paul for the support afforded him in his ministry by the Philippian congregation and thus is significant for the discussion of

¹⁸⁶ However, cf. D. G. Horrell, 'Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity', in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, ed. D. G. Horrell (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), pp. 309-58 (p. 316), who states that 'we should be careful not to draw too sharp a distinction between itinerant and resident leadership. At least some of the leaders of the Jerusalem church are clearly itinerant as well as community-based'.

¹⁸⁷ Whatever the identity of the James who leads the church in Jerusalem (Acts 15:13; 21:18; Gal 1:19; 2:9, 12), he was almost certainly a brother of Lord and apparently had a settled ministry. There is no specific identification of him as one who is supported, but he certainly could be one of the 'brothers of the Lord' or apostles who receives maintenance from a congregation.

¹⁸⁸ Similar language is used in 1 Cor 16:15-18 of Stephanas and his family. It might, however, be pressing the issue to view Epaphroditus as a congregational leader. P. T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 341, refers to 'the leadership of such people', perhaps because of the command to submit to (ὑποτάσσω) such people, but in his ensuing discussion regarding the work of Epaphroditus, backs off from this language and refers to 'ministry' instead. Cf. pp. 341-44.

¹⁸⁹ Respect and disrespect, acts showing honour and dishonour, are specific to social contexts. In some cultures eructation following a meal expresses honour, while in others it is rude and disrespectful. It is valuable to know what is appropriate, and Paul simply commends respect, expecting his audience to know how that should be proffered.

support of those who minister. Details regarding the gift itself are not given, but it evidently was something tangible and placed his relationship with them on a different level than that which he shared with other congregations, at least in the early days of his ministry to them (Phil 4:15).¹⁹⁰ Additionally, this support was given numerous times (Phil 4:16). It would be entirely inappropriate to read into this any modern concepts of a regular wage, but this was not a one-time act of charity. Paul had benefited from the Philippians' generosity on more than one occasion in what may have been a formal arrangement.¹⁹¹

There is thus no direct evidence for the financial support of local congregational leaders in the undisputed Paulines. Nothing is stated, however, which would be prejudicial to a later derived practice of support of resident leaders, and later congregations may have appealed to the precedent of the practice of the support of itinerant apostles that is reflected in Paul's discussions. The apparent reference to James as one of 'the brothers of the Lord' in 1 Cor 9:5 is too tenuous to be considered incontrovertible evidence for financial support of resident leaders, but seems at least a possibility. The reference in Gal 6:6 also allows for the existence of teachers who are somewhat settled rather than purely itinerant, and at the very least would have offered later congregations a precedent for the support of resident leaders who teach and preach.

2.3.2 – Reward of Leaders in the Disputed Pauline Texts

The passage of interest here is 2 Thess 3:7-10, which has similarities to as well as differences from 1 Thess 2:9-12 and the Corinthian passages. The author offers Paul

¹⁹⁰ The phrase used by Paul, εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως, employs technical and commercial language, and denotes financial sharing, related to 'monetary transactions on two sides of a ledger'. As O'Brien points out, this should not be restricted only to financial support, but in contemporary Greek and Roman usage also involved other friendship nuances. This implies a dual context of true friendship (with no strings attached) as well as of financial support with nuances from the world of business and commerce. This appears to have been more than simple ad hoc support. Cf. O'Brien, *Philippians*, pp. 533-34.

¹⁹¹ Cf. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, p. 346.

and his companions (Silvanus and Timothy) as examples of appropriate behaviour: not being idle or importune, but rather working to support themselves, eating bread for which they themselves paid. This was done not only to avoid being a burden to the Thessalonians (v. 8) but also to give a suitable example to them of proper conduct (v. 9). As in the Corinthian passages, the author insists on the right of the apostles to be supported by those to whom they minister (v. 9), while assuming the right to refuse such support.¹⁹² The idea that those who are unwilling to work should not eat (v. 10) need not be in conflict with the idea of supporting congregational leaders, but the latter practice is not mentioned in 2 Thess 3.¹⁹³

2.4 – Reward of Leaders in the Other NT Writings

There is little discussion of pay or support for church leaders in New Testament writings outside of those works authored by or traditionally attributed to Paul. The only passages which have a bearing on this issue are Matt 10:10; Luke 10:7; Acts 20:33-35; and 1 Pet 5:2.

The statements on support in Matt 10:10 and Luke 10:7 are almost identical, differing mainly in the word chosen for the recompense: food (τροφή) in Matt 10:10 and wage or reward (μισθός) in Luke 10:7. The context in both cases is the sending of disciples: in Matt 10 the twelve are sent, while in Luke 10:1-12 the seventy are sent out. In both cases those sent are to go out with minimal, even inadequate provisions, for they are to receive their support from those to whom they minister. They have received without paying, and are to give without pay (Matt 10:8). On the other hand, they are to take no money, nor extra clothing, nor even sandals and a staff, for they are to be supported by those to whom they bring their message (Matt 10:9-10; Luke 10:4, 7).

¹⁹² The relationship adduced here is that of a teacher offering an example to be imitated (μιμέομαι) rather than a parent. The concept of imitation is also found in the undisputed Paulines (1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; 1 Thess 1:6; and 2:14) as well as in Eph 5:1. Where the Corinthian arguments had a polemic aim, this passage sees a didactic function in Paul's foregoing of support.

¹⁹³ Cf. Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 42-60, for a discussion regarding idleness and support.

The objection might well be raised that these passages speak not of church leaders but rather of itinerant evangelists. In response, it is worth noting that in the narrative setting there were as yet no Christian congregations and therefore congregational leaders could not exist, yet these accounts were doubtlessly written at a time when congregations did exist. The function of proclamation or preaching (Matt 10:7) was a part of the charge given to Timothy by the Pastor (2 Tim 4:2; cf. 1 Tim 4:13) and the labour of the elders in preaching and teaching (1 Tim 5:17) is at least related to this task. It can therefore be argued that these pre-Christian workers bear some analogy to those Christian workers who later become the leaders of congregations. The objection that this is not an instruction to the congregation to support its leaders may be answered with the observation that those who were expected to support the twelve and the seventy were those to whom they ministered. By the time 1 Cor 9:4-18 was written, this principle of congregational support was an expected facet of church life, so much so that Paul had to defend his divergent practice in this area. More importantly, the inclusion of these sayings as dominical commands, written in a time where congregations existed with some form of leadership, is likely to have had the same significance in the mind of the writers as it had for the Pastor: the Christian worker was to be supported by those on whose behalf he or she laboured. The original narrative context was that of itinerant apostles, but the context at the time the mission discourses of Luke 10:7 and Matt 10:10 were written would have included the existence of at least some local congregations. The tradition surrounding the sending of the twelve and the seventy offers a plausible precedent for support of Christian workers, even if the precise source of Paul's saying commanding support for itinerant apostles and the Pastor's dominical saying commanding pay for Christian workers and leaders is not known. In the minds of the evangelists as well as the readers, the message of these passages is not likely to have been restricted to itinerant workers in the time of Jesus but would have had a broader implication.

The account of Paul's speech in Miletus to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:33-35) makes reference to Paul's custom of supporting himself in his ministry. This Pauline practice received fuller attention in the Corinthian and Thessalonian correspondence, but is here affirmed in Luke's portrayal of Paul's transactions with the Ephesians. Insufficient information is given to enable significant conclusions. Paul is recorded as not having coveted that which belonged to others, including gold, silver, and apparel (v. 33) and having worked to support himself and his companions (v. 34). As is the case in 1 Cor 9:14, Paul cites a dominical saying in v. 35 to support his controversial practice, this one without a corresponding record in the gospel accounts. Whether Paul received help from the Philippians at this time or was completely supported by his own work is not recorded. As Bruce points out, Paul's situation as an apostle to the Gentiles was different from that of the twelve and the seventy who were sent out: 'as Israelites announcing the fulfilment of God's promises to his people they could expect to be provided with simple bed and board by fellow Israelites, many of whom were themselves looking for the kingdom of God'.¹⁹⁴ This passage would seem to offer a tacit argument against support of congregational leaders, but must be viewed in the light of Paul's other arguments, where his right not to be supported is placed alongside the right of other leaders to be supported.

An additional statement regarding leaders and money is found in 1 Pet 5:2, where the elders are exhorted to lead their congregations willingly and eagerly, rather than for sordid gain (*ἀισχροκερδῶς*). This is addressed to the leaders rather than to the congregation, and is a warning about greed rather than instruction regarding support. This reference implies that leadership of a congregation provided opportunity for enriching oneself, whether through legitimate support or fraudulent misappropriation of congregational funds designated for other purposes, such as the support of widows attested in Acts 6:1-6, 1 Tim 5:3-16, and enjoined upon believers in James 1:27. It

¹⁹⁴ Bruce, *Thessalonians*, p. 38.

deserves mention in view of the frequent warnings in the PE against selection of leaders who are avaricious.

The only real affirmation of congregational support of leaders in the New Testament is to be found in the writings of Paul (with the provisos that he is primarily speaking about apostles and that he himself largely eschewed such support) and in the PE. The situation in the Matthean and Lukan references may be related but is not identical in its context (although Paul certainly understood the principle as being applicable), and the Petrine warning regarding greed does not specifically address whether leaders were paid or supported.

2.5 – Reward of Leaders in the Apostolic Fathers

The writings of the Apostolic Fathers contain a good deal of language related to honour and respect, incorporating the terms τιμή and μισθός.¹⁹⁵ Most of this is not specific to leaders and is related to more general reward or punishment received, often in an eschatological sense, or the honour rendered to God, generally coupled with glory (δόξα), similar to the usage in 1 Tim 1:17.¹⁹⁶ References which connect honour or more tangible reward to leaders are found in *1 Clement*, the *Didache*, several works of Ignatius, and the *Shepherd* of Hermas. These will be considered below.

2.5.1 – 1 Clement

1 Clement, generally dated around 95-97 C.E., was written because of a crisis of leadership in Corinth, apparently involving a power struggle between established older

¹⁹⁵ The Greek text and English translation of Ehrman will be used for all citations from the Apostolic Fathers, unless noted otherwise. B. D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers: Vol 1: 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache*, LCL 24 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); B. D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers: Vol 2: Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas*, LCL 25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

¹⁹⁶ Passages using μισθός include *1 Clem.* 34:3; *2 Clem.* 1:5; 3:3; 9:5; 11:5; 15:1; 19:1; 20:4; *Barn.* 1:5; 4:12; 11:8; 19:11; 20:2; 21:3; *Did.* 4:7; 5:2; *Diogn.* 9:2; *Herm.* 51:5; 59:7. Passages using τιμή in a sense other than honouring church leaders include *1 Clem.* 7:4; 15:2; 45:8; 55:2; 61:1, 2; 64:1, 65:2; *2 Clem.* 3:4, 5; *Barn.* 20:1; *Diogn.* 2:8; 3:5; 5:15; 9:6; *Herm.* 32:2; 63:2-4; 64:4; 65:3, 4, 6, 7; 66:2, 6; *Ign. Eph.* 2:1; 21:1, 2; *Ign. Smyrn.* 11:2; *Ign. Magn.* 15:1; *Ign. Phld.* 11:2; *Ign. Pol.* 5:2; *Ign. Trall.* 12:2; *Mart. Pol.* 6:2; 10:2; 15:2; 18:2; 20:2; 21:1.

individuals and younger individuals who desired to bring about changes in the status quo.¹⁹⁷ The entire letter focuses on this issue, using numerous examples and repetition to plead for an end to the crisis. The letter makes reference to reward and honour of congregational leaders in *1 Clem.* 1:3 and 21:6, but neither reference seems to have anything more tangible in mind than general respect and honour.

The use of the terms *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος* is frequent, with *πρεσβύτερος* sometimes referring to older men and other times to individuals acting in an official capacity. *1 Clem.* 1:3, for instance, refers to ‘submitting yourselves to your leaders (*ἡγέομαι*) and rendering all due honor (*τιμὴ*) to those who were older [*Or: presbyters*] (*πρεσβύτερος*) among you’. Does this passage distinguish between the leaders and the presbyters (older men), or does it refer to presbyters who function as congregational leaders? The context fails to clarify this. *1 Clem.* 3:3 addresses lack of respect in the congregation, and while the *πρεσβύτεροι* are among those who are improperly treated, it is the young who rise up against the aged, suggesting that these passages refer to presbyters in the sense of older men rather than specifically as leaders. *1 Clem.* 21:6 offers the instruction that ‘we should respect our leaders (from *προηγέομαι*); we should honor the elderly [*Or: the presbyters*]’ (also *πρεσβύτερος*). This passage refers to leaders as well as presbyters/older men, but as it also refers to young men and wives one cannot positively identify the presbyters as leaders. In *1 Clem.* 44:5, however, the presbyters are referred to in a clear context of leadership. *1 Clement* 44 deals with strife related to the office of the bishop and refers to a structure of succession, instituted by the apostles. The presbyters ‘who passed on before’ are spoken of as fortunate, ‘for they have no fear that someone will remove them from the place established for them’ (*1 Clem.* 44:5). The context of *1 Clement* seems to provide

¹⁹⁷ M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Updated edn (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), pp. 22-23; S. Mason and T. A. Robinson, *Early Christian Reader: Christian Texts from the First and Second Centuries in Contemporary English Translations including the New Revised Standard Version of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), p. 690.

the greatest support for Campbell's thesis regarding the connection between seniority and leadership.¹⁹⁸

2.5.2 – Ignatius

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, wrote seven letters to various churches of Asia Minor and to his friend Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. These are generally dated just prior to his martyrdom in 107-8 C.E.¹⁹⁹ Passages related to respect and honour for church leaders are found in Ign. *Smyrn.* 9:1 and Ign. *Magn.* 3:2. Neither passage seems to have any tangible honour in mind in the sense of the 'double honour' and 'wage' of 1 Tim 5:17-18.

In regard to leadership terminology, Ignatius uses the term πρεσβύτερος exclusively in terms of office rather than age, most often in the plural, and generally in connection with a bishop (singular) and often with a triumvirate of bishop, presbyters, and deacons.²⁰⁰ Ign. *Pol.* 6:1 refers to the congregation as 'subject to the bishop, the presbyters, and the deacons', making it clear that the presbyters are not just assistants to the bishop but are themselves in leadership. Ign. *Magn.* 6:1b speaks of 'the bishop presiding in the place of God and the presbyters in the place of the council of the apostles, and the deacons...entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ'. The fluid use of these titles seen in the PE seems to have been rejected in favour of more rigid categories.

¹⁹⁸ Campbell, *Elders*.

¹⁹⁹ Recent scholarship has tended to move the date to the latter portion of Trajan's reign, perhaps into the reign of Hadrian (117-38 C.E.). Cf. Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 131.

²⁰⁰ References marked with * refer to a bishop assisted by presbyters, while the others refer to a bishop, presbyters, and deacons. Ign. *Eph.* 2:2*; 4:1*; 20:2*; Ign. *Smyrn.* 8:1; 12:2; Ign. *Magn.* 2:1; 3:1*; 6:1; 7:1*; 13:1; Ign. *Phld.* 1:1; 4:1; 7:1; 10:2; Ign. *Pol.* 6:1; Ign. *Trall.* 2:2*; 3:1; 7:2; 12:2*; 13:2*.

2.5.3 – *Didache*

The *Didache* is considered ‘one of the most important literary remains of early Christianity outside of the New Testament’.²⁰¹ It is held by many scholars to predate some of the canonical books of the NT, and itself achieved near-canonical status, although it was essentially lost to the church from the fourth century until 1873. General agreement is that the material itself is closer in time of writing to Paul, James, or Matthew than it is to Ignatius, though it was probably edited into its final form near 100/110 C.E.²⁰²

The *Didache* has extensive instruction on numerous issues, with appropriate use of money prominent among them. The major section related to congregational support of leaders is found in chs. 11-13, and further relevant material is found in *Did.* 1:5-6; 4:1, 5-8; and 15:1-2.

Not specific to leaders but relevant are the instructions regarding charity and giving in *Did.* 1:5-6 and 4:5-8. The first of these passages starts by commanding that the audience ‘give to everyone who asks, and do not ask for anything back’. The Didachist goes on to speak of the blessing of giving and the dangers of receiving: ‘Woe to the one who receives. For if anyone receives because he is in need, he is without fault. But the one who receives without a need will have to testify why he received what he did, and for what purpose’ (*Did.* 1:5). This passage then adds a modification of the original instruction to give, apparently citing a saying of the time which instructed that one is to let one’s charitable gift ‘sweat in your hands until you know to whom to give it’ (*Did.* 1:6).²⁰³ This warning would suggest that support is only to be given to those in need of it.

The second passage, *Did.* 4:5-8, is less cautionary on the issue of charity and has a context which relates more specifically to leaders. The reader is told to

²⁰¹ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers 1*, p. 405.

²⁰² Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers 1*, p. 411; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 247-48.

²⁰³ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers 1*, p. 419 n. 10.

‘remember the one who speaks the word of God to you; honor (τιμάω) him as the Lord’ (*Did.* 4:1a). This is followed by instructions for fellowship as well as fair judgement, and then exhortations on charity. These essentially stress that as one has received, so also one should give, for ‘if you acquire something with your hands, give it as a ransom for your sins’ (4:6). This should be done cheerfully, recognizing the ‘good paymaster of the reward’ (μισθός, *Did.* 4:7b). One is to share with those in need, ‘for if you are partners in what is immortal, how much more in what is mortal?’ (*Did.* 4:8b). While this chapter is somewhat eclectic in its content, going on to discuss disciplining of one’s children, appropriate giving of orders to slaves, and other behaviour, the command to honour the one ministering in the word (4:1) and the reference to partnership in the immortal as well as the mortal (4:8b, cf. 1 Cor 9:11; Gal 6:6) may well have the intention of urging appropriate support of congregational leaders in need. The method of honouring is not specified, but the language used in the context suggests that such honour includes a tangible component.

Further instruction regarding honour and money is found in *Did.* 15:1-2. In an abbreviated qualification list, the congregation is to ‘elect (χειροτονέω) for yourselves bishops (ἐπίσκοποις) and deacons who are worthy of the Lord, gentle men who are not fond of money, who are true and approved. For these also conduct the ministry of the prophets and teachers among you’ (15:1). As with the larger lists in the PE, the congregation is to avoid selecting as leaders those who are greedy for money. However, those who have been selected and are ministering as prophets and teachers in the local congregation (‘conduct...among you’: a settled rather than itinerant ministry) are not to be disregarded but rather honoured, along with the prophets and teachers (15:2). Although appropriate attitudes toward money are mentioned in the immediate context, the honour to be accorded is not specified.

By far the largest body of instruction specific to support of leaders in the Apostolic Fathers is found in *Did.* 11-13. Here are instructions for support of ministers,

both itinerant and settled.²⁰⁴ This follows instructions on baptism (*Did.* 7), fasting (*Did.* 8), and the eucharist (*Did.* 9-10), and starts by commanding that those who teach in accordance with the given instructions should be welcomed, but those who differ should not be listened to (11:1-2). Apostles and prophets are to be welcomed as the Lord (11:4), but are not to stay more than three days, may take only bread along for their journey to their next lodging, and ‘if he asks for money, he is a false prophet’ (11:5-6). Any prophet who ‘orders a meal in the Spirit’ is not to eat of it, or else he is a false prophet (11:9). A prophet who commands giving to others is not to be judged, but one who says ‘in the Spirit, “Give me money” (or something else)’ should not be listened to.

The next chapter appears to concern believers passing through and requesting hospitality. These are presumably other than prophets and teachers and are to be assisted, but they are not to stay more than two or three days (12:2). If they desire to stay longer, they should ply their trade and support themselves. Those who wish to be idle and make merchandise of Christ are to be avoided.

The following chapter, *Did.* 13, addresses a settled ministry, and starts with a usage similar to that of Matt 10:10, stating that ‘every true prophet who wants to settle down with you deserves his food. So too a true teacher, like the worker, deserves his food’ (τροφής, *Did.* 13:1-2). This is followed by instructions to take the first portion of produce and livestock and give it to the prophets, ‘for they are your high priests’ (13:3).²⁰⁵ This appeal to temple precedent and Jewish practice is significant in that it echoes Paul’s appeal to the same in 1 Cor 9:13. The ‘first portion’ language is clarified and expanded to include bread, wine and oil, money, clothing, ‘and everything you own’ (13:5-7). Although no specific amount of money or produce is stated, the

²⁰⁴ Dungan considers this passage functioning to simultaneously support and limit pay and maintenance for Christian workers. In his view, the *Didache* presents a situation in which the apostles are being supplanted by the ‘resident priest’. Cf. D. L. Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), pp. 77-78.

²⁰⁵ If no prophet is present, this should be given to the poor instead (13:4).

Didachist clearly expects that the congregation will at least partially support its settled leaders.²⁰⁶ The identification of the true prophets and teachers as high priests of the congregation, as well as the dedication of the first fruits to them (cf. Lev 18:8-24, esp. 12-13) provides a linkage with Jewish practice which suggests a higher level of prescription than is found in Paul. This is, however, tempered by *Did.* 13:7, which states that the giving is to be 'as it seems good to you', suggesting a voluntary rather than prescribed level of support.

What is not clear is whether the injunction against idleness of believers in *Did.* 12:4-5 would have been intended to suggest that leaders needed to work for their keep as well as receive support. The specific interpretation of 12:4 is open to discussion. Ehrman suggests 'If he does not have a trade, use your foresight to determine how he as a Christian may live among you without being idle', but also offers 'through your understanding you should know in advance that no idle Christian is to live among you'.²⁰⁷ The first reading gives room for doing other work which would justify one's support, while the second reading would imply that believers (and perhaps leaders) who do not support themselves are to be avoided: they are Christmongers (12:5).²⁰⁸ Either way, this passage offers significant similarity to 1 Tim 5:17-18 as a settled ministerial leadership is in view.²⁰⁹ These leaders are to receive some level of congregational support, including tangible items such as food and money.²¹⁰

²⁰⁶ The bishops and deacons are identified in *Did.* 15:1-2 as conducting 'the ministry of the prophets and teachers among you', indicating that titles (in the sense of office) were fluid at this time, much like the situation in the PE, where function seems more important than office.

²⁰⁷ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers 1*, p. 437.

²⁰⁸ Bruce, *Thessalonians*, pp. 206-7, argues that it is the 'refusal to work that is reprobated here', referring to 2 Thess 3:10 and citing *Did.* 12:2-5 as a parallel.

²⁰⁹ In fact, as Horrell, 'Leadership Patterns' (p. 321), observes, 'the *Didache* takes some steps to encourage and promote resident leadership'.

²¹⁰ The commanded differences between the treatment of itinerant and settled ministers are intriguing but are not the focus of this study. These do, however, indicate that by this time there was no question that the Pauline recognition of the propriety of support for the apostles (1 Cor 9) had been extended to settled ministers.

2.5.4 – *Shepherd of Hermas*

The *Shepherd of Hermas*, which recounts apocalyptic revelations and angelic communication to a second century prophet called Hermas, was one of the most popular writings of early Christianity. It offered glimpses of the future but focused mainly on issues of Christian life in its present time, especially questions of sin and repentance. The book consists of five Visions, twelve Commandments or Mandates, and ten Parables or Similitudes. While some scholars argue that the book is composite, derived from multiple sources, most favour a single author, and assign a date in the range of 110-40 C.E.²¹¹ Material related to honour and support of leaders is presented more in the form of an observation than instruction, and can be found in Herm. *Mand.* 43:12 and Herm. *Sim.* 102-3.

Hermas offers perhaps the most similar language to 1 Tim 5:17, with a reference to ‘the presbyters (πρεσβύτεροι) who lead (προΐστημι) the church’ (Herm. *Vis.* 8:3), using the same Greek word as is translated ‘govern’ in the PE passage.²¹² Other uses by Hermas of terms similar to πρεσβύτερος refer to age rather than function or office. Hermas also refers to other leaders: apostles, bishops (ἐπίσκοποι— note the plural use), teachers, and deacons, all performing their duties properly (Herm. *Vis.* 13:1). Hermas refers to these ‘apostles, bishops, teachers, and deacons’ as the living stones forming the building seen in his vision, suggesting that Hermas had a much less rigid view of ecclesial structure and office than seen in Ignatius. As Ehrman points out, there is no reference to a solitary bishop in charge.²¹³ The author’s interest seems to be more in the fulfilling of a role rather than the occupying of an office, and little distinction if any is made between the various titles used: all seem to form one building without distinction as to their placement or role.

²¹¹ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers 2*, pp. 162-69. The *LCL* mode of citation, with consecutively numbered chapters, will be used for citation in this work. Thus, Herm. *Vis.* 25 (which corresponds to Herm. *Vis.* V or Herm. *Vis.* 5 in older nomenclatures) is followed by Herm. *Mand.* 26 (Herm. *Mand.* I or Herm. *Mand.* 1). The more traditional Mandates (*Mand.*) will be used in place of Commandments and Similitudes (*Sim.*) rather than Parables.

²¹² τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προΐσταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

²¹³ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers 2*, p. 167.

Also mentioned are prophets, and the Eleventh Mandate gives instruction regarding the discerning of false prophets. The audience is not so much commanded to do something specific as given observations regarding appropriate responses. For instance, those who are ‘strong in the faith of the Lord and have been clothed with the truth’ will abstain from false prophets rather than cling to them (Herm. *Mand.* 43:4). One of the primary signs of a false prophet (besides self-exaltation, pride, impetuosity, and garrulousness) is that the false prophet ‘receives wages (μισθός) for his prophecy—without them, he does not prophesy’ (Herm. *Mand.* 43:12a). The desire for money is presented as one of the ‘works used by evil desire to hand the slaves of God over to death’ (Herm. *Mand.* 44:3b; 45:1). Further discussion of proper relationship between leaders and wages can be found in Herm. *Sim.* 102:2, where reference is made to apostles and teachers who taught with reverence and holiness, and ‘misappropriated nothing for their own evil desire, but always proceeded in righteousness and truth, just as they received the Holy Spirit’. These are contrasted in the next chapter with ‘ministers who have ministered badly, snatching away the livelihood of widows and orphans and providing a living for themselves out of the ministry they have received’ (Herm. *Sim.* 103:2).

There are some clear distinctions to be drawn between Hermas’ writings and those of the Pastor. The Pastor gives fairly clear instructions in 1 Tim 5:17-18 to the congregation regarding support of its leaders. By contrast, Hermas offers observations rather than instructions, and these are mostly negative, pointing out inappropriate behaviour rather than focusing on positive role models. While the use of ‘misappropriated’ and ‘snatching away the livelihood of widows and orphans’ suggests fraudulent behaviour, and while the Pastor also expresses censure of greed and those who seek gain from their ministry, Hermas offers no suggestion that it would be appropriate to support in a tangible fashion those who minister in the church. It would

be difficult to conclude from Hermas' works that it is appropriate to pay the leader, while the Pastor argues that it would be inappropriate *not* to pay the leader.

2.5.5 – Further Apostolic Fathers

The other Apostolic Fathers (2 Clement, Barnabas, the Fragments of Papias and Quadratus, the Epistle to Diognetus, Polycarp, and the Martyrdom of Polycarp) offer very little additional material to the discussion of reward of leaders.²¹⁴ Other than general exhortations regarding generosity and charity, there is no clear instruction on the use of money, let alone instructions to the churches regarding pay for their leaders.²¹⁵ The writing of Polycarp to the Philippians makes reference to a former presbyter, Valens, who lost his position over the 'love of money' (Pol. *Phil.* 11:1-4).²¹⁶ While there are instructions given regarding the restoration of Valens and his wife, no context is given to clarify the offence beyond this general statement, nor indication regarding whether leaders were paid. The writer expresses surprise that Valens should 'so misunderstand the office that was given him', but this does not clarify whether Valens sought that office for purposes of payment, or whether he misused funds while in office.²¹⁷

2.6 – Contemporary Approaches to Reward of Leaders

The general context of the societies in which the Christian communities were born and developed is to be considered here. These will include Jewish writings and practices before and after 70 C.E., identifiable practices in Græco-Roman civic life as

²¹⁴ Adding other second century Christian works to the study has little to offer. For instance, Justin Martyr's *Apology* makes reference to the leader as the 'president of the brethren' (τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν - Justin, *Apol.* I:65), offering another title for leadership, and refers to weekly collections which assisted in taking care of those in need (Justin, *Apol.* I:67), but offers no hint whatsoever that leaders were remunerated or otherwise supported for their ministry.

²¹⁵ For material on charity and giving, see 2 *Clem.* 15:5; 16:4-5; Barn. 19:9, 11;

²¹⁶ The mention of Valens' wife in Pol. *Phil.* 11:4 seems to be as one who participated with him in his avarice, perhaps similar to Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-10). It is also possible that she is mentioned as one who suffered as a consequence of the deposing of Valens.

²¹⁷ Johnson, *Timothy*, pp. 287-88, states that the 'misdeeds [of Valens] had to do with avarice and the misuse of funds' and considers it possible that the situation in the PE (which could have led to the discipline of the leader) had a similar basis in financial transgressions.

well as the philosophical schools and various associations in the Mediterranean. The intention of this portion of the study is to identify similarities as well as differences between the practices of the PE and those of the surrounding groups. To what extent were instructions of the Pastor to support congregational leaders normal or foreign to the usual practice of the surrounding society?

2.6.1 – Reward of Leaders in Jewish Literature: pre-70 C.E.

2.6.1.1 – The Jewish Scriptures

The Jewish Scriptures do not record that a specific amount of money should be paid to those who minister in the tabernacle and later the temple, but the idea of congregational support of its leaders and of those who minister is explicit and its practice is mandated. In particular, Moses was commanded to set apart the Levites for God's service (Num 3:5-10 and parallels) as the 'first-born' of the males (Num 3:44-45). As there were 273 more Israelite first-born than Levites, redemption money of 5 shekels apiece for the 273, or 1,365 shekels, was to be paid to Aaron and his sons (Num 3:46-51).

As a result of their service in the tabernacle, the Levites were precluded from pursuing a normal livelihood. Moses was instructed regarding regular support for the Levites in Num 18:8-32 (cf. esp. vv. 8, 18, 19, 21, and 24). The portions of offerings not otherwise consumed in tabernacle ritual were to be a portion, a perpetual due to the Levites and their families. This included the redemption money for all first-born males, at five shekels each (Num 18:16). When Israel went out to battle, the booty was to be divided, half for the men who went to battle and the other half for the congregation (Num 31:26-27). From the half belonging to the soldiers, one five hundredth was to be set aside for the Lord (vv. 28-29). From the half belonging to the congregation, one fiftieth was to be given to the Levites (vv. 30, 47). When Israel was to enter Canaan, Moses was instructed regarding provision of cities and pasture land for the Levites, a

total of forty-eight cities (Num 35:2-8). Although a set wage is not provided for the Levites, the idea of congregational support of those who lead Israel's worship and minister to the people was clearly set forth. Furthermore, while this provision generally was comprised of food, it was not limited to this, but also consisted of the redemption tithe for first-born males as well as the provision of land.

Also present is an intriguing linkage of provision for widows and Levites, as well as other disenfranchised groups. This can be seen in Deut 14:29 (cf. 14:27-29); 16:11, 14; and Deut 26:12-13. On specific occasions the tithe was to be taken to a place of the LORD's choosing and consumed, while being shared with the Levite, the sojourner, the fatherless, and the widow.²¹⁸ The Levites' inclusion in this company was explicitly 'because they have no allotment or inheritance with you' (Deut 14:27) and thus needed this basic provision. The Levites, sojourners, fatherless, and widows alike lacked the resources to mount an adequate feast, and so provision was to be made for them. There is no explicit linkage in the PE between the provision for widows and leaders in 1 Tim 5 and the provision for widows and Levites in Deuteronomy. There is, however, clear linkage of provision for those who ministered and the widows in the passages in Deuteronomy, and the Pastor instructs that true widows are to be honoured and supported (1 Tim 5:3, 16), as are those leaders who labour at teaching and preaching (v. 17).²¹⁹

²¹⁸ The specified occasions were every third year in Deut 14:28-29 and 26:12-13 and at Pentecost in Deut 16:9-15. If the way to the designated place was too long, the tithe was to be turned into money and then at the destination was to be converted back to 'whatever you desire, oxen, or sheep, or wine or strong drink, whatever your appetite craves' (Deut 14:26) and then consumed with one's household and the Levites, sojourners, fatherless, and widows (v. 29).

²¹⁹ The support of the priests through contributions (along with the widows and others) was probably seen as demeaning. Cf. J. R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context*, WUNT 2/172 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), p. 126, regarding a proper response to such provision: '...how should the recipients of divine grace respond to God as εὐεργέτης and to His human servants who dispense χάριτες? Undoubtedly, Philo was well aware of the shame often associated with ancient benefaction rituals. One illustration from Philo will suffice. While God bestows gifts (χαρίσασθαι) easily, Philo concedes that "it is no light matter to receive the proffered boons (δωρεάς)". Nevertheless, the priests who ministered in the temple should feel no shame in accepting their share of the first fruit offerings, since these gifts originated in the free beneficence (χαρίζεσθαι) of God – not men. Overall, then, Philo assumes that thankfulness to the benefactor was the fitting response, along with the conferral of appropriate honours.' Cf. also Seland, 'Philo and the

A much more negative perspective on pay for leaders is to be found in Micah 3:11 (cf. 7:3), where the prophet offers a scathing indictment of the leaders of the Judean establishment.²²⁰ Micah accuses the rulers of the house of Jacob and the chiefs of the house of Israel thus: ‘Its rulers give judgment for a bribe, its priests teach for a price, its prophets give oracles for money; yet they lean upon the LORD and say, “Surely the LORD is with us! No harm shall come upon us.”’ The leaders who should have helped people in need instead demanded money, ensuring that only those with means could receive help. The priests were specifically provided for by the tithes, but were enriching themselves by charging additionally for their teaching. The issue here is not one of support per se, but rather of violating the law and justice (cf. Exod 23:8 and Deut 16:19). What is in view is not priests receiving pay and maintenance, but rather their illicitly adding to such provision and the perversion of justice which results when the rich can buy a favourable judgement. The thrust of this indictment is not markedly different from the Pastor’s rejection of those who make the gospel into a marketplace commodity (1 Tim 6:5; Titus 1:11).

The provision made for those who ministered to and led the congregations of Israel seems to be similar in some respects to the provision commanded by the Pastor for those who ministered to and governed the congregations of this Pauline community. Both food and money are named in the provision made by the Jewish Scriptures as well as in the PE.²²¹ No specified wage (probably in the sense of honorarium or

Associations’ (pp. 117-25), who analyzes Philo’s scorn of those who accept contributions, unless ‘the purpose is to gain prudence’ (p. 121).

²²⁰ The rulers were to judge in legal matters, the priest was to rule in religious problems, and the prophet was to assist in personal issues. All of these had, according to Micah, taken that which should be freely offered and made it into a money-making racket. Cf. Exod 23:8; Deut 16:19; 1 Sam 8:3; Isa 1:23; 5:23; and Mic 7:3. Also cf. L. C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 317-18; K. L. Barker and D. W. Bailey, *Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah*, NAC 20 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), pp. 80-81.

²²¹ 1 Tim 5:18 makes reference to the grain eaten by the oxen as well as the wage paid to the labourer, so food and money are mentioned in the supporting argument offered by the Pastor.

compensation) as such is stated, but in both cases the context suggests proportion: the tithe in Deuteronomy and 'double honour' in the PE.²²²

What is significantly different, however, is that the tithe in the Torah was something separate and consecrated to the priests. The provision was given to the tabernacle (and later the temple), not to those serving in the tabernacle or the temple. In the practice of Israel, the provision for its leaders emphasized their apartness, their separation from the rest of the congregation, both in the need of such provision as well as the practice surrounding its use. While the congregation was the source of the support, once it had been brought to the temple it was reserved for those who were themselves consecrated to the temple. In the provision made by the Pastor, as was the case also in Paul's arguments to the Corinthians, such separation is not present. The examples given by the Pastor (oxen and day-labourer) are altogether ordinary, and stress commonality rather than separation and exaltation. While Paul refers to the example of the provision for the Levites in 1 Cor 9:13, the author of the PE makes no such appeal.

Additionally, the explicit instructions and prescribed amounts in the Jewish Scriptures regarding tithes made this support an involuntary affair.²²³ It was proportional to the ability of the individual and family to give, but there was no question as to whether one would give one's tithe or not. The 'double honour' reference of the PE is a proportionality for the recipient rather than the donor's ability to give, and the congregation is simply told that its leaders are worthy of double honour and should be supported. The instructions given by Paul in 1 Cor 16:1-4 regarding the collection for Jerusalem do suggest proportional giving by ability ('as he may prosper',

²²² Cf. Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 36; Karrer, 'Ältestenamnt', p. 178.

²²³ Voluntary or freewill offerings were known in Jewish practice, as seen in Exod 35:29; 36:3; Lev 7:16; 22:18-23; 23:38; 15:3; 29:39; Deut 12:6, 17; 16:10; 2 Kings 12:4; 1 Chron 29:6, 14, 17; 2 Chron 31:14; Ezra 1:4, 6; 2:68; 3:5; 7:15-16; 8:28; Ps 54:6; Ezek 46:12; and Amos 4:5. The references in Exodus and the historical books focus mostly on giving to the building and outfitting of the tabernacle or temple itself, while the remainder often specify that the foods brought are to be eaten on the same day they are brought as a sacrifice (cf. Lev 7:16). The stipulations in Deut 16:10 are of particular interest because of the mention of the Levite and widow who are to share in the feast.

v. 2). While the context is that of assistance of a needy congregation, it would be safe to assume that similar proportional giving, by one's level of ability to give, would have been the case with the congregation's support of its leaders. The portion one is to set aside is, however, never spelled out.

Current understanding regarding what might be called synagogues prior to 70 C.E. is marked by a great lack of consensus, as previously noted. A good deal of this originates with the difficulty of determining whether the extant material, largely from a somewhat later period, was descriptive (offering historical reflection) or prescriptive (offering wishful recreations, an 'idealized prescription').²²⁴ Some of the confusion has to do with whether the terms used (προσευχή and συναγωγή) refer to buildings or gatherings.²²⁵ These groups may well have appeared to outsiders as if they were *collegia*, voluntary associations of Jews analogous to those assembled for various purposes throughout the Mediterranean.²²⁶ Recent scholarship indicates that the structure of these groups was similar to that of the *collegia* and that leadership positions were largely filled by laypeople rather than rabbis and priests.²²⁷

Terms used for leaders in these Jewish communities included 'archisynagogos, archon, gerousiarch, prostates, and father/mother of the synagogue'.²²⁸ Of these, the term *prostates* seems to have the closest connection to the terminology of 1 Tim 5:17, although it is used in the PE as a verb rather than a noun or title, as it apparently was in the setting of the synagogues where it was used. In one case, that of the Agrippesians, no mention is made of an *archisynagogos*, and it seems that *prostates* was used in the

²²⁴ Clarke, *Community*, pp. 103-4 n.1.

²²⁵ Cf. discussion in Clarke, *Community*, p. 108, as well as the significant new evidence for early synagogues, especially outside Palestine (pp. 111-19).

²²⁶ Clarke, *Community*, pp. 124-25.

²²⁷ Clarke, *Community*, p. 126. In keeping with what seems to be the current convention, these Jewish communities will be referred to as synagogues, with the noted caveats. These were mostly expatriate communities, probably because the existence of the Temple in Jerusalem rendered such communities largely superfluous in Palestinian Judaism and more desirable in diasporan Judaism. (cf. p. 103)

²²⁸ Clarke, *Community*, p. 127. Cf. the discussion regarding the meaning and functions associated with these terms on pp. 127-34. This list is by no means exhaustive: L. I. Levine, 'Synagogue Officials: The Evidence from Caesarea and Its Implications for Palestine and the Diaspora', in *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, ed. A. Raban and K. G. Holum, DMOA 21 (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1996), pp. 392-400 (p. 394), also names 'presbyter, *phrontistes* (treasurer or administrator), ... and *grammateus*, all of which are connected in one way or another with the synagogue' (p. 394).

sense of patron as well as of ‘the presiding officer of a religious association’.²²⁹ It would be injudicious to read too much into this one situation and into the associated absence of the more usual title. It does establish, however, that this term was used in regard to leaders within the expatriate Jewish community.

Not much is known regarding the issue of reward and support for community leaders in the Jewish synagogues of this time. Philo affirmed the right of the priests to the tithe and the sacrifice:

In addition to all the rest it ordains that the priests who minister at the holy sacrifices should receive the hides of the whole-burnt-offerings, the number of which is incalculable, and this is no small gift, but represents a very large sum of money. From these things it is clear that the law did not provide the consecrated tribe with a single portion, like the others, but gave it, under the guise of first-fruits from every kind of sacrifice, a source of revenue of greater dignity and sanctity than that of them all put together.

But that none of the donors should taunt the recipients, it ordered the first-fruits to be first brought into the temple and then taken thence by the priests. It was the proper course that the first-fruits should be brought as a thank-offering to God by those whose life in all its aspects is blessed by His beneficence, and then by Him, since He needs nothing at all, freely bestowed with all dignity and honour on those who serve and minister in the temple. For if the gift is felt to come not from men but from the Benefactor of all,

²²⁹ Clarke, *Community*, p. 133. Apparently this was one of the oldest such communities in Rome, and ‘it may be that the term *archisynagogos* did not become widely used until later’ (p. 134). This is, however, speculative.

its acceptance carries with it no sense of shame. (Philo, *Spec.* 1, 151-52)²³⁰

This is a significant statement on several levels. It affirms that the support provided through the tithes was not insignificant. These may not have been ‘wages’, but they were substantial. It also at once affirms the honourability of the priests’ means of support as well as the need to assert that honour: a part of the provision is seen as serving the purpose of precluding taunting of the recipients as well as the assurance that receiving such support carries with it no shame.

As far as the leadership structure and the titles used in the synagogues themselves go, in some cases the epigraphic sources honour children with a title, suggesting that these were not purely functional titles but were also used as an honorific, perhaps given on the basis of status and wealth or even inherited titles rather than the realistic expectation of current fulfilment of an office.²³¹ If this is the situation, then a case could be made that the synagogues, much like the surrounding *collegia*, had leaders who were supporters of their communities rather than being supported by them.²³² Increasingly, evidence has shown that the diasporan Jewish communities adapted structure and language from their Mediterranean surroundings to their own use.²³³ The author of the PE used a Jewish term (πρεσβύτερος) for leaders in 1 Tim 5:17, and argued for their support with material drawn from the Jewish Scriptures in v. 18, suggesting some level of common heritage. It does not appear, however, that a practice of voluntary community support of its leaders was the norm for the Jewish communities, beyond that commanded for the priests and Levites who served in the temple in Jerusalem. Even the one title in common (elder) is not reflective of the normal practice in the Jewish communities, and other differences between the synagogues and the Pauline communities include the group designation (ἐκκλησία

²³⁰ Philo, *Philo*, trans. F. H. Colson, 11 vols, LCL 320, 7 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950), pp. 185-86.

²³¹ Clarke, *Community*, pp. 135-36.

²³² Cf. Clarke, *Community*, pp. 135-41.

²³³ Cf. J. M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996); Clarke, *Community*, pp. 138-40, 166-67.

rather than either προσευχή or συναγωγή) and the day on which they chose to meet, which is a marked departure from Jewish practice as commanded in Exod 20:8-11.²³⁴

2.6.1.2 – Qumran Literature

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls brought not only significant information regarding biblical texts but also about a religious community whose writings are typically dated between 200 B.C.E and 70 C.E.²³⁵ The community was founded by an anonymous Zadokite priest called the Teacher of Righteousness and is probably to be identified with the sect known as the Essenes.²³⁶

A variety of titles were employed for leaders in this community. The highest office was that of the Guardian, also known as the Master.²³⁷ The community was arranged in a ‘strict and formal hierarchy’, with the Guardian and the Bursar drawn from the Zadokite high-priestly family.²³⁸ There were also priests who were under-leaders, responsible to be at any gathering of ten or more members as well as to recite the grace before common meals (1QS VI, 1-10).²³⁹ Full membership in the community was restricted to males.²⁴⁰ One’s age was a definite qualification factor for office in Qumran. At twenty one was permitted to marry, as one had reached adulthood and could ‘know [good] and evil’ (1QSa I, 9-11).²⁴¹ At thirty one was considered mature

²³⁴ Clarke, *Community*, pp. 168-69.

²³⁵ The bulk of these writings are dated in the first century B.C.E. and are generally associated with the Essenes. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 46-48. Vermes’ English translation will be used for quotations. Line numbers will be approximate, based on the line numbers given by Vermes. To assist in use of other versions of Vermes, the standard nomenclature will be used in the text (e.g., 1QS II, 4-7, referring to scroll 1QS, second column, lines 4-7).

²³⁶ Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 26-48, 60-66.

²³⁷ Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 29. The titles Guardian (*mebaqqer*) and Master (*maskil*) were used interchangeably.

²³⁸ Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 28. The bursar was responsible for disbursement of funds (cf. 1QS VI, 15-20).

²³⁹ Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 28. Vermes notes that ‘one interesting feature of the priesthood at Qumran is that their precedence was absolute’, while in mishnaic Judaism a ‘bastard’ who was a man of learning would precede the high priest who was an uneducated ‘boor’ (p. 29).

²⁴⁰ Significant debate surrounds the marital status of the Qumran members. Much of the written material speaks only of men, although the *Damascus Document* found in Cave 4 (4Q270 fr. 7) speaks of a married membership and imposes a penalty on anyone murmuring against ‘the Mothers’, although this is less severe than imposed on those who would murmur against ‘the Fathers’. The presence of female and child skeletons on the peripheries of the graveyard suggests that the community was not exclusively male. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 34.

²⁴¹ Cf. also Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 35.

and permitted to participate fully in tribunals and assemblies and could hold office, with one's responsibilities diminishing as one aged and became less capable (1QSa I, 10-20).²⁴² This diminished responsibility was specified and rationalized in the *Damascus Document*, which stated not only a minimum age for office holders, but also commanded that judges were to cease their role at age sixty, citing Jub. 23:11 ('because man sinned his days have been shortened, and in the heat of His anger against the inhabitants of the earth God ordained that their understanding should depart even before their days are completed' - CD X, 5-10). These Qumran documents make it clear that although age was a determinant of the role one could play in the community, being old not only did not automatically qualify one for a leading role but in fact would eliminate those over sixty from service in at least certain leadership positions.²⁴³

One of the functions of the Guardian (or Master) was to act as teacher. The *Community Rule* starts with the instruction that '[The Master shall teach the sai]nts to live(?) {according to the Book} (4Q255, 257) of the Community [Rul]e, that they may seek God with a whole heart and soul, and do what is good and right before Him...' (1QS I, 1-5).²⁴⁴ A similar instruction is given in the *Damascus Document*, where the Guardian was to 'instruct the Congregation in the works of God. He shall cause them to consider His mighty deeds and shall recount all the happenings of eternity to them [according to] their [ex]planation' as well as give explicit instruction to the priests upon each application of the laws of leprosy (CD XIII, 5-10).²⁴⁵ Other documents command that the people should be instructed to '[appoint wise men whose] work it shall be to

²⁴² There are strong similarities but also some differences between the *Community Rule* (1QS, with supporting material also in the Messianic Rule, 1QSa) and the *Damascus Document* (CD, with supporting material in 4Q270 and other documents). The *Damascus Document* envisioned a life side by side with Jewish and Gentile neighbours, though following a very different lifestyle. Precedence of priests was not absolute in CD as in 1QS, and the Guardian was not supported by a council in CD.

²⁴³ None of the extant material translated thus far indicates whether this maximum age stipulation also applied to other leaders, such as the Guardian.

²⁴⁴ Cf. 1QS III, 10-15; IX, 15-20.

²⁴⁵ Portions reconstructed by Vermes from 4Q267, fr. 9 IV, 2. For his explanation regarding insertion of these variants, cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 127.

expound [to you and your children] all these words of the Law' (1Q22 II, 5-10).²⁴⁶

The importance of teaching in Qumran is made clear in the instruction that 'no man [shall be in the] Community of His truth who refuses to enter [the Covenant of] God so that he may walk in the stubbornness of his heart, for his soul detests the wise teaching of just laws' (1QS II, 25-III, 5). This work of teaching is not placed in any context of pay or other tangible expression of honour. It is clear that this was a role of honour, as seen by the identification of the Guardian as the one who bears responsibility for the teaching, the injunctions against sharing any of this knowledge with those outside the community, and the labelling of the founder of the community as the Teacher of Righteousness.²⁴⁷

The practice of the Essene settlements at Qumran was one of community of goods.²⁴⁸ This extended not only to the possessions of those joining the community but also to earnings while in the community.²⁴⁹ This is, however, community property sharing for the good of the entire community, not a pooling of resources to enable leaders to minister without distractions such as earning one's living. In addition,

Hippolytus records of the Essenes:

²⁴⁶ This document is a 'new commentary' (one which departs from the biblical text and creates a new story), in this case taking its inspiration from various passages of Deuteronomy. The document, given the title *The Words of Moses*, is chiefly notable for its 'emphasis laid on the appointment of special teachers, or interpreters, of the Law (Levites and Priests)' cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 461, 574. Donfried sees strong similarities between Paul and Qumran on linguistic and conceptual grounds, and between this document and 1 Thess 5:12-13. Cf. Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, p. 231.

²⁴⁷ Regarding the teaching of those outside the community, cf. the instruction regarding the Master that he is to 'conceal the teaching of the Law from men of injustice, but shall impart true knowledge and righteous judgement to those who have chosen the Way' (1QS IX, 15-20).

²⁴⁸ Cf. A. Baumgarten, 'Graeco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Ancient Jewish Sects', in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 93-111 (pp. 95-101), for a comparison of the Essenes and Epicureans. Baumgarten concludes that the commensal exclusivism of the Essenes, only eating within the community, rather than occasionally having a common meal (p. 97); the loss of identity and severe regulations of the Essenes (p. 98); and emphasis on sharing of property within the Essene communities (p. 100) were important distinctions between the Essenes and the Epicureans. The Epicureans apparently rejected commonality of property as implying a lack of trust, preferring rather that private possessions were to be made available as needed (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, 10. 119).

²⁴⁹ Cf. Capper, 'Palestinian Cultural Context' (pp. 331-35), who argues that the property sharing seen in the Acts account parallels that of the Essenes and 'was probably modelled upon Essene practice' (p. 335). This is seen in 1QS VI, 19-20 and IX, 22, as well as recorded of the Essenes by Philo (*Hypothetica* 11:4-9), according to Capper (pp. 331-32). Capper concludes that the pattern seen later in the Pauline communities, where 'the poor received succour, but in which community of goods was not practised', is closer to the 'widows and orphans tax' of the *CD* than to the full property sharing commanded by the *Rule of the Community* (1QS) of the main Essene group (pp. 354-55).

And they despise wealth, and do not turn away from sharing (their goods) with those that are destitute. No one amongst them, however, enjoys a greater amount of riches than another. For a regulation with them is, that an individual coming forward (to join) the sect must sell his possessions, and present (the price of them) to the community. And on receiving (the money), the head (of the order) distributes it to all according to their necessities. Thus there is no one among them in distress. And they do not use oil, regarding it as a defilement to be anointed. And there are appointed overseers, who take care of all things that belong to them in common, and they all appear always in white clothing.²⁵⁰

This commentary on the Essenes by an early historian states that leaders of this community were not singled out for support over their fellow members.

There are, however, suggestions of distinction made within the community in its literature. A provision of preferential treatment and honour is to be found in the eating of the pure meal, the central element of ritual community life.²⁵¹ Little else is known of the details of the meal, but the *Community Rule* specifies that ‘when the table has been prepared for eating, and the new wine for drinking, the Priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand to bless the first-fruits of the bread and new wine’ (1QS VI, 5-6). This was an act of blessing, saying a prayer over the food.²⁵² The honour involved in this preference is explicit in the *Messianic Rule*, which looks forward to the engendering (or revelation, in another reading) of the Messiah.²⁵³ A precise ‘order of dignity’ is prescribed for the placement at the table, and no man is to

²⁵⁰ Vol 5 of ANF. Hippolytus, *The Refutation of All Heresies*, Book 9, Chapter 14. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans (1978), trans. by J. H. MacMahon, p. 134.

²⁵¹ Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 32.

²⁵² For an extensive discussion of blessings and prayer related to meals in rabbinic traditions, cf. Instone-Brewer, *Prayer and Agriculture*, pp. 71-91.

²⁵³ Computer image enhancement of the originals seems to have confirmed ‘engendered’, but the alternate reading ‘will be revealed’ is preferred by E. Puech. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 161 n. 1.

extend his hand over the firstfruits of bread and wine before the Priest; for [it is he] who shall bless the firstfruits of bread and wine, and shall be the first [to extend] his hand over the bread. Thereafter, the Messiah of Israel shall extend his hand over the bread, [and] all the congregation of the Community [shall utter a] blessing, [each man in the order] of his dignity. (1QSa=1Q28a II, 10-25)

The act of being the first to bless the food, here even before the Messiah, is very clearly an honour.

This act of blessing the food is not innovative or markedly different from other Jewish practice, but seems to be connected to the tithe reserved for priests and Levites in documents labelled *Rules Concerning Gleanings and Agricultural Priestly Dues*.²⁵⁴ One of these documents specifies that no one may eat from the threshing floor or the garden ‘before [the prie]sts have stretched out their hand [to ble]ss first’, following immediately after a section related to the portion to be set aside as the tithe (4Q271, fr. 2, 1-10).

Although no provision is made for something resembling a fixed wage, the priests (presumably including those leaders who are over the priests) were to receive and partake of the tithe, which was also to be used to help support the needy.²⁵⁵ This provision for ‘the virgin with no near kin, and the ma[id] for whom no man cares’ is interesting in its similarity to the instructions regarding care of true widows in 1 Tim 5:3-16.²⁵⁶ The *Temple Scroll* had extensive rules regarding the tithe and the use thereof

²⁵⁴ These are 4Q266, 269, 270, and 271. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 151-52.

²⁵⁵ The *Damascus Document* stipulated that ‘they shall place the earnings of at least two days out of every month into the hands of the Guardian and the Judges, and from it they shall give to the fatherless, and from it they shall succour the poor and the needy, the aged sick and the homeless, the captive taken by a foreign people, the virgin with no near kin, and the ma[id] for whom no man cares’ (CD XIV, 10-20).

²⁵⁶ This is not directly parallel, in that the *Damascus Document* passage is specific to those widows without near relatives, while 1 Tim 5:3-16 is generally concerned with the obligation of relatives to be the primary providers for widows. At the same time, ‘real widows’ are defined in 1 Tim 5:5, 16 as being ‘all alone’, not having relatives.

by the Levites (11QT LX, 1-15).²⁵⁷ The regulations concerned themselves not only with tangible support but also with honour. There were to be pillars on the roof of the temple to ease the construction of tabernacles for the annual feast of the Tabernacles for the 'elders of the congregation, for the princes, the heads of the fathers' houses of the children of Israel, the captains of the thousands, (and) the captains of the hundreds' (11QT XLII, 10-20). Whether such tithe was to be in addition to the regular provision within the community (the shared property) is not clear.

In the documents which stipulated that no one was to eat of the food or produce until it had been blessed by the priest, permission was expressly granted for the priests to sell the tithe to buy something, though what it was that they were permitted to buy is not in the extant manuscripts (4Q266, fr. 6, 1-5; 4Q271, fr. 2, 5-10).²⁵⁸ Other documents detailed the eating of the tithe by the priests at the feast of Weeks (11QT XVIII, 10-XXII, 20). From the booty of war, the king was to be given 'his tithe', and the priests given one thousandth and the Levites one hundredth 'from everything' (11QT LVIII, 10-15). The mutilated fragments of documents together entitled *MMT* (Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah, or Some Observances of the Law) also states that the 'fruit trees planted in the land of Israel, they are like [firstfruits] destined for the [priests]. {And the tithe} of the cattle and sheep is for the priests'.²⁵⁹

Another set of documents is entitled *Blessings* and speaks blessings over the faithful (1QSb I), the High Priest (1QSb II (?)-III, 25), the priests (1QSb III, 20-V, 20), and finally the 'Prince of the Congregation' (the Messiah of Israel) (1QSb V, 20-30).

²⁵⁷ This document (11QT = 11Q19-21, 4Q365a, 4Q524) is thought by some scholars to be something other than a Qumran composition, but Vermes argues for its inclusion and suggests that it may predate the *Damascus Document*, which may depend on it. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 192. The support of those ministering was not restricted only to the extant community: 'If a Levite come from any town anywhere in Israel where he sojourns to the place where I will choose to cause my name to abide, (if he come) with an eager soul, he may minister like his brethren the Levites who attend on me there. He shall have the same share of food with them, besides the inheritance from his father's family.'

²⁵⁸ The second of these, which is more fragmented, may refer to some group other than the priests, but the first one is explicit: '...All sacred offerings from the planting of vineyards and all fruit trees (producing) food shall belong to them (the priests), as is decreed for them, in the holy [lan]d and in the land of (their) sojourn. And afterwards they may sell of them to bu[y]...' (4Q266, fr. 6, 1-5).

²⁵⁹ This a composite reconstruction by Vermes, labeled by him as '4Q396 1-2 iii conflated with 4Q394 8 iv and 4Q397 6-13'. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 221-22, 226.

These are reconstructed from fragments and are missing significant portions, but the priests are in particular honoured for their inquiry into God's precepts and their instructing of God's people, and the provision of the tithe ('may he give you as your portion the firstfruits of [all delectable things]') is a part of the blessing bestowed upon the priests for their service (1QSb III, 20-30).

The Qumran materials present an interesting commentary on one community's interpretation of Jewish law, and carry on the practice of provision for community leaders through the system of tithes. As with the Levites, there is no provision of a regular wage, and there is a stressing of separation by the entire concept of the 'pure meal' and stipulations on the priests' blessings and their use of the tithe. In this, the Qumran community seems much closer to overall Jewish practice than to anything in the PE or the Pauline circle. In terms of the structure at Qumran, Vermes argues that

monarchic administration (i.e. single leaders, overseers at Qumran, bishops in Christian communities) and the practice of religious communism in the strict disciplines of the sect and at least in the early days in the Jerusalem church (cf. Acts ii, 44-5), would suggest a direct causal connection. If so, it is likely that the young and inexperienced church modelled itself on the by then well-tryed Essene society.²⁶⁰

This is a major speculative leap and assumes a good deal. The discussion regarding the extent to which the early church had a monarchic administration is heated and by no means resolved. It does not appear, however, that the churches in the PE had a structure nearly as rigid as that of the earlier example of Qumran or of the probably later example offered (or proposed) by Ignatius. Additionally, the community or communities of the Dead Sea Scrolls differed from the Pauline communities of the PE in their practice of property sharing as well as the lack of provision for support of

²⁶⁰ Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 22.

leaders beyond that of the Jewish practice related to the Levites and priests. As with the Jewish Scriptures, support through tithing was involuntary rather than optional.

2.6.2 – Reward of Leaders in Jewish Literature: post-70 C.E.

The rabbinic writings did not materially alter the provision for the priests through the tithe. There were, of course, statements refining the law. For instance, a *Mishnah* on the offering of the First Fruits (*bikkurim*) asks and answers as follows: ‘In what respect did they rule that the *bikkurim* were the [exclusive] property of the priest? In that he can purchase therewith slaves and immovable property and unclean cattle, and a creditor [of his] may take them for his debt, and his wife for her *kethubah*’ (*m. Bik.* 3, 12).²⁶¹ Thus, these sacred foods which were forbidden to non-priests on pain of the death penalty (Exod 23:19; *m. Bik.* 2:1) could be converted to other items, even bartering them for non-food items, to pay debts, or as a gift to a woman to betroth her.²⁶² Because these had to be brought to the temple (Deut 26:2, 4) the theoretical end to such offerings would have been 70 C.E., although there is evidence that they continued to the middle of the second century.²⁶³

Rabbinic practice regarding wages for teaching seems to have been decidedly in favour of supporting oneself with a secular occupation rather than being paid for teaching, much as Paul did.²⁶⁴ Rabbi Gamaliel III, a later teacher (early third century) is recorded as stating, ‘Excellent is the study of the Torah together with a worldly occupation, for the energy [taken up] by both of them keeps sin out of one’s mind; and [as for] all [study of the] Torah where there is no worldly occupation, the end thereof

²⁶¹ *BTalmSP, Seder Zera'im*, pp. 402-3.

²⁶² O. Bertinoro, *Seder Zeraim, 5: A New Translation with an Anthologized Commentary*, trans. M. Rabinovitch, 1st edn, MishAS (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Mesorah Publications, 2004), pp. 136-37.

²⁶³ Instone-Brewer, *Prayer and Agriculture*, p. 395.

²⁶⁴ This is not to suggest that Paul’s practice was the result of rabbinic schooling. Evidence for this practice among the rabbis is late (mid-second century C.E. and thereafter), and it is more likely that Paul learned his trade from his father rather than as a requirement of rabbinic training. Cf. Green, *PNTC: Thessalonians*, p. 130. J. J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), p. 87, states that ‘it is very arguable whether he (Paul) would have adopted a trade in adulthood, in accordance with rabbinic practice’, but fails to offer any support for his contention. For the instruction of one’s son in a vocation, cf. Green, p. 130 n. 77.

[is that] it comes to nought and brings sin in its train' (*m. Abot* 2:2).²⁶⁵ A further statement on this is offered by Rabbi Judah, who said, 'He who does not teach him (his son) a craft teaches him brigandage. "Brigandage"! can you think so? – But it is like teaching him brigandage. Wherein do they differ? – They differ where he teaches him business' (*b. Qidd.* 30b).²⁶⁶ Thus, not teaching one's son a trade was considered equivalent to making him a robber.²⁶⁷

In a later period, the Palestinian Talmud expressed strong censure of those who were ordained on the basis of money, citing Exod 20:23. 'R. Mana cursed those who were appointed [in exchange] for a payment of money' (*y. Bik.* 3.3, VIII. A).²⁶⁸

Similarly, the *Mishnah* on *ʿAbot* proclaims:

R. Ishmael said: He who learns in order to teach, they afford him adequate means to learn and to teach; and he who learns in order to practise, they afford him adequate means to learn and to teach and to practise.

R. Radok said: Make them not a crown wherewith to magnify thyself, nor a spade wherewith to dig; even so was Hillel wont to say, 'And he who makes [unworthy] use of the crown [of learning] passeth away.' Lo, [hence] thou hast learnt: anyone who derives worldly benefit from the words of the Torah, removes his life from the world (*m. ʿAbot* 4:5).²⁶⁹

This is a very clear rejection of profiting from the teaching of the Torah.

²⁶⁵ *BTalmSP, Seder Nezikin IV, Aboth*, pp. 12-13. Cf. Bruce, *Thessalonians*, p. 34.

²⁶⁶ *BTalmSP, Seder Nashim IV, Kiddushin*, p. 148.

²⁶⁷ However, cf. the rejection and disdain of manual labour in contrast to the wisdom of the sage in Sir 38:25-39:11.

²⁶⁸ Cf. J. Newman, *Semikhah (Ordination): A Study of its Origin, History, and Function in Rabbinic Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950), pp. 20-21, for a discussion regarding whether such accepting of bribes is likely to have occurred in the times of R. Judah Nesi'ah I or II, early fourth century C.E.

²⁶⁹ *BTalmSP, Seder Nezikin IV, Aboth*, pp. 46-47.

At the same time, Rabbinic material records a discussion on the paying of wages to a certain category of teachers:

R. Isaac b. Radifa said in the name of R. Ammi: The inspectors of [animal] blemishes in Jerusalem received their wages from the Temple funds. Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: The learned men who taught the priests the laws of ritual slaughter received their fees from the Temple funds. R. Giddal said in the name of Rab: The learned men who taught the priests the rules of *kemizah* received their fees from the Temple funds. Rabbah b. Bar Ḥana said in the name of R. Joḥanan: Book readers in Jerusalem received their fees from the Temple funds.²⁷⁰

The context of this discussion is disapproval of pay for teaching, and the argument presented by the rabbis is that these individuals were in effect hirelings being paid for a specific task: they were not specifically teachers of the law but rather teachers of proper ceremony. What is clear is that individuals who were offering instruction in procedure related to the law were being paid wages for doing so, while at the same time such receiving of support was considered inappropriate for the rabbis.

In the Jewish context there was clear provision for support of the activities of the tabernacle and the temple, including the support of those who served there. The provision was involuntary and for the temple, however, rather than the workers, and thus quite different from the instruction of the PE that the congregation willingly provide for its leaders. Further, the idea that those who taught the law would profit by this or receive wages for their teaching was rejected as dishonourable, while the Pastor connects honour with support.

²⁷⁰ *b. Ketub. 106a, in BTalmSP, Seder Nashim II. 681.*

2.6.3 – Reward of Leaders in Græco-Roman Civic Life

The concept that group members should materially support the leaders of that group was foreign to Græco-Roman practice, particularly in terms of some form of payment. Slaves and free personnel, as well as the legionary forces in the employ of the State were paid, and there seems to have been a somewhat regulated rate of pay for such positions. These were, however, being paid by individuals who were superior to them rather than by individuals over whom they had leadership: the norm was that resources flowed downwards rather than upwards.²⁷¹ In addition, the peculium of the slave (the fund of money or other resources given to the slave for his use) technically continued to belong to the owner, so that the peculium, whether gained from the owner or from external employment, was legally considered similar to a loan (working capital) rather than to wages or a gift.²⁷²

Malina argues that Mediterranean society was built on an ideal of the preservation of the status quo, and acquisition of wealth was viewed as having negative impact on the community, as was the loss of one's resources, becoming 'poor'.²⁷³ One should seek not to build wealth but rather to preserve the status quo: 'the honorable person would certainly strive to avoid and prevent the accumulation of wealth, since he would see in it a threat to the community and community balance, rather than a

²⁷¹ B. Rapske, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*, BAFCS 3 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), pp. 259-61. Rapske recites numerous cases of bribery and extortion, which would have come from private parties rather than the State. These cannot, however, be considered voluntary support. However, cf. R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A.D. 284* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 118, who points out that in situations where money would be distributed to the populace, it was based on status not on need – more money went to the upper classes than to the ordinary. 'Honor qualified, rarely need.'

²⁷² Cf. A. Watson, *Roman Slave Law* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), pp. 95-101. In fact, this fund could be so substantial as to permit the slave to in turn hold other slaves, and the humanizing and morale benefits of the peculium were significant, but it could only exist with the consent of the slave owner (p. 97). The peculium could be used to buy the slave's freedom if the owner was willing to offer it (p. 95). However, when a slave was freed by testamentary manumission (upon death of the owner), the peculium was not automatically the possession of the slave: a separate legacy had to be given (p. 97). Additionally, the slave was not permitted to make a gift from the peculium, and above all this meant that the slave could not give resources to a third party in order to buy the slave and then offer him or her freedom (pp. 100-1).

²⁷³ B. J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981), pp. 82-85. This is, in fact, one area where resources might flow 'upwards': when a patron became needy, his or her freedmen were compelled to provide support. Cf. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 40, citing *P.S.2.32*.

precondition to economic and social improvement'.²⁷⁴ Greed was considered despicable.²⁷⁵ To be 'poor' was not primarily a statement of one's position in society or financial resources, but rather one of having become lower in position/honour than one previously was. This was not so much a question of the haves and the have-nots, but of the 'hads and now-don't-haves'. This is even expressed in the matter of seeking work, as seen by the day-labourers of Matt 20:7, who did not ask for work but rather waited to be offered a job.²⁷⁶ If Malina's analysis holds up, then in such a culture it would have been inappropriate for those teaching the Christian communities to seek wages or pay. This may have been why the communities were instructed to support their resident leaders: because it was not honourable for them to seek this on their own. In any case, the Pastor made it clear that those seeking personal enrichment, especially through

²⁷⁴ Malina, *NT World*, p. 83.

²⁷⁵ Malina, *NT World*, pp. 83-84, overstates the case in calling all trading or profit-making immoral and godless. 'By and large, only the dishonorable rich, the dishonorable non-elites, and those beyond the pale of public opinion (like city elites, governors, and regional kings) could accumulate wealth with impunity. This they did in a number of ways, notably by trading, tax collecting, and money lending. At bottom, the trader, the tax collector, and the money lender (at interest, of course) were all the same: they made profit by defrauding others, by forcing people to part with their share of limited good through extortion. (p. 83)' 'All these forms of capital accumulation [trading, tax collecting, and money lending] were perceived to be forms of usury. Technically, usury means making money on the use of money, much as our banks and other modern lending institutions do; *in the first century they would all be considered dishonorable and immoral forms of usury. ... The trader, like the money lender and tax collector, was considered basically godless*' (pp. 83-84, emphasis added). Malina supports such categorical condemnation with passages such as James 4:13-16, where he concludes that 'the criticism in the passage is that traders do not trust in God, but in their own devices' (p. 84). Surely not! This passage condemns those who do not trust in God rather than those whose livelihood is trading or doing business. Those doing business in the course of their travel, with the uncertainties this brings, are merely used as an example of those who might trust in their own abilities rather than in God. Malina's generalizations are much too sweeping: James does not accuse all traders of being godless. At the core, there are very few if any transactions between humans which do not involve some form of trading! Malina does consider 'wages, customary rent, reciprocal lending, or direct sale from producer consumer' (p. 84) to be excluded from the category of godless and immoral transactions, but surely these are also subject to abuse, and not all goods can reasonably be provided by direct sale. As Crook, *Law and Life of Rome*, p. 180, points out, the upper classes considered 'working for one's living at all rather sordid', but at the same time, the individuals who 'owned the shops and ships and hired the labour' ... 'were not ashamed of themselves' (p. 193). This does not mean, however, that these labourers and traders had any sort of honourable status in the eyes of those who considered themselves to be important. The traders and workers evaluated themselves differently than did those who belonged to the upper echelons of society, who had both social standing and wealth. Those with wealth had to acquire and maintain that wealth by some means, and it is important to distinguish between the dishonour of doing something oneself (for instance, being a manure hauler) and the rather different status of being someone who has become wealthy as a fertilizer manufacturer, profiting from the manure hauling efforts of others.

²⁷⁶ Malina, *NT World*, p. 78.

preaching the gospel or through fraud, were regarded as dishonourable (1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:5-11; 2 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:7).

The leaders of Mediterranean society were generally those who were wealthy enough to be benefactors or patrons. It would have been difficult for the less wealthy to make the needed commitment of time (with attendant loss of income) to serve on, for instance, the civic council of their city, the βουλή. In many cases, there was a 'stringent property qualification' for those who desired such a position.²⁷⁷ The expectation was that these leaders would support the other members of society or of their group, rather than the reverse.²⁷⁸ Those who were benefactors were expected to have sufficient resources to support not only themselves but also droves of hangers-on. In his *Precepts of Statecraft*, Plutarch warns a young man regarding the costs, financial and otherwise, of a role in public leadership: 'But if your property is moderate and in relation to your needs strictly circumscribed "as by centre and radius", it is neither ignoble nor humiliating at all to confess your poverty and to withdraw from among those who have the means for public expenditures' (Plutarch, *Mor.* 822D).²⁷⁹ Leaders in religious life likewise were expected to be able to supply the needs of others rather than be supported.²⁸⁰ Banqueting at temple feasts was extravagant, and the cost of providing such feasts was 'expected of rich men in general and of imperial priests in particular'.²⁸¹ Such feasts not only involved abundance of food, but in some cases provision was also made for food and decor to be carried away after the feast, and even

²⁷⁷ Clarke, *Community*, pp. 15-16.

²⁷⁸ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, p. 167, argues that 'it is in fact questionable whether élite patronage ties really functioned at all for any but a minority of the non-élite in the Graeco-Roman world'. While it is true that a senator would not be likely to be involved directly with someone from the lower echelons of society, the support provided by that senator to a number of clients would tend to filter down.

²⁷⁹ Plutarch, *Plutarch's Moralia*, trans. H. N. Fowler, 14 vols, LCL 321, 10 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 281-82. Cf. also Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 86-89.

²⁸⁰ Clarke, *Community*, pp. 26-33, points out that there was significant 'overlap between the religious and the political' in Greece prior to the Roman empire, and that this continues and even strengthens within the empire.

²⁸¹ Clarke, *Community*, p. 28; D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, EPRO 108 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), p. 587.

for sums of money to be given to those in attendance.²⁸² By the first century C.E., leaders in both civic and religious sectors of the Roman empire were ‘selected from among the wealthier echelons of the community. Leadership had become the exclusive domain of the affluent’.²⁸³ Winter makes the case that such benefaction, provision for others, was also expected from wealthy Christians, who were to be benefactors in civic life.²⁸⁴

Several scholars suggest that it was in fact honour, more than acquisition of funds, which was the driving force in Mediterranean society.²⁸⁵ Financial resources were of course important: honour without financial resources to support an appropriate lifestyle could lead to embarrassment.²⁸⁶ One could hardly be a wealthy benefactor without wealth, and this had to be acquired by some method, whether by inheritance or some form of commerce. Nonetheless, Malina observes of the ancient Mediterranean world that ‘name and honor hold the central concern of people in every context of public action and give purpose and meaning to their lives, like money does in our society’.²⁸⁷

This is not to say that there was no advantage to the patron or benefactor.

Winter observes that ‘the patron’s very purpose in establishing a financial relationship with a client was that the latter would not need to attend primarily to his own affairs.

²⁸² Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 170-1. Clarke, *Community*, pp. 41-47, points out that the council of decurions, the court which ratified most civic decisions, drew its members from the local élites, who were required to have been freeborn, to be between 25 and 55 years old, and have ‘significant wealth’. Those without sufficient funds to foot the bills for such extravaganzas were advised not to seek such office, as impoverishment which would result from borrowing funds would make them a ‘pitiful and ridiculous object’ and would result not in honour but ‘rather shame and contempt, which they acquire by such expenditures’ (Plutarch, *Mor.* 822D). Plutarch, *Plutarch’s Moralia* 10, p. 283.

²⁸³ Clarke, *Community*, p. 32. This is not to say that wealth necessarily offered honour. Freedmen could become fabulously wealthy (cf. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 44, who refers to a freedman who executed a will leaving ‘4,116 slaves, 3,600 pairs of oxen, 257,000 other herd animals, and 60 million sesterces in cash’, at a time when the minimum fortune of a senator was 1 million sesterces!) but were nonetheless legally disadvantaged and of low social status. Cf. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 35-45.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 21-3, 33-40, 42, citing Rom 13:3-4 and 1 Peter 2:14-15. Cf. also F. W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis, MO: Clayton Publishing House, 1982).

²⁸⁵ Cf. the bibliography and discussion offered by DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 25; Malina, *NT World*, p. 33.

²⁸⁶ Cf. the previous reference to Plutarch, *Moralia* 822D.

²⁸⁷ Malina, *NT World*, p. 33. Cf. DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 25, who states that ‘the culture of the first-century world was built on the foundational social values of honor and dishonor’.

He was being supported by his patron in order to give attention to the latter's concerns in the public domain.²⁸⁸ One word commonly used to express honour was τιμή, the word employed in 1 Tim 5:17. Honour was a 'dynamic and relational' concept in the Mediterranean world, as practices considered honourable by Jews (circumcision, avoidance of worship of gods other than the God of Israel) were considered dishonourable within Græco-Roman culture.²⁸⁹

The stipulation that the Christian community leaders be hospitable (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:8) would be viewed in the surrounding cultures in terms of benefaction, bringing honour to that leader. Another path to honour which could fit the context of Christian community leaders is found in the idea of one patron brokering contact with another patron on behalf of a client, also referred to as being a mediator.²⁹⁰ Paul's act of bringing the message of salvation to Philemon may in fact be the basis of his claim to have benefited Philemon (Phm 1:18-19).²⁹¹ The apostles could thus be considered mediators (simultaneously benefactors to their 'clients', the churches, while themselves benefiting from the great gift of God, acting as clients to him).²⁹² It was Jesus Christ, however, who is the real broker or mediator, as he is 'the sole grantor of access to the Father (see Mt 11:27; Jn 14:6; 1 Tim 2:5), placing him in the familiar role of broker, whose principal gift is connection with another patron'.²⁹³ This concept of being a broker gives a cultural framework for greater understanding of the apostles as benefactors, in addition to those wealthier members of the community who provided a meeting place and most likely other forms of support to the Christian communities, and

²⁸⁸ Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 49-50.

²⁸⁹ DeSilva, *Honor*, pp. 25, 37-42.

²⁹⁰ DeSilva, *Honor*, pp. 97-99.

²⁹¹ Philemon's home was used as a meeting place for the church (v. 2) and he had shown love and offered 'refreshment' to the saints (vv. 5, 7), indicating that he was himself a benefactor of the church as well as of Paul. Paul's tone, at times assuming the right to command Philemon, at other times assuming a friendship which could expect favours, suggests that this was more an exchange among friends (an equals transaction) than a patron-client exchange (a non-equals transaction). Cf. DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 99.

²⁹² DeSilva, *Honor*, pp. 138-39.

²⁹³ DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 137.

probably acting as its leaders.²⁹⁴ It does not offer any help in understanding how community leaders ('patrons') could honourably be supported by their 'clients'.²⁹⁵

An intriguing possible model that might explain the practice reflected in the PE is that of the equals exchange, with reciprocity between individuals on a common social level. Such relationships were called 'friendship' (*amicitia*) rather than 'patron-client' (*patronus, cliens*) exchanges.²⁹⁶ The essential idea of reciprocity and mutual fidelity was a part of this exchange, but no disparity in honour was involved. It must be noted that in many cases, 'because patrons were sensitive to the honor of their clients, they rarely called their clients by that name. Instead, they graciously referred to them as friends, even though they were far from social equals. Clients on the whole did not attempt to hide their junior status, referring to their patrons as "patrons" rather than as "friends" so as to highlight the honor and respect with which they esteemed their benefactors'.²⁹⁷ This new category of bestowed equality was thus 'sufficiently

²⁹⁴ DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 228, argues that the household had become 'the center of the new religion' and that the requirements of 1 Tim 3:5 and Titus 1:6 argue that only householders could serve as bishops. The requirements of hospitality, managing the household well, and having a good reputation with outsiders imply relative wealth. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, pp. 75-153, challenges the economic heterogeneity of Pauline communities contended for by what he calls the 'new consensus' represented by Theissen and Meeks, together with Becker, Chow, Clarke, Hengel, Judge, Malherbe, P. Marshall, Osiek, Winter, and Witherington (p. 99 n. 119). Meggitt concludes that the Pauline communities 'shared fully in the bleak material existence that was the lot of the non-élite inhabitants of the Empire' and rejects the existence of any wealthy individuals in the Pauline communities (p. 153, emphasis in original – cf. also p. 179). Although Meggitt's arguments against interpreting every hint of wealth or privilege in the Pauline corpus have logical merit, certainly this does not mean that none of these possible references involved individuals with wealth and/or social standing. For instance, 1 Cor 1:26 states of the Corinthian congregation that 'not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth', indicating that at least some had power and the privileges which came with noble birth. (Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, pp. 102-6, dismisses this as referring to relative power and nobility.) In the PE, 1 Tim 6:17-18 gives instructions to Timothy intended to be passed on to the rich regarding the use of their wealth, and this would be meaningless if there were no rich people in the community. For responses to and by Meggitt, cf. D. B. Martin, 'Justin J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival', *JSNT*, 84 (2001), 51-64; J. J. Meggitt, 'Response to Martin and Theissen', *JSNT*, 84 (2001), 85-94; Theissen, 'Social Structure: Critical Remarks on Meggitt'; Theissen, 'Social Conflicts: Further Remarks on Meggitt'. Cf. also T. Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*, SBS 162 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995), p. 81, who points out that 'not many' implies that there were at least 'some'.

²⁹⁵ Giving to the poor and acting as benefactors brought honour to those who were generous. DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 154, suggests that 'those who contribute to the local church do not lay the minister or the congregation under obligation but are enacting faithfully their service to God (and ought to be honored on that basis)'. This would certainly agree with Matt 25:40, but does not coincide with the understanding of honourable practice regarding leaders in Græco-Roman civic life.

²⁹⁶ Cf. DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 99; R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 8-15.

²⁹⁷ DeSilva, *Honor*, p. 99.

ambiguous to encompass both social equals and unequals', while not endangering the hierarchical Roman society.²⁹⁸ This friendship needed to be based in fidelity rather than utility, so that it would endure (Seneca, *Lucil.* 9.8-9; 48.2-4; Pliny, *Ep.* 9.30.1). Fidelity was aided by commonality of interests and character (Pliny, *Ep.* 4.15; 5.14; Seneca, *Prov.* 1.5; *Lucil.* 6.3). Friends should forgive one another, and yet be frank in their advice and criticism (Seneca, *Ben.* 6.33.1-2; *Ira* 3.13.3-4; *Lucil.* 25.1; 112.1-2). Friends would build up each other's reputation, their honour (Pliny, *Ep.* 3.11.1, 9; 7.28). Should a friend become ill or die, the mutual responsibility would go on (Pliny, *Ep.* 1.12.7-8; 1.17.2; 2.10.5; 3.5.3; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.71; 15.62, 71; Seneca, *Lucil.* 78.4; 85.29).²⁹⁹ The range of services which could thus be exchanged in a friendship system included services similar to those provided by bankers, lawyers, hotel owners, insurers, and others.³⁰⁰ Although one was not to engage in such a friendship exchange for the benefits one would derive (*utilitas*), such benefits were naturally an important part of the process (Cicero, *Off.* 1.56). It is perhaps this concept of friendship which offers the best analogy for the honourable support found in 1 Tim 5:17-18. Plutarch's *Moralia* even suggests stratagems for helping needy friends which are not dishonourable, such as sending lucrative work to the friend (Plutarch, *Mor.* 808B-C, F-G).

This series of 'friendship' exchanges offers a model of bestowed equality which may assist in understanding honourable support of leaders in a group. Within this surrounding society, the idea that leaders would seek to be financially enriched by those they led would have been an anomaly and even culturally offensive. The idea of being supported as a leader seems not to have been known, let alone prevalent. However, the concept of a bestowed equality (a patron treating a client as a friend) was known and even common. The client was expected to honour the patron and not to presume an

²⁹⁸ Saller, *Personal Patronage*, p. 11. Eventually a hierarchy of these 'equals' developed, with *amicitiae inferiores* or *amicitiae minores* distinguished from the true *pares amicitiae* (pp. 11-12). Cf. also S. J. Joubert, 'One Form of Social Exchange or Two? "Euergetism," Patronage, and Testament Studies', *BTB*, 31 (2001), 17-25, p. 20, who discusses the use of such friendship language to 'describe relations between socially disproportionate individuals involved in exchange relationships'.

²⁹⁹ Cf. Saller, *Personal Patronage*, p. 13.

³⁰⁰ Saller, *Personal Patronage*, p. 14.

equality which did not actually exist. However, between equals the situation was different: mutual support (although apparently not direct financial provision) was normal and honourable. This does not provide a direct precedent for the support of leaders (patrons) by the others in the group (clients), but suggests the possibility of a fictive or bestowed equality which could enable such mutual support to occur.

Civic leadership in the Mediterranean offers no direct cognate to the Pauline expectation that community leaders deserve support. The instruction of the Pastor that the congregation should render double honour, including tangible support, to its leaders suggests that some new mechanism was in force here.

The comparability of leaders and Greek teachers of philosophy in the context of reward may not at first glance be apparent. In the Christian and Pauline context, however, leadership and teaching were very much connected.³⁰¹ Likewise, the philosophical schools should not be thought of as organisations directed by a board but rather were led by philosophers who held to the teaching of that school, and in some cases given a name related to the originator of that school of thought. The idea that the instructed had a duty to support their instructors was novel to the society of Paul's time, and converts from gentile society would not have expected this custom.³⁰² Ramsay states that this is in part because there was no system of instruction in the pagan religions (hence no teachers to support). At the same time there was an expectation that pagan priests would receive fees for their services, in some cases enjoying a very lucrative priesthood.³⁰³ These fees and dues were involuntary tariffs, and the idea of voluntary support of religious leaders was not an element of common practice.

³⁰¹ Acts 2:42; 4:2; Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:28-29; Eph 4:11-12; 1 Tim 2:7; 3:2; 4:11-13; 5:17; 2 Tim 1:11; 2:2, 24; 4:2; Titus 1:9.

³⁰² Ramsay, *Galatians*, p. 457.

³⁰³ Ramsay, *Galatians*, pp. 457-58. This consisted of an entry fee, or a part of the sacrifice, or other recompense. 'In the Roman world generally, fees were imposed for entering the temple, for approaching the place of sacrifice, for the presentation of gifts or the offering of sacrifice; and the collecting of the fees was farmed out by the State. Sometimes the right to engage in worship and sacrifice without payment of fees was granted to individuals (*immunitas sacrum faciendorum*, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* VI 712). A tariff of charges is published, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* VI 820, Henzen 6113. This custom is hardly known in republican times, except that Cicero, *Leg.* II 10, 25. says *sumptu ad sacra*

The Greek philosophical schools varied greatly regarding whether teachers were paid for their instruction. There was a feeling among some that teachers should be paid, and some teachers took large fees. Socrates (Xenophon, *Mem.* 1. vi. 1), Plato (*Gorg.* 520; *Apol.* 20), and Aristotle (*Eth. nic.* IX. i. 5-7) condemned this greed, to which ‘the Sophists replied that those who taught gratuitously did so because they knew that their teaching was worth nothing’.³⁰⁴ The idea of sharing with one’s teacher was thus not entirely foreign to Mediterranean society, but it was also not universally accepted. Betz considers communal living to have been seen as an ideal in a number of movements by the time of Paul, including the Academy of Plato, the Peripatos, and Epicurus’ ‘Garden’.³⁰⁵ A passage in the Hippocratic oath commands the oath-taker ‘to hold him who has taught me this art as equal to my parents and to live my life in partnership with him, and if he is in need of money to give him a share of mine’.³⁰⁶ Strictly speaking, these need-based provisions could not be regarded as wages or pay, for they were not regular support.

Pliny is recorded as encouraging the organizing of a school in his native town, arguing that ‘to engage teachers’ and pay their ‘salaries’ would cost less than is spent on sending the students elsewhere for their studies.³⁰⁷ In addition to such resident teachers, there were itinerant lecturers, many of whom had a bad reputation, some of which was related to their charging of fees or dependency on the hospitality and largesse of wealthy patrons.³⁰⁸ One of the more amusing writings on the topic is

addito deorum adito arceamus’ (pp. 457-58 n. 2). For more on the exact prices paid for some of these services, Ramsay points to the inscription of Erythræ, published in Michel *Receuil d’Inscr. Gr.* 839. Cf. Ramsay, p. 458 n. 1.

³⁰⁴ A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC 34 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), p. 302.

³⁰⁵ Betz, *Galatians*, p. 305.

³⁰⁶ Betz, *Galatians*, p. 305; Martyn, *Galatians*, p. 551. Translation by L. Edelstein, in Edelstein’s *The Hippocratic Oath: Text, Translation and Interpretation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1943). Such reciprocation was also required of manumitted slaves, who were expected to have ongoing commitments to their former masters. These included days offered in service, as well as financial assistance if the freedman’s former master became needy. Cf. Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 153-54. Cf. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 40.

³⁰⁷ Pliny, *Ep.* 4:13.

³⁰⁸ Cf. Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, p. 517 n. 32, who draws attention to Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*. 1:13; Lucian, *Hermitimus* 59; and Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* 8:9.

Lucian's *Merc. cond.* ('Salaried Posts in Great Houses'), written to criticize those who were supported by attaching themselves to the great Roman households. Years later Lucian wrote his *Apology for the 'Salaried Posts in Great Houses'* when this essay became a liability to his career in civil service.³⁰⁹ This makes it clear that there were contexts in which teaching for pay would occur, some of which were considered honourable and others not.

Others in the philosophic traditions rejected any exchange of pay for instruction. Socrates boasts of not having accepted pay of anyone.³¹⁰ Similarly, the Cynics offered their instruction without charge, and supported themselves by begging on the street corners.³¹¹ The upper classes had only disdain for those who engaged in manual labour, and supporting oneself by manual labour would not lead to greater respect among such as the Sophists.³¹² Begging was thus in some contexts a more honourable method of obtaining support than was working at a trade. Unlike the rabbinic attitude, supporting oneself through manual labour was not viewed as honourable among the philosophers. 'Greek sentiment would not allow a free citizen to undertake manual labour for anything less than dire necessity' (Aristotle, *Pol.* iii, 5).³¹³

Some groups within the philosophical schools thus offer an idea of an appropriate exchange of support in return for instruction, but this seems not to have been a matter of universal agreement. Other groups had very different standards of appropriate practice. An argument could thus be made that the support of hard-working leaders in the Pauline communities (including the undisputed Paulines as well as the

³⁰⁹ Lucian, *Lucian III*, trans. A. M. Harmon, LCL 130 (London: William Heinemann, 1969), p. 411.

³¹⁰ Cf. Plato, *Apology* 31B-C; Socrates (Xenophon *Mem.* 1.6.1); Plato (*Gorg.* 520, *Apol.* 20); and Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 9.1.5-7). However, note the disdain for manual labour prevalent in Mediterranean society (cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* 3.5).

³¹¹ Winter, *Welfare of the City*, p. 44. This is taken from the Alexandrian oration of Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32:9, which is dated 70 C.E.

³¹² A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1958), p. 106. Also Plutarch, *Pericles*, 1:4-2:2; Philo, *Det.* 33-34.

³¹³ Plummer, *2 Corinthians*, p. 302. Cf. also Haraguchi, 'Unterhaltsrecht', pp. 180-81, who points out that Paul's abstention from wages for his teaching may have lowered his social status, but the working classes were positive to that same self-support. Haraguchi considers Paul to have stood in the Socratic tradition in not profiting by teaching (p. 184).

PE) was not entirely foreign to the Mediterranean societies surrounding those communities. It is evident, however, that such receiving of wages was not universally seen as an acceptable or honourable practice.

2.6.4 – Reward of Leaders in the Inscriptions of Voluntary Associations/Collegia

From the evidence of the known inscriptions, there is very little provision made in the voluntary associations or *collegia* for support of leaders.³¹⁴ In this segment of Mediterranean life, honour and shame functioned much as it did elsewhere.³¹⁵ As with other institutions in the Græco-Roman world, religious and secular functions were blended, and thus leadership of the associations was not purely either a sacred or a secular function.³¹⁶ One aspect of leadership within the associations which differed slightly from civic life was that leadership was not exclusively the prerogative of the wealthy and freeborn.³¹⁷ In general, however, the associations were hierarchical in organization and very seldom homogenous to any significant extent.³¹⁸

The Poseidoniastai of Berytos, a Phoenician association in existence by the second half of the second century B.C.E., was a guild related to shipping, warehousing, and merchandising.³¹⁹ Its inscription, *ID* 1520, refers to a ‘Marcus Minatius son of Sextus’ who made a benefaction of 7,000 drachmae to the association.³²⁰ In return, various honours were to be bestowed on Marcus Minatius, with the salient monetary reward being exemption from public expenditures.³²¹ While these expenditures are not

³¹⁴ The best term to use for these groups is not clear. The most common term is ‘voluntary association’, with *collegia* also used frequently. Not all of these groups were voluntary, however, as participation in a trade guild might well be crucial to one’s success as a tradesperson. The terms ‘voluntary association’, ‘association’, and *collegium/collegia* will be used somewhat interchangeably. Cf. Clarke, *Community*, p. 62; J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 1-2, 16-23.

³¹⁵ Clarke, *Community*, p. 60.

³¹⁶ Clarke, *Community*, p. 73.

³¹⁷ Clarke, *Community*, p. 60.

³¹⁸ Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 44-49.

³¹⁹ B. H. McLean, ‘The Place of Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos’, in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 186-225 (p. 196).

³²⁰ *ID* 1520, 6-20. Translated by McLean and cited in McLean, ‘Place of Cult’ (p. 198).

³²¹ *ID* 1520, 6-20. Cf. McLean, ‘Place of Cult’ (p. 199).

specified, it seems unlikely that Marcus Minatius gave the equivalent of 19 years' wages in order to avoid having to pay dues or festival expenses (he was permitted one guest at processions). The release from these comparatively minor expenses certainly was not something which could be viewed as support.³²² The inscription also records that provision was to be made for 'herdsmen who have been prepared according to the law' and are to be paid 150 drachmae for 'leading the ox for Marcus in procession' and a further 150 drachmae for services related to the ox at the sacred reception. If any of these herdsmen failed in his task, he was to 'owe 1,000 sacred drachmae to Poseidon and ... be brought to trial for wrongdoing'.³²³ The value of the money involved, especially the amount of the fine to be levied for non-performance, suggests that these were not common cattle herders but rather individuals of standing and most likely leaders. They had to be of sufficient means to be able to face a fine amounting to three years' wages. Even if these were leaders, this example of recompense for a task accomplished does not suggest that this was standard practice among the other *collegia*, nor was it a case of regular support of leaders in the sense of a living wage.

Another example of tangible expression of honour is found in the inscription of the Lanuvium burial society (136 C.E.) regarding their dinners. This specifies that 'any member who become *quinquennalis* in this society shall be exempt from such obligations [?] for the term when he is *quinquennalis*, and that he shall receive a double share in all distributions. It was voted further that the secretary and the messenger shall be exempt from such obligations [?] and shall receive a share and a half in every

³²² This situation in the voluntary association differs from that referred to by Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 130, 169-70, where individuals with political aspirations would foot the entire bill for feasts, which could indeed be a substantial expense.

³²³ *ID* 1520, 69-80. Cf. McLean, 'Place of Cult' (p. 200). A drachma was 4.1 grams of silver and was the Greek coin representing a day's wage. 1,000 drachmae would be about 142.85 ounces of silver. At late October, 2005 prices for silver (£4.35/oz or \$7.66US/oz), this would be about £621 or \$1,094US, a not insignificant sum. In its original context, however, 1,000 drachmae represented nearly three years' wages. The later Roman denarius, also a day's wage, weighed 3.8 grams, or a little bit less than the drachma.

distribution.³²⁴ The four ‘masters of the dinners’ were to provide ‘an amphora of good wine each’, as well as to supply each member of the society ‘a bread costing 2 asses, sardines to the number of four, a setting, and warm water with service’.³²⁵ These were presumably the ‘obligations’, as these four officials were not only not obligated to make available such food, but were themselves given a double share of the provision, along with the *quinquennalis*. An ongoing share and a half is to be provided to the *quinquennalis* ‘as a mark of honor’ after completing the term of office. The ‘double share’ reference is intriguing and in this case presumably refers to food made available at the regular dinners.³²⁶ Schöllgen cites this inscription in his argument against 1 Tim 5:17 as referring to a living wage, arguing instead for a double portion of food at congregational meals and feasts.³²⁷ This would have more merit in the PE context if the Pastor had employed τροφή in v. 18 instead of μισθός. The practice in the Lanuvium inscription is, however, an example of tangible expression of honour made to leaders of a group in Græco-Roman society. This provision of a double portion at the six annual dinners was an expression of honour and acted as an incentive to serve as a leader, but did not, however, provide for support in the sense that 1 Tim 5:18 does: that of a workman’s wages. As Schmeller states, this provision of honour in Lanuvium had the purpose of encouraging group members to serve as leaders despite the significant expense.³²⁸

³²⁴ *CIL* 14.2112 (= Dessau, 7212 = *FIRA* 3.35), translated by N. Lewis and M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings: Vol. 2, The Empire*, RoC (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 275. The [?] designation is present in the translated text, both in the English and German translations and seems to refer to the requirement of monthly dues of 5 asses, or 5/16th of a denarius. The Latin inscription (lines 18-19) reads *partes dupl[as] dari* (‘given a double portion’), referring to provision of food at meetings. Cf. also Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 99-105, for the complete Latin text of this inscription and another translation of the same, this one in German and more complete than the one offered by Lewis and Reinhold.

³²⁵ *CIL* 14.2112 (= Dessau, 7212 = *FIRA* 3.35), in Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization: Empire*, p. 275.

³²⁶ There were six such dinners each year in this group. Cf. Schöllgen, ‘διπλή τιμή’, p. 237.

³²⁷ Schöllgen, ‘διπλή τιμή’, p. 237.

³²⁸ Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, p. 39. ‘Solche Regelungen haben unter anderem den Zweck, Mitglieder zu motivieren, trotz der damit verbundenen Last Ämter zu übernehmen. Sie sind eine Art Entschädigung, insofern sie eine soziale Hierarchie schaffen oder verstärken und den Amtsträgern zu gesteigertem Status verhelfen.’ He goes on to point out that the double portion was hardly a real benefit, since the recipients had themselves provided the food for the feast, thus for their own double

There was, thus, no real equivalent in the context of the *collegia* for support of leaders to enable them to do the work of leading. If anything, the expectation seemed to be that leaders would be of sufficient means to be able to do their work without recompense, although it was expected that they would be honoured for their service.³²⁹

Although the inscriptions of the associations sometimes used words which were also used in the churches (ἐκκλησία, ἐπίσκοπος, διάκονος, προστάτης, προστάτις), Kloppenborg cautions against assuming too close a connection between the associations and the churches, as

similar terminology and even similar organizational structures can be adopted by groups with radically different ideologies and purposes. Yet they do suggest that, despite the manifest differences between them, these groups can usefully be considered together as part of a broad social phenomenon. It is important to note the limits of this claim: we are suggesting analogies between the various associations and not, as has too often been done in the past, genealogical relationships or influences.³³⁰

portion ('außerdem erhalten ja Patrone und Amtsträger höhere Zuteilungen von den Geschenken, die sie zuvor *selbst gestiftet* haben!').

³²⁹ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, pp. 171-72, questions the ability of the *collegia* to offer much in the way of tangible mutual economic assistance, and states that they were 'economically all but impotent'. This is not, however, substantiated by Meggitt, and these associations were by no means all drawn from the lower classes, as Meggitt assumes. Besides, if these associations had nothing to offer, why be a part of them? Cf. N. F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*, MAPS 176 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1987), p. 65, for a discussion of the 'considerable amounts of property' held by a number of these associations. Cf. also the inscription of the association for Asclepius and Hygieia (ILS II/2, 7213), c. 153 c.e., reproduced with German translation in Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 106-9. This well-funded group (two separate gifts of 50,000 and 10,000 sesterces (lines 5, 18)) seemed to provide for the festival expenses of all of its members, the number of which was limited to sixty (line 5). At regular festivals food and money was distributed from the proceeds of the bequest with greater portions for the officials. On several occasions, the *quinquennalis* was to provide the food and gifts for the others, so it is clear that this was not support of leaders but rather a method of expressing honour. (Cf. lines 9-17). It appears that those in the group were generally wealthy.

³³⁰ Kloppenborg and Wilson, *Voluntary Associations*, p. 4. For discussion on the use of ἐκκλησία, cf. J. S. Kloppenborg, 'Edwin Hatch, Churches and Collegia', in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, ed. J. C. Hurd and B. H. McLean, JSNTSup 86 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 212-38 (pp. 215 n. 13, 231-2); for sources on ἐπίσκοπος cf. F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1909), p. 377, on διάκονος pp. 391-2, on προστάτης, προστάτις pp. 363-67.

While there were indeed coincidences of terminology, there is nothing to suggest that this is the result of deliberate imitation rather than a common social background.

2.7 –Reward of Leaders: Summary

Although the Pastor does not demand a double wage (μισθός) for those who labour over and for the congregation, the double honour (τιμή) demanded on their behalf almost certainly includes the concept of some form of tangible support. The same honour language was used in the immediate context for support for true widows, those without family to care for their needs. It is evident that the Pauline communities were not strangers to the idea of supporting Christian workers, as evidenced by the statements made in the undisputed Pauline writings, although no clear context of resident leaders was given.

A contemporary concept of a fixed remuneration was present in the monetary unit of the denarius, the ‘day’s wage’, but no guidelines were offered in the PE or in the undisputed Pauline material as to an appropriate level of support for the congregational leaders. The command to provide ‘double honour’ argues for support which was not merely adequate, and may very well be related to the demand that leaders be chosen who were not controlled by money, as well as the stern warnings against greedy teachers who misappropriate funds.

That the Pastor commanded that the congregation make appropriate provision for its leaders is clear. Much less clear is the source of this concept. Greek and Roman civic life did not have any practice of voluntary support of leaders. On the political as well as religious levels, any support upwards (from the poor to the wealthy) was involuntary, through taxation and mandatory fees for religious services. Wealth and honour rather than ‘proven leadership skills, administrative ability or other qualifications’ were deciding factors in accession to positions of leadership.³³¹ The

³³¹ Clarke, *Community*, p. 148.

Mediterranean patronage system had a flow of provision counter to that commanded for the Pauline communities as seen in the PE. Those in positions of leadership typically had independent means and were considered to have a civic responsibility to provide for those under them, who were generally less well off. As benefaction in the new community of the ἐκκλησία seems to be expected of the entire community, not just of the well-off, one could either conclude that Paul and his followers were being counter-cultural in their implementation of patronage, or that the Christian communities were viewed more as an association of equals rather than a rigidly stratified group.³³² It could also be these were combined: that the community internally held to counter-cultural values, while desiring to present itself as not being a threat to society.

The Jewish practice of supporting priests, Levites, and their families through the sacrificial system, tithes, and the redemption money paid for the first-born was something that was known by Paul and cited by him as a model of appropriate provision (1 Cor 9:13).³³³ There is not apparent in Paul's writings, however, any regulated system for the proportion of one's income or goods which was to be given for the benefit of the congregation. Even though there is a sense of obligation regarding support in Paul's instructions, there is no statement that a set sum is to be given by those in the congregation or provided to the leaders. Instead, one's giving was to be voluntary and cheerful rather than forced and grudging (2 Cor 9:7). The instructions in the PE make support explicit for the leaders of local congregations. Only Gal 6:6 in the undisputed Paulines comes anywhere close to this provision for settled rather than itinerant leaders and even there the reference is implicit. The instructions of the Pastor, even with the 'double honour' statement, do not offer any other significant refinement

³³² Cf. Winter, *Welfare of the City*, p. 78.

³³³ This Jewish precedent is also cited by the Didachist (*Did.* 13:3-7), though not by the Pastor, who does not refer to temple or Levitical law in connection with support for leaders. Even 2 Tim 2:20, which might reasonably have referred to the temple in regard to noble and ignoble vessels, simply refers to a 'large house'. The PE are not devoid of references to the Jewish Scriptures (1 Tim 5:18; 2 Tim 3:8, 16), but also do not rely on references to Jewish practice to the same extent as the undisputed Paulines.

of or more stringent guidelines regarding the support of those who minister than are found in the writings of Paul. The instructions given in the undisputed Pauline writings as well as in the PE, while drawing on arguments from religious as well as secular contexts of the Mediterranean world, were not close parallels to any of the contemporary communities. The concept of voluntary support of congregational leaders seems to have been an innovation rather than simple emulation of any cognate group. Indeed, as Aejmelaeus points out regarding Paul's apostleship, 'There was nothing in the Hellenistic tradition – neither in the Jewish religion, in the pagan religiosity nor in the conditions of life in the social environment of Paul – which would have forced Paul to take a salary from the congregation if he wanted to be taken seriously as an apostle; things were rather the other way around.'³³⁴

As has been seen, the tendency was against wages or other support for leaders, with the specific options dependent on one's social context. For Greek philosophers, there were four options: charge fees, become a resident intellectual, beg, or work.³³⁵ If one was a philosopher, then the fourth option, to work, was the most degrading.³³⁶ If one was a Jew, then to work was the most honourable. This might explain Paul's stance towards being paid by the Corinthians, but what about his confirmation of right to pay for other Christian workers? What should be understood in the situation in the PE?

Was it the Pastor's attempt to bring about somewhat of a social revolution in this reversal of what would seem to have been a norm in a Greek milieu, such as in Ephesus? Had the communities adopted an attitude regarding honour values different from that of Græco-Roman society, perhaps mimicking Paul's status reversal of 1 Cor 4:9-13? It seems unlikely that this was entirely the case: the affirmation of law in general (1 Tim 1:8-11), the urging of prayers for and obedience to the authorities (1 Tim 2:1-4; Titus 3:1-2), concern for the leaders' good reputation with outsiders (1 Tim

³³⁴ Aejmelaeus, 'The Question of Salary' (p. 375).

³³⁵ Aejmelaeus. 'The Question of Salary' (p. 356).

³³⁶ As already seen, however, the options of charging fees and living as a resident intellectual were also considered dishonourable by many philosophers.

3:7), the instructions regarding respect of masters by slaves (1 Tim 6:1-2) all speak for rather than against the status quo. The purpose of this was to enhance the acceptance of the gospel (1 Tim 2:3-4; Titus 2:10-11), and it seems highly unlikely that the Pastor would have commanded something which hindered the spread of the gospel. As MacDonald observes, ‘The lack of evidence for tendencies of world-rejection in 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus is striking. Language of separation is connected for the most part with the problem of false teaching.’³³⁷

The Pastor’s instruction regarding provision for the community’s leaders, while clearly demanding tangible support (μισθός – v. 18) also included a demand of not just honour, but double honour (διπλή τιμή – v. 17). It was not the support (whether a portion of the food or more likely financial provision) that was to be doubled or increased but rather the honour. Notwithstanding the lack of precedent for understanding ‘double’ as addition of another element (a+b) rather than increase or proportionality (2a), the command that support be provided within a context of double honour suggests that a double entendre (provision + respect) may have been the intent of the ‘double honour’ (v. 17).

One way of providing support without reducing honour would be if the group was comprised of individuals who were all on the same social plane. This would take things out of the client-patron relationship into the sphere of social equals, permitting mutual assistance. Was the congregation in fact socially homogeneous? This seems not to have been the case, given the references to slaves and masters (1 Tim 6:1-2; Titus 2:9-10) and to the wealthy (1 Tim 6:17-19) which suggest diversity. In the eyes of outside observers, the community portrayed in the PE was not comprised of social equals.

Meggitt speaks of ‘mutualism’, defined as ‘the implicit or explicit belief that *individual and collective well-being is attainable above all by mutual*

³³⁷ MacDonald, *Pauline Churches*, p. 165.

interdependence', further defining this idea by stating that 'if mutualism has to be understood in the language of "reciprocity" then it can be said to be, in a rough sense, a form of horizontal reciprocity'.³³⁸ In Meggitt's construct, however, this is all based on his contention that the communities are not just fictively equal, but are genuinely poor.³³⁹ This cannot be supported based on the text of the PE, given the clear references to differences in social status.³⁴⁰ It may be, though, that members treated each other as equals ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, within the community, whatever their social status was outside that community (Gal 3:28).³⁴¹

³³⁸ Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, p. 157.

³³⁹ At the same time, Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, p. 159, argues that the charity 'was not intended to be the work of a few wealthy members or congregations' and cites 2 Cor 8:1-5; 9:1-4 in support. This statement seems to invalidate his basic premise of uniform poverty. Nor does it seem likely that the earlier Pauline community in Corinth was uniformly poor. Cf. Horrell, *Social Ethos*, pp. 93-101, in opposition to this thesis of homogenous poverty.

³⁴⁰ Cf. the discussion rejecting much of Meggitt's thesis of uniform poverty in the early church as well as his responses in Martin, 'Meggitt', pp. 51-64; Meggitt, 'Response to Martin and Theissen', pp. 85-94; Theissen, 'Social Structure: Critical Remarks on Meggitt', pp. 65-84; Theissen, 'Social Conflicts: Further Remarks on Meggitt', pp. 371-91. A similar approach to that of Meggitt is found in Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 94-95, who argues against Chow and Clarke in their portrayal of a sharp status differentiation within the Corinthian congregation, and sees the genuinely Pauline communities (especially in Corinth) as essentially egalitarian while at the same time being heterogeneous in legal status and gender. His interpretation of the situation in 1 Cor 5 (pp. 64-66, 86-87) is not convincing. He sees the cause for the toleration of the incest situation simply as moral libertinism rather than issues of status (p. 66). As for the court cases of 1 Cor 6, while he considers these to be between wealthy status-equals and for purpose of status enhancement, such an interpretation contradicts his thesis and supports the contention that the congregation in Corinth was not egalitarian.

³⁴¹ J. H. Elliott, 'The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian But Family-Oriented', *BibInt*, 11 (2003), 173-210, pp. 178-87, esp. p. 180, cautions against reading too much equality into Gal 3:28, and points out that the specific relationship stated is one of unity, not equality. Elliott is probably correct: one should not take Gal 3:28 to mean that there was actual equality in the Pauline communities or even that Paul thought they should be egalitarian. However, the unity spoken of in Gal 3:28 suggests notions of equality. Elliott states that this 'pre-Pauline baptismal formula affirms the all-inclusive oneness of all who through faith and baptism are "in Christ." The formula, also as understood and employed by Paul, affirms that former conventional ethnic, economic, and social distinctions remain but are no longer determinative of who is or can be "in Christ" (p. 186). If the issue is inclusion, so that the only change is 'who is or can be "in Christ"', why include the gender and economic distinctions? Paul is arguing in Gal 3 against a return to a Jewish approach to covenant, and women and slaves were not excluded from participation as covenant people in the Jewish understanding. The ethnic distinction has a clear context in Galatians, but even there Paul's argument is not regarding whether Gentiles 'can be "in Christ"'. Rather, Gal 3:28 must be speaking to something more than simple inclusion, and so the issue here is that there is no difference in their status *in Christ*. Whether Jew or Gentile, male and female, slave or free, all are one *and equal* in coming into the relationship with Christ in this way and are therefore one *and equal* in their status in Christ or as Abraham's offspring. This does not mean that their social status in the world was leveled. It does mean, however, that these distinctions are now secondary to being 'in Christ'.

The device which permitted the Pastor to suggest that leaders be paid without diminishing their honour in Græco-Roman society is not disclosed in the text.³⁴² There are no instructions here regarding a stratagem of artificial equality. There is, however, in the Pauline corpus a good deal of discussion of the equality of those in Christ.³⁴³ This equality, seen as real by those inside and most likely as fictive by those outside, could offer a plausible explanation which would have assisted in rendering acceptable to outsiders the practice of supporting resident leaders.³⁴⁴ If the gospel was to spread unhindered, it was necessary to provide support for the leaders, enabling them to carry out their labour. It was also necessary that the leaders' reputation in the greater community in which the church existed not be diminished. The way in which these instructions are formulated in 1 Tim 5:17-18 seems to provide for both sets of needs.

³⁴² Elliott, 'Jesus Movement', p. 203, argues that the honour to be given the elder in 1 Tim 5:17-19 is an example of 'status differentiation' and 'superior status' rather than equality. As seen in this study, the act of supporting the leader was not likely to normally be perceived as honouring.

³⁴³ Cf. Horrell, *Social Ethos*, pp. 124-25, 154-55, 195-98. It would be wise not to overstate the understanding of equality within the community. Horrell remarks of the situation in Corinth that 'social distinctions and stratification were clearly evident among the believers and that struggles for power and position still took place. This is not to deny that Paul *may* have had a vision of the community as in some way "egalitarian", but it certainly cannot simply be assumed that this ever or anywhere approximated to the reality encountered' (p. 125). Even if the equality was not always clearly expressed ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, Paul proclaimed it as nonetheless real ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Gal 3:28).

³⁴⁴ If this is indeed the case, then there are counter-cultural values to be seen here. In the undisputed Pauline material these are seen in the baptismal and other equality statements. In the PE, this equality is expressed in the practices in view here (primarily reward, but cf. the later discussion on discipline) and this counter-cultural equality could also be what enabled those in the surrounding culture to deem reward for leaders in the group not dishonourable.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE LEADER: 1 TIMOTHY 5:19-21

The next section of the Pastor's instructions deals with the discipline necessary to ensure proper behaviour within the group, particularly, but not exclusively, of the leadership. The author's concern is to protect leadership from spurious accusations, but also to ensure that genuine problems are resolved to benefit the entire community. Strife within the church presents a real danger.³⁴⁵ Unhealthy tendencies on the part of the congregation as well as on the part of the leadership are to be curtailed.³⁴⁶ This section includes the discussion of proper evidence and testimony as well as the process of enforcing discipline.

3.1 – Text, Variants, and Translation of 1 Timothy 5:19-21

¹⁹ κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου,
ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων.

²⁰ Τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε,
ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσιν.

²¹ Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων,
ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξης χωρὶς προκρίματος,
μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν.

1 Tim 5:19 has two significant textual variants in the manuscripts.³⁴⁷ Several manuscripts omit ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων, making the instruction one of summarily rejecting all accusations against elders.³⁴⁸ Elliott suggests that this may have been due to either a flaw in the manuscript being copied or theological or

³⁴⁵ H. C. Kee, *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective: Methods and Resources* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980), p. 166.

³⁴⁶ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 200.

³⁴⁷ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 83, also lists the following minor or poorly attested variations: he deems the substitution of πρεσβυτέρους for πρεσβυτέρου in v. 19 in L a 'sheer' scribal error. The substitution of καταδέχου for παραδέχου in 2, 1311, 823, and 635 is considered to be the result of scribal confusion due to the κατὰ earlier in the sentence, and the substitution of ἐπιδέχου for παραδέχου, while more suitable in the context, is thought to have been used in 1022 and 1245 because of the ἐπί later in the sentence.

³⁴⁸ Omitted by b, Cyp, Ambst, Pel^A, Ps-Hier^(codd), Hier^(codd). Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 83-84. Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 609; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 575.

sociological objections.³⁴⁹ The manuscript evidence suggests the reading adopted by the text, and follows other passages which refer to evidential requirements to support accusations (including LXX Deut 17:6, 19:15; Matt 18:16; 2 Cor 13:1; Heb 10:28), notwithstanding Bartsch's suggestion that the original intent of this passage was complete immunity from disciplinary action.³⁵⁰

The second variant has to do with whether the original reads δύο ἢ τριῶν ('two or three') or δύο καὶ τριῶν ('two and three').³⁵¹ 'Two and three' is more faithful to LXX Deut 19:15, but even there the sense is one of 'two or three'.³⁵² Elliott argues that ἢ is an assimilation to Heb 10:28 and LXX Deut 17:6, so that the reading with καί is the original, but Marshall points out that the MS evidence for this is too weak.³⁵³ The reading adopted by NA²⁷ is most likely the original. In any case, both readings blend elements of LXX Deut 17:6 and 19:15, and neither is an exact quotation of either reference.³⁵⁴

1 Tim 5:20 has one significant variant reading, which is the addition of δέ ('but') between τούς and ἀμαρτάνοντας.³⁵⁵ This presents an easier reading, contrasting those who have sinned with those who refuse to repent, and as such the omission of δέ probably represents the original reading.³⁵⁶ The addition clarified the

³⁴⁹ Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 83-84. Cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 303.

³⁵⁰ H. W. Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen: Studien zu den Pastoralbriefen* (Hamburg: Evangelischer Verlag, 1965), p. 100, states: 'Ebenso dürfen wir in der ursprünglichen Regel die vollständige Immunität der Presbyter bezeugt sehen. Weil sich dies in der Praxis also unzugänglich erwies, wurde aus der Proklamierung der Immunität die Einschärfung, daß gegenüber den Presbytern auf die Einhaltung der Regel von Dr. 19,15 zu achten ist, obwohl diese Regel für die gesamte Gemeinde galt.'

³⁵¹ The reading καί is found in 1022, 1739, 1245, 2005, vg^{codd}, Aug, Cass, and Eucherius.

³⁵² Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 84.

³⁵³ Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 83-84; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 609. 255 also substitutes τρισίν for τριῶν, but this is probably due to confusion with the use of the dative plural in LXX Deut 17:6 and in Heb 10:28, according to Elliott. Elliott also points out that F, G, Pel^B, and (it^{d.g}) omit ἐπί, most likely on stylistic grounds, but it is necessary to the meaning here and should not be omitted.

³⁵⁴ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 617. Likewise, Matt 18:6 blends elements of both LXX Deut 17:6 and 19:15.

³⁵⁵ Added in A, D*, (s F, G), 1175, pc it, vg^{mss}, Ambst, Hier, and Pel^B.

³⁵⁶ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 214; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 609; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 303.

meaning of the author regarding which elders are to be reproved publicly but is unnecessary as other elements in the passage already make this distinction clear.³⁵⁷

A number of variants are found in 1 Tim 5:21.³⁵⁸ As usual, the available manuscripts show various readings in the order of the sacred names. ‘Christ Jesus’ is preferred by a number of the most important manuscripts, while a number of others support ‘Jesus Christ’.³⁵⁹ The reading adopted seems most typical of the style of the PE.

A number of manuscripts add αὐτοῦ to ἀγγέλων, changing the meaning from ‘before God and (before) Christ Jesus and (before) the elect angels’ to ‘before God and before Christ Jesus and his elect angels’.³⁶⁰ Elliott hesitantly holds to ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, seeing the angels as God’s, but notes that ‘the occurrence of the longer reading in two positions is significant and may warn us against its originality’.³⁶¹ The lack of early attestation for the addition suggests that the first reading produced above is likely to be correct. In some manuscripts πρόσκλισιν, ‘partiality’, is replaced by πρόσκλησιν, ‘judicial summons’ or ‘invitation’.³⁶² The change is considered to be purely orthographical, thus the reading selected.³⁶³

³⁵⁷ καί is omitted in 330, 2400, some vg^{mss} and r, and most of the Latin Fathers. Many scribes felt that this use of καί was superfluous and therefore removed it. However, its use in 2 Tim 2:10 (as well as the manuscript evidence) suggests that it is appropriate to leave it in place. Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 208.

³⁵⁸ 506 and 206* substitute μαρτύρομαι for διαμαρτύρομαι, but the more intensive compound form is quite typical in the PE and common in the NT as well. This is most likely a scribal change, as the scribes tended to prefer simple to compound forms. One witness, 33, reads φυλάξης ταῦτα rather than ταῦτα φυλάξης, which disagrees with the standard practice of the PE and is probably sheer error. 88 reads κατὰ χάριν instead of κατὰ πρόσκλισιν, but this is an accidental addition by the scribe, as it is unsuitable in this context. Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 84-85.

³⁵⁹ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is supported by κ, A, D*, G, 33, 81, 104, 365, 629, 1739, 442, pc latt, co, Cl. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is supported by D², K, L, P, TR, 69, 1908 *et al.*, sy^p, hl, goth, arm, eth, and Chrys. F, Ψ, 630, 1175, 1739, 1881, pc bo^{mss} have Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 199-201.

³⁶⁰ 88, 436, 327, Bas, Ps-Hier, Hier, Dionysius Exiguus have αὐτοῦ ἀγγέλων, while 33, Ψ, (vg), sy^p, bo, Patricius, and Pel^B have ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 85, 237; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 610.

³⁶¹ Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 85, 237. The ‘two positions’ refers to the placement of αὐτοῦ, found before ἀγγέλων in some mss. and following it in others. Elliott accepts the second placement with reservations (αὐτοῦ following ἀγγέλων), without establishing a reason for the preference.

³⁶² πρόσκλισιν is found in κ, F, G, K, 81, 630, 1881, 1908**, 424**, latt, sy, Cl, Chr, and Thret, while πρόσκλησιν is found in A, D, Ψ, 1739, TR, L, P, 69, 1827, 33 *et al.*, Ath. Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 85, incorrectly mentions TR in support of πρόσκλισιν, but Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 610, Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 303, and the NA²⁷ text indicate that the TR follows the rejected πρόσκλησιν reading.

³⁶³ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 85; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 103; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 610; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 303.

The passage therefore reads as follows:

Against an elder do not accept an accusation, except on the basis of two or three witnesses. Those sinning reprove before all, in order that the rest might fear. I charge before God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels that [you] hold yourself to these things without prejudice; do nothing with partiality.

3.2 – Exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:19-21

The context of community life and leadership continues to be the author's focus. However, rather than honouring and rewarding the elder, the concern is one of community discipline of the elder, with care taken for the protection of the elder as well as for the community.

3.2.1 – κατὰ πρεσβύτεροι κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου

At this point in the discussion, the question is not one of judgement but rather one of the accusations which precede judgement.³⁶⁴ The Pastor intends to protect the elders from malicious and unsupported accusations which cause harm even in the case of a 'not guilty' verdict.³⁶⁵ Protection from unsubstantiated allegations, bringing to mind the 'idle gossip' of 1 Tim 5:13, is appropriate for any member of the congregation.³⁶⁶ The author recognizes that the visibility and prominence of those who lead expose them to greater danger of such accusations.³⁶⁷

³⁶⁴ Chrysostom, *Homily 15 on Timothy*, v. 20. *NPNF*¹ 13:461.

³⁶⁵ Bratcher, *Translator's Guide Timothy and Titus*, pp. 51-52; H. F. Bürki, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an Timotheus*, 2nd edn, WSB (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1976), p. 180; Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 37; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 617; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 311; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 544; Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 126.

³⁶⁶ J. D. G. Dunn, '1 and 2 Timothy and Titus', in *The Second Letter to the Corinthians, the Letter to the Galatians, the Letter to the Ephesians, the Letter to the Philippians, the Letter to the Colossians, the First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians, the First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus, the Letter to Philemon*, ed. L. E. Keck, NIB (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), 11, pp. 773-880 (p. 822).

³⁶⁷ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 200, labels this 'eine begrenzte Immunität' and Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 45, suggests that this is a special expression of trust in the elders. Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 310 n. 427, differs with Brox, seeing even limited immunity as only supported by the much later manuscripts which omit 1 Tim 5:19b. This seems unlikely, though, as the removal of v. 19b would

Besides malice and envy, another factor which may cause such unfounded accusations is that of resistance to change. Brown calls this the ‘Caiaphas principle’ – ‘it is better that one person should die for the people than that the whole people perish’ (John 11:50) – and sees this rejection of those who disturb the status quo as a consequence of the teaching of the PE in general. While there may be ‘a certain societal inevitability to that principle’, the instructions given to Timothy in 1 Tim 5:19-21 would protect, among others, precisely that ‘brilliantly disturbing leader’.³⁶⁸

The substance of the accusation is not defined here. The term κατηγορία, ‘accusation’, also occurs in Titus 1:6, its only other appearance in the PE.³⁶⁹ In that passage the author stipulates that the children of the elder should not be open to accusations of being wild and disobedient. Other potential problems addressed in the PE include false doctrine, anger and violence, sexual behaviour, misuse of money, proper respect within and care for one’s family, gossip, and misuse of alcohol.³⁷⁰ It is probable that accusations against an elder would fit a broad category of moral misdemeanour, perhaps the misuse of money, rather than heresy or insubordination.³⁷¹ The immediate context of support for widows as well as governing elders lends credence to this idea.³⁷² The stress on proper use of alcohol and gentleness within the

give unlimited immunity. Cf. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 130; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 126-27; Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 256. Cf. also the discussion on the interpretation of Deut 19:15, following.

³⁶⁸ R. E. Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (London: Chapman, 1984), p. 42.

³⁶⁹ BDAG, p. 533. It is also used in John 18:29 of the accusation against Christ.

³⁷⁰ The following list is not exhaustive, but does indicate the relative space given to these issues. (The underlined passages are explicitly related to community leaders in the PE.) For false teaching, cf. 1 Tim 1:3-11, 19-20; 4:1-7; 6:3-5, 20-21; 2 Tim 2:16-18, 23; 3:2-8, 13; 4:3-4; Titus 1:13-16; 2:1; 3:9-12. For anger, violence, and strife, cf. 1 Tim 1:9, 13; 2:8, 3:3; 5:1; 2 Tim 2:23-25; 3:3; Titus 1:7; 2:9; 3:3. For moral issues, cf. 1 Tim 1:10; 2:9-10; 5:6; 2 Tim 2:22; 3:4; Titus 1:5; 3:3. For money issues, cf. 1 Tim 3:3, 8; 6:5, 9-10; 2 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:7. For familial relationships, cf. 1 Tim 3:4-5, 12; 5:4, 8, 16; 2 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:6. For gossip and slander, cf. 1 Tim 3:8, 11; 5:13; 2 Tim 3:3; Titus 1:5; 2:3. For warnings against misuse of alcohol, cf. 1 Tim 3:3, 8, 11; Titus 1:7; 2:2, 3.

³⁷¹ Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, pp. 126-27, argues that false teaching is in view, pointing to Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim 1:20) and Philetus (2 Tim 2:17), but then expresses caution regarding the use of this passage to brand others ‘heretics’. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 131, suggests that ‘the concern is more likely with erring elders who, as false teachers, are having considerable influence in the community’. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 312, pointing to Titus 1:6, considers extravagance and insubordination likely. While these are possible, the immediate context seems to be one of misuse of money (so Marshall) or moral failings and/or misuse of money (so Roloff). Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 617; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 310.

³⁷² Johnson, *Timothy*, pp. 260-64, 272-75, 280, 286-87.

leadership suggests another likely possibility for accusation within the framework of the PE. Further conclusions cannot be supported from the text.

The construction followed in v. 19 makes the target of the accusation clear: κατηγορία is preceded by κατά followed by the genitive of the noun referring to the one against whom an accusation is brought.³⁷³ Here it is an elder who is being accused, and is to be protected from unfounded accusations.

In v. 17 the plural ‘elders’ was used, and elders (plural) are to be disciplined in v. 20. In v. 19, however, the singular elder is the subject. The next verse makes it clear that more than one of the elders within the group may be guilty of sin, and each one of the elders was to be dealt with individually and appropriately, without any favouritism, as v. 21 clearly states. Each situation is to be investigated separately, with proper evidence presented. The Pastor is now dealing with the case of the elder who is not worthy of honour (v. 17).³⁷⁴

παραδέχομαι, ‘to accept’, is to ‘acknowledge as correct’.³⁷⁵ This term has a fairly broad semantic range.³⁷⁶ The closest equivalent use is Luke’s record of Paul’s speech in Acts 22:18, where Paul is told to leave Jerusalem, as his testimony about Christ will not be accepted. The instruction in this passage is to reject the accusation unless the specified requirements are met, thus offering an apparently needed protection.³⁷⁷ The force of the command (v. 20) and the solemnity of the charge which the writer declares that he has presented to Timothy (v. 21) make it clear that this disciplinary process was not to be trivialized, lending support to the idea that parts of

³⁷³ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 617. Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 463, note that while this use of κατά with the genitive is common in the rest of the Paulines as well as Luke-Acts, this is its only use in the PE.

³⁷⁴ Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 463.

³⁷⁵ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 617.

³⁷⁶ In Mark 4:20 the soil accepts the seed. In Acts 15:4 Paul and Barnabas are accepted or welcomed by the church. In Acts 16:21 the discussion is about practices which are not to be accepted. In Heb 12:6 God chastises every son whom he accepts.

³⁷⁷ Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 126 n, suggests that the ‘present-tense *do not entertain* may imply that inadequate evidence was being accepted as sufficient’. Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 279, goes further, stating that ‘the negative imperative in this verse may bear the nuance of “stop receiving,” with the implication that Timothy had been allowing some’. These interpretations are certainly possible but not necessary, indicated by the use of ‘may’ by both writers.

the process had not been properly implemented. The general rule set down for Timothy is not to accept accusations against elders, followed by a provision for accusations which can be properly substantiated.³⁷⁸ The Christian community is obligated to provide a fair examination.³⁷⁹

3.2.2 – ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων

The use of ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ is a pleonastic (double negative) construction, also found in 1 Cor 14:5 and 15:2, noted as a redundancy by Moule.³⁸⁰ While it is more common in late writers, it is also used in the larger Pauline corpus.³⁸¹ It has the sense of ‘unless’ or ‘except’.

ἐπί, ‘on the basis of’, introduces the lifting of the ban on accepting accusations: if specific requirements are met, then the accusation may be heard. When it is used with the genitive, it can mean ‘in the presence of’ and refer to appearing before judges in lawsuits (1 Cor 6:1; 1 Tim 6:13).³⁸² As used here, however, the following phrase makes it clear that the correct reading is ‘on the basis of’, in keeping with its use in Matt 18:16 and 2 Cor 13:1.³⁸³ Even though the latter texts use ἐπὶ στόματος (‘on the basis of the mouth of’ or ‘from the mouth of’, i.e., ‘based on the oral testimony of’), Heb 10:28, like 1 Tim 5:19, does not use στόματος. The sense in both the latter references is that

³⁷⁸ Bratcher, *Translator’s Guide Timothy and Titus*, pp. 51-52; Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 463.

³⁷⁹ J. W. Fuller, ‘Of Elders and Triads in 1 Timothy 5. 19-25’, *NTS*, 29 (1983), 258-63, p. 260.

³⁸⁰ C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 83. Cf. also J. H. Bernard, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899), p. 86.

³⁸¹ Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 86.

³⁸² Other possible meanings for ἐπί plus the genitive include ‘on’, ‘at’, ‘near’, ‘before’, ‘toward’, ‘over’, ‘in the time of’, and ‘for’. Cf. BDAG, pp. 363-67.

³⁸³ BDAG, p. 365; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 617; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 545.

of witnesses who give legal testimony.³⁸⁴ These are individuals who are able to confirm that the transgression took place.³⁸⁵

Knight differs, citing the Matt 18:16 process which involves witnesses who in effect *become* witnesses by sitting in on the discussion of the dispute. According to this view, Timothy is being urged by the writer to follow this procedure ‘before the church accepts or acknowledges as correct an accusation against an elder. The process may consist of two or three witnesses bringing an accusation, but normally it would consist of two or three witnesses verifying an accusation that may come from only one individual before it is considered further.’³⁸⁶ There are problems with Knight’s argument. While ἐπί can mean ‘in the presence of’, Knight himself rejects that reading and argues that it means ‘on the evidence of’.³⁸⁷ The clear intent of the passage is to prevent spurious allegations. Any accusation accepted would therefore have to be substantive, based on proper testimony. In Knight’s scenario, however, the thrust of v. 19 is ‘make sure you have two or three witnesses present to hear the accusation’. The testimonial rather than observing function of the witnesses in 1 Tim 5:19 is confirmed by virtually all commentators and also fits the original meaning of the Scripture cited (Deut 19:15). The command ‘against an elder do not accept an accusation’ is powerful and forceful. Following this with ‘unless you have two or three witnesses present to hear the accusation’ is anticlimactic, presenting no real obstacle to the accusation and

³⁸⁴ Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 86; F. W. Danker et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 235; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 619. Cf. H. Strathmann, ‘μάρτυς’, trans. G. W. Bromiley, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, G. Friedrich, and G. W. Bromiley, 10 vols (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1967), 4, pp. 474-514 (pp. 489-90), for a discussion on judicial use of ‘witness’.

³⁸⁵ Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 452.

³⁸⁶ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 235. G. Wohlenberg, *Die Pastoralbriefe: (der erste Timotheus-, der Titus- und der zweite Timotheusbrief)*, KNT 8 (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1906), pp. 180-81, holds a similar view, citing use of the genitive rather than the dative. He sees the protection for the elder not in a requirement of multiple witnesses to the offence, but rather in the idea that the accusation will have to be presented before not just Timothy and the accused, but others as well.

³⁸⁷ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 235. Knight in fact seems to change his mind from one paragraph to the next. He first states that the meaning is ‘on the basis of’ and that ‘witness’ is used ‘in the sense of one who bears testimony’. He then goes on to state that ‘the process may consist of two or three witnesses bringing an accusation, but *normally* it would consist of two or three witnesses verifying an accusation that may come from only one individual before it is considered further’ (emphasis added). There is nothing in this passage to support this interpretation.

thus offering no protection to the elder. Following the command rather with the limiting clause, ‘except on the basis of two or three witnesses’, offers the protection which is the evident intent of the command.³⁸⁸ Evidence from at least two witnesses must be present before accusations against an elder are to be entertained.³⁸⁹ A single unsubstantiated testimony was not enough to convict anyone, particularly in capital offences (Deut 17:6). The witnesses needed to be individuals who had witnessed the actual offence, according to Deut 19:15, rather than ones who had heard a charge from a single person and then relayed this to Timothy.³⁹⁰

The specific identity of the witnesses and/or accusers is not given. In light of v. 20, where ‘all’ is a reference to the whole church and ‘the rest’ to the other elders, it appears that accusations may be tendered by any member of the congregation, not only by one of the other elders.³⁹¹

3.2.3 – τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγε

It is implicit in the text that Timothy has the authority to convene a hearing and judge such cases, as well as to reject them if they are found to be without merit.³⁹² If the accusations prove to be true, those sinning are to be reprovved before all. The structure of this passage suggests that ‘those sinning’ refers to elders who were properly accused according to v. 19 and have been found to be at fault.³⁹³ The use of the participle ἁμαρτανοντες in v. 20 rather than the substantive ἁμαρτωλός argues that sinning

³⁸⁸ If it had been the writer’s intent to state that observers were needed, the text would probably read ‘ensure that you have two or three witnesses present when an accusation is presented against an elder’, putting the force of the sentence on the presence of witnesses rather than on limiting of accusations against elders.

³⁸⁹ Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 86; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 545.

³⁹⁰ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 312.

³⁹¹ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 102; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 312.

³⁹² Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 618.

³⁹³ Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 130; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 102; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 304-6, 312. Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 279, points to the lack of clarity regarding the subject of ‘those sinning’, which may be a reference to those bringing spurious or malicious charges. That would make 1 Tim 5:19-21 more focused on the protection than the discipline of the elders, which seems unlikely. Johnson himself proceeds on the assumption that this is the elder who sins, ‘without special attention to the note of persistence in sin’. Johnson considers that the emphasis should be placed here on the ‘rebuke in the presence of all’ rather than supposed persistence in sin.

presbyters rather than sinners in general are in view.³⁹⁴ The discipline of errant elders is a significant part of the health of the community.³⁹⁵

τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας, ‘those sinning’, could refer to elders who sin constantly rather than occasionally, to continued sin after established accusations, or simply to elders whose guilt has been established. Mounce sees a linear aspect to ἀμαρτάνοντας as well as ἔλεγχε and suggests that both could be correct: this is an elder who lives a life of sin rather than commits an occasional sin, and that Timothy is to be in the habit of confronting this.³⁹⁶ Fee states that this refers to ‘those who are sinning’ rather than ‘those who have sinned’.³⁹⁷ The elder who has not repented but persists in his sin is to be reproved.³⁹⁸ Kelly suggests, however, that ‘when an elder’s guilt is established in this way, Timothy should publicly expose him, so that the rest may be afraid’, rather than restricting such public discipline only to those who persist in their error.³⁹⁹ Knight also sees this as commanding public reproof of all elders whose guilt has been established.⁴⁰⁰ Bratcher correctly points out that ‘the Greek present participle need not mean here “those who continue to sin” but only “those who commit sins” (TEV)’.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁴ N. Adler, ‘Die Handauflegung im NT bereits ein Bußritus? Zur Auslegung von I Tim 5, 22’, in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mußner (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963), pp. 1-6 (pp. 2-3).

³⁹⁵ Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 257. The argument that the subject changes here from elders to sinners in general seems unlikely in view of the structure of the passage as well as the common shift from singular to plural in the PE, seen in 1 Tim 2:9-15 and 5:13-16. Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 608-9; Meier, ‘*Presbyteros*’, pp. 331-32; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 304-6; Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 465.

³⁹⁶ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 312.

³⁹⁷ Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 130.

³⁹⁸ Others supporting the concept of persistence in sin, generally citing the present tense or linear aspect and appealing to church practice as in Matt 18:17 include Bürki, *Erste Brief an Timotheus*, p. 181; Dunn, ‘1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’ (p. 823); Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 102; Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 37; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 618; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 312; Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 466; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 545; Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 126; Wohlenberg, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 180-81.

³⁹⁹ Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 127.

⁴⁰⁰ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 236. He then goes on to say that ‘a sinner is publicly rebuked...only when the other steps have failed’, suggesting that the offending party is persisting in sin. The text does not, however, give any ‘other steps’. Knight and others assume that the writer of the PE knew of and was implementing Matt 18:15-17.

⁴⁰¹ Bratcher, *Translator’s Guide Timothy and Titus*, p. 52. Scholars taking the view that ‘those sinning’ are elders whose guilt has been established, regardless of persistence, include Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 200; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 77; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 279; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 127; Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 45; Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 257; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, pp. 310-11.

This passage does not clearly establish whether all established sin is to be reproved or only persistent sin. Certainly, the suggested outcome of fear has more force if all confirmed sin is reproved. This would remove the option of avoiding shame by quick repentance, genuine or feigned. In the immediate context of protecting the elder unless an accusation of sins can be substantiated (v. 19), it seems most likely that the intent of the writer was to give instructions on what to do once the accusation was substantiated. Logically, ‘persistence in sin’ could only apply to those who were reproved and have not repented, so the reproof must precede the persistence. Otherwise, the instructions given to Timothy are incomplete. The passage argues: ‘Do not accept accusations against elders unless they are properly substantiated. If substantiated, take the proper corrective action.’ There is no mention of private or public warning which could result in recalcitrance or persistence, which should then be publicly reproved. The passage suggests that there were at the time individuals in the community who were sinning and needed to be dealt with.⁴⁰²

The Greek word order is similar between the instruction regarding accepting accusations and that about reproof, suggesting a connection in the writer’s mind between v. 19 and v. 20.⁴⁰³ The focus of both the protection and the discipline is the body of elders.⁴⁰⁴ This does not exclude the rest of the congregation from either protection or discipline, but places the centre of attention on the elders.⁴⁰⁵

ἐλέγχειν has a range of meanings, from exposing to penalizing, and is found in four other PE passages.⁴⁰⁶ In Titus 1:13, Titus is instructed to confront the Cretans

⁴⁰² Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, pp. 130-31.

⁴⁰³ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 313.

⁴⁰⁴ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 200; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 102-3; Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 96; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 618; Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 250; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 310 n. 432.

⁴⁰⁵ Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 130; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 618; Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 127.

⁴⁰⁶ BDAG, p. 315, has four levels of ἐλέγχειν: ‘to scrutinize or examine carefully, bring to light, expose, set forth’; ‘to bring a pers. to the point of recognizing wrong-doing, convict, convince’; ‘to express strong disapproval of someone’s action, reprove, correct’; and ‘to penalize for wrongdoing, punish, discipline’.

sharply.⁴⁰⁷ The other three occurrences pair ἔλεγχειν with παρακαλεῖν (‘to exhort’), suggesting the remedial goal of reproof.⁴⁰⁸ The nuance in v. 20 suggests that Timothy is to ‘express strong disapproval of someone’s action, reprove, correct’, one step below punishing or disciplining.⁴⁰⁹ The discipline here is not excommunication (as suggested in 1 Tim 1:20) nor does it explicitly or necessarily include dismissal from office.⁴¹⁰ In other discipline in the PE the goal is restoration (2 Tim 2:25). The intent is not forensic but rather moral pedagogy: bringing someone back from their error. This is particularly seen in 2 Tim 4:2, where this word plays a prominent role in the proper functioning of a pastor, who is to ‘convince, rebuke, and exhort’.⁴¹¹ The Pastor’s instructions end with the reproof itself and prescribe no further specific disciplinary measure.⁴¹² The sin is not likely to be ‘extremely serious’, since harsh penalties are not being exacted.⁴¹³

ἐνώπιον can either modify τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας or ἔλεγε. If the former, then those who sin before all (sin publicly) are to be reproved; if the latter then the reproof is to occur before all (public correction). The desired result, ‘that the rest might fear’, argues for the latter reading. The author charges Timothy ‘before God’ and others to act in a specific way in the very next verse, and a similar charge ‘before others’ occurs in several passages in the PE.⁴¹⁴ Although in these passages ἐνώπιον follows the verb, the context suggests that ἐνώπιον modifies what follows, consistent with the chosen translation of ‘before all’, giving a public venue for the act of discipline.

⁴⁰⁷ While Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 313, considers this use to be ‘in its harshest sense’, it seems more likely that BDAG’s categorization of reproofing and correcting (the third level) is correct. In the PE references, Titus 1:9, 13 are categorized in the second level, the remainder in the third level. BDAG, p. 315.

⁴⁰⁸ 2 Tim 4:2; Titus 1:9; 2:15. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 313.

⁴⁰⁹ BDAG, p. 315. The ultimate level of ἔλεγχειν seems to lie within the domain of God, though even there the expression is remedial rather than destructive (Heb 12:5; Rev 3:19).

⁴¹⁰ Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 127. Quinn differs, stating that whatever the transgression is, it is ‘conduct that could even disqualify a presbyter already in office from continuing to preside’. This is, however, assumed rather than being stated by the text. Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 463.

⁴¹¹ Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 311 n. 433.

⁴¹² Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 311.

⁴¹³ Fuller, ‘Elders’, p. 260.

⁴¹⁴ 1 Timothy 5:21. 2 Tim 2:14 and 4:1 all use an identical construction, and a similar one is used in 1 Tim 6:13.

Another question is the identity of those referred to as πάντων. If this refers to the elders, the reproof would occur in the context of a group of elders; if to the whole congregation, the reproof would occur before everyone in the church; if to all people, then before all of humanity.⁴¹⁵ If it were possible to fix the identity of οἱ λοιποὶ ('the rest') in the next phrase, the identification of this group might be eased. However, 'the rest' could be the rest of those who are sinning, or it could be the rest of the elders. It seems clear that there are two different groups in mind here: 'the rest' and 'all'. They could be and most likely are partially congruent ('the rest' are part of 'all') but not identical. If they were identical, it would have been logical to use οἱ λοιποὶ twice. If the primary goal was to cause all members of the congregation to fear, there would be no need to specify 'elders' in v. 19. Since the specific case being dealt with concerns elders, it is unlikely that 'the rest' would now have in mind all members of the congregation. If the group meant by οἱ λοιποὶ is the remainder of the elders, πάντων would most likely be the whole church.⁴¹⁶

3.2.4 – ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσιν

The desired result of Christian discipline is generally positive. Elsewhere in the PE the expectation is that Hymenaeus and Alexander will learn not to blaspheme (1 Tim 1:20). In 1 Cor 5:5 even the unpleasant destruction of the body is worthwhile, in view of the prospect of the salvation of the spirit. In Matt 18:15 the result of heeded

⁴¹⁵ Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 466, argue that the PE typically indicate when πάντων refers to believers rather than all humanity and that one should restrict 'all' to the elders, for it clearly does not refer to all of humanity. However, οἱ λοιποὶ is generally understood in terms of the remaining (not-sinners) elders, and Quinn and Wacker acknowledge this problem in terms of the intent of the passage. For other uses of ἐνώπιον πάντων, cf. Acts 19:19, where books of sorcery are burned publicly; Acts 27:35, where Paul breaks bread and gives thanks publicly; and in the larger NT context, Luke 8:47, where a woman healed of hemorrhaging confesses her unauthorized touch of Christ publicly; and Rom 12:17, where Paul instructs believers to be careful to 'do right' before all.

⁴¹⁶ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 200; Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 130; Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 118; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 280; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 127; Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 236; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 314. Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 127, differs, citing traditions of honouring elders and finding it unthinkable that the elders would be disciplined in front of women and children. He suggests that the context is the eucharist, where a general 'Bußzucht' was practiced, making the public reproof of the elder less ostentatious. Cf. also Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 87, who sees the reproof as occurring before the other elders rather than the entire congregation.

admonition is the winning of one's brother. In this case, while a good outcome is presumably desired for the errant brother, the reference to καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ indicates that benefit is also sought for a wider circle.⁴¹⁷

This section as a whole is about ensuring the proper behaviour of those who exercise leadership. It is logical therefore that the desired result of the discipline would be the improvement of that leadership.⁴¹⁸ As has been indicated, πάντων seems to refer to the whole congregation, while οἱ λοιποὶ best suits the rest of the elders.⁴¹⁹ Fee points out that οἱ λοιποὶ typically means 'the others in the same category'. This reinforces the contention that the other elders are to have fear (while not excluding the concept of the entire congregation taking note and fearing as well).⁴²⁰

The result of the discipline is specified, rather than any specific punishment or disciplinary action beyond the act of reproof itself.⁴²¹ φόβος, 'fear', could be the fear of public shaming, the fear of the eschatological consequences of sinning, or the fear of God. This word does not occur elsewhere in the PE, so one cannot know exactly which sense is intended. The context of public reproof (contrasted with the double honour of the preceding section) suggests that fear of the shame of public exposure may be the focus here.⁴²² The intention is to scare the elders away from sinning, as well as to call them to proper behaviour.⁴²³ This fear is to work on and benefit all the leaders and thus the whole community. The use of ἔχωσιν indicates that the rest of the elders are to 'have as their own' this same fear, much as is indicated in the LXX of Deut 13:11.

⁴¹⁷ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 236-37.

⁴¹⁸ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 200; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 103; Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 236-37; Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 45; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 314.

⁴¹⁹ Taking the contrary position, Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 127, argues that 'the rest' is a favoured Pauline phrase for the body of believers at large, citing Phil 1:13; 1 Thess 4:13; Eph 2:3. He points to the broader NT context of Luke 8:10; 18:9, 11; 24:9-10; Acts 5:13; 17:9; 27:44. Holtz thus sees 'all' as the elders, and 'the rest' as the church. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 77, 79, see 'all' and 'the rest' as the rest of the elders.

⁴²⁰ Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 130. In effect two groups of elders are disciplined in v. 20: those who receive the direct action of discipline, and those who observe it and fear or take warning.

⁴²¹ Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 45.

⁴²² Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 314.

⁴²³ Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 311, esp. n. 435.

3.2.5 – διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων

In keeping with the strict rules related to evidence, Timothy is given a solemn charge about his handling of such a case. Similar language is found in 1 Tim 6:13 and 2 Tim 4:1-2a. The Pastor's strong language does not necessarily indicate that Timothy has been unfair in his dealings, but expresses a caution to exercise great care because of the seriousness of the process.⁴²⁴

διαμαρτύρομαι means to testify under oath. It is language found in a court of law. The διά prefix adds intensity to μαρτύρομαι, 'I testify', and is an emphatic demand or affirmation, depending on its context. In v. 21 the author is speaking as a witness himself, representing this as the will of God and himself as a witness to and transmitter of that will.⁴²⁵ Timothy is being warned or adjured to heed the instructions.⁴²⁶

The charge to Timothy is laid down ἐνώπιον, 'before', a heavenly forum, a triad of the heavenly figures.⁴²⁷ Numerous commentators see eschatological overtones to this, and regard the triad as referring to the divine figures who themselves will judge Timothy.⁴²⁸ This is unlikely, however, as there is no explicit mention of judging by this triad nor is there an eschatological element, as is found in 2 Tim 4:1. Instead, the activity of testifying is in the present tense, and these are three witnesses who are witnessing the charge, echoing the 'two or three witnesses' who would substantiate an

⁴²⁴ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 315. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 80, suggest that this begins a new section, but this is unlikely. The urgency of this charge relates much better to the preceding than the following instructions. Cf. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 131.

⁴²⁵ Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 128.

⁴²⁶ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 619.

⁴²⁷ As noted by Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 453, the association of Christ with God blurs the distinction between dyad and triad. 'Thus one might well read the triad as a dyad, with Father and Son in one division and all the holy angels in another.' It is doubtful that the intent of doing this was to echo 'two or three' or to distinguish between Father and Son on one hand, and the angels on the other.

⁴²⁸ Those who see an eschatological element to the triad, judging Timothy's handling of discipline, include Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 201; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 80; Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 131; Fuller, 'Elders', pp. 260, 262; Hanson, *Pastoral Letters*, p. 62; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 103; Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 37; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 127; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 315; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 546. Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, pp. 453-54, 467, first refer to the triad as witnessing the charge, but then also as eschatological judges.

offence of v. 19.⁴²⁹ The heavenly witnesses are to testify that the Pastor has properly laid out the charge to Timothy and called him to be impartial in his judging. The term most likely is used in the sense of ‘before the eyes of’ or ‘in the presence of’ rather than ‘to’.⁴³⁰

The expression ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ appears in Gal 1:20; 1 Tim 5:4; 6:13; 2 Tim 2:14; 4:1 as well as in this passage, and Christ is connected with God in two of these uses: 1 Tim 6:13 and 2 Tim 4:1. In Gal 1:20 God is called as a solemn witness.⁴³¹ In 1 Tim 5:4 correct behaviour toward genuine widows is pleasing before God. In 1 Tim 6:13 God and Christ Jesus are witnesses to the writer’s charge, which is given in v. 14. 2 Tim 4:1 reminds Timothy of God’s judicial function, but God and Christ Jesus are witnesses to the giving of the charge.⁴³²

Three of these references, 1 Tim 5:21; 6:13; and 2 Tim 4:1, have Christ Jesus appearing with God as a witness. All three omit the definite article before Christ Jesus. Granville Sharp’s rule would suggest that God and Christ Jesus are one and the same.⁴³³ However, as Bernard observes, ‘such quasi-official words as Χριστός are

⁴²⁹ Writers taking this position include Bürki, *Erste Brief an Timotheus*, p. 181; Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 128; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 280; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 619; Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 258-59; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 312; Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 127; Wohlenberg, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 181.

⁴³⁰ Rapske, *Paul in Roman Custody*, p. 402.

⁴³¹ God is also called as witness for Paul in Rom 1:9; 2 Cor 1:23; Phil 1:8; 1 Thess 2:5-10; by Christ in John 8:13-18.

⁴³² R. F. Collins, *Letters that Paul Did Not Write: The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Pseudepigrapha*, GNS 28 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988), p. 104, draws attention to the binitarian rather than Trinitarian nature of this passage: the witnesses are God, Christ Jesus, and the ‘elect’ angels rather than the Holy Spirit. This is not, however, unique to the PE: Mark 13:32 and Luke 9:26 appeal to this same triad. Cf. Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 103; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 618.

⁴³³ This is a well-known Greek construction where one article is used for two singular nouns joined by ‘and’ (καί), where these are not proper nouns. Where this occurs (notably 2 Pet 1:11 and Titus 2:13, but also in other passages) the two nouns refer to the same thing. For instance, in Titus 2:13 the appositive, Jesus Christ, must refer to both ‘God’ and ‘Saviour’. 1 Tim 5:21 is not an exception to the Granville Sharp rule but rather a passage which does not meet the criteria of the rule, even though Granville Sharp considered this to be a corroborating passage (pp. 48-49). In the version of the Greek text selected by him the passage read τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (thus ‘our God and Lord, Christ Jesus’) rather than τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and as seen in the discussion on variants, the addition of κύριος is not supported by the best manuscripts. Since ‘Christ Jesus’ is used exclusively as a proper noun in the PE 1 Tim 5:21 therefore does not meet the criteria of the Granville Sharp rule. Cf. the original work by G. Sharp, D. Whitby, and T. Burgess, *Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament: Containing Many New Proofs of the Divinity of Christ, from Passages Which Are Wrongly Translated in the Common English Version*, repr. 1995 edn (Atlanta: Original Word, 1798). pp. 25-62, 90-91. esp. p. 90 n. §, as

often used without the article, like proper names'.⁴³⁴ The omission of the definite article places Christ with God rather than with the angels in terms of position, rather than making the two identical.⁴³⁵

The third entity of the witnessing triad is 'the elect angels'. In this passage, the angels are not specified as being 'Christ's angels' or 'God's angels'. In the Pauline tradition, angels are Christ's in 2 Thess 1:7, and related to God in Gal 4:14. Elsewhere in the NT there are numerous references to the angel of the LORD (especially in the birth narratives) as well as to the Son of Man's angels (Matt 13:41; 16:27; Mark 13:27). The identification of the angels as belonging to either Christ or God is not significant to this passage, and the ambiguity may be intended.

The use of ἐκλεκτός, 'elect', is taken by some to refer to a subcategory of the angels who serve God and carry out specific tasks at his command.⁴³⁶ Although 1 Tim 5:21 is the only reference to 'elect angels' in the NT, it seems most likely that these are simply all the unfallen angels, with 'elect' used as an alternative to 'holy' angels.⁴³⁷ In other Scripture passages ἐκλεκτός refers those chosen by God, including Israel, the Messiah, and believers.⁴³⁸

well as the more recent discussions in F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. R. W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 145; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th edn (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), pp. 785-86; D. B. Wallace, 'Sharp Redivivus? A Reexamination of the Granville Sharp Rule', pp. 3 n. 9, 5, 32-33, 33 n. 151, 36 n. 165, (1998, accessed 1/10/2005); available from http://www.bible.org/assets/worddocs/wallace_sharp.zip.

⁴³⁴ Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 87.

⁴³⁵ Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 453; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 546.

⁴³⁶ 1 Cor 4:9 1 Tim 3:16; Rev 2:1. Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 312 n. 440, suggests that these are the archangels. Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 87; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 316; Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 467.

⁴³⁷ For fallen angels cf. 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6. For 'elect' applied to believers cf. Titus 1:1 and 2 Tim 2:10. Hanson, *Pastoral Letters*, pp. 62-63, states that 'the author may not consciously have accepted this implication' (regarding a reference to the fall of the angels). Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 96, takes the view that 'elect' is in distinction to 'fallen', and Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 131, suggests that the context of judgement (assumed by him and others) may also argue for 'unfallen' as elect. Bratcher, *Translator's Guide Timothy and Titus*, p. 52, simply states that 'elect angels' is 'a way of speaking about angels as a group; it is not a special classification of angels' but offers no support beyond this statement. Cf. Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 546.

⁴³⁸ Israel in, e.g., 1 Chr 16:13; Pss 88:4; 104:6, 43; Isa 65:9, 15, 23; the Messiah in Luke 23:35; John 1:34; 1 Pet 2:4, 6; and believers in Matt 24:22, 24, 31; Mark 13:20, 22, 27; Luke 18:17; Rom 8:33; 16:13; Col 3:12; 2 Tim 2:10; Titus 1:1; 1 Pet 1:1; 2:9; 2 John 1:1, 13; Rev 17:14.

Angels participate in a variety of aspects of God's work. They have special prominence in Christ's return and humanity's judgement, working with Christ as the final judge.⁴³⁹ In Rev 14:10 the 'holy angels' witness the punishment of Satan; in Rev 3:5 the angels witness the vindication of the faithful. In Paul's writings, other passages involving angels as witnesses (observing and/or testifying) are 1 Cor 4:9 and 11:10. In the PE, angels are witnesses in 1 Tim 3:16.⁴⁴⁰ Elsewhere in the NT, they testify and observe in Luke 12:8, 9; 15:10.

3.2.6 – ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξης χωρὶς προκρίματος

The content of the charge is now made clear, with ἵνα, 'that', introducing the charge itself. The use of the plural ταῦτα, 'these things', suggests that the charge relates back to the instructions of both vv. 19 and 20.⁴⁴¹ It is possible that ταῦτα also refers to the earlier instructions about honour due to worthy elders (vv. 17, 18).⁴⁴² The smaller context of 1 Tim 5:19-20 seems more likely than the expanded context of reward *and* discipline. The section on reward involved relatively clear instructions, with μάλιστα clarifying who should be rewarded. The appeal to ἡ γραφή suggests that no further discussion on reward was needed. Questions of honour and remuneration are not trivial, but the solemnity of the charge and warnings given regarding partiality point to the rather more serious and weighty issue of discipline.

Holtz suggests an even smaller context, stating that 'ταῦτα muß auf die Zuchtübung an Sündiggewordenen bezogen werden'. He focuses entirely on the

⁴³⁹ Regarding angels related to Christ's return and judgement, cf. Matt 13:39-42; 16:27; 24:31; 25:31; Mark 8:38; 13:27; Luke 9:26; 12:8-9; 1 Thess 4:16; 2 Thess 1:7; Rev 14:10, 14-20.

⁴⁴⁰ For a different interpretation of 1 Tim 3:16, cf. U. Borse, *1. und 2. Timotheusbrief, Titusbrief*, SKKNT 13 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985), pp. 48, 49, who translates ἄγγελος as 'messenger' rather than 'angel'. Christ was thus seen by 'the witnesses of the resurrection and the announcers of the good news', or the apostles. Cf. also Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, pp. 337-41, for a more extended discussion supporting a human rather than superhuman audience.

⁴⁴¹ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 237; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 620; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 316.

⁴⁴² Cf. Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 258; Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 468.

discipline (v. 20) rather than including the evidentiary process (v. 19).⁴⁴³ This does not adequately address the sternness of the command not to accept accusations without adequate basis. The plural ταῦτα is best understood as a reference to the necessary protection and discipline of elders, appropriate to their individual situation.

φυλάξης, ‘keep’ or ‘guard’, has to do with the command given to Timothy. In 1 Tim 6:20 and 2 Tim 1:12, 14 ταῦτα φυλάξης emphasizes guarding the ‘deposit’, the Pauline teaching and guidance. The thrust of this passage is that Timothy is to keep the instructions faithfully, and thereby to guard proper order in the church.⁴⁴⁴

προκρίματος, ‘prejudice’, originally comes from the courtroom, conveying the idea of judging in advance of knowing the facts.⁴⁴⁵ The term was used in the second century B.C.E. as a legal technical term.⁴⁴⁶ It occurs only here in the NT and has a more general force. In common use the term can have both good and bad associations, and is not inherently negative.⁴⁴⁷ Here it does have negative connotations, for it is being ruled out.

3.2.7 – μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν

In keeping with the instruction not to pre-judge, Timothy is charged not to engage in πρόσκλισις, partiality or favouritism. This explains what the author had in mind in the preceding phrase.⁴⁴⁸ The term describes an inclination or partiality to a perspective. Whenever used in early Christian literature it has negative overtones.⁴⁴⁹ Favouring someone in the disciplinary process is always wrong. Timothy is being instructed not to allow any personal biases to enter in to his decisions during the entire

⁴⁴³ This is placed in the context of confession before the Eucharist, but no clear proof for this is presented. Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 128.

⁴⁴⁴ Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, pp. 468-69.

⁴⁴⁵ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 315.

⁴⁴⁶ BDAG, p. 881; Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 238-39.

⁴⁴⁷ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 80; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 620.

⁴⁴⁸ Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 312 n. 437, labels the two commands of v. 21 as ‘faktisch synonym’. Cf. Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, pp. 469-70.

⁴⁴⁹ Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 239; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 316.

process, from acceptance of an accusation through the meting out of appropriate disciplinary measures.⁴⁵⁰

If the variant reading, πρόσκλησιν, were accepted as original, then it could indicate counterchallenges and offers (plea-bargaining). The charge not to engage in this ‘would presumably mean that questions of presbyteral discipline are not to be settled out of court or compromised’.⁴⁵¹ This is intriguing, as it seems to offer something other than repetition or expansion of the previous phrase. The accepted reading, πρόσκλησιν, is not radically different from προκρίματος in its ultimate effect. This instruction would suggest that Timothy not only be fair in his dealings but also ensure that the dealings remain public. As already noted, the reading chosen is much more likely to be original. The apparent repetition emphasizes that one is not to have decided the outcome in advance, nor is one to play favourites.⁴⁵²

3.2.8 – Disciplinary Practice in the Remainder of the Pastoral Epistles

The disciplinary passages found elsewhere in the PE can be expected to be the closest to 1 Tim 5:19-21 in authorial intent and consistency of process. Issues of concern include whether the individuals involved in the discipline are leaders, and whether there are distinct general components to the disciplinary practice which permit comparison and contrast to the procedures of 1 Tim 5:19-21. Passages of interest here are 1 Tim 1:3-4, 19b-20; 2 Tim 2:24-26; and Titus 3:10-11.⁴⁵³

In 1 Tim 1:3-4, the recipient is urged to ‘charge certain persons not to teach any different doctrine’. This is the first issue raised by the writer after the standard

⁴⁵⁰ Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 127, suggests that there may have been cases of ‘scandal arising out of the preferential treatment which erring elders have received’. The opening admonition suggests that accusations were being accepted too quickly, although bias during the disciplinary action is also to be avoided. Cf. Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 119; Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 129; Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 37; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 281.

⁴⁵¹ Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 103.

⁴⁵² Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 239; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 620.

⁴⁵³ Cf. South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 170-75.

epistolary greetings, omitting even the standard prayer/report/thanksgiving.⁴⁵⁴ Their aberrant teaching is to be resisted, with the intent of preserving the community. The offenders are not named, nor the venue for the resistance specified (private or public), nor any detail given beyond the charge to Timothy and some hints regarding the content and manner of the false teaching.

To what extent can the place within the community of these false teachers be determined? It is clear that these individuals were insiders, unlike the offenders of Rom 16:17 who seem to have been outside the group.⁴⁵⁵ As indicated by 1 Tim 1:7, the offenders wanted a role for themselves within the church which corresponded to that of Jewish teachers.⁴⁵⁶ Their false teaching had enough influence within the community to pose a threat to the group. This is not to say that they were regarded as leaders by the church, for they are ‘would-be’ teachers rather than real ones (1 Tim 1:7).⁴⁵⁷ These teachers of error were individuals of influence, whatever their official position, and were to be disciplined for doing improperly something that was the task of legitimate leaders.⁴⁵⁸ If they were at the time or had previously been elders, they were clearly not among those to be considered worthy of double honour!

The instruction becomes sharpened in 1 Tim 1:19b-20. Some (probably the offenders rather than those who had paid heed to them) have already suffered a

⁴⁵⁴ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 360.

⁴⁵⁵ South, *Disciplinary Practices*, p. 171. Cf. also Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 359, who considers 1 Tim 1:3-3:16 a piece which deals with ‘teachers and church leaders’.

⁴⁵⁶ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 372.

⁴⁵⁷ For a contrary view, cf. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 39, who states that ‘the church has been greatly endangered by some elders (probably), who think of themselves as **teachers of the law** (v. 7), but who in fact **teach false doctrines** (v. 3).’ (Emphasis in the original.) Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 40, goes on to point to the teaching responsibility of elders (1 Tim 5:17), the excommunication of two of these ‘teachers’ by Paul (1 Tim 1:19-20), and the ongoing concern over leaders in 1 Tim 3:1-7 and 5:19-25 as indications that these teachers of false doctrines came from within the leadership ranks of the church. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 19, also considers the opposition to have come ‘from within the leadership of the church’.

⁴⁵⁸ Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, pp. 63-64, considers this passage to refer to more than congregational members, but cites v. 7 as indication that the writer here refers to ‘Lehrer, die ihrerseits der Gemeinde mit einem gewissen Autoritätsanspruch gegenüberreten’. Roloff goes on to state that this struggle for correct doctrine is simultaneously a ‘Kampf zwischen legitimen und illegitimen Lehrern’. Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 233, concludes that the individuals involved in teaching false doctrine in the PE are a consistent group (rather than presenting a different set of opponents in each letter) and that they are teachers from within the congregation, known to the church and working within the church. For a contrary view, arguing for separation of the opponents between the various letters, cf. Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 166.

‘shipwreck of their faith’. This time names are given: Hymenaeus and Alexander. In language reminiscent of 1 Cor 5:5, these were ‘delivered to Satan’ by the author in order that they might ‘learn not to blaspheme’. Satan is mentioned as a tool of discipline, employed with remedial intent.⁴⁵⁹ The method and manner of delivering someone over to Satan is not specified. If these individuals are identical with those of 2 Tim 2:17-18 and 4:14, then the issue becomes still more confusing, for Hymenaeus in particular still seems to be doing active harm.⁴⁶⁰ Has he not yet been excommunicated? Perhaps the former insider is now working from outside the church and continuing to plague it?⁴⁶¹ Perhaps something more than formal excommunication is meant, such as a negative physical outcome, even death?⁴⁶² The writer’s terseness (and apparent expectation that the audience already knew the details) means that scholars today are restricted to speculations rather than firm conclusions.

Some overall conclusions can be reached, however. This disciplinary action differs from and is similar to 1 Tim 5:19-21 in several ways. In 1 Tim 1:19-20, it was the Pastor who carried out the discipline, while in 1 Tim 5:19-21 Timothy is instructed to carry it out. Those undergoing discipline were possibly leaders or former leaders in 1 Tim 1:19-20, but are explicitly leaders at the time of the discipline in 1 Tim 5:19-21. The stress on substantiation prior to establishment of guilt seen in 1 Tim 5:19, 21 is not found in 1 Tim 1:19-20, but this is not surprising, as the guilt of Hymenaeus and Alexander seems to have been clearly established in the mind of the writer, and the disciplinary action already transacted. Presumably the discipline would not have been carried out if the offence could not be proven. The action seems much more severe in 1 Tim 1:19-20 than that prescribed in 1 Tim 5:20. Both situations exhibit clear concern

⁴⁵⁹ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 414-15; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 106; South, *Disciplinary Practices*, p. 172.

⁴⁶⁰ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 413, argues that these named opponents (Hymenaeus, Alexander, and Philetus) were most likely figures well-known to the churches. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 59, Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 45. and Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 105, suggest that these were elders, particularly because of the context of Timothy’s commissioning.

⁴⁶¹ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 413, suggests that this is the case.

⁴⁶² Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 414, considers this, but points out that in such cases (Acts 5:1-11; 13:11; 1 Cor 11:30) it is God, not Satan, who inflicts the disaster.

for the health of the community. The use of παιδεύω in 1 Tim 1:20 (cf. 2 Tim 2:25) suggests a redemptive rather than destructive goal.⁴⁶³ The use of ἔλεγχειν in 1 Tim 5:20, coupled with the lack of any more stringent action, suggests that a similar concern for the restoration of the individual is present there.

In 2 Tim 2:24-26 the community leader is instructed in proper attitude during discipline. The focus of the discipline is teaching, and the intent is protection of the community from error. The attitude of the leader should be one of correcting those in error with gentleness, and the further intent is remedial: the correction is to bring about repentance, a return to the truth and an escape from the devil. These instructions are very general, not prescribing a specific form of discipline beyond teaching but rather advocating an attitude and stating a desired outcome. The objects of this gentle didactic discipline might well be Hymenaeus and Philetus (2 Tim 2:17-18) who had erred in their eschatology.⁴⁶⁴ In any case, argument and quarrel are to be avoided, and gentleness is commanded. The suggestion is that Timothy, a healthy community member,⁴⁶⁵ will act to bring errant members⁴⁶⁶ back in line with the community, for the benefit of those in error as well as the greater community.

The identity of those being disciplined is not explicitly stated, nor are the exact measures to be taken specified beyond gentle correction (παιδεύω). The stress in this

⁴⁶³ Cf. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 59; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 415; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 106. Consider also the self-characterization of the writer as a blasphemer in 1 Tim 1:13.

⁴⁶⁴ This is suggested by the proximity to the instruction.

⁴⁶⁵ Timothy is addressed as δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου, not negating his leading role, but placing him within the community as one of the useful utensils (2 Tim 2:20-22)

⁴⁶⁶ Whether these individuals are still to be considered members of the community is disputable, but the gentle attitude commanded by the writer suggests that they are. The NRSV renders 2 Tim 2:26 as 'and that they may escape from the snare of the devil, having been held captive by him to do his will', giving the alternate reading for the last phrase in a footnote as 'by him, to do his (that is, God's) will'. Those taking the view that these individuals have been taken captive by the devil in order to do the devil's will include Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 252; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 114; Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 266; Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 166-68; Hanson, *Pastoral Letters*, p. 90; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 142-43; Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 177; Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 52; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 191-92; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 767-68; Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 70; Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, p. 189. Those taking the view that the purpose of this action is so that the individuals would return to doing God's will, echoing the redemptive purpose of 'giving over to Satan' include Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 127-28; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 403; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 537-38; Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, pp. 655, 703-5. Mounce lists Guthrie and Jeremias as holding to the second of these options, but this is incorrect. The consensus is that those caught in the devil's snare are still members of the community, redeemable by God.

passage is the restoration of the offender, although community health is suggested by 2 Tim 2:16-17.

Titus 3:10-11 suggests what is to be done if the gentle teaching has not had its desired effect. Someone who is factious is to be admonished ‘once or twice’. Thereafter, in the absence of a positive response to correction, this person is to be avoided. He is an insider who has become an outsider, ‘perverted and sinful’, ‘self-condemned’. No specific form of discipline is given besides having ‘nothing more to do with him’.

The disciplinary passages in the PE show a consistent concern for the health of the community, coupled with a desire for the salvation or restoration of the errant member. It is possible to argue that the disciplinary concern of the PE is directed mainly toward leaders of the community, although this is only explicit in 1 Tim 5:19-21. The actions are consistently being undertaken by leaders of the community (the Pastor and Timothy), with the community itself taking on more the role of a spectator. The passages differ from one another in the specific actions being commanded or taken, ranging from gentle correction to avoidance to handing over to Satan. Prudence is urged regarding the disciplinary process itself: adequate evidence must exist, favouritism and partiality are forbidden, and gentleness is demanded of the one doing the disciplining.

3.3 –Discipline of Leaders in the Pauline Corpus

A significant portion of Paul’s ministry as recorded in the NT involved the correcting of doctrinal and behavioural problems. Disciplinary approaches of Paul and the communities founded by him, as well as in the communities based on his teaching, will be the substance of the following section. South’s definition of discipline as instructions ‘to act in some specifically corrective or defensive manner in response to deviant behaviour or teaching by community members or outsiders threatening the

community's welfare' will be used.⁴⁶⁷ General similarities and differences in disciplinary practice are of interest for the light they shed on Pauline practice, but the primary concern must be to establish whether any of the non-PE passages involves discipline of church leaders as church leaders, and if so, how these relate to 1 Tim 5:19-21.

3.3.1 – Discipline of Leaders in the Undisputed Pauline Texts

The passages of greatest interest here are 1 Cor 5:1-13; 2 Cor 2:5-11; 1 Cor 6:1-8; 2 Cor 13:1-2; Gal 6:1; and Rom 16:17.⁴⁶⁸ Of these, the Corinthian disciplinary events offer the most material.

From the divisions of 1 Cor 1:10-16 through the correction of issues in worship in 1 Cor 11-14, to the defence of Paul's apostleship itself throughout 2 Corinthians, Paul's experience with the Corinthians was tumultuous. The events of 1 Cor 5 and 2 Cor 2:5-11 form a useful case study or case studies of Paul's approach to discipline.

The situation in 1 Cor 5 was one which came about in Paul's absence. A man was living in incest, apparently with his stepmother (1 Cor 5:1). While the Græco-Roman world accepted more forms of sexual activity (including some forms of incest) than did Judaism, incest with one's mother or stepmother was reviled and denounced.⁴⁶⁹ Although this was offensive enough, Paul was horrified to discover that this had been tolerated by the church. Instead of entering a state of mourning and removing the offender from the community, the Corinthians had instead remained

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 2, 148.

⁴⁶⁸ These references, other than 1 Cor 6:1-8, are identified as examples of Pauline exercise of discipline by South, *Disciplinary Practices*. South also includes Phil. 3:2, which appears to be a warning rather than actual discipline and will be excluded from this study.

⁴⁶⁹ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 196-201; South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 27-30; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 385-87; B. Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), pp. 153-56.

complacent (1 Cor 5:2). This complacency may have been aggravated because the offender was one of the leading members of the community.⁴⁷⁰

Paul reacted decisively and clearly: as one who was spiritually though not physically present he had already pronounced the lacking judgement on this offender.⁴⁷¹ When they next assembled, the Corinthians were to be cognizant of this spiritual presence among them and were to ‘hand this one over to Satan’ with the intent that though his flesh be destroyed, his spirit might be saved at the day of the Lord (1 Cor 5:3-5).⁴⁷²

Paul went on to explain his concern and the need for this extreme act of discipline: it was for the ultimate health of the community. He made a distinction between those outside the boundaries of the community and those inside. Outsiders should be expected to act like outsiders (1 Cor 5:10), but when insiders acted like outsiders, they were to be judged and expelled (1 Cor 5:11-13). The community was to act in keeping itself pure.

The text offers only a strong hint of a few elements of this exclusion. The reference to eating (1 Cor 5:11) suggests that a result of the community’s action would be exclusion from fellowship, including from table fellowship. The command ‘with such a one do not even eat’ stresses the importance of individual action in effective

⁴⁷⁰ One reason for engaging in such incest would have been the preservation of property, suggesting that this may have even been one of the community’s patrons. This would help explain the community’s reluctance to act in the matter. Cf. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, pp. 130-39; A. D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*, AGJU 18 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 80-85; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, p. 386.

⁴⁷¹ H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 11th edn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), p. 117, suggests that the community is simply a forum in which Paul himself is doing the judicial work. This seems unconvincing: the more likely view is that of the entire community, including Paul, working together. Cf. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 204-6; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 390-92.

⁴⁷² Fee, *1 Corinthians*, p. 208, esp. n. 59, argues that the community is to hand over the person, while Conzelmann, *1. Korinther*, p. 117, sees Paul stating that he himself has already done so. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 393-95, translates 1 Cor 5:5a ‘we are to consign’, suggesting a community activity which includes Paul. Regarding the ‘handing over to Satan’, Thiselton sees this not as a physical death sentence or magical curse formula, but rather translates this verse as instructing the Corinthians to ‘consign this man, such as he is, to Satan with a view to the destruction of the fleshly, in order that the spirit may be saved at the day of the Lord’. The issue is thus not the destruction of the body but rather of negative fleshly (rather than positive spiritual) characteristics. (p. 384). For recent discussion, cf. South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 35-36, 38-68; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 395-400.

discipline.⁴⁷³ The reference to ‘judging’ (1 Cor 5:12) suggests some sort of process or ritual, which is not detailed in the passage. Harris suggests a ‘formal ceremony of removal carried out in the community’, but the text does not explicitly confirm the existence of, nor give any details of a formal ritual.⁴⁷⁴

The ultimate result of Paul’s instruction is not known. The offender is not named, nor is there any unambiguous reference to the resolution of the situation. Some commentators consider 2 Cor 2:5-11 to refer to a successful end to the case in 1 Cor 5, while the majority consider them to be separate cases.⁴⁷⁵ Either way, 2 Cor 2:5-11 refers to the aftermath of some disciplinary action which ended in mostly positive fashion, but required some more instruction from Paul to ensure that it had its most beneficial resolution.

Although the community (and he himself – cf. v. 10) had been caused pain by whatever necessitated the discipline of 2 Cor 2:5-11, Paul noted that ‘this one’ had responded positively to being punished by the majority of the community and his punishment has therefore been enough; the remedial intent has been realized. The shame of public exposure of the offence has been effective. He should now be forgiven so that he might not be overwhelmed by sorrow. The Corinthians should reaffirm their love for the offender and forgive him as Paul has forgiven him. As Satan apparently played a role in the discipline of 1 Cor 5, here his involvement is invoked in cautionary fashion: Paul cautions that an incorrect response to completed successful discipline by the disciplining group can result in further damage caused by Satan, the earlier damage doubtlessly being the result of the transgression which ended in discipline.

⁴⁷³ G. Harris, ‘The Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Corinthians 5’, *NTS*, 37 (1991), 1-21, pp. 17-18.

⁴⁷⁴ Harris, ‘Church Discipline’, p. 17, sees the use of the expulsion formula from Deut 17:7 as support that such a formal ceremony was carried out. This is possible but not explicitly supported by the text.

⁴⁷⁵ Writers proposing linkage include Bernard, Denney, Garland, Hughes, Hyldahl, Lampe, South, Stephenson, and Vanbeck. Those arguing against connection of the two cases include Allo, Barrett, Bruce, Furnish, Godet, Harris, Héring, Martin, Mignard, Plummer, Strachan, Tasker, Thompson, and Thrall.

1 Cor 6:1-8 contains instructions commanding the settling of disputes within the community itself. This also relates to community discipline, for it involves a breach of community and presents a bad witness to the world.⁴⁷⁶ The nature of the dispute may involve property, given the references to ‘matters pertaining to this life’ and fraud (1 Cor 6:2, 3, 7, 8). This situation seems to be comparatively trivial in Paul’s eyes because it is not of direct eschatological significance, the judging of the world (1 Cor 6:2).⁴⁷⁷ Notwithstanding this reference to ‘trivial cases’, it is likely that the parties involved were among those in Corinth with real property and were leaders of the Christian community.⁴⁷⁸ This increases the impact of the conflict upon the church as well as the likelihood of bringing shame to the cause of Christ in the surrounding community (1 Cor 6:5-7). While 1 Cor 6:1 is addressed to the plaintiff, the entire community is reminded of its communal responsibility to do what is right (1 Cor 6:2-8).

What this would entail is not specified. No instructions are given to constitute a church-based tribunal or law-court, let alone suggesting an exemplar on which such a formal proceeding should be modelled.⁴⁷⁹ On the one hand, the statement is made that the church will judge the world (v. 2), which suggests that the community should have the competence to form its own court. On the other hand, being defrauded and wronged are proclaimed a lesser evil than to be involved in pagan law-courts (v. 7), suggesting that the participants in this situation should be willing to forego their rights.

⁴⁷⁶ Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, p. 164.

⁴⁷⁷ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 230, 233-36.

⁴⁷⁸ Chow, *Patronage and Power*, pp. 123, 127-130; Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, pp. 62-64; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 228-29; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 420-21. Against this, M. M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), p. 118, calls these ‘minor matters’ and refers to them as ‘trivial’. Taking a very different position on 1 Cor 5 and 6 is Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, pp. 122-25, 149-53, who argues against the ‘new consensus’ represented by Theissen and Meeks, together with Chow, Clarke, Judge, P. Marshall, Winter and others (p. 99 n. 119). The arguments presented by Chow and Clarke regarding the likely social position of those involved in these conflicts in Corinth are more plausible than Meggitt’s rejection of *any* individuals of standing and wealth in *any* of the Pauline communities (Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, p. 153). Cf. the discussion in Horrell, *Social Ethos*, pp. 109-12.

⁴⁷⁹ This depends partly on whether v. 4 is read as an ironic question or as an instruction to the congregation to create their own court. In any case, no detailed or unequivocal instruction is given that a court should be created.

2 Cor 13:1-2 is relevant to the current discussion because of its possible application of the ‘two or three witnesses’ rule. Paul points out to the Corinthian believers that this will be his third visit to them and cites an abbreviated version of the LXX (Deut 19:15). He goes on to warn them that on his return he will not be lenient with those ‘who sinned previously and the others’.⁴⁸⁰ At issue was the apostolic authority of Paul (v. 3), and the substantiation by multiple testimony may suggest a congregational hearing.⁴⁸¹

What is unclear is how multiple visits might constitute legal testimony, especially since ‘they still represent the testimony of just one witness, Paul’.⁴⁸² Furnish observes that a common Palestinian application of the rule given in Deut 19:15 was not only to require appropriate substantiation of charges but also to require that those suspected of wrongdoing ‘should be carefully forewarned about the possibility of punitive action against them’.⁴⁸³ If this is the usage that Paul had in mind, this reference in 2 Cor 13:1 is not to two or three evidentiary witnesses as in 1 Tim 5:19, but rather a requirement of appropriate warning, a requirement which Paul states he has met.⁴⁸⁴ However, as van Vliet states, the purpose of the warning was to ensure ‘that the transgressor *actually knew* what he did’, thus precluding entrapment by the accuser in the sense of not offering opportunity for mending of one’s ways.⁴⁸⁵ If further action was then necessary, independent corroborating witnesses were needed to establish guilt

⁴⁸⁰ No clear information is given as to the sin in view and the identity of ‘the others’. Barnett, pp. 598-602, discusses the issue of sexual sin, especially related to participation in pagan temple ritual (cf. 2 Cor 6:14-7:1; also the references to purity and impurity of 7:1 and 12:21). Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 877-78, suggests that those who sinned previously were ‘guilty of the sexual vice mentioned in 12.21’, but reaches no firm conclusion on the identity of ‘the others’.

⁴⁸¹ So Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, p. 598. Against this, cf. V. P. Furnish, *II Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), p. 575.

⁴⁸² Furnish, *II Corinthians*, p. 575.

⁴⁸³ Furnish, *II Corinthians*, p. 575; Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, p. 873. Cf. also H. van Vliet, *No Single Testimony: A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 par. into the New Testament*, STRT 4 (Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1958), pp. 53-62.

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. however A. A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 205-6, who states that ‘despite the view of a great many commentators... three visits are *not* the testimony of three witnesses’ (p. 205). seeing rather the normal judicial understanding of μάρτυς as Paul’s intent. That is, Paul challenges the Corinthians to produce witnesses to establish their case, as he is ready to do the same.

⁴⁸⁵ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 55. Cf. Matt 18:15-17, which may be an example of this.

in keeping with the more usual understanding of Deut 19:15. Further, the first visit was not disciplinary, but had the function of establishing the church, while the third visit would have been the one during which the discipline was to be carried out and therefore was not really a ‘witness’.⁴⁸⁶ What seems most likely here is that Paul is stating that he has offered the necessary warning and that when he comes to visit the Corinthians, the evidentiary rules of Deut 19:15 would apply to establish the truth of the matter.⁴⁸⁷

It is by no means explicit that this situation involves congregational leaders. One might infer that leaders were involved from the fact that Paul himself was coming back to deal with the congregation rather than instructing others (the leaders in place, if such exist, whoever they might be and whatever role they might play) to do so. On the other hand, the situation might simply be that the leaders or the congregation itself had been ineffectual in enforcing discipline, necessitating a visit by Paul to resolve matters. If that were the case, however, one might expect that Paul would make reference to the congregation’s disobedience to its leaders. In any case, the disciplinary event presaged by 2 Cor 13:1-2 differs from the instruction of 1 Tim 5:19, possibly in the application of Scripture as well as what is known regarding the position of those disciplined.

Paul gives further general instructions regarding congregational discipline in Gal 6:1.⁴⁸⁸ In this passage, those individuals who are spiritual should restore those overcome in a trespass in a spirit of gentleness, bearing in mind that they are likewise susceptible. In Gal 6:1 the well-being of the offender seems the focus. No course of discipline is specified, suggesting that an attitude of gentleness rather than a specific corrective action is appropriate for the offender who was repentant rather than

⁴⁸⁶ C. G. Kruse, *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1987), pp. 216-17.

⁴⁸⁷ Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, p. 598. Cf. Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, pp. 871-76, who sees Paul as not having ‘in view some actual process of ecclesiastical law’ (p. 875), so that the sequential (rather than simultaneous) presentation of the testimony of a single witness (rather than the two or three independent witnesses of Deut 19:15) is not a problem here. The function here then is one of warning rather than testimony, more akin to Matt 18 than 1 Tim 5.

⁴⁸⁸ There seems to be no specific case in mind here, but rather a general instruction for gentleness in discipline and mutuality in community (Gal 6:2). Cf. Betz, *Galatians*, p. 295.

persisting in trespass (1 Cor 5:11-13). Although the instructions are addressed to the entire community, those who are spiritual are expected to transact the discipline in a proper manner. Paul gives no indication as to who should be considered spiritual other than what can be inferred from his catalogue of fleshly and spiritual characteristics in Gal 5:15-26. Presumably, those who restore others are to be considered spiritual, and if one wishes to be considered spiritual one is to be among those who restore others. Paul expects all members of the community to be or to seek to be in this category (cf. 3:3-5, 14; 5:16, 18, 25) and therefore be in a position to restore any who have temporarily lapsed.

General instructions are also given in Rom 16:17, where readers are encouraged to turn away from those who cause dissensions and oppose the taught doctrine.⁴⁸⁹ The purity of the community is the prime directive.

Some general observations can be made on the basis of these instructions and accounts given by Paul. Notwithstanding the instruction to hand the offender over to Satan, it is clear that even this severe action is not a death sentence but has a remedial goal: the salvation of the offender's spirit. The general instructions to the churches of Galatia (Gal 1:2) urge a similar concern for restoration. The ultimate well-being of individual community members who have offended is a consistent concern in diverse locations.

There is a consistent concern for purity and preservation of the community as a whole. In Corinth, the one who offended and refused to see the errors of his actions (cf. 1 Cor 5:11) is to be shunned and expelled from the community (1 Cor 5:13). In Rome those who would disrupt the community are to be noted and avoided.

⁴⁸⁹ South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 139-42, 148, considers Rom 16:17 disciplinary under his primary criterion of instruction for responses to deviation in behaviour or teaching. The inclusion of this portion of Romans as authentically Pauline is in question. There is sufficient cause, however, to see 16:17-20 as a part of the original letter, and in any case, the elimination of Rom 16:17 would not materially change the Pauline view as constructed.

The local community's involvement in discipline is very clear in the Corinthian passages. The members of the congregation should note the need for discipline, they should impose it, and they should properly deal with those who reject the discipline as well as with those who are rescued by it. Rather than abandoning responsibility for discipline to any external authority, such as a delegation from Jerusalem or pagan law courts, the disciplinary action should arise from within the community itself.⁴⁹⁰

Not only is the *local* community responsible for discipline, but also the *entire* local community. This plenary context is evident in 1 Cor 5:4, which is in the framework of the whole group, 'when you are assembled'. These passages suggest an open forum as the norm for the exercising of the ultimate activity of discipline.⁴⁹¹ Paul does not specify the reasons for such open handling of embarrassing matters, but the threat of public shame and the warning presented to those present could serve the dual purposes of individual remedy and community preservation.

There is significant boundary-setting behaviour involved in Pauline discipline. That which pertains to the group is to be restricted to the group, so that group matters do not become public property to the shame of the group and the cause of Christ. The community should handle its own affairs, without dragging them into the public venue. Within the community there should be open and frank handling of discipline. The group's problems should not, however, be exposed to those outside the group.

The extent of community responsibility for discipline is broad in terms of substance and status. That is, discipline within the Pauline community is not only related to matters of belief and faith, but also to matters of daily conduct. It is also not restricted to the common members, but as was likely the case in 1 Cor 5 and almost

⁴⁹⁰ In 1 Cor 5:3 Paul makes it clear that though he is not physically present with them, he is a part of the community and his presence is no mere fictive spiritual presence. (Cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 390-92.)

⁴⁹¹ Assumptions about private confrontation preceding open rebuke are neither supported nor precluded by these texts. The passages at hand are not prescriptive enough to have been intended as a step-by-step guide to communal discipline.

certainly was the case in 1 Cor 6:1-8, community leaders were also to be subject to discipline. Their status as leaders is not explicitly stated, although this would not have been needed for the original audience. In this case, it is the community which was being disciplined for its handling of issues related to these leaders rather than the leaders themselves. The implication is clear in both cases: the community *should* have taken care of the disciplinary matters, but failed to do so. The motivation for this failure is not given, although the influential status of the leaders may logically have played a role. The community should have disciplined its errant leaders and did not. At the very least, leaders were not exempt from the community's discipline.

What is absent is prescriptive detail. These examples do not state that any specific mechanism (such as a church tribunal) should be used for the disciplinary actions. Paul was flexible in his approach to the form the discipline should take. A prescribed course of action (expulsion) is given in 1 Cor 5. In the other situations he suggests avoidance but no specific form of punishment. What is consistent is the group-individual and present-future orientation of Paul's discipline. Salvation of the individual and preservation of the community are mandated: the forms by which these goals are to be achieved are not.⁴⁹² Concern for present behaviour ('proper living') and reputation is generally balanced with concern for the future (including the eschatological) state of the individual. Paul's orientation in discipline is not just related to 'here and now' but also to the ultimate result.

How do these instructions in the undisputed Pauline texts compare to those in the PE? There is a similar breadth of approach, with no 'one size fits all' solution presented. The major goals of discipline remain the same: salvation for the individual coupled with preservation of the community. The interest in present and future states is very like that found in the undisputed Pauline texts. Satan is presented variously as an agent of achieving discipline (1 Cor 5:5; 1 Tim 1:20) as well as a malevolent worker of

⁴⁹² South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 183-85.

destruction (2 Cor 2:11; 2 Tim 2:26) in the undisputed Paulines and the PE.

Although angels do not appear as witnesses in the chosen disciplinary passages in the undisputed Pauline material, they are amply present as such in Paul's writing to the Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor 4:9; 11:10). South observes, 'Other than the fact that individual church leaders are purportedly addressed, the Pastorals reveal no significant advance over the undisputed letters of Paul... The disciplinary teaching in the Pastorals is very much in line with the Pauline tradition.'⁴⁹³

One dissimilarity is that 1 Tim 5:19-21 and the other disciplinary instructions in the PE are indeed addressed to leaders (Timothy and Titus, in their own contexts) rather than to the whole community. It is correct that in the PE the instructions were directed to an apparent audience of one person rather than the community, but that one person was to function (fictively or really) as Paul's vicar and was to exert authority in that community which was very similar to that which Paul exhibited. Paul gave specific instructions to the Corinthians as their apostle/leader and expected these to be followed.

It would be incorrect to label the discipline of the PE as exclusively leader-based and that of the undisputed Paulines as exclusively community-based. Given the individual addressees of the PE, the directing of instructions to community leaders (2 Tim 2:24-26) and the focus on individuals carrying out discipline (1 Tim 1:19b-20; cf. 1 Cor 5:5) are understandable, and even these have parallels in the undisputed Pauline material. An apparent difference between 1 Cor 5:5 and 1 Tim 1:20 is that in the PE it seems to have been the author who handed the errant members over rather than the entire community. On the other hand, Paul included himself in the activity of handing over the offender in 1 Cor 5:5, having already pronounced judgement himself (v. 3). In the Corinthian handing over, it is uncertain 'just how the community participated in the act that Paul himself was going to perform from afar'.⁴⁹⁴ In the PE handing over, the

⁴⁹³ South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 174-75.

⁴⁹⁴ Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, p. 156.

community's involvement is not specified nor excluded.⁴⁹⁵ The differences between the PE and undisputed Pauline materials on discipline are congruent with the apparent literary audience: in the PE, a community leader in training is the recipient, in the undisputed Paulines, a community which is to carry out its leader's instructions is the intended audience.

The most significant unresolved difference is that of procedural detail. 1 Tim 5:19-21 gives information on disciplinary procedure far beyond that seen in the undisputed Paulines. The disciplinary act itself is certainly not described in more detail, and its severity lies well within the range of Pauline discipline. The stress on avoidance of prejudice and favouritism in discipline is seen only here, as is the insistence on adequate evidence before the disciplinary procedure may progress. In these important distinctives 1 Tim 5:19-21 differs from other disciplinary process instructions given in the PE and other scriptural material in the Pauline tradition.

3.3.2 – Discipline of Leaders in the Disputed Pauline Texts

Of interest under this heading is 2 Thess 3:6-15.⁴⁹⁶ In this passage the author is dealing with disorderly idlers who are rejecting the Pauline tradition of hard work and self-support, echoing similar sentiments found in 1 Thess 4:11, 12 and 5:14.⁴⁹⁷ The passage starts and ends with instructions to the community, and is as much about the

⁴⁹⁵ The wording here does not exclude the idea of the Pastor leading the community of the PE in pronouncing the sentence of expulsion. (Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 414; South, *Disciplinary Practices*, p. 172) A similar merging of action by the leader and action by the community may be seen in 1 Tim 4:14, where the council of elders laid hands on Timothy, and 2 Tim 1:6, where the Pastor laid hands on Timothy.

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 160-70. South also includes Eph 5:6-7, 11, but he is wrong in considering this a case of community discipline. As observed by most commentators, this passage is a warning against participating in the immorality of outsiders: the 'unbelieving Gentiles from amongst whom the readers have been saved'. Cf. A. T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990), pp. 325-26.

⁴⁹⁷ The context of this idleness is not specified by the writer. Some commentators see a connection to the errors regarding the *parousia* previously dealt with in both 1 and 2 Thessalonians, which is a fairly logical assumption. Others suggest that these may have been Christian workers living off the church rather than working to support themselves, which explains the use of Paul's example. Others argue for general disdain for manual labour or abuses of the patronage system. The text does not specify why the idlers did not work, but rather instructs the community in its proper handling of their failure. Cf. D. M. Martin, *1, 2 Thessalonians*, NAC 33 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), pp. 274-77, for an overview of these positions.

exercise of community discipline as it is about the specific act of discipline enjoined.⁴⁹⁸ The author commands the community to keep away from such a person (2 Thess 3:6, 14). It is clear that, as was the case in 1 Cor 5, the offenders are members of the community (2 Thess 3:11-12). The offenders are addressed directly (albeit in the third person - 2 Thess 3:12), suggesting that they would be present for the reading of this letter or would be made aware of its contents. The discipline is open and made known to the entire community. The community is to act decisively in responding to the persistent offender by not feeding them (v. 10) and avoidance (v. 14). The instruction to continue to warn the individual as a brother suggests a remedial intent. The exclusion is not intended to be total or permanent.⁴⁹⁹

These brief and somewhat general instructions do not conflict in any way with the teachings seen in either the PE or the undisputed Pauline material. There is similar concern for remedy and preservation of the community. The acts of discipline are carried out in what seems to be plenary assembly, in that not-feeding and avoidance activities are only effective if the entire community participates. The form of the corrective action is not specified beyond avoidance, warning, and implied shaming.

In relation to the disciplinary materials in 1 Tim 5:19-21, this passage does not explicitly relate to offences by leaders, but rather to idlers in the community.⁵⁰⁰ Guilt is assumed as established, and there is no evidentiary process specified in 2 Thess 3:6-15. There are similarities in the open handling of the matter. In both situations those erring are addressed directly by a community leader, resulting in their shaming before the community (cf. 1 Tim 5:20; 2 Thess 3:12, 14).⁵⁰¹ Community approbation and shaming are thus a significant component of the discipline. A positive outcome is hoped for and expected, particularly in regard to those in error. The discipline does not explicitly

⁴⁹⁸ Martin, *Thessalonians*, p. 271.

⁴⁹⁹ South, *Disciplinary Practices*, pp. 163-64.

⁵⁰⁰ For a contrary opinion, suggesting that Christian workers are the idlers, cf. Ellis, 'Co-Workers', pp. 450-52.

⁵⁰¹ In 1 Tim 5:20, instructions are given by the writer to Timothy that he is to carry this out, while in 2 Thess 3:12 the writer directly addresses those in error in the third person, suggesting that the writer's authority will bring about the desired outcome. Both cases suggest discipline by a leader.

extend beyond the shaming/reproof to a formal act of expulsion or excommunication, although the Thessalonian instruction does specify avoidance. Both situations appeal to cosmic authorities, but differ in that 1 Tim 5:21 calls on God, Christ Jesus, and the elect angels to witness that the charge has been passed on to Timothy, while in 2 Thess 3:6 the writer charges his audience ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ’ to cooperate with the disciplinary instructions given by him. In both cases a charge is made, in one situation to an individual who is to carry out discipline in a fashion consistent with Pauline tradition in the context of a larger community, and in the other to a community which is to support disciplinary action by a leader (the writer) in a fashion consistent with Pauline tradition. The largest differences are thus the absence of specifics regarding the substantiating of the offence, the lack of focus on leaders in 2 Thess, and the transfer of authority from one leader (‘Paul’) to another (‘Timothy’) regarding the directing of community discipline in the PE.

3.4 – Discipline of Leaders in the Other NT Writings

There are no passages in the remaining NT material which deal specifically with the discipline of leaders by their congregation. There are, however, passages which appeal to the same Scriptures used by the Pastor and offer insight into contemporary application. The primary passage is Matt 18:15-17, although the requirement of multiple witnesses is also confirmed in John 8:17 and Heb 10:28. Additionally, the reports of the trial of Jesus (Mark 14:53-64; cf. also Matt 26:57-66; and Luke 22:66-71) may shed light on some specific elements of the disciplinary practice set out in 1 Tim 5:19-21.⁵⁰²

⁵⁰² Luke 17:3-4 deals with reproof as a redemptive tool, but otherwise has little in common with 1 Tim 5:19-21. The aim of reproof in Luke 17:3 is to bring back the sinning brother, while in 1 Tim 5:20 the desire is to preclude sin among the other leaders. Cf. U. Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, trans. J. E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), pp. 448-49, for a discussion of the priority of the material in Luke and the accuracy of the Matthew material. Luz concludes in regard to Matt 18 that ‘verse 18 probably came from the church rather than from Jesus, but it is very old’ (pp. 449-50).

The instructions recorded in Matt 18:15-17 for dealing with conflict in the church seem quite distinct from the disciplinary instructions of the PE. The context is different as are a number of the instructions. The areas of congruence are the requirement of multiple witnesses (Matt 18:16) and the public rebuke (v. 17), but the public rebuke bears little resemblance to the practice and intended result in the PE. Most significantly, the context here is the restoration of an errant individual with disciplinary consequences if the offender's situation is not changed, while in 1 Tim 5:19-21 the language is judicial: there is an accusation which could lead to what amounts to a trial of a church leader.⁵⁰³

The circumstance of the process in Matt 18:15 is one of a private offence. The one who has been 'sinned against' is to start the process of correction.⁵⁰⁴ The first stage of this response is to be a private confrontation (ἐλέγχω – 'reprove', but also 'lay open' or 'expose') with an expressed hope of resolution at that level, so that minimal public harm is done.⁵⁰⁵ While v. 15 is entirely private, 'among four eyes', v. 16 indicates that one or two others should be taken along for the next stage of confrontation so that the word of two or three witnesses might establish the matter. The multiple witnesses in this case simply add force to the reproof and act as witnesses of recalcitrance: there is no hint that they were witnesses of the original offence.⁵⁰⁶ There is also no indication of

⁵⁰³ R. T. France, *The Gospel According to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985), p. 274.

⁵⁰⁴ Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, p. 451. Here the parallel passage, Luke 17:3-4, is useful to support the idea that the offence is entirely private, maybe known between only two individuals.

⁵⁰⁵ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 87, sees a greater affinity between Matt 18:15-17 and Deut 19:15-21 than do other scholars. He argues that the initial private confrontation is in effect a delaying of the search for a second witness, motivated by love. If this is unsuccessful, the one or two witnesses are witnesses in a legal sense: 'of the fact that the other brother is sinning'. 'If the sinning brother commits a sin seen by one other alone, that sin is not subject to reproof by others. The sin must become clear to and be recorded by two or three. They must reprove together, and if the sinner does not listen to them, the case is mature for reproof and decision by the church.' This seems unlikely, as Matt 18:15-17 gives no instruction to conduct a search for witnesses for what was clearly a private offence. However, cf. J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1970), p. 163, who sees Jesus 'relying upon Lv xix.17 and Dt xix.15'. Further, 'Jesus believed that reclamation should be tried before the offender was condemned on the evidence of two witnesses, whom, in fact, a court would be bound to believe if their credit was not undermined'.

⁵⁰⁶ W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 26 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971), p. 220; France, *Matthew*, p. 274; Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, p. 452. C. S. Keener, *Matthew*, IVPNTC 1 (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1997), p. 288, states that the witnesses are to 'gather evidence in the proper order in case we later need proof of what transpired'. This

any qualification of the witnesses in regard to status or competence.⁵⁰⁷ The text only specifies the number of witnesses. These witnesses therefore fill an entirely different role than in Deut 19:15 or 1 Tim 5:19.⁵⁰⁸ Should the confrontation with witnesses present not bring about a resolution, then the affair is to be made public to the entire congregation, and if there is no positive result from this public reproof, the individual is to be shunned as an outsider (v. 17). There are no details given as to how the exclusion or expulsion is to be performed, nor is there any hint of whether and on what basis restoration might occur. It is very definitely the congregation's action in shunning the errant individual which is the core of the disciplinary act, rather than any action of a specific leader.

Although there are superficial similarities between the instructions of Matt 18:15-17 and 1 Tim 5:19-21, they clearly arise in distinct contexts and exhibit major differences. In Matthew, the existence of an offence is assumed as proven, while in 1 Timothy the instructions first deal with whether an offence may be considered to exist and whether the accusation should be entertained. The role of the witnesses is thus dissimilar: in Matthew they will testify to the attempt to restore, while in 1 Timothy they are to establish whether cause for action exists. The response to a proven accusation differs as well: in Matthew the concern is to minimize harm to the individual who sinned while not permitting sin to continue. In 1 Timothy the congregational leader whose guilt is established is to be publicly rebuked in such a way as to cause the

surely must be evidence of the response to correction, as anyone not at the original event could not witness to what transpired there!

⁵⁰⁷ The escalation of the process, taking it before the church, suggests that it would be good strategy to select individuals of authority and reputation as witnesses, as this would facilitate the church's acceptance that due process was followed. Against this must be noted the evidence in Matthew's gospel of an anti-hierarchical and anti-authoritarian view (cf. esp. 23:8-12). There is no evidence here for the involvement of community leaders.

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol II: Commentary on Matthew VIII-XVIII*, 3 vols, ICC, 2 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), pp. 784-85; Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, p. 452, for a discussion of the use of 'witness' in a context of warning and reproving in Judaism as well as rabbinic texts. R. H. Mounce, *Matthew*, NIBC 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), p. 176, ignores the concept of judicial witness entirely and sees the role of the witnesses as 'not to prove the other's guilt but to help in reconciliation'. This seems unlikely, as terms for such a role would then have logically been employed rather than this judicial term.

other leaders to fear, avoiding a similar result. There is no mention in the PE passage of private rebuke first, or of escalation for recalcitrant leaders: the concern is to minimize harm to the congregation by protecting the good leaders and punishing the bad ones. There is no mention of the involvement of congregational leaders in Matthew, while in 1 Timothy it is a leader who will decide whether the action shall proceed and it is another leader whose misbehaviour is under scrutiny. Neither passage offers insight into what should be done if the errant individual eventually repents. It seems that the expected worst-case end result of Matt 18:15-17 is exclusion or expulsion of the individual, while in 1 Tim 5:19-21 the punishment seems to consist only of some form of rebuke or reproof. Further, only 1 Timothy suggests a beneficial disciplinary result in the onlookers as a result of the discipline. Both passages deal with issues of discipline within a group of believers, and both passages exhibit some similarity of terminology. They are otherwise quite dissimilar.

The account of the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin given in Mark's gospel (14:53-64) is useful for understanding the application of Deut 19:15.⁵⁰⁹ At issue is the question of properly constituting a charge, and Mark's account 'reads not as a trial on an already formulated charge, but as a search for a charge which could be made to stick' (cf. v. 55).⁵¹⁰ The likely charges would have been religious wrongdoing, such as Sabbath-breaking, and blasphemy. It should not have been difficult to produce numerous witnesses who had observed various such transgressions, and indeed Mark reports that many testified, but their testimonies did not agree with one another (v. 56). Eventually some were found who stated that they had heard him say (thus, had witnessed the same event) that he would tear down and then rebuild the temple, but even their testimony did not meet the high Jewish standard of testimonial agreement

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. France, *Mark*, pp. 599-603; Lane, *Mark*, pp. 529-30, for a discussion and further sources related to the historicity and accuracy of the accounts. The specific item being highlighted in present discussion, viz., the requirement for two witnesses who agree with each other, exhibits concern for proper process, is consistent with all that is known of Jewish practice, and can most likely be regarded as historically accurate.

⁵¹⁰ France, *Mark*, p. 602.

(vv. 57-59).⁵¹¹ At the point where Jesus claimed for himself the right to sit beside God (v. 62), the high priest tore his robes and declared that a case had been established: there was no further need of witnesses, as those present had heard the blasphemy themselves (v. 63).⁵¹² The group duly sentenced him as worthy of death.⁵¹³ Given the political situation in Palestine, this meant that Jesus needed to be turned over to the Roman authorities so that they might execute him (Mark 15:1-5). Setting aside all other details, this account makes it clear that the early Christian community understood proper Jewish judicial process to include the need for agreement between at least two witnesses, who needed to have observed the same event and had substantial harmony in their accounts, before a proper accusation could be considered as levied.

It is evident that the elements of multiple witnesses and rebuking seen in the instruction in 1 Tim 5:19-21 were accepted as appropriate in the early Christian communities. It is also clear that the Pastor's instructions were aimed at a different situation and had a goal in mind which was not identical to that seen in Matt 18:15-17. The instructions are not incompatible, but they are discrete in their situation and dissimilar in their application.

3.5 – Discipline of Leaders in the Apostolic Fathers

Among the Apostolic Fathers, general instructions on discipline can be found in *1 Clement*, the writings of Ignatius, and *2 Clement*. These are of interest in this study but not clearly related to congregational discipline of leaders. The writings which either clearly or very likely do contain material on discipline of leaders include the *Didache*, the *Shepherd* of Hermas, and Polycarp's writing to the Philippians. The other Apostolic

⁵¹¹ Even trivial differences in the deposition of witnesses would render them inadmissible as evidence. Cf. Lane, *Mark*, p. 533; Trites, *NT Concept of Witness*, p. 186, and the previous discussion in 3.6.2 on rabbinic evidentiary process. Cf. also Sus 54, 58, 61.

⁵¹² Cf. France, *Mark*, p. 614; Lane, *Mark*, pp. 538-39, on mishnaic rules (found in *m. Sanh.* 7:5) regarding rending one's garments in response to blasphemy (cf. also 2 Kings 18:37; 19:1).

⁵¹³ Cf. France, *Mark*, pp. 614-17, on the specifics of how Jesus' statement would have been understood as constituting blasphemy.

Fathers do not address discipline in any way which sheds light on Pauline practice related to discipline of leaders.

3.5.1 – 1 Clement

1 Clement makes numerous reference to schisms and disciplinary matters.⁵¹⁴

The material is hortatory and admonishing rather than offering disciplinary instruction.

The writer addresses the Corinthian church regarding ‘the vile and profane faction’ plaguing them (1 Clem. 1:1). The audience is commended for their previous lack of partiality and lawful lives, submitting to the leaders (ἡγουμένους) and honouring the older men (πρεσβυτέρους), instructing the young to think temperate and proper thoughts, and generally furthering appropriate behaviour among the women (1 Clem. 1:3). Jealousy and envy motivated persecution of the ‘greatest and most upright pillars’ of the church (1 Clem. 5:2), amply seen in the lives of Peter, Paul, and others (1 Clem. 5:3-6:4). The audience is admonished with this historical recounting and they are encouraged to repent (1 Clem. 7:1-8:2). Ezekiel 33:11 is cited as a reminder that God’s desire is repentance rather than the death of the sinner.⁵¹⁵

Those who, in jealousy, have set themselves up as arrogant and disorderly leaders are not to be followed, although it is appropriate to be kind to them (1 Clem. 14:1-3). The readers are to unite with those who actually practice peace (1 Clem. 15:1). This quest for peace and kindness may not be at the expense of truth: it is better to offend these troublemakers than God (1 Clem. 21:5). Fear for the Lord Jesus Christ is to be coupled with respect for the leaders, honour for the elders, and appropriate instruction for the young, the women, and children (1 Clem. 21:6-8).

The author states that the apostles appointed these leadership offices as permanent, providing for succession (1 Clem. 44:1-2), having foreknown that there

⁵¹⁴ Cf. 1 Clem. 1:1, 3; 5:2; 8:2; 14:1-3; 21:5-6; 44-51; 54:1-2; 56:1-4; 57-59; and 63:1.

⁵¹⁵ Throughout 1 Clement the author generally addresses the congregation rather than the offenders. The references to repentance here seem to address the issue of remedial intent rather than being a command to the readers themselves to repent. However, cf. 9:1; 48:1; 54:1, 2; 56:2; 57-59; 63:1 for direct address to the offenders.

would be trouble over the bishop's office (τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς).⁵¹⁶ This trouble has indeed come, and men have been 'deposed' from their ministry by some in the church (1 Clem. 44:3-6). The readers are instructed to reserve their contentiousness and zeal for items that relate to salvation rather than tearing at each other (1 Clem. 45:1; 46:4-9). The author's tone is no longer one of commendation but rather of confrontation: 'Your schism has corrupted many and cast many into despondency, many into doubt, and all of us into grief. And your faction persists even now!' (1 Clem. 46:9) The readers, in their 'foolishness', are creating danger for themselves (1 Clem. 47:7).⁵¹⁷

The congregation is admonished to take care of the situation. They are instructed: 'And so let us dispose of this problem quickly and fall down before the Master and weep, begging him to be merciful and to be reconciled to us, and to restore us to our respected and holy conduct, seen in our love of others' (1 Clem. 48:1). With encouragement to love each other, the audience is instructed to ask forgiveness for their sins and those who have rebelled are to look for common ground (1 Clem. 51:1). Those who are noble, compassionate, and loving, and recognize that they are the cause of dissension, should retire or depart and thereby allow peace to flourish (1 Clem. 54:1-2). Those causing trouble are urged to submit to whatever the congregation as a whole wants them to do.

Attention is briefly turned to the initial audience, who are encouraged to intercede for those who have erred and to pray that they submit to the will of God and accept his (and the congregation's) correction and discipline (1 Clem. 56:1-4). This is

⁵¹⁶ The offices are apparently those of bishop and deacon, according to Holmes. The succession could be that of apostolic leadership with the right to appoint local officials, or the succession of both those who appoint and the ones they appoint. A third option is that those who are appointed by the apostles will then appoint others as their successors. Lightfoot favours the last understanding. Cf. Clement, *The Apostolic Fathers: Part 1: S. Clement of Rome: A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations*, by J.B. Lightfoot, 2nd edn (London: Macmillan, 1890), p. 133; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 77 n. 108.

⁵¹⁷ Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 83, translates ἀφροσύνην as 'stupidity'. Ehrman's rendering of 'foolishness' is in line with BDAG, p. 159, which suggests 'lack of prudence or good judgement, foolishness, lack of sense' as an appropriate meaning for this word in 47:7.

followed by more instruction to the leaders of the rebellion, who are to submit to the πρεσβυτέρους and subordinate themselves. An eschatological tone enters with ‘it is better for you to be considered insignificant but reputable in the flock of Christ than to appear prominent while sundered from his hope’ (1 Clem. 57:2). This threat is repeated but not clarified with the warning that ‘if some disobey the words he has spoken through us, they should realize that they entangle themselves in transgression and no little danger’ (1 Clem. 59:1). The teaching ends with a last encouragement to ‘bow our necks’, being obedient and thereby halting the ‘futile faction’ (1 Clem. 63:1). There is concern to see the elders restored, with the rebels either stepping back or going into voluntary exile.⁵¹⁸ Specific instructions regarding avoidance and other measures are lacking.

This material does not outline a disciplinary process as such, but rather urges the offenders to mend their ways, with asides to the remainder of the congregation as to the expected outcome. The instruction, if it can be labelled as such, is very oblique and certainly offers none of the focus on process found in 1 Tim 5:19-21. Clement’s aim seems to be to preserve the community’s structure and ensure respect for its leaders, whereas the Pastor desires to make certain that valid accusations against leaders are appropriately handled, with protection for all parties concerned.

3.5.2 – Ignatius

Ignatius offers an insight on dealing with disciplinary problems in Ign. *Trall.* 11:1; Ign. *Smyrn.* 5:1-7:2; 9:1b; and Ign. *Pol.* 1:2-5:2.⁵¹⁹ Like the instructions offered in *1 Clement*, these are more advice than direct instruction.

The warning given in Ign. *Trall.* 11:1 is terse and clear: ‘Flee, therefore, from these wicked offshoots that bear deadly fruit; if anyone even tastes it, he dies on the

⁵¹⁸ The removal of harmful elements from the community has some parallels with 1 Cor 5, but there the exile is imposed by the community rather than voluntary on the part of the offender.

⁵¹⁹ One additional instruction of interest is found in Ign. *Smyrn.* 4:1, where the readers are instructed not to accept or entertain (μὴ παραδέχομαι) heretical teachers. This is coincidence of language.

spot. These people are not the Father's planting.' This warning follows a defence of the humanity of Christ and a refuting of any who would say that he suffered in appearance only (Ign. *Trall.* 9-10). The concern here is for appropriate belief, and a clear statement is given to the community concerning its response to those in error.

A similar error seems to have occurred among the Smyrnaeans, as individuals blasphemed Christ 'by not confessing that he was clothed in flesh' (Ign. *Smyrn.* 5:2). Ignatius does not name them, and expressly considers it not worthwhile to record their names or to remember them, until they come to a better mind and repent (v. 3).⁵²⁰ A statement regarding eschatological judgement follows, together with observations regarding the behaviour of the ones in error. Among their practices are neglect of the disadvantaged and abstaining from the Eucharist and prayer, behaviour which is contrary to the mind of God (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:2; 7:1). The offenders are instructed to forego contentiousness for love, and the community enjoined to avoid them and 'not speak about them either privately or publicly' (Ign. *Smyrn.* 7:1-2). This suggests depriving them of publicity in addition to excluding them from the community.

Ignatius also addresses the issue of submission to leadership with another group in Ign. *Smyrn.* 8-9. Apparently some were conducting their own baptisms and fellowship meals without the bishop.⁵²¹ This is strictly forbidden, with the strong statement that 'the one who honors the bishop has been honored by God; the one who does anything without the bishop's knowledge serves the devil' (Ign. *Smyrn.* 9:1b).

In his letter to his fellow bishop, Polycarp of Smyrna, Ignatius starts with praise and then goes on with advice regarding the rebellion Polycarp is facing. The tone and content of this are more personal and offer more direct instruction than does the general letter to the congregation at Smyrna. Polycarp is to 'exhort all people, that they may be

⁵²⁰ Not naming these people, in effect ignoring or failing to acknowledge them, is another way of excluding them from the community.

⁵²¹ The previous offenders, in 7:1, abstained from the eucharist and prayer entirely, over issues related to the body of Christ and its presence in the eucharist. These offenders are conducting their own baptisms and eucharists, which are not valid because they are not officiated by the bishop (8:1-2).

saved', pay attention to their physical and spiritual needs, focus on unity, and be forbearing (Ign. *Pol.* 1:2). He is to be constant in prayer, alert, and 'speak to the people individually' (Ign. *Pol.* 1:3).

Ignatius reminds Polycarp that it is no great credit to like those who are good disciples. Rather, he is to bring the more troublesome ones into submission with gentleness, noting that different diseases require different treatments, thus, each offender may need different handling. Polycarp is reminded that he himself is physical as well as spiritual and that this should encourage him to treat others gently (Ign. *Pol.* 2:1-2). At the same time, he is to stand firm and not be baffled by those who present a false 'trustworthy' front (Ign. *Pol.* 3:1). Apparently one of the improper behaviours in Smyrna is neglect of the widows, for Polycarp is reminded not to permit this. He is again told to take a firm hand and neither allow things to be done without his consent nor himself do things without God's consent (Ign. *Pol.* 4:1). Ignatius counsels personable behaviour and suggests that Polycarp 'seek out everybody by name', as well as meeting more frequently (Ign. *Pol.* 4:2). Polycarp is to preach sermons against wicked practices and encourage appropriate behaviour (Ign. *Pol.* 5:1).⁵²²

Like *1 Clement*, the writings of Ignatius present more advice than direct disciplinary instruction. There are, however, differences which make these writings more similar to 1 Tim 5:19-21 than *1 Clement*. The instructions are more explicit, though not with the details of the PE. In the letter to Polycarp, the bishop has a greater level of authority, more like the situation of Timothy in the PE. The instructions on avoidance and proper eucharist relate to the congregation rather than being directed to its leader, and this differs from the PE. At the same time, the public rebuke of 1 Tim 5:20 suggests that congregational approbation is a significant component of the discipline of the PE. The most significant difference from the PE is that Ignatius

⁵²² These 'wicked practices' seem to have involved marital irregularities. Polycarp is instructed to encourage the wives 'to love the Lord and to be content with their husbands physically and spiritually', and the husbands are to be encouraged to 'love their wives, as the Lord loves the church'.

adamantly seeks to preserve and restore the honour and dignity of the leader, while 1 Tim 5:19-21 offers protection for worthy leaders but also imminent correction for those who err. No such prospect of discipline seems likely for the leaders in the churches addressed by Ignatius.

3.5.3 – *Didache*

Passages in the *Didache* which address the issue of discipline include 4:3b, 4; 11-13; and 15:3.⁵²³ These passages assist in understanding the Didachist's approach to discipline, and some of this material is specific to the question of discipline of leaders.

The issue of showing favouritism in the course of discipline is raised in *Did.* 4:3b, 4. The recipient (addressed as an individual) is instructed to 'give a fair judgment; do not show favoritism when you reproach others for their unlawful acts. Do not be of two minds, whether this should happen or not.' This instruction, preceded by a command to 'remember the one who speaks the word of God to you; honor him as the Lord' (v. 1), is seemingly not addressed to someone who is the sole leader of this congregation, for the recipient owes honour to his/her teacher. Yet, the expectation is that this one has the power to deal unfairly in judgement (literally, the command is to 'judge righteously'), a position which would include reproaching others, and enough autonomy to decide whether the act of discipline should occur or not. There is no similarity in use of words to 1 Tim 5:19-21 other than in the disciplinary act of reproof or reproach (ἐλέγχω) nor is the individual being disciplined the same (unspecified in the *Didache*, an elder in 1 Tim 5), but in other ways there are similarities to the PE. An individual is presumed to have the power to act in relation to others, similar to the position of Timothy in the PE. Instruction is given to forestall improper or unjustified discipline (1 Tim 5:19; *Did.* 4:3b). The specified outcome is that of reproof (1 Tim

⁵²³ The list of evildoers in *Did.* 5, ending with the command 'be delivered, children, from all such people' (v. 2b), is not discipline but warning, particularly because the recipients are not told to act in their own deliverance from these evil people.

5:20; *Did.* 4:3b). Favouritism is to be avoided, and there is urgency in the instruction, as if the recipient might be hesitant to carry out the discipline (1 Tim 5:21; *Did.* 4:3b, 4).

The community (plural pronouns are used) is to act to protect itself in *Did.* 11-13. At issue are itinerant ministers who are to be welcomed and honoured, if they are true prophets (11:1-4, 7, 11; 12:1; 13:1-3; cf. 15:2). False prophets are known by their heterodox teaching (11:2), failure to do as they teach (11:10), and their desire to gain wealth from the gospel (11:5, 6, 9, 12; 12:2-5). If they are unworthy, then they are to be judged as such (12:1), are not to be listened to (11:2, 12), and are to be avoided (12:5). This warning is a disciplinary instruction, for specific misdeeds are named, instruction is given to note these offences, and an action is to be taken which has an effect on the offenders, namely the removal of their livelihood. The action also pertains to leading individuals, though not the internal leaders of the congregation.⁵²⁴ Like 1 Tim 5:19-21, details are not provided in terms of the judgement process: there is no mention of convening a tribunal or anything similar. The action taken, that of non-support of the itinerant minister, needs to be a community decision to be effective, as does the public reproof of the elder in 1 Tim 5:20.⁵²⁵ The avoidance of false teaching is a familiar theme in the PE. What is different is that, unlike *Did.* 4 and 1 Tim 5:19-21, the instruction is addressed to the group rather than to an individual. This does not mean that the congregation played no role in the reproof of *Did.* 4, nor that no leader was involved in coordinating the acts of the congregation in *Did.* 11-13, but simply that where *Did.* 4:3b, 4 explicitly has an individual acting in discipline, here the congregation is presumed to do so.

⁵²⁴ This is somewhat analogous to the situation in 1 Tim 5:19-21. There, although the elders are leaders ('govern well') and are from within the community (cf. 1 Tim 5:17), they are subject to discipline by someone presumed to have power over them. The itinerant ministers of *Did.* 11-13 are not from within the community, but they teach within the community for a brief time, deserve honour and support for their labour within the community, and are subject to discipline by that community.

⁵²⁵ Similarly, the instruction given in *Did.* 12:4 to work out some method of self-support for worthy non-tradesmen is addressed to the whole community.

Further instructions related to discipline are found in *Did.* 15:3. After instructions in vv. 1, 2 to elect bishops and deacons (ἐπισκόπους and διακόνους) who are worthy, true, and approved, the Didachist gives rules for mutual reprimanding.⁵²⁶ The instruction is, ‘Do not reprimand one another in anger, but in peace, as you have learned from the gospel. Let no one speak with a person who has committed a sin against his neighbor, nor let him hear anything from you, until he repents.’ These are general instructions, not specifying much beyond one’s attitude while reprimanding (ἐλέγχετε). The attitude of the one disciplining, while not dealt with in 1 Tim 5:19-21, is addressed in the PE in 2 Tim 2:24, 25. The recipients of the reproof are not defined. Avoidance is clarified in terms of not speaking with someone who is in wrong standing, not even letting him/her overhear you, until the individual has repented. This reference to repentance, while not expressing as clear a desire for restoration as found in 2 Tim 2:24-26, nonetheless shows that reconciliation rather than punishment is the goal of the discipline of the *Didache*.

The writings of the Didachist are more similar to than different from those of the Pastor. Both address individuals who are responsible for and have authority to exert discipline in the congregation. Both stress proper process, lack of favouritism, and appropriate attitude. Both address the discipline of individuals who would deserve honour if they taught and behaved appropriately, and through their conduct have instead earned discipline. Both employ public reproof/shaming and avoidance as tools of discipline, and thus involve the congregation in some way. The instructions of 1 Tim 5:19-21 are specific to resident elders who govern, preach, and teach, while those of *Did.* 11-13 relate to itinerant prophets who teach. Other details of the disciplinary process differ, as the Didachist does not, for instance, specify evidentiary details. The

⁵²⁶ K. Niederwimmer, *Die Didache* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), p. 203, considers vv. 1-2 to be a digression, so the disciplinary instructions following are unrelated to leadership but are rather related to a kinship structure.

Didachist also addresses the main disciplinary instruction related to leaders to the congregation rather than to an individual.

3.5.4 – 2 Clement

2 Clement has a little material related to discipline, but it does not have any relationship to the discipline of leaders in 1 Tim 5:19-21. The recipients ('we') are instructed to repent, and are to help, save, and admonish (νουθετέω) one another, responding favourably when admonished by the presbyters (*2 Clem.* 17:1-3). The one being admonished should not be displeased and indignant, for this action may save them in the end (*2 Clem.* 19:2-4). The tone of eschatological salvation is closer to 1 Cor 5:5 than it is to 1 Tim 1:20, but at no point does it appear that congregational leaders are among those who are subject to discipline.

3.5.5 – *Shepherd of Hermas*

The *Shepherd of Hermas* includes a small amount of instruction related to discipline of leaders in Herm. *Vis.* 17:7-10.⁵²⁷ Hermas directly addresses those who lead (προηγούμενοις) the church, starting by pointing out their inward flaws. The disciplinary instruction itself is not specific to the method or details of the discipline, but is emphatic as regards its need.⁵²⁸ Herm. *Vis.* 17:10 states, 'How can you want to discipline the Lord's chosen ones, when you yourselves have no discipline? And so, discipline one another and be at peace among yourselves, that I also may stand before the Father cheerfully and so render an account to our Lord for all of you.' While lacking in specifics as to the direct offence, any discussion of process or method of discipline, the passage makes it clear that discipline is needed and that it is to be

⁵²⁷ Herm. *Mand.* 43 gives instructions related to false prophets and commands that 'those who are strong in the faith' should 'abstain from them' (v. 4. cf. v 21). This is not, however, disciplinary in the same sense as *Did.* 11-13, where the avoidance has direct effect on the livelihood of the false prophets. Hermas indicates no consequence to the false prophet, either eschatological or temporal, and also makes no provision or appeal for the restoration or ultimate salvation of these false prophets.

⁵²⁸ Previously in the chapter Hermas primarily speaks to issues of greed and misuse of wealth.

imposed within the leadership, the leaders mutually seeing to each other's good standing. In this sense, there is some similarity to 1 Tim 5:19-21, where one church leader (Timothy) is instructed to see to the discipline of other church leaders (the sinning elders) who need it.

There is a good deal of indication within the writings of Hermas that leaders (including he himself) need correction. His *Visions* and the subsequent *Mandates* and *Similitudes* arise from Hermas' vision of a woman named Rhoda, who had formerly owned him. In his vision, Hermas comes upon her bathing in the Tiber, helps her out of the water, observes her beauty and thinks that one would be fortunate to have her as his wife. 'This is all I had in mind, nothing else.' (Herm. *Vis.* 1:1, 2) She subsequently accuses him of his sins for desiring her, while suggesting that forgiveness might be possible (1:5-9). The entirety of Herm. *Sim.* 103 relates to 'ministers who have ministered badly', primarily by stealing from the widows and orphans (103:2).

A possible connection to the handing over to Satan of 1 Tim 1:19b-20 may be present in Herm. *Sim.* 61-63 which refers to a number of shepherds who deceive the sheep and lead 'some to death and others to ruin' (62:1-2). Those sheep which are consigned to death have committed blasphemy and have no hope of recovery (62:3). However, those consigned to ruin have succumbed to luxuries and deceits without committing blasphemy, and there is hope of new life (62:4). There was another shepherd, however, one who 'had an extremely bitter look about him' (62:5) and was chastising and beating the sheep who had not blasphemed, all for the purpose of rescuing them and bringing them to repentance (62:6-63:6). The discipline is directed first and foremost at the leaders, who must be disciplined even if they themselves are not very wicked but their 'household' is (66:1-3). The discipline which Hermas envisions seems largely imposed at the hand of God, rather than by either leaders or the congregation. The situation is very different from that of 1 Tim 5:19-21.

3.5.6 – Polycarp

The letter of Polycarp to the Philippians gives some insight into his approach to discipline. In *Pol. Phil.* 6:1 the characteristics of presbyters are listed, including several specific to discipline: they are to abstain from prejudice (προσωποληψίας) and unfair judgement, they are not to be ‘quick to believe a rumor against anyone’, and ‘not severe in judgment’. While these relate to 1 Tim 5:19-21, the similarity is one of intent rather than language, as the words used are quite different. The context of this discipline is not given, but there is no reason to suppose that it involves the discipline of leaders.

Instructions are given in *Pol. Phil.* 11 regarding Valens, who was ‘once a presbyter among you’ (11:1) and had apparently misappropriated money.⁵²⁹ Polycarp expresses a wish for the restoration of Valens and his wife, praying that the Lord would ‘give them true repentance’ (11:4). Regarding this former leader, apparently deposed, the congregation is not to ‘judge such people as enemies, [but] call them back as frail and wayward members, so as to heal your entire body’ (11:4). Some act of discipline was clearly carried out in relation to Valens (or he voluntarily stepped down), as he is no longer a presbyter. No detail is given as to what happened or who did it. The congregation is, however, encouraged to seek the restoration of this man and his wife.

3.6 – Contemporary Approaches to Discipline of Leaders

This section will deal with the issue of discipline within cognate groups. Optimally, instructions will be found where the members of a group exert discipline upon the group’s leaders. However, the existence of similar patterns of disciplinary practice (but divorced from a context of disciplining leaders) can also be considered significant. In this case, key elements would be the requirement of multiple witnesses, the ability to accuse and pursue discipline against leaders, and the public or private

⁵²⁹ Cf. the earlier discussion of Valens in 2.5.5 in connection with the issue of reward.

nature of the punishment and its intended effect on others who observe it being carried out.

3.6.1 – Discipline of Leaders in Jewish Literature: pre-70 C.E.

3.6.1.1 – The Jewish Scriptures

Although the Pastor does not repeat the ἡ γραφή formula which indicates an appeal to Scripture, the requirement of two or three witnesses stipulated in 1 Tim 5:19 has obvious and doubtlessly deliberate similarities to Deut 19:15. In terms of discipline of leaders by the congregation, there is little precedent for this in the OT. There was discipline of leaders in the cases of Miriam and Aaron (Num 12:1-15; cf. also 20:1, 28) and of Moses and Aaron (Num 20:7-12; 27:12-14; Deut 32:48-52), but sentence was pronounced and carried out by God, and thus the requirement of witnesses did not pertain. The primary passage for the requirement of witnesses as well as the salutary effect on those observing the punishment is Deut 19:15-21, with Deut 17:6-13 the primary parallel. While the context of this passage is not congregational discipline of leaders, its apparent use in 1 Tim 5:19 and the similarities to vv. 19-21 give cause for its exposition.

There are several other relevant passages which offer corroboration but do not materially change the understanding of the requirements given in the main passage (Deut 19:15-21). Num 35:30 simply confirms the requirement of more than one witness. Lev 19:17 urges that neighbours be reprovved (presumably in situations of wrongdoing) so as not to share in their guilt.⁵³⁰ Deut 13:1-18 offers a number of examples of the implementation of discipline, mostly related to those who would go after other gods (vv. 1-7). These are to be stoned without mercy (vv. 8-10), so that ‘all Israel shall hear and be afraid, and never again do any such wickedness’ (v. 11). This

⁵³⁰ This is not quite the same as the sharing of guilt in 1 Tim 5:22, as in Lev 19:17 the addressee’s potential fault would be the failure to rebuke in a situation of known guilt, while in 1 Tim 5:22 Timothy’s potential fault would lie in his failure to adequately examine those on whom he lays his hands.

intended outcome of public discipline, the causing of fear in order to forestall negative behaviour, is in agreement with the purpose of the public rebuke in 1 Tim 5:20. There are several passages against favouritism: Deut 10:17 stresses the impartiality of God, while Exod 23:2 stresses impartiality when testifying in a lawsuit, which is relevant to 1 Tim 5:21.

The similarities between Deut 19:15-21 and 1 Tim 5:19-21 are extensive, although, in addition to the greater detail in the OT instructions, there are also differences. One similarity is that in Deut 19:15 proper evidence (two or more witnesses) is needed to convict for any crime or offence, and in 1 Tim 5:19-21 the rebuke of sinning elders suggests that the offence is not of a capital nature. Deut 19:15-21 thus differs somewhat from the specific context of capital offences in Deut 17:6 and in Num 35:30. At the same time, Deut 19:1-10 makes provision for cities of refuge in cases of accidental manslaughter, and vv. 11-13 make it clear that one who has deliberately committed murder should not be able to find refuge there, so the idea of capital punishment is not absent in the context. The instruction immediately before the stipulation regarding witnesses relates to the moving of boundary markers, so that property crimes as well as capital offences form the context of Deut 19:15-21.

The stated requirement is that a single witness may not prevail in an accusation: at least two or three (that is, more than one) witnesses are needed (Deut 19:15).⁵³¹ The reason for this is simple: it is to forestall a situation where a malicious witness might arise (v. 16). In such a situation (of a single witness?) the parties to the dispute are to appear before the priests and judges (v. 17), who will inquire as to the truth of the matter (v. 18). If the accusation is not established (in other words, if further witnesses cannot be produced) and if it is established that the witness accused falsely, then the punishment which would have come to the accused if found guilty is to be visited on

⁵³¹ Cf. J. H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPSTC (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), p. 163, who states that 'two are the minimum but not the maximum' and 'as many witnesses as are available must be heard so that the truth may be clear'.

the accuser instead (v. 19). The effect shall be that the rest (the people) will fear and not permit such evil (v. 20). The passage ends with an injunction against favouritism in the form of misplaced pity: 'life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot'.⁵³²

Does this mean that one could not bring an accusation without a second witness? Opinions differ, as vv. 16-19 apparently occur in a context of a solitary accuser.⁵³³ The absence of a second known witness did not mean that a crime had not occurred, and it is reasonable that the single witness would not know that no one else had observed the crime.⁵³⁴ The following instructions detail what is to be done if the accuser is malicious and is lying: the accuser is to receive the punishment that would have resulted if the case could have been proven. What is not specified is what is to be done if a second witness could not be found. It seems that if it could not be established that the crime had occurred through corroborating testimony, the accused would then be considered not convicted.⁵³⁵

It is possible to take a different stance on v. 15: that the accusation is not even to be given a hearing if there is only one witness. Most modern translations (NIV, NRSV, RSV) have a variation on 'prevail against' or 'convict'. However, the AV, ASV, NKJV, and Luther typically have 'rise up against' or 'auftreten', which is the net effect of the instruction in 1 Tim 5:19: the accusation is not to be considered (let alone the

⁵³² This is a generally misunderstood concept, with many seeing it as evidence of the vengefulness of God. However, cf. C. J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy*, NIBCOT 4 (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1996), pp. 225-26, who states that the purpose of the *lex talionis* was to demand proportionality, not permitting escalation as in a feud. Cf. also J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy*, AOTC 5 (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), p. 313, who stresses that besides its 'element of limitation', this law also 'treats all people as exactly on a par, as do all the laws of Deuteronomy, in contrast to ANE law codes'.

⁵³³ This position is taken by most commentators, the exception being S. R. Hirsch, *Deuteronomy*, trans. I. Levy, 2nd edn, 5 vols, PTE, 5 (New York: Judaica Press, 1971), pp. 376-77.

⁵³⁴ P. C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 269-70, incl. nn. 17, 18.

⁵³⁵ Cf. Hirsch, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 370-84, who discusses Jewish implementation of these instructions and concludes that 'legal validity can only rest on the declaration of two witnesses' (p. 376). It should also be noted that in Jewish understanding of proper witness, it was necessary that both witnesses could testify to seeing the same event: multiple witnesses to multiple events would not constitute proper testimony. 'The very first assumption of the declaration of a witness to an act is that he was present at the place and at the time of the declared witnessing of the occurrence. Without being present at the place and at the time of the event which is to be proved having happened nobody can be witness of its having happened' (p. 377). Further, 'Jewish jurisdiction knows only one legal means of proof: the declaration of eye-witnesses' (p. 378).

individual convicted) if there are not sufficient witnesses. Van Vliet renders this ‘proceed against’, so that the bringing of an accusation is only possible if there are two or three witnesses.⁵³⁶ What then of vv. 16-19? If a single accuser does arise, a second witness is to be sought out before the court case may be heard, and if one is not found, then no lawsuit shall ensue.⁵³⁷ Lev 5:1 might well suggest this sort of a process, where supporting witnesses are sought to establish a case, and the instruction given there is that if one knows the truth of a matter, one must testify. Hirsch offers yet another perspective: that vv. 16-19 pertain to pairs of witnesses rather than solitary accusers.⁵³⁸ He states that because ‘the evidence of a single witness making a charge against a person is deprived of any validity, the following case can only deal with the testimony resting on the declaration of two witnesses’. What should be made of the singular form used in vv. 16-19? Hirsch’s solution is that ‘the form of the singular with which the pair of witnesses appear in the text of the Torah, just justifies the demand for complete unity between the two witnesses in every direction’.⁵³⁹ This is not convincing and ends up creating more problems, as then one must posit (as Hirsch does) that the lying pair of witnesses is shown up by yet another pair of witnesses establishing that the first pair was false. The better solution seems to be that the lawsuit is not to be initiated without a second witness, who is perhaps to be found in a process implied in Lev 5:1, and that false accusations should be dealt with severely. As Trites observes, ‘While these rules undoubtedly prevented the conviction of criminals in many cases, they certainly provided the innocent person with almost complete protection. It was felt better to leave

⁵³⁶ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 64. Cf. also D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9, revised*, WBC 6A (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), p. 430, who translates this ‘a case is established’, but then explains the meaning of this with ‘that is, placed before the magistrate’.

⁵³⁷ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 65.

⁵³⁸ Hirsch, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 376-84.

⁵³⁹ Hirsch, *Deuteronomy*, p. 376. (The original has ‘just justifies’, most likely in the sense of ‘simply justifies’.)

the guilty party in the hands of the divine Judge than to risk the possibility of the court shedding innocent blood.⁵⁴⁰

What of a situation which did not easily permit witnesses, such as sexual crimes, generally done in private? Deut 22:23-27 specifies that if a man has sexual intercourse with a woman betrothed to another man in a situation where she could cry for help (thus providing the requisite witnesses) and she does not cry out, both are to be stoned to death because the act is considered consensual (vv. 23-24).⁵⁴¹ If, however, the crime occurs in the countryside and the woman screamed without eliciting help, the woman is not to die, although the man is to be executed (vv. 25-27). At first glance this would be a single-witness case, but it is likely that the blood stains on her clothing (cf. vv. 15, 17; Gen 37:32-33) would in essence act as a second witness.⁵⁴²

What about situations in which a crime has clearly occurred, albeit without any witnesses whatsoever? The witness-less crime is discussed in Deut 21:1-9, where someone is discovered murdered in the open country without knowledge of who killed him (v. 1). The instructions which follow are for a sacrifice which is intended to atone for the innocent blood shed among the people (vv. 2-9). In essence, retribution is left up to God, leaving room for him to have his way.⁵⁴³

The requirement of multiple witnesses is clearly present in Deut 19:15 as well as in 1 Tim 5:19. What may be different is that the Pastor forbids the acceptance of an accusation (it is not to be entertained) if there is only one witness, while in Deut 19 it may be that the accusation is to be made known and corroboration sought. Also, in the

⁵⁴⁰ Trites, *NT Concept of Witness*, p. 231. Cf. L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man: Lectures Delivered at the Invitation of the University of Tübingen, December 1952; With an Appendix on 'Justice in the Gate'*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd (London: S. C. M. Press, 1956), pp. 156-57, points out that 'in Hebrew, "to judge" and "to help" are parallel ideas', so that judgement is not automatically understood as punishment (p. 156). The judges were thus 'helpers' more than individuals who pronounced judgement, and judges and witnesses were often not differentiated.

⁵⁴¹ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 341.

⁵⁴² E. H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, NAC 4 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), pp. 302-5. Cf. also Wis 4:6, where children born of an improper union are a witness against their parents. Consider, however, the rabbinic inveighing against any form of circumstantial evidence, as will be seen in 3.6.2.

⁵⁴³ Cf. Trites, *NT Concept of Witness*, p. 231; Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 71.

PE the context is that of leadership, while in Deuteronomy it is general, for all Israelites. This is not to suggest that the congregation was not to receive the protection offered by Deut 19:15-21, just that concern is to protect the elder from spurious accusations. In Deuteronomy, a significant level of protection against malicious accusations is offered through the risk of having the tables turned on the accuser, while in the PE the accusation is simply not to be entertained, most likely in the sense of being made public and investigated.

In both situations the punishment is to be carried out in such a way as to deter further transgression: it is to be public and produce fear. In the PE the punishment is for those elders who are determined to be sinning. Nothing is said of retribution for a solitary accuser, malicious or not. On the other hand, in Deuteronomy the punishment is expressly meted out to the false accuser. This does not at all mean that, according to the OT, those who were accused and were then determined to be sinning were not subject to punishment. The Pentateuch is replete with examples of public punishment intended as a deterrent (cf. Num 16:1-50). The affinity between the instructions in Deut 19:15-21 and 1 Tim 5:19-21 is clear, even if the contexts and level of detail differ.

3.6.1.2 – Qumran Literature

The literature of Qumran, together with the Cairo Document manuscripts (CD), offers a substantial, if disorganized, view of various practices of the Qumran community, including the disciplinary practices of this community or communities.⁵⁴⁴ The bulk of the disciplinary information is found in 1QS and CD.⁵⁴⁵

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*, STDJ 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1998); C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, CQSc 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), pp. 1-14; Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 1-19.

⁵⁴⁵ The extensive parallels between the mss. will not be listed. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 90, points out that the existing portion of 4QS^d = 4Q258 corresponds to 1QS V, 1-XI, 7. CD, sometimes called the Damascus Document, exists in two variant manuscripts found in Cairo, as well as fragments found in three of the Qumran caves (5Q12, 6Q15, and 4Q265-73). CD is also called the *Zadokite Fragments* by Schiffman and others. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 95. Cf. the remarks regarding nuances within the body of Qumran literature referred to in section 1.3.

The boundary-setting language of 1QS, with its curses on non-members and clear differentiation of those within the community from outsiders, forms the foundation on which the discipline of this community took place.⁵⁴⁶ Those inside the community were not to consort with the 'men of injustice' (outsiders) for this would burden them with the guilt of the other (1QS V, 15-20). To be outside the community was to be cursed for ever (1QS I-IV, esp. II, 18). Those who chose to be a part of the community committed themselves with a binding oath 'to live in community and to take part in the trial and judgement and condemnation of all those who transgress the precepts' (1QS V, 7-8). Preservation of the community was in effect the salvation of all those within the community.

The purity of the community was to be enforced in part because of the presence of angels. Those with mental or physical defects, as well as the young, were excluded from the Community, 'for the Angels of Holiness are with them' (4QD^b17 I, 6-9).⁵⁴⁷ Other brief allusions to God and 'His holy angels' are found in 4Q285 (frs. 1-2), 2, 9 and 11Q14, 5, 13. The function of the angels is not defined, but their presence and holiness in some way are to influence the appropriate conduct of the members of the community.

There was to be a yearly mutual examination, with rebuking and correction, which determined one's ranking in the group (1QS V, 20-25). In addition, examination and maintenance of purity are to be an unceasing process. Three clear and specific provisos related to the ongoing examination: there was to be no anger or ill-temper; the

⁵⁴⁶ The amount of disciplinary material in the entire body precludes a full treatment in the context of this work. Out of necessity, only materials related to discipline of leaders and materials which are either very similar to or very distinct from the Pauline tradition will be considered. The Temple Scroll (11QT = 11Q19), with its extensive regulations on cultic and related matters, was surveyed. The regulations on pure monotheistic worship of YHWH (11QT LIV, 9-LV, 22) are significant in terms of boundary setting, but are not markedly different from Deut 13:1-18; 17:2-5. The regulations for kings, especially in restriction of polygamy (11QT LVI, 19), are of interest in relationship to community leaders, but not germane to the discussion of reward, discipline, and installation of leaders.

⁵⁴⁷ 'No madman, or lunatic, or simpleton, or fool, no blind man, or maimed, or lame, or deaf man, and no minor, shall enter...' Cf. Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, p. 106. Cf. also 1QSa I, 20-22; II, 4-11, which repeats and expands on the list of excluded individuals, while also mentioning the 'Angels of Holiness'.

rebuke had to be given on the same day the transgression was noted ‘lest he incur guilt because of him’; and no one was to be accused before the Congregation without having been admonished in the presence of witnesses (1QS IV, 25-V, 1, expanded in CD IX, 1-8). This last requirement, based on Lev 19:17,⁵⁴⁸ apparently stipulated that ‘unless reproof had been made and recorded for a previous offense, the offender could not be punished at a later date’.⁵⁴⁹ This was to ensure that the offence was indeed intentional.⁵⁵⁰

The rules and regulations of the community were numerous. Entry to the Congregation involved a probationary process, with the applicant first eating of the ‘pure Meal of the Congregation’ after one year and touching the ‘Drink of the Congregation’ after a second year, culminating in being ‘inscribed among his brethren in the order of his rank’ if the examination was positive (1QS VI, 17-24). The keeping of order in community meetings was a high concern, with express forbidding of interruption as well as of speaking out of turn, or without the permission of the Congregation or its Guardian (1QS VI, 11-13). A list of transgressions and penalties was defined, with penance (reduction of the Meal by one quarter for periods from ten days to one year) as the light penalty, exclusion from the Meal and/or Drink for up to two years as the heavier penalty, and expulsion from the group as the ultimate form of discipline.⁵⁵¹ Gesticulating with one’s left hand or interrupting a companion who was speaking earned ten days penance, while uttering ‘the [Most] Venerable Name even

⁵⁴⁸ ‘You shall not hate your brother in your heart, but you shall reason with your neighbour, lest you bear sin because of him.’

⁵⁴⁹ Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 220. Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 221, for the record of an actual formal reproof proceedings as recorded in the *Decrees of Reproof 212-3, 2 II 3-6. (Decrees of Reproof = 4Q477)*

⁵⁵⁰ On the most serious offences, those of transgressing the Law of Moses, provision was made for inadvertent transgression (1QS VIII, 20-IX, 2), probably echoing the provision of redress for unintentional sin in Lev 5.

⁵⁵¹ Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 109, for a table of offences and punishments.

though frivolously, or as a result of shock or for any other reason whatever' brought dismissal without appeal (1QS VI, 25-VII, 25).⁵⁵²

The concept of sharing in the sin and penalty was implicit in the exclusion from the Meal, and explicit in the expulsion of those who shared their food or property with those under ultimate discipline (1QS VII, 25). It was also clear in the demand for reproof prior to formal accusation. In that situation one did not become a participant in the specific transgression of the offender, but rather one's anger, vengeance, and rancour were themselves capital transgressions (CD IX 1-8). The sin of another community member, not properly dealt with, has caused one to become guilty of a grievous offence oneself.

Leaders were not explicitly protected from discipline. Within the Council of the Community were twelve men and three Priests, 'perfectly versed in all that is revealed of the Law, whose works shall be truth, righteousness, justice, loving-kindness and humility' (1QS VIII, 1-2). Should any one of those who had entered the Council of Holiness and walked 'in the way of perfection' deliberately or through negligence transgress one word of the Law of Moses, that one was to be expelled to return no more, while someone who has acted inadvertently was to be excluded from the Meal and the Council of the Community for two years, being reinstated if he was perfect during those two years (1QS VIII, 20-IX, 3).⁵⁵³ There were also rules of conduct given for the Master, generally exalted versions of the conduct expected of others in the

⁵⁵² CD X, 12-XIV, 21 offers an expanded list of rules, albeit without specific penalties assigned to most of the acts of transgression, other than for preaching apostasy or profaning the Sabbath and the feasts (CD XII, 2-6). The document ends with what seems to be the start of a list of penalties, with the one who 'deliberately lies in a matter of property' receiving penance for six days, and one who 'slanders his companion or bears rancour unjustly' receiving penance for one year (CD XIV, 20-21). Cf. also 4QD^{a/e} = 4Q266/270, which parallels 1QS VII but adds explicit mention of women (murmuring against the Mothers, and fornicating with one's wife).

⁵⁵³ A possible distinction seems to be made between the members of the Covenant of the Community and the men of holiness. 1QS VIII, 13 states that 'when they have been confirmed for two years in perfection of way in the Foundation of the Community, they shall be set apart as holy within the Council of the men of the Community'. Cf. also 1QS VIII, 20-23. This group, the twelve and the three, are not referred to elsewhere in the materials available, so their exact status is open to question. Cf. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 4-5.

community, albeit without stated penalties or implied expectation of failure (1QS IX, 12-X, 5).

All transgressions were to be judged within the community, with no resort to external parties. 'Every man who vows another to destruction by the laws of the Gentiles shall himself be put to death' (CD IX, 1-2). The regulations for evidence in capital and property cases differed. If only one individual witnessed a capital offence, he was to report it to the Guardian and rebuke the offender in his presence. The offence would be recorded against the transgressor, and if the same sort of offence were committed subsequently, again before only one witness, 'his case shall be complete' (CD IX, 16-20).⁵⁵⁴ In this situation, where there are two witnesses to separate offences, the offender is excluded from the pure Meal provided that the witnesses were trustworthy and that they informed the Guardian on the same day that the offence was witnessed (CD IX, 21-23).⁵⁵⁵ Capital punishment, however, could only be meted out on the basis of three separate witnesses to similar events, or at least two witnesses to the same event.⁵⁵⁶ In property matters, the offender could be excluded from the pure Meal on the basis of one witness. If there were two trustworthy witnesses to sequential similar offences, the culprit was considered to have been proven guilty (CD IX, 21-24).

The Temple Scroll (11QT LXI, 5-13) differs from the other Qumran material in that its reading is very close in wording to that of Deut 19:15-21 on the issue of

⁵⁵⁴ But cf. Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, pp. 58-59, who argues that to exclude an individual from membership required two separate transgressions, with at least two witnesses to each transgression, so that this was not a permission of sequential testimony (to separate events) but rather a more stringent application of protection.

⁵⁵⁵ Witnesses needed to be male, of the age of enrolment (twenty years old) and God-fearing, and anyone who had wilfully transgressed any commandment could not be a trustworthy witness until he had been purified and was able to return into the community (CD X, 1-4). Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 284.

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 284, who argues that two witnesses were needed for property matters and three for capital matters, and that 'witnesses were permitted to testify before the examiner about independent occurrences of the same transgression, provided that the violator had been informed of the gravity of the transgression prior to committing the offense and that the offense had been duly recorded by the sectarian official. This is the process termed "reproof"...' Schiffman goes on to note that the demand for prior reproof and admission of cumulative testimony are peculiar to the *Zadokite Fragments* and 'disagree with rabbinic halakhah. Although the requirement of three witnesses has some Second Temple parallels, it is not known as a legal requirement anywhere else but in our text. Furthermore, later Talmudic law considered and rejected the notion of cumulative testimony to separate repeated occurrences of the same offense.'

witnesses. Vermes renders 11QT LXI, 5 as ‘a single witness may not come forward against a man’, which is stronger than the NRSV’s rendering of ‘a single witness shall not suffice to convict a person’ for Deut 19:15, but is close to the NASB’s more literally correct rendering of ‘a single witness shall not rise up against a man’ of the original text, which reads *לֹא־יָקוּם עֵד אֶחָד בְּאִישׁ* (‘a (single) witness shall not arise against a man’).⁵⁵⁷

Accusations were brought before the Guardian and the case would be tried before the Judges of the Congregation. There were to be ten of these, four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron, and six from Israel. They were to be learned and had to be between the ages of twenty-five years and sixty years (CD X, 5-11).

In terms of where the Qumran materials fit, this is not easily determined. In many ways they are quite similar to the rules of Deut 19:15-21, and probably were consciously modelled on these and extended from them for the needs of the community. A few differences are visible besides the abundance of rules for nearly every situation. The first of these is the expectation that leaders were subject to the same discipline and consequence (exclusion from the pure food) as others, apparently at the hands of the judges rather than of God, as was the case with Korah, Miriam, Aaron, and Moses. Another important difference is the provision for cumulative testimony, so that the witnessing of separate but similar events was considered to be sufficient to proceed with the case. A greater number of these cumulative witnesses were needed than when identical witnesses (those who have seen the same event) were available, but in the acceptance of sequential or cumulative witnesses the Essenes were significantly at odds with the Torah, rabbinic practice, as well as the statement in 1 Tim 5:19. It is very likely that this provision of cumulative testimony arose from the Essene demand that confrontation and rebuke occur on the same day as the offence, so that one

⁵⁵⁷ The issue here may be one of Deut 19:15 being interpreted in connection with vv. 16-17, so that the NRSV is correct in relation to the whole passage, while not being quite as literally accurate on v. 15.

might not have time to find a second corroborating witness. Whatever the reason, the practice seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls shows a considerable extension and interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures, and it is only in the express provision of discipline of leaders that this material is closer to the instructions of the PE than is Deut 19:15-21.

3.6.2 – Discipline of Leaders in Jewish Literature: post-70 C.E.

The rabbinic materials expand on the Jewish Scriptures in the matter of discipline and evidentiary process but unlike the Qumran documents do not materially alter the gist of what was believed and done. The obligation to protect others is strongly preserved, as seen in *m. Pesah.* 113b: ‘Three the Holy One, blessed be He, hates: he who speaks one thing with his mouth and another thing in his heart; and he who possesses evidence concerning his neighbour and does not testify for him; and he who sees something indecent in his neighbour and testifies against him alone.’⁵⁵⁸ In this case, the individual who does not testify on behalf of a neighbour (with exculpatory evidence) is reviled, as is the one who is a solitary witness. The same passage explains: ‘As it once happened that Tobias sinned and Zigud alone came and testified against him before R. Papa, [whereupon] he had Zigud punished. “Tobias sinned and Zigud is punished!” exclaimed he, “Even so,” said he to him, “for it is written, *one witness shall not rise up against a man*, whereas you have testified against him alone: you merely bring him into ill repute.’”⁵⁵⁹

The process of cross-examination became a significant component of the trial process and thus a good deal of material was written on the topic.⁵⁶⁰ Pains were taken to ensure that the testimony of the witnesses was in agreement, with seven enquiries:

⁵⁵⁸ *BTalmSP, Mo'ed vol II*, p. 583.

⁵⁵⁹ *BTalmSP, Mo'ed vol II*, p. 583.

⁵⁶⁰ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, pp. 50-53, sees this as a Pharisaic innovation, an act of loving-kindness intended to prevent injustice. In his analysis, ‘Sadducees and foreigners wanted justice. But the Pharisees and other circles wanted justice in accordance with the whole of the Law, in accordance with humility and loving-kindness’ (p. 52).

‘in what Sabbatical year, in what year, in what month, on what date of the month, on what day, in what hour, in what place’ (*m. Sanh. 5.1*).⁵⁶¹ ‘The more [a judge] examines [the evidence] the more praiseworthy is he’, and ‘whether during inquiries or during examinations, when [the witnesses] contradict one another their evidence is nullified’ (*m. Sanh. 5:2*).⁵⁶² The process of examination was done sequentially: the witnesses were brought in one at a time (*m. Sanh. 5:3*) in order to ensure that their testimony was not tainted by hearing the testimony of other witnesses.

The testimony had to be based on witnessing the act itself (*t. Sanh. 5.5b*) and circumstantial evidence was ruled out (*t. Sanh. 8.3*). It is worth citing *b. Sanh. 37b*:

Our Rabbis taught: what is meant by BASED ON CONJECTURE? – He [the judge] says to them: Perhaps ye saw him running after his fellow into a ruin, ye pursued him, and found him sword in hand with blood dripping from it, whilst the murdered man was writhing [in agony]: If this is what ye saw, ye saw nothing.

It has been taught: R. Simeon b. Shaṭaḥ said: May I never see comfort if I did not see a man pursuing his fellow into a ruin, and when I ran after him and saw him, sword in hand with blood dripping from it, and the murdered man writhing, I exclaimed to him: Wicked man, who slew this man? It is either you or I! But what can I do, since thy blood [i.e., life] does not rest in my hands, for it is written in the Torah, *At the mouth of two witnesses etc., shall he that is to die be put to death?* May He Who knows one’s thoughts exact vengeance from him who slew

⁵⁶¹ *MishJP, Nezikin*, p. 256.

⁵⁶² *MishJP, Nezikin*, pp. 256-57.

his fellow! It is related that before they moved from the place a serpent came and bit him [the murderer] so that he died.⁵⁶³

The concern for protection of the accused is clear in the rabbinic material as it was in Deuteronomy. The need for multiple witnesses who had themselves observed the identical event was explicit.

Even in civil cases, where capital punishment was not in question, the following were necessary to prove a disputed fact: two must testify to the same fact (Deut 19:15); the witness must be an Israelite (*m. B. Qam.* 1.3) and not a slave (*m. B. Qam.* 88a); the witness must be a man (*m. Roš. Haš.* 1.8; *m. Šebu.* 30a), of full age (over thirteen years old), and not a deaf-mute or lunatic (*m. B. Bat.* 128a); the witness could not be a ‘wicked man’ (Exod 23:1; *y. Sanh.* 3.3; *t. Sanh.* 5.5a; *b. Sanh.* 25a-b); the witness could not have a conflict of interest – any benefit as a result of the litigation (*B. Bat.* 29a; 43a); nor be related to the party that calls him (an interpretation of Deut 24:6; cf. *b. Sanh.* 27b; *y. Sanh.* 3.3).⁵⁶⁴

The rabbinic material on disciplinary practice is significantly in agreement with the instructions of the Torah. It is not in conflict with the practices outlined by the Pastor in 1 Tim 5:19-21. More importantly, while a process of clarification and definition is clearly present in the rabbinic material, the core principle remains essentially unaltered: that of protecting the rights of all those accused while not leaving unpunished those acts which can be proven. This principle seems to be consistently interpreted and applied in all the literature. Unlike some elements of ritual, such as the understanding and practising of the imposition of hands, the Jewish understanding and implementation of proper disciplinary practice seem not to have undergone drastic revision during the period from ca. 100 B.C.E. through 200 C.E.

⁵⁶³ *BTalmSP, Nezikin* vol III, p. 235.

⁵⁶⁴ In criminal cases, none of the witnesses could be related to the accused. On this entire list, cf. Trites, *NT Concept of Witness*, pp. 233-36. For information on the mode of examination, cf. pp. 236-38.

3.6.3 – Discipline of Leaders in Græco-Roman Civil Life

The right to accuse and bring about the punishment of individuals in Roman society was, with constrained exceptions, restricted to superiors. No one was permitted to summon to court ‘parents and patrons, and ascendants and descendants of patrons and patronesses’ (Justinian, *Inst.* 4.16.3) without the permission of the praetor, and such permission would not be given if the patron could be discredited if the case were lost.⁵⁶⁵ Neither slaves nor freedmen could accuse or give evidence against their masters or patrons.⁵⁶⁶ In such attempts, ‘the assertion of such atrocious audacity shall be repressed at the very outset of their offense, a hearing will be denied them, and they will be crucified’.⁵⁶⁷ Somewhat later, Roman law noted a few exceptions: any sexual liaison between a female slave owner and a male slave (though there was no such stigma attached to a male slave owner forming liaisons with a female slave) and treason. Regarding the sexual liaison of a female slave owner and her male slave, if this is discovered ‘she shall be subjected to the capital sentence, and the rascal will be delivered to the fire. All persons will have permission to bring this public charge, and the power to report it is a duty. Even a slave is permitted to lodge a complaint and he is given his freedom if the charge is proved; but punishment hangs over him if the accusation is false’.⁵⁶⁸ The other exception was for treason, where ‘betrayal is honorable even for slaves, for this crime too is directed against *domini* [i.e., the emperors]’.⁵⁶⁹

⁵⁶⁵ ‘Qua parte praetor parentibus et patronis, item liberis parentibusque patronorum et patronarum hunc praestat honorem, ut non aliter liceat liberis libertisque eos in ius vocare, quam si id ab ipso praetore postulaverint et impetraverint’ (Justinian, *Inst.* 4.16.3). Justinian, *Justinian's Institutes*, trans. P. Birks and G. McLeod (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 143. Cf. also Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 39. *Cod. justin.* 6.6.1 stated that ‘against your patron you may not institute an action that brings discredit’ (based on Alexander Severus, 223 C.E., cited p. 40). Cf. Winter, *Welfare of the City*, pp. 107-8.

⁵⁶⁶ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 40. Cf. *Coll.* 4.4.2, 9.2.2, 9.3.3; *Dig.* 48.2.8; *Cod. justin.* 4.20.12.

⁵⁶⁷ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 83, citing *Cod. theod.* 9.5.1.1 (based on Constantine, 320-23 C.E.).

⁵⁶⁸ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 15, citing *Cod. theod.* 9.9.1 (based on Constantine, 329 C.E.).

⁵⁶⁹ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 83, citing *Cod. theod.* 9.6.2 (based on Valens, Gratian, and Valentinian, 376 C.E.). Other texts included exceptions for the suppression of ‘wills that gave the slaves freedom, for certain public frauds and tax offenses, for forgery of coins, and for regrating’ (pp. 83-84, citing *Dig.* 5.1.53, 48.4.7.2, 48.10.7, 48.12.1). Watson notes that these exceptions seem to have been earlier than Constantine’s more severe constitution, but the general prohibition of

This meant that court cases generally involved the wealthy, the elite, and the powerful, in most cases as social equals.⁵⁷⁰ To a large degree, wealth and social status determined one's believability in court.⁵⁷¹ This applied to the institution of proceedings (bringing an accusation) as well as to the process of the case (witnessing), so that those of lower status had no hope of success in prevailing when the case involved either witnesses or opponents of higher status. The witnesses were 'weighed', so that the 'testimony of a honestior was preferred to that of a witness of lower rank'.⁵⁷²

The value of witnesses was sometimes a matter of dispute. Plato seems to affirm multiple witnesses, but then rejects them in favour of reason, as in the law courts 'one party is supposed to refute the others when they bring forward a number of reputable witnesses to any statements they may make, whilst their opponent produces only one, or none. But this sort of refutation is quite worthless for getting at the truth; since occasionally a man may actually be crushed by the number and reputation of the false witnesses brought against him' (Plato, *Gorg.* 471E-472A).⁵⁷³ Ultimately, Plato argues for the supremacy of reason and integrity and states that he will 'take but your vote only and disregard the rest' (Plato, *Gorg.* 475E-476A).⁵⁷⁴ Some years before him, Antiphon found himself in court, prosecuting his stepmother for poisoning his father without any witnesses.⁵⁷⁵ A similar case is found in *Against Euthynus*, subtitled 'A Plea without Witnesses', delivered by Isocrates. Isocrates states that since his client, the

accusations against a superior by an inferior stands even if it could be shown that any exceptions were made in the period under study. It should also be noted that these exceptions seem to pertain to two discrete categories: the slave who was to have been freed by action of a will was permitted to obtain his or her freedom by testifying on his or her own behalf (cf. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 25-34, for a discussion of testamentary manumission), and the other offenses were regarded as ones which endangered the state. (Regrating was the offense of buying up commodities which are known to be in danger of becoming scarce with the intent of profiting thereby.) Where the testimony of slaves was permitted in civil cases, the indication is that other evidence had to exist, and the slave's evidence was 'not to be believed without torture' (Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 84, citing *Dig.* 22.5.22.1 (based on Arcadius, *Witnesses*). This precludes the bringing of an accusation, but rather suggests the forced extraction of evidence by torture after other evidence already exists.

⁵⁷⁰ Winter, *Welfare of the City*, p. 120.

⁵⁷¹ Winter, *Welfare of the City*, p. 112.

⁵⁷² Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 8.

⁵⁷³ Plato, *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias*, trans. W. R. M. Lamb, LCL 166 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 343.

⁵⁷⁴ Plato, *Lysis Symposium Gorgias*, p. 359. Cf. Trites, *NT Concept of Witness*, p. 12.

⁵⁷⁵ Cf. K. J. Maidment and J. O. Burt, *Minor Attic Orators*, 2 vols, LCL 308, 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 2-31.

plaintiff Nicias, had no one with him when he deposited the money, 'it is impossible either by torture of slaves or by testimony to get at the facts, but it is by circumstantial evidence that we must plead and you must judge which side speaks the truth' (Isocrates, *Euth.* 4).⁵⁷⁶ Somewhat later, Demosthenes restricted evidence to matters personally known (Demosthenes, *2 Steph.* 6=46.6),⁵⁷⁷ but if no supporting witnesses could be found one could simply seek to persuade with rhetoric, and these unconfirmed statements sometimes prevailed (Demosthenes, [*Macart.*] 9-10, 30=43.9-10, 30).⁵⁷⁸

In the time of Cicero and later, although witnesses and testimony were considered of value, 'jurisprudence was less important than eloquence', so that sentences were often passed on the testimony of one witness.⁵⁷⁹ So it was that Seneca was sentenced to commit suicide by Nero without a trial, on a complaint lodged by one man.

It was not until August 25, 334 C.E. that Constantine introduced into formal Roman law that 'the testimony of one witness shall not be heard at all, even though such witness should be resplendent with the honour of the glorious senate'.⁵⁸⁰ An exception was to be made in the case of a bishop, so that 'the testimony given by a bishop, even though he may be the only witness, shall be unhesitatingly accepted by every judge'.⁵⁸¹ Even here the level of protection which was offered by Deut 19:15-21 is absent, as one accuser could prevail not only in bringing about a lawsuit but also in winning it. Logic and reason, swayed by the eloquence of the orators, could and sometimes did prevail.⁵⁸² The actual role of evidence presented through witnesses in

⁵⁷⁶ Isocrates, *Isocrates in Three Volumes*, trans. L. Van Hook, 3 vols, LCL 373, 3 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 353.

⁵⁷⁷ Demosthenes, *Demosthenes, Private Orations*, trans. A. T. Murray, 4 vols, LCL 346. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 247-48.

⁵⁷⁸ Demosthenes, *Private Orations*, pp. 64-67, 80-81.

⁵⁷⁹ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, pp. 14-15.

⁵⁸⁰ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, pp. 11, 102 n. 89. Cf. *Cod. Inst.* 4.20.9 = *Cod. theod.* XI. 393.

⁵⁸¹ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, pp. 11, 102 n. 92. Cf. *Cod. Inst.* 4.20.9 = *Cod. theod.* XI. 393.

⁵⁸² Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 16.

Greco-Roman courts of law was negligible. One's delivery of testimony was regarded as more significant than its content.

Both the Roman government and the Pastor sought to protect their communities. In the Roman system, however, punishing the guilty took precedence and eloquence was often prized above truth. In the Pastor's instructions the community is to be protected, but not at the cost of its individual members. A matter had to be established before one could proceed. The differences between Greek and Roman practice in court proceedings and the disciplinary instructions of the Pastor are profound.

3.6.4 – Discipline of Leaders in the Inscriptions of Voluntary Associations/Collegia

Disciplinary materials in the inscriptions of the *collegia* are sparse, with the inscriptions having much more of a laudatory and honouring function within these groups. Brief glimpses of disciplinary practice are afforded by the Code of the Labyadai,⁵⁸³ the Zeus inscription,⁵⁸⁴ the inscription of the Poseidoniastai of Berytos,⁵⁸⁵ the association at Lanuvium,⁵⁸⁶ and the association for Asclepius and Hygieia.⁵⁸⁷ The most detailed known source for information on discipline within such groups is the inscription of the Iobacchoi in Athens.⁵⁸⁸

The Code of the Labyadai in Delphi suggests a complex inter-relation between the rules of this group and civic life in Delphi.⁵⁸⁹ Although offerings related to wives are mentioned, the individuals participating in the group seem to be exclusively male.

⁵⁸³ Identified by S. Walker-Ramisch, 'Graeco-Roman Voluntary Associations and the Damascus Document', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 128-45 (pp. 133, 143 n. 11). as *RIG* 995 = *Syll*² 434 [*SIG*=*Syll*] Delphi, third century B.C.E. P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 2, places it in the fifth/fourth century B.C.E. Text, French translation, and commentary also found in *CiD* I (pp. 26-99).

⁵⁸⁴ *SIG*³ 985, Philadelphia, Lydia, late second/early first century B.C.E.

⁵⁸⁵ *ID* 1520, Delos, c. 153/4 B.C.E.

⁵⁸⁶ *CiL* 14.2112, Lanuvium, c. 136 C.E. Cf. also Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 99-105.

⁵⁸⁷ *ILS* II/2.7213, Rome, c. 153 C.E. Cf. Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 106-9.

⁵⁸⁸ *IG* II² 1368 = *SIG*³ 1109 = *LSCG* 51, Athens, c. 178 C.E.

⁵⁸⁹ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, p. 12. The article by V. Sebillotte, 'Les Labyades: Une *Phratrie* à Delphes?' *CCGG*, 8 (1997), 39-49, calls into question whether the Labyads were actually an association (*phratrie*) or rather a gentilitial (*genos* or *syngeneia*) group. The latter groups were based on birth and kinship rather than a common occupation or guild. This has implications for the difference for relationships within the group as compared to those outside the group.

The first portion of the rules, Face A, relates to the leadership, the *tagoi*, whose number and precise function are not defined.⁵⁹⁰ These are to swear oaths by Zeus Patroios and ensure that their successors ('the *tagoi* for the next year') swear the same oath.⁵⁹¹ The oath primarily involves a promise to serve justly (according to the laws of the city and the Labyadai) and to be honest in dealing with money and property.⁵⁹² A significant component of the Code relates to regulations regarding cake offerings for marriage or for children, and sacrificial victims (the last apparently related to admission to the group).⁵⁹³ The 'collectivity of the *patria* from which the person making the offering comes' must endorse the offerings or the *tagoi* may not receive them.⁵⁹⁴ The sacrificial victims may be brought on only one day, the Apellai. Anyone involved in offering or receiving on another day is to pay a fine of ten drachmas, and if someone (apparently anyone in the group) wishes to accuse the *tagoi* of improperly receiving the offerings, this is to be done after the current *tagoi* are succeeded in office.⁵⁹⁵ The one obligated to the offerings (sacrificial victims and cakes) must bring them in the same year. If unable to do so, a stater is to be deposited, but the offerings must be brought the following year. A complex sequence of fines (twenty drachmas) and penalties ('he is to be listed and pay interest') follows if this is not observed.⁵⁹⁶

The second portion, Face B, continues the restrictions and penalties on the *tagoi* as well as on those members who 'do not act according to what has been written or do not make the *tagoi* swear the oath'.⁵⁹⁷ A *tagos* who serves without having sworn the

⁵⁹⁰ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, p. 9.

⁵⁹¹ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 2-3. [Lines A.11-18]

⁵⁹² Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 2-3. [Lines A.1-10]

⁵⁹³ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, p. 9, note that 'like so many early laws, these regulations lay great stress on controlling the officers – so much so that the admissions procedure is not itself clearly laid out'. It is assumed from indications in the text and parallels to other groups that boys are recognized at birth or in their early years, and wives at marriage with the offering of cakes. At maturity boys can become full members by offering a sacrificial victim, as long as their offering, hence also their membership, is accepted by a quorum of the group and confirmed by the *patria* to which they will belong.

⁵⁹⁴ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 2-3. [Lines 23-30]

⁵⁹⁵ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 2-3. [Lines A.31-43]

⁵⁹⁶ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 2-5. [Lines A.44-59]

⁵⁹⁷ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines B.4-29]

oath is to pay a fine of fifty drachmas.⁵⁹⁸ The transgressions related to improper reception of the offerings appear to be the same, yet the penalties are much more severe, possibly because these offerings are related to the induction of members. The fine for the *tagoi* who do not receive offerings properly is now fifty drachmas, and until this is paid the *tagos* 'is to lose his rights among the Labyadai'. The person whose offering was improperly received is 'not to be a member of the Labyadai nor share the common funds or institutions', suggesting permanent exclusion.⁵⁹⁹ The inscription ends with the tantalizing statement: 'If any of the *tagoi* makes an accusation of doing anything contrary to what is written, and he denies it, the *tagoi* in the ...'⁶⁰⁰

The third portion of the inscription, Face C, gives rules for the bringing of complaints and for burial arrangements. A good deal of the material is missing or damaged, but the first portion extant suggests that the election of individuals to try cases is in view. These are to be elected, and if they do not pass judgement they are to pay a fine of five drachmas and 'another' is to be elected to complete the case.⁶⁰¹ Those bringing a successful accusation are to receive half of the fine, and the *tagoi* are to ensure that this is paid, under penalty of being liable themselves to double the fine. The person owing the penalty loses his rights until payment is made.⁶⁰² Rules regarding burial follow, mostly having to do with their cost and display (forbidding of ostentatious exhibitions and wailing, limiting of those who remain at the tomb) which are to be limited under penalty of further fines.⁶⁰³

The fourth and final portion of the inscription, Face D, lists the standard feasts, more disciplinary warnings, and some closing matters, including details of a dowry paid by Phanatos to his daughter Buopyga. In terms of discipline, anyone breaking one

⁵⁹⁸ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines B.30-34]

⁵⁹⁹ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines B.35-50]

⁶⁰⁰ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines B.51-54]

⁶⁰¹ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines C.3-9]

⁶⁰² Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines C.10-16] The identity of the elected 'judges' is not given, whether these are from among the *tagoi* or the Labyadai. The *tagoi* are, however, to ensure that the fine is paid.

⁶⁰³ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-7. [Lines C.19-52]

of the written rules related to feast attendance is to be fined an amount not specified in this section, which is to be exacted by the *damiorgoi* and all the other Labyadai, with 'the Fifteen' to enforce it.⁶⁰⁴ Anyone disputing the fine 'is to swear the customary oath and be released'.⁶⁰⁵ A magistrate who is absent at an assembly or disrupts the assembly is to pay a one obol fine.⁶⁰⁶

The swearing of an oath to Zeus Patroios, with its binding of the oath-taker to consequences both good and bad, suggests the involvement of deity in the disciplinary procedures. In 1 Tim 5:21, the previously discussed calling of God as a witness has the force of invoking and involving God in the actions of the Pastor and the charge laid down to Timothy. Unlike the Labyadai, however, 1 Tim 5 does not have any ritualized formal swearing of an oath.

The accusation process seems less defined than that of the Pauline communities, but the lacuna in the text between Faces B and C may have incorporated a more complex process. In the detailed extracting of specific monetary fines, including the entitlement of the accuser to half the fine, the Code of the Labyadai is much more prescriptive than is 1 Tim 5:19-21 which lacks any mention of monetary fines and sharing in penalties.

A very significant difference in practice lies in the process of disciplining leaders: while some fines are simply to be paid immediately, it seems that it is not until a *tagos* has been succeeded in office and is no longer an officer of the group that he is liable to further and more severe disciplinary action. Unlike the practice of the Labyadai, in 1 Tim 5:20 the discipline of leaders is not delayed until such time as that leader leaves office.

⁶⁰⁴ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 7, 9. No explanation is given for these offices or the 'five-day office' of D.16.

⁶⁰⁵ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 6-7. [Lines D.17-25]

⁶⁰⁶ Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 6-7, 11. [Lines D.25-29] This fine is apparently quite negligible, and it is not known why so small a fine is extracted from an official for not attending.

Most of the Labyadai disciplinary measures towards leaders have to do with entrance of common members into the group, thus preserving the purity of the group itself. Such a concern does not play a part in 1 Tim 5:19-21. While both groups are concerned with doing their jobs well, the Labyadai leader is to ensure that only qualified applicants enter the group, while the leader in 1 Tim 5 is to ensure that proper teaching and governing occur and are duly rewarded (vv. 17-18), that proper protection and correction of the leaders are provided for (vv. 19-21), and that only qualified leaders are placed in their roles (v. 22). There is nothing in the Code of the Labyadai to suggest responsibility on the part of a leader to ensure that only duly qualified leaders are placed in their roles. The Code of the Labyadai has a few similarities to but is generally unlike the disciplinary practices seen later in the Pauline communities.

The Zeus inscription of Philadelphia and Lydia, recording the rules of a private association dedicated to Zeus, offers significant use of moral language.⁶⁰⁷ An individual, Dionysius, is given instructions in a dream which relate to the 'health and common salvation and the finest reputation' of his *oikos*, and all are related to the proper worship of Zeus Eumenes and numerous other gods.⁶⁰⁸ The detailed regulations which follow forbid all members to know or make use of deceit, poison, and spells which would harm any in the household. Those who would plot or do such things are to be exposed so that the members can defend themselves, and in fact, anyone aware of

⁶⁰⁷ SIG³ 985, Philadelphia, Lydia, late second/early first century B.C.E. For an English translation and commentary, cf. S. C. Barton and G. H. R. Horsley, 'A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches', *JAC*, 24 (1981), 7-41. The gender- and class-inclusive nature of this group is one of its remarkable characteristics. Cf. Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 16-17.

⁶⁰⁸ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 3-14] The altars set up in the *oikos* of Dionysius are to Zeus Eumenes, Hestia his coadjutor, 'the other saviour gods', and Eudaimonia, Plutus, Arete, Hygieia, Agathe Tyche, Agathos Daimon, Mneme, the Charitae, and Nike. [Lines 6-11] In this passage, *oikos* seems to be used in terms of the dwelling place of Dionysius in line 5, an area within the house (a shrine) in line 15, and the household and/or association in line 23. The reference in line 5 seems more likely to be a reference to the building than to the group. Line 6, 'in this place', suggests that his *oikos* in line 5 is the building to which people are given access, rather than the association or the shrine. The absence of language referring to leaders and organization may mean that Dionysius is in a leading role, but does not necessarily force that conclusion. On the other hand, the stress on sexual fidelity and protection of children suggests that the group originated as a household, membership in which has been opened to others. Cf. Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 15-16, 22-23.

such a plot is to expose it.⁶⁰⁹ Sexual fidelity is required of the members, both men and women.⁶¹⁰ Fidelity to these ordinances (and one's spouse) is enjoined by statements such as 'great are the gods set up in it [this *oikos*]: they watch over these things, and will not tolerate those who transgress the ordinances'.⁶¹¹ More detail is given regarding the discipline and restrictions on the female members of the *oikos* than on the males. Those women who are not chaste are 'defiled and full of endemic pollution, and unworthy to reverence this god whose holy things have been set up'.⁶¹² Such a woman may not participate in the various rites of the group but is rather subject to curses. The inscription records that 'the god does not desire these things [the evil curses] to happen at all, nor does he wish it, but he wants obedience'. Those who obey will receive good things, but 'should any transgress, they shall hate such people and inflict upon them great punishments'.⁶¹³

These ordinances are stated to have been placed with Agdistis, 'the very holy guardian and mistress of this *oikos*'.⁶¹⁴ She is a Phrygian manifestation of the Great Mother, whose cult is an ancient one and especially known in Gordium, about 200 km. north-east of Philadelphia.⁶¹⁵ Her help is invoked in creating good thoughts and ensuing obedience in the members of the *oikos*.⁶¹⁶ An expectation of present involvement of the deities is seen in the touching of the inscription at the monthly and annual sacrifices. Those 'who have confidence in themselves' are to do this, so that it might be manifest

⁶⁰⁹ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 15-25] Love potions, abortifacients, contraceptives, 'or any other thing fatal to children' are included in the list of things forbidden.

⁶¹⁰ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 25-51] The men are addressed in lines 25-34 and the free women in 35-51. In the case of the men, 'a man is not to have sexual relations with another married woman, whether free or slave, nor with a boy nor a virgin girl; nor shall he recommend it to another'.

⁶¹¹ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 33-34]

⁶¹² Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 37-39] While the inscription stresses equality of access, the greater detail regarding discipline and curses and the tighter moral restriction of women does indicate that a distinction is made between men and women in certain areas. Cf. Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 20-21.

⁶¹³ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 44-51]

⁶¹⁴ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 9-10. [Lines 51-52]

⁶¹⁵ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', p. 13.

⁶¹⁶ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 9-10. [Lines 52-54]

who does and does not obey the ordinances.⁶¹⁷ The end of the inscription is incomplete, but what is there consists of a prayer to ‘Saviour Zeus’ to deal mercifully and kindly with the *oikos*.⁶¹⁸

This inscription of a private association of Zeus in Philadelphia offers significant similarities to the instructions in 1 Tim 5:19-21 as well as those of the larger Pauline tradition, along with some differences.⁶¹⁹ The serious attention paid to moral behaviour is a strong point of comparison, as is the belief that the gods are watching and indeed act in the present and in the future.⁶²⁰ The activity of swearing of an oath before the deity is comparable between the Labyadai and the private Zeus association, and has some similarities to Pauline practice, albeit without a formal oath and in a different context (cf. 2 Cor 7:12; Gal 1:20).⁶²¹ The expectation that the members of the community will act to safeguard it, accusing those who transgress, is a significant one, even if the Zeus inscription does not specify whether the transgressor is a common member or a leader of the group.⁶²²

In the broader Pauline tradition, the prohibition of improper sexual behaviour parallels the concerns of 1 Cor 5:1-13. The prohibition of poisons, working of harmful spells, love potions and the like finds an echo in Gal 5:20, where involvement in *φαρμακεία* is prohibited. The harming of children in abortion and infanticide is not specifically named in the undisputed Pauline texts, but *Did.* 2:2 commands ‘you shall

⁶¹⁷ Barton and Horsley, ‘Hellenistic Cult Group’, pp. 9-10. [Lines 55-59]

⁶¹⁸ Barton and Horsley, ‘Hellenistic Cult Group’, pp. 9-10. [Lines 60-64]

⁶¹⁹ For a broader comparison cf. Barton and Horsley, ‘Hellenistic Cult Group’.

⁶²⁰ The present may be represented in lines 55-59, the touching of the inscription. Both present and future are implicit in the great punishments to be inflicted by the gods on transgressors in lines 43-45 and 50-51. In the touching of the stele, Barton and Horsley, ‘Hellenistic Cult Group’, p. 14, suggest that it is moral inability to touch the stone which brings about the exposure of transgressors. The involvement of the deity is not only negative (cursing) but also positive (blessing, lines 47-50; creating good thoughts and obedience, lines 53-54). There is no hint in this inscription, however, of an eschatological expectation of reward or discipline in the afterlife. This was not, however, lacking in all of the religious associations. Cf. W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), pp. 21-23.

⁶²¹ Cf. also 1 Tim 5:21; 6:13; 2 Tim 2:14; 4:1 in the PE.

⁶²² Cf. the discussion on other associations, where the leader is specifically exempt from significant punishment, at the very least while acting as a leader. Barton and Horsley, ‘Hellenistic Cult Group’, pp. 22-23, comment on the egalitarian nature of the group and its general lack of hierarchy. This may be a significant reason for what seems to have been a general charge to see to the appropriate behaviour of others.

not commit adultery; you shall not corrupt boys; you shall not be sexually promiscuous; ... you shall not practice magic; you shall not engage in sorcery; you shall not abort a child or commit infanticide'.⁶²³ The prohibitions are very similar, although the texts are different in their structure and the usage of the words.⁶²⁴

The disciplinary process of the Zeus association is more like that of the Pauline tradition than of the Labyadai and the Poseidoniastai in that no financial penalty is imposed, but rather involves exclusion from the group, either total (exclusion/excommunication) or partial (banning from the sacrifices, mysteries, and some of the other religious practices of the group).⁶²⁵ Concern for the preservation of the group is evident throughout, and there is some interest in individual well-being, including expression of regret for those who would transgress.⁶²⁶ It is not known whether there was any provision made in the Zeus association for confession and restoration. None is provided for in this inscription, nor is it expressly excluded.⁶²⁷ This is also an area of difference, for the Pauline stress on gentleness and kindness in disciplinary activity is not paralleled in the Zeus inscription. In the Pauline tradition, group preservation and individual well-being are intricately connected, and an active concern is shown for the restoration of the transgressor (2 Cor 2:5-11; Gal 6:1; 2 Thess 3:15; 2 Tim 2:24-26).

Although the inscription clearly intends to protect against transgression, the identity and status of such a transgressor are not specified. Among the Labyadai the primary concern seems to have been to ensure proper conduct among leaders. Within the Zeus inscription, it seems that the concern is protection against misconduct of common members. However, the lack of information given regarding the organization

⁶²³ Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 253. Cf. also Acts 19:11-19; Did. 5:1.

⁶²⁴ Where Did. 2:2 reads οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, the Zeus inscription uses μὴ φάρμακον [line 18]. Did 2:2 reads οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ, the Zeus inscription uses μὴ φθορεῖδον [line 20] and μὴ ... παιδοφόνον [lines 20-21] to cover similar concepts.

⁶²⁵ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. 'Let him not enter this *oikos*' suggests total exclusion [line 33], while the partial ban is explicit [lines 39-41].

⁶²⁶ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 8-9. [Lines 44-50]

⁶²⁷ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 24-25.

of the group prevents firm conclusions. The Pauline tradition, including that seen in the PE, is similar to the Zeus association in this lack of specification. While the discipline processes of 1 Cor 5 and 6 seem likely to involve community leaders, this is not specified. In Gal 2:11-14 Paul presents himself as confronting Peter, clearly a leader within the greater Christian community, if not of Antioch. In most of the surveyed texts, other than 1 Tim 5:19-21, the status of the transgressor within the group is not explicit.

The major concern of this association dedicated to Zeus seems to be present moral behaviour. There is no expectation of eschatological consequences in the afterlife, or of an afterlife itself.⁶²⁸ The curses suggest ongoing and future consequences for transgressing, but these are not stated to transcend the lifetime of the transgressor. By contrast, the Pauline tradition considers the present consequences of transgression and ensuing discipline to be of negligible significance compared to the eschatological state of the transgressor, as is clearly seen in 1 Cor 5:5, 13. Also, the material about the Zeus association verges more on being a set of rules, a record of moral and ethical information, than it does a manual of discipline. Where this focuses on the acts to be avoided, the PE instructions focus on procedure.

The inscription of the Poseidoniastai, an exclusively male association at Delos, dated about 154/3 B.C.E.,⁶²⁹ concerns itself with the imposition of penalties on all who change the decree or the honours conferred upon the patron, Marcus Minatius. The inscription imposes a curse ('may he...be utterly ruined and his children also') and

⁶²⁸ Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 30-31, point out the partial inversion of morality and belief. In the Zeus group, moral behaviour is mostly, though not exclusively, a condition of acceptance within the community and an achievement to be attained, while in the Christian communities moral behaviour is mostly, though not exclusively, a sign of proper faith relationship and a gift from God. This is, however, a matter of degree rather than a sharply polarized difference. It is in the area of eschatological consequences that R. S. Ascough, *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians*, WUNT 2/161 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), pp. 65-67, is somewhat critical of Barton and Horsley. He views their work as not presenting strongly enough the analogues between this group and New Testament churches, specifically mentioning their treatment of salvation, present or future. Cf. Ascough, *Paul's Macedonian Associations*, p. 66 n. 91; Barton and Horsley, 'Hellenistic Cult Group', pp. 26-27, 41.

⁶²⁹ ID 1520, Delos, c. 153/4 B.C.E. For an English translation, cf. McLean, 'Place of Cult' (pp. 197-200). Like the Iobacchoi, this group seems to have been exclusively male.

significant monetary penalties of ‘6,000 sacred drachmae of Poseidon’. Should the leader, the *archithiasitēs*, fail in his duties, he is to owe the same financial penalty as well as being brought to trial.⁶³⁰ In addition, there are to be ‘herdsmen who have been prepared according to the law’, who are to lead in the sacrificial ox both in procession and in the reception for Marcus. These are to be paid 300 drachmae total, and if they fail to accomplish this are to ‘owe 1,000 sacred drachmae to Poseidon’ and be brought to trial.⁶³¹

A disciplinary process which apparently related to the leader is then described. ‘Those who do not accomplish any of the obligations recorded in this decree’ (presumably the one or more of the leaders) are to be subject to a curse and denounced by any member of the congregation who so desires. The leader, the *archithiasitēs*, is to bring forward the accuser and the defendant (singular in both cases) and a voting pebble is to be distributed to each of the members. Portions of the inscription are missing, but it seems that if the accusation stands, the accuser gains one third of the fine collected. In relation to the *archithiasitēs*, if he fails in his task, ‘let there be a prosecution against him when he becomes a private citizen, according to these things’.⁶³²

This inscription of the Poseidoniastai on Delos is similar in many aspects to that of the Labyadai. The prescription of specific monetary penalties is similar. The offences which bring about disciplinary action are not given in as much detail, other than the very clear setting of boundaries around the honouring of Marcus Minatius. While group activities include the festivals of Poseidon and Apollo and the specified penalty involves ‘sacred drachmae’, the deities are not explicitly presented as having an interest in the disciplinary practices. The idea that leaders can be disciplined is similar to what is found among the Labyadai and in 1 Tim 5:19-21. While the Code of the

⁶³⁰ McLean, ‘Place of Cult’ (pp. 199-200). [Lines 58-69]

⁶³¹ McLean, ‘Place of Cult’ (p. 200). [Lines 69-80]

⁶³² McLean, ‘Place of Cult’ (p. 200). [Lines 81-96]

Labyadai seems to be generally written to define and restrict the activity of the group's leaders, the Poseidoniastai inscription pays more attention to issues of honouring the group's patron, and the disciplinary action (including towards the leader) is focused on ensuring that this honour is not somehow diverted or neglected. Both the Labyadai and Poseidoniastai inscriptions specify that the overall leader can be disciplined, and both reserve the most severe action until that leader is a private citizen, giving him an effective immunity for the period in which he is *tagos* or *archithiasitēs*. Such immunity while in office is not the case in 1 Tim 5:19-21. No monetary penalties are suggested, let alone specified in the PE. The interest of God in the charge laid down to Timothy is different from the relative disinterest of the deities in the case of the Labyadai and Poseidoniastai. The disciplinary practices of the Poseidoniastai differ significantly from those of the PE.

The disciplinary practices related to the leaders of the association at Lanuvium and that dedicated to Asclepius and Hygieia, like those of the much earlier Labyadai, involve financial penalties. In the case of the association in Lanuvium the individual whose turn it was to provide the group meal and failed to do so was to pay a fine of thirty sesterces and would have to provide the next meal nonetheless.⁶³³ In the association of Asclepius and Hygieia any official who had misused the founding bequest, using the funds for purposes other than the regular meals, was to be fined 20,000 sesterces which were then to be added to the bequest.⁶³⁴ This was to be enforced by the *quinquennalis* or the curators who had succeeded the offending official in office, suggesting that there was immunity while in office present here, as it was with the Labyadai and the Poseidoniastai. In the case of the burial association at Lanuvium, with its generally poorer membership and rotating responsibility in office, there was

⁶³³ Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, p. 103, lines 9-10.

⁶³⁴ Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, p. 109, line 22.

apparently no corresponding immunity while in office for the one providing meals.⁶³⁵ However, this person may not have been an ‘officer’ as such, as the *quinquennalis* may have been excluded from this requirement. Against this is the provision in the inscription that a *quinquennalis* who had properly discharged his duties was to be honoured with a portion and a half in future provisions, suggesting that the office of *quinquennalis* was also open to scrutiny and later discipline.⁶³⁶ The financial nature of the disciplinary action of both of these groups is unlike that of 1 Tim 5:19-21. The Asclepius inscription, with its provision for the immunity of leaders while in office, is more similar to those of the other voluntary associations than it is to the material in the PE. The Lanuvium association, while it has a similar monetary penalty and thus differs from the PE, seems to be closer to 1 Tim 5:19-21 in that a penalty is assessed for those failing their task while they are in ‘office’. It seems most likely, however, that this was not an office of leadership as such, being rather a part of the regular responsibility of group members to provide for the meals of the group.

The inscription of the Iobacchoi offers a substantial glimpse into one specific group.⁶³⁷ The great diversity exhibited among Dionysiac groups prevents any conclusion that the practices of this group, in Athens, were similar to those of other Dionysiac groups elsewhere.⁶³⁸ The groups are somewhat alike in their worship of Dionysos/Bacchus, the wine god, and in their common connection to cowherds.⁶³⁹ The groups are otherwise diverse: some are made up mostly of one social class, and others are socially diverse; some are exclusively male or female, while others are mixed.

⁶³⁵ On the issue of social standing of the members in the Lanuvium association, cf. Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, p. 26. The discussion of rotation and responsibility for the regular meals is found on lines 9-16.

⁶³⁶ Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, p. 105, lines 21-22.

⁶³⁷ *IG II² 1368 = SIG³ 1109 = LSCG 51*, Athens, c. 178 C.E. For an English translation and commentary, cf. Danker, *Benefactor*, pp. 156-66.

⁶³⁸ P. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2003), pp. 46-49.

⁶³⁹ This association with cowherds may date back to Euripedes in the late 5th century B.C.E. It is not a formal association, but rather elements of cowherd life and practice are generally incorporated into Dionysiac groups.

This inscription records the by-laws of the Iobacchoi, an exclusively male group, shortly after the appointment of a new priest, the very wealthy and influential Claudius Herodes Attikos, and dates to the period prior to his death in 178 C.E.⁶⁴⁰ The participants in this group decided to inscribe their rules in stone and this clearly was both caused by pride and was itself a source of pride, evidenced by statements such as ‘now all the other Bakchic societies will have to look up to us’.⁶⁴¹ The approval of these rules as well as the decision to inscribe them and order the stele for the inscription were voted on and approved by all members, and the officers were charged with guarding ‘against any deviation from the text as adopted’.⁶⁴²

The rules themselves record the process for becoming and remaining a member, including appropriate behaviour at meetings as well as the payment of entrance fees and monthly and anniversary dues. If the member was in arrears, he was to be excluded from the banquet until he paid the payment determined by the priest.⁶⁴³

Notwithstanding the dismissal of the Iobacchoi as ‘drinking buddies’, they had extensive rules governing their behaviour at meetings.⁶⁴⁴ A good portion of the inscription consists of the duties and privileges of various officers of the group. A priest was to preside over the meeting, with responsibility for the drink offering and ‘divine story’, a play acting out the story of Dionysos.⁶⁴⁵ The Sergeant-at-Arms was to indicate, by placing ‘the official wand of our God’ next to an Iobacchos, that this individual had been guilty of inappropriate or disruptive behaviour. Should the member not be willing to leave, the Horses (bouncers) were to eject him and he would be subject to the brawlers’ fine.⁶⁴⁶ The priest, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Horses apparently were the

⁶⁴⁰ Lane Fox considers these rules a revival of previous rules which had been allowed to lapse and were now being reinstated. There is no way to determine the actual date of the earliest implementation of these rules. Cf. Harland, *Associations*, p. 83; R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986), pp. 85-86.

⁶⁴¹ English translation by Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 157. [Lines 27-28]

⁶⁴² Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 158. [Lines 30-32]

⁶⁴³ Danker, *Benefactor*, pp. 158-59. [Lines 69-72, 105-9]

⁶⁴⁴ This designation was offered by Engelbert Drerup in 1899. Cf. Harland, *Associations*, p. 71.

⁶⁴⁵ Danker, *Benefactor*, pp. 159-60, 165. [Lines 114-121]

⁶⁴⁶ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 160. [Lines 138-45]

officers primarily responsible for discipline. During the meeting, 'deliver[ing] a speech without recognition by the priest or the vice-priest' carried a fine of 30 light drachmai.

Other behaviours which brought disciplinary action included 'raucous and disruptive behavior at the meetings'.⁶⁴⁷ The section of the inscription dealing with penalties offers insight into these disruptive behaviours and the rules for their resolution. 'If anyone starts a quarrel, is found to be uncivil, takes someone else's place, insults or demeans another, the victim of such treatment shall present two Iobakchoi, who shall under oath declare that they heard the insult or derision to which the plaintiff was subjected.'⁶⁴⁸ This would result in a fine of 25 light drachmai, as would the starting of a quarrel. In addition, the guilty party would be excluded from meetings until the fine had been paid. If the quarrel had escalated to the level of blows being exchanged, a membership meeting would be convened, a vote taken, and a fine levied, not to exceed 25 denarii. If the victim had taken the matter outside the group to the public rather than to the priest or the arch-Bacchos, the victim would also be liable to the same fine as the offender. If the Sergeant-at-Arms failed to eject the participants in a brawl, the same punishment was to be imposed on him. The meeting convened to deal with such disciplinary matters was to be a plenary meeting, and if any Bacchos deliberately did not attend, he was to pay a fine of 50 light drachmai.⁶⁴⁹

Exclusion from the group for those who had not paid their fines had consequences in terms of access to the social network of the group and to its benefits. One of these, common to many of the Mediterranean *collegia*, involved proper observance of death and burial.⁶⁵⁰ At the death of an Iobacchos, a wreath was to be

⁶⁴⁷ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 158. [Lines 64-65]

⁶⁴⁸ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 159. [Lines 74-79]

⁶⁴⁹ The penalties section is found at Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 159. [Lines 74-103]

⁶⁵⁰ Cf. Kloppenborg and Wilson, *Voluntary Associations*.

provided in his honour with a maximum cost of five denarii, and those Iobacchoi who attended his funeral were to have one jar of wine set before them.⁶⁵¹

There are a number of significant analogues and some differences between these rules of the Iobacchoi and those to be observed in 1 Tim 5. The voting of the membership for matters of discipline is quite different from the leader-driven process of the PE.⁶⁵² The extensive rules of behaviour, with rigorous enforcement and the provision for a Sergeant-at-Arms and the Horses (acting as bouncers), is far in excess of what Paul commands in his writings. The levying of monetary fines on offenders and the disciplining of those who avoid participating in the disciplining body is also without analogue in the Pauline writings.

The recorded inscription for regulation of behaviour among the Iobacchoi gives minimal stated cosmic, eschatological, or social motivation for disciplinary actions of the group. Worship services are to be conducted ‘in an appropriate manner’ and a drink offering is to be made ‘for the return of Bakchos’.⁶⁵³ Such a celebration ritual for the absence and return of a deity is common in religious worship,⁶⁵⁴ but differs from the understanding in 1 Tim 5:21 of the presence of God and other cosmic figures as witnesses of the behaviour of the community and its leaders.⁶⁵⁵ The placing of the ‘official wand of our God’ next to a disruptive person seems to have been a simple act of demarcation -- that person was to depart or be ejected -- although the terms ‘official’ and ‘of our God’ suggest an acknowledgement of the presence and displeasure of the deity.⁶⁵⁶

⁶⁵¹ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 161. [Lines 160-64]

⁶⁵² However, this voting may or may not be similar to what the Pauline communities did when deciding to punish offenders (1 Cor 5:5).

⁶⁵³ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 159. [Lines 111-15]

⁶⁵⁴ Danker, *Benefactor*, pp. 164-65.

⁶⁵⁵ Cf. e.g., 1 Cor 5:4, 11:10; 1 Tim 5:21. Cf. also the understanding of the eucharist, with its elements of absence and return (1 Cor 11:26) but also the belief in Christ’s presence.

⁶⁵⁶ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 160. [Lines 138-39] This seems to be understood as a passive rather than active presence. Cf. the comments below on the absence of eschatological or cosmological dimensions in the discipline of the Iobacchoi.

Should the member die without having paid applicable disciplinary fines and/or dues, one could assume from the inscription that the funerary honours due a member would be withheld, though this is not stated.⁶⁵⁷ The importance of such a withholding of honour is suggested by the existence of funerary *collegia*.⁶⁵⁸ The burial functions of these seem to have been secondary, however, to the networking functions and may even have served as a ploy to enable the constituting of such a group in the second century C.E.⁶⁵⁹ There certainly is no trace of an eschatological or cosmological dimension to the Iobacchoi inscription corresponding to the notion of handing over to Satan in order to be taught not to blaspheme (1 Tim 1:20).⁶⁶⁰

The effect on the group of tolerating inappropriate behaviour is not explored in the inscription.⁶⁶¹ There are mentions of ‘good order’, ‘good taste’, ‘appropriate manner’, and identification of disruptive and improper behaviour, but no mention of the effect on the member or the group of tolerating inappropriate behaviour, in marked contrast to 1 Tim 1:4, 19b in the PE. While Ascough is correct in pointing out that maintaining internal order was essential to the survival of the groups and that moral

⁶⁵⁷ Danker, *Benefactor*, pp. 158-59. [For exclusion for non-payment of fees and fines, cf. lines 49-51, 69-72, 83-84, 89-90, 99-102, 105-8]

⁶⁵⁸ J. S. Kloppenborg, ‘Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership’, in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 16-30; S. G. Wilson, ‘Voluntary Associations: An Overview’, in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 1-15.

⁶⁵⁹ The inscription’s silence regarding whether offenders lose burial honours, focusing rather on the exclusion of members from the meetings and festivities, suggests that the social rather than burial function was primary among the Iobacchoi. For general discussion on social networking and funerary *collegia*, cf. W. Cotter, ‘The Collegia and Roman Law: State Restrictions on Voluntary Associations’, in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 74-89 (pp. 76, 86-88); Kloppenborg, ‘Collegia and *Thiasoi*’ (pp. 18-23); H. Remus, ‘Voluntary Association and Networks: Aelius Aristides at the Asclepieion in Pergamum’, in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 147-75; Wilson, ‘Voluntary Associations’ (p. 13).

⁶⁶⁰ Cf. also 1 Tim 6:13-19 for discussion of eschatological implications of present behaviour in the PE.

⁶⁶¹ This silence should not be understood as stating that such motivations were absent: they may simply have not been recorded. The logistics of inscribing on a stele would militate against excessive wordiness. Against this it must be noted that the inscription records the specific cheers of the group upon ratification of its rules [lines 13-18] and expressions of pride such as ‘Now all the other Bakchic societies will have to look up to us!’ [lines 26-27] This suggests that the Iobacchoi were not overly concerned with the cost of the inscription and probably recorded whatever they actually wanted on the stele.

language was used to promote this,⁶⁶² the Iobacchoi inscription does not make this explicit. The regulation of appropriate speech as well as behaviour certainly brings to mind 1 Cor 14, but lacks the explicit motivation of building up the group (1 Cor 14:3-12, 26, 31).

The requirement of two witnesses in lines 74-79 is somewhat startling. Van Vliet's treatment of the question of a two-witness requirement in the Roman world concludes that 'Greek-Roman culture did not know such a rule'.⁶⁶³ The origins of the Iobacchoi two-witness requirement are not known, but it seems to be unmatched elsewhere in Greek and Roman culture.⁶⁶⁴ The Iobacchoi seem rigorous and explicit in their requirement of having the entire group participate in disciplinary action, which is similar to 1 Tim 5:20, which indicates that public rebuke is the significant component of the discipline called for by the Pastor. This piece of literature from the Greco-Roman world of the *collegia* is significantly analogous to some aspects of the disciplinary practices of the PE, as well as to Pauline disciplinary practice as seen in his dealings with Corinth.

With the Iobacchoi the only leadership role which is explicitly addressed as subject to discipline is that of the Sergeant-at-Arms, while the Code of the Labyadai and the Poseidoniastai inscription specify that the overall leader can be disciplined. In both cases any serious action taken must wait until that leader is a private citizen, giving him an effective immunity for the period in which he is *tagos* or *archithiasitēs*.

⁶⁶² Ascough, *Paul's Macedonian Associations*, p. 66.

⁶⁶³ H. van Vliet, *Did Greek-Roman-Hellenistic Law Know the Exclusion of the Single Witness? The Answer of the Early Christian Writings/The Law of Deut. 19:15 par. and the Early Christian Writings* (Franeker: Wever, 1980), pp. 19-20, 26, deals with the Iobacchoi but in essence dismisses their adherence to this standard as an anachronism, without traceable genealogy. He concludes (p. 20) that 'the Iobakchen-statutes, dating from times a hundred years later than the beginning of the circulation of N.T. literature, are not sufficient evidence for the existence of a rule asking for two witnesses, which might be supposed [sic] to be generally known in the Greek world in the time of Paul'. One caveat which must be noted to van Vliet's otherwise excellent work is his failure to note the requirement of two witnesses in Hindu law of great antiquity, as pointed out by Derrett, *Law in the NT*, p. 160 n. 2.

⁶⁶⁴ As previously seen, although there are numerous statements affirming the preferability of multiple witnesses, this was not a *requirement* and in fact was often ignored. It may be that the Iobacchoi also ignored their own regulation, but van Vliet dismisses them too easily, as the two witness rule is stated as a requirement and we have no record that this was set aside.

All of these inscriptions offer points of similarity to and difference from each other as well as in relation to the surveyed texts within the Pauline tradition. In some ways, the differences among similar groups provide a striking similarity to the differences among Pauline congregations. Within the Pauline tradition, even restricted to the undisputed texts, there is no one model of discipline imposed on all of the churches. It is also evident that among the various associations and groups, the *collegia* of the society in which the Pauline communities started and flourished, there was no one dominant model of discipline. The Pauline communities are more similar to each other in their consistent concern for group preservation intricately coupled with individual well-being, and concern for present behaviour and relationship seen as inexorably connected to future and eschatological effects and relationship. In other ways, however, their practices and concerns have significant analogues within the *collegia*.

3.7 – Discipline of Leaders: Summary

Having urged that good leaders be provided for in an adequate fashion, the Pastor now instructs Timothy regarding his obligations regarding the discipline of leaders. To protect the leaders from harassment, Timothy is not to permit accusations to come to the fore which do not have an adequate basis even for consideration. In keeping with the Scriptures, unless two or three witnesses can testify to the truth of a single matter, the accusation should not be permitted to become a case. If the witnesses exist and the matter is established, so that it is known that a leader is guilty of sinning, that leader is to be reprovved before the entire congregation so that the other elders would take cautionary note. The Pastor solemnly charges Timothy that he should do these things (provide protection as well as needed discipline) without either pre-judging or favouritism.

These instructions regarding discipline of congregational leaders are much closer to the intent and practice of the Jewish Scriptures and what is known of rabbinic practice than to any other contemporary cognate group. Although the Qumran documents indicate that leaders were held to the same regulations as the remainder of the group and thus subject to discipline, the addition of a regulation of rebuke (thus initial discipline) on the same day as the offence occurred meant that the regulation regarding witnesses was changed. Cumulative or sequential witnessing, to discrete events, became a permissible part of the evidentiary process.

The idea that single witnesses to separate offences could combine their testimony was essentially foreign to Jewish and rabbinic practice, notwithstanding the practice in the Qumran communities. The primary concern of Jewish law was protection (of God, his people, individuals); the punishment of the guilty was only secondary. As van Vliet observes, 'Detection of criminals was not seen as a duty prescribed by the Law, but only punishment in case of crime seen by two witnesses as representatives of the community. Punishment was a duty towards God, for which the community, being called to holiness, was responsible. But He would see to the punishment of those transgressors whom human justice was not to seize. Vengeance was not allowed.'⁶⁶⁵

The Græco-Roman practice of discipline was markedly different from that found in 1 Tim 5:19-21. Witnesses were by no means needed to establish or even win a case. Eloquence was frequently valued over accuracy and truth. Accusations against one's social superiors were not permitted except in those situations which were defined as threatening the society (treason and adultery), and the testimony of a slave was not considered of value unless it had been gained under torture. The instructions given in 1 Tim 5:19-21 would have seemed strange to the general Græco-Roman society.

⁶⁶⁵ Vliet, *No Single Testimony*, p. 56.

A somewhat greater affinity may be found in some of the documents of the voluntary associations. Although the leaders generally were immune to discipline, in some cases this was only as long as they were in a position of leadership within that group. By contrast, the disciplinary instruction in 1 Tim 5:20 offers no such temporary immunity and in fact lacks even the initial face-saving private confrontation of Matt 18:15. At least one inscription, although it is from a slightly later period than the PE in virtually all scholars' estimation, gives an instruction of gathering two witnesses to an offence before proceeding with its prosecution. The instructions are generally more prescriptive and detailed than those found in the PE, though not than those in the Qumran material. Although quite a few of the offences are against 'order' and proper conduct, some of the associations showed concern with moral behaviour and the well-being of individuals in the group.

The other NT materials giving instruction for discipline, especially Matt 18:15-17, have a few things in common with the PE material, primarily because of the use of the same Scriptures. The context of the discipline is different, however, as is the application of those Scriptures. Although both mention multiple witnesses, these witnesses fill completely different roles in the two passages. The Pastor makes no mention of private attempts at reconciliation, and while both instructions have public disclosure as a possible outcome, the object of the public disclosure in the PE is to cause the other leaders to fear and not engage in similar behaviour, while in Matthew the goal is to warn the congregational members from associating with the offender.

In terms of the instructions given for discipline of leaders, the Pastor's directives are closest to those found in the non-sectarian Jewish materials. There is little variation from the instructions in Deut 19:15-21, and while the rabbinic materials offer considerable expansion and elucidation of Deuteronomy, there is nothing which disagrees with the Pastor's commands to Timothy.

The idea that leaders were to be subject to congregational discipline was culturally anomalous.⁶⁶⁶ The Labyadai and Poseidoniastai permitted discipline of the leader, but only after that leader ceased leadership and in essence became one of the group again. Once again there seems to be a perceived equality within the group that permits discipline of leaders. It may be that an understanding of equality ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ offered a context which made the discipline of leaders in the PE less objectionable to a Græco-Roman congregation. As with the issue of reward, however, there is no clear instruction to treat each other as equals: only references to practices related to reward and discipline which seem to imply that there was within the community a disregarding of status.

⁶⁶⁶ The Qumran materials implied that leaders were subject to the same purity regulations as the congregation, although in other ways the group exhibited a rigid and defined hierarchy.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE INSTALLATION OF THE LEADER: 1 TIMOTHY 5:22

The last section of this study concerns itself with practices related to the installation of leadership. The author's concern is that this be done properly, not just in relation to the leader but also for the sake of Timothy's well-being. At issue are the significance of the laying on of hands and the responsibility of the one performing an installation of a leader.

4.1 – Text, Variants, and Translation of 1 Timothy 5:22

²² χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει
μηδὲ κοινώνει ἀμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις·
σεαυτὸν ἀγνὸν τήρει.

The passage reads as follows:

Lay hands on no one hastily: do not be a partner in the sins of others.

Keep yourself pure.

The manuscripts have several variants in 1 Tim 5:22, but none of these is significant to the point of influencing the meaning of the text. In place of ἐπιτίθει, D* has ἐπιτίθου, 69 has ἐπιτίθε, and L and 2344 have ἐπιτίθη. The last two are probably orthographical variants, and the aorist imperative form of D* is not a common usage in this context (and not strongly supported), hence the reading chosen.⁶⁶⁷

A few manuscripts reverse the order of ἀμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις (giving ἀλλοτρίαις ἀμαρτίαις).⁶⁶⁸ However, in Rom 15:20 ἀλλοτρίαις precedes its noun, while in Heb 9:25 it follows its noun, and in both cases it has the sense of 'not one's own' or 'belonging to another', so this change in order is not significant.⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶⁷ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 85.

⁶⁶⁸ Seen in P, 796, Tert., and Pacian. Cf. Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 86.

⁶⁶⁹ Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 86.

Finally, one manuscript omits two lines, from $\sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ in v. 22 through $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\rho\omicron\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\iota$ in v. 23.⁶⁷⁰ This is probably an accidental omission of this portion of the material, as the passage is awkward without these lines.

4.2 – Exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:22

In this third directive to Timothy regarding his treatment of elders the Pastor gives instructions which relate to the laying on of hands.⁶⁷¹ In some way, doing this hastily could result in becoming a partaker of the sins of others. Timothy receives guidance intended to protect him.

4.2.1 – $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon$

The simple instruction to ‘lay hands on no one hastily’ is clear, but the context of this laying on of hands is not.⁶⁷² The laying on of hands was a common practice in the recorded ministry of Christ, used in healing and blessing. In the early church it also signified the impartation of the Spirit⁶⁷³ and was also apparently employed in connection with setting apart for ministry.⁶⁷⁴ Some scholars propose that the ceremony relates to the restoration of penitents: in this context, the restoration of penitent presbyters who had fallen into sin, or of sinners in general. However, given the late

⁶⁷⁰ Seen in 2401*. Elliott, *Greek Text*, p. 86.

⁶⁷¹ It is anachronistic to label this ‘ordination’, a rite which is first attested in the *Apostolic Traditions* of Hippolytus (200-220 C.E.). While it is most likely the scriptural precedent for the later rite of ordination, its significance to its participants in the PE was almost certainly not as formalized as modern understandings. A better term would be ‘commissioning’ or ‘ritual of appointment’ (so Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 620-21). Cf. M. Warkentin, *Ordination: A Biblical-Historical View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 41, 145.

⁶⁷² Cf. Warkentin, *Ordination*, pp. 136-52, who sees 1 Tim 4:14 and 2 Tim 1:6 as a commissioning rite (p. 140), but 1 Tim 5:22 as a warning against touching anything unclean and thereby becoming impure in terms of Mosaic law. This is intriguing but not convincing, as it would be quite anomalous to the PE, which makes little if any appeal to purity laws. In the PE, the law is held up as good but subject to abuse, and is intended for those who break it (1 Tim 1:7-10). The focus of the PE is the ‘deposit’, sound teaching, rather than the keeping of Nazarite vows and rituals of the law (cf. 1 Tim 4:1-5).

⁶⁷³ Laying on of hands in healing is recorded often, including in Luke 4:40; 13:13; Acts 9:12; 28:8. Its use in blessing is seen in Matt 19:13, 15; Mark 10:16. Its use in relation to the Spirit, tongues and prophecy is seen in Acts 8:17-19; 9:17; 19:6. For a discussion of the hand as an extension of one’s self (including of God – cf. Isa 45:12) cf. J. Coppens, ‘Imposition of Hands’, in *NCE* 7, ed. Catholic University of America (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 401-3 (p. 401).

⁶⁷⁴ In the PE, this is seen in 1 Tim 4:14, where the $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ laid their hands on Timothy, and in 2 Tim 1:6 where the author states that he did so. The same apparent sense is recorded in Acts 6:6 and 13:3.

(third century) evidence for such a practice, which is acknowledged even by proponents of the restitution view, the Pastor's concern here is not with this as-yet unknown ritual of reconciliation.⁶⁷⁵ In addition, the first evidence for the imposition of hands on penitents is offered by Tertullian, who also understood it as a baptismal rite, so that in his understanding it was not strictly a penitential act.⁶⁷⁶ The act of laying on of hands is not attested in the NT as a penitential act.⁶⁷⁷ This is not in the category of *hapax prassomena*, occurrences in the text of otherwise unmentioned acts.

The warning against hasty imposition of hands, with attendant sharing in the sins of others, suggests that more is involved in this instance than healing, blessing, or impartation of the Spirit. None of the texts referring to these functions suggests a need for prior qualification of those upon whom hands are to be laid. The most likely context, then, is either the installation of new leaders, whether in general or to replace deposed leaders who have sinned, or the restoration of penitent elders.⁶⁷⁸ The other references to laying on of hands in the PE (1 Tim 4:14 and 2 Tim 1:6) *could* (but need not) be understood simply as gifting, as their context does not demand that an act of commissioning was involved. 1 Tim 5:22, however, with its injunction against haste

⁶⁷⁵ Scholars inclined toward a rite of reconciliation include Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 80; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 103; Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 129; Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 96. Scholars favouring an ordination rite include Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 88; Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 201-2; Bürki, *Erste Brief an Timotheus*, p. 182; Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, pp. 131, 134; Jeremias and Strathmann, *Timotheus und Titus*, p. 37; Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 281; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 127-28; Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 316-17; Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 259-60; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, pp. 313-14; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 547; Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, pp. 128-29; Wohlenberg, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 183-84. Hanson, *Pastoral Letters*, p. 63, posits that ordination had a more elaborate structure, argues that the context in 1 Tim 5:22 is that of restitution, and states that 'to ordain someone would certainly require the consent, and probably the assistance, of the presbyters. This would be much more difficult to carry out hastily.' However, this makes assumptions about the position of the text in time which are not established. Additionally, the commissioning of Timothy himself is stated to have been variously at the hands of Paul and the presbyters, and caution would be in order whether Timothy acted at his own discretion or as a part of a group. This is simply not defined in the text.

⁶⁷⁶ J. D. Quinn, 'Tertullian and I Timothy 5:22 on Imposing Hands: Paul Galtier Revisited', in *Studia Patristica: Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, StPatr 21 (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1987), pp. 268-70 (p. 269).

⁶⁷⁷ Adler, 'Bußritus' (p. 4). If there were an exception, it might be the imposition of Ananias' hands on Saul (Acts 9:17), but the clearly stated context there is healing and filling with the Holy Spirit (vv. 12, 17-18).

⁶⁷⁸ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 80, point out that v. 21 'need not be limited to behavior toward presbyters' and so this could also be related to the general reconciliation of those who have sinned, but the context of 1 Tim 5:17-22 is quite clearly in relation to leadership within the church.

and mention of associated hazards, suggests that something more than the impartation of an equipping gift is involved here.⁶⁷⁹

Some of those holding to v. 22 as describing the restoration of penitent sinners argue that a change of subject comes between vv. 19 and 20, or at least between 20 and 21.⁶⁸⁰ 1 Tim 5:22, and perhaps v. 21 as well, would thus relate to general church discipline rather than questions of practice related to leaders. The idea of such a transition is not convincing.⁶⁸¹ 1 Tim 5:17-22 reads as a set of instructions to Timothy in relation to one group: leaders in the church with responsibility for governance, preaching, and teaching. The need to ensure the continuity of proper teaching is the background to these directives.

There is no first century evidence that a period of testing ('no one hastily') was to be obligatory regarding repentant sinners. While there is later attestation for the laying on of hands in a repentance rite, the earliest support for this is in the third century, whereas there is clear support in the PE for the laying on of hands in connection with equipping for ministry.⁶⁸² In the context of the PE, where laying on of hands is seen in 1 Tim 4:14 and 2 Tim 1:6 in connection with Timothy (and most likely in connection with his ministry), the most likely understanding is that 1 Tim 5:22 refers to the installation of leaders. There is nothing to suggest that a new practice (a restoration ritual) is being introduced. The rule regarding the qualification of those who are to serve as deacons (1 Tim 3:10), as well as the general stress on selecting leaders of good character (1 Tim 3:1-15), suggest that 1 Tim 5:22 continues with a similar

⁶⁷⁹ Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, p. 18, for instance, sees only 1 Tim 4:14 and 2 Tim 1:6 as referring to ordination as such, while 1 Tim 5:22 names only a part of the ritual (namely, laying on of hands) which is included in the entire act of ordination. The warnings of the latter reference argue for the gravity of the procedure, thus surpassing the instructions given in the other passages.

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 80; Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 129.

⁶⁸¹ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 201-2, points out that while there is a change from singular in v. 19 to plural in v. 20, this presents no difficulty as there is a corresponding opposite change from v. 17 to v. 19. Additionally, 'those sinning' in v. 20 are a portion of the accused elders in v. 19, who in turn are a subsection of elders in general (v. 17). Cf. Roloff, *I. Timotheus*, p. 313 n. 445.

⁶⁸² Among others, cf. Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 88; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 128; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 621-22; Spicq, *Saint Paul*, p. 548.

concern for the character of these leaders, cautioning that haste in installation is inappropriate.

Oberlinner rejects the idea that this rite was used to distinguish the elders who preach and teach (and were thus worthy of double honour – cf. v. 17) from the rest of the elders. Rather, he considers this passage a model for general practices related to the installation of leaders in general.⁶⁸³ This may be so, and the general nature of the instructions certainly does not argue against their application to other leaders. Yet, nothing in the text states that the author intended these instructions to apply to all leaders, using the elders as his example. It seems best to agree with Roloff that this text is specific to those elders who functioned in a role which separated them from those who were simply older men. This role also qualified them for reward as well as discipline.⁶⁸⁴

In 1 Tim 5:24-25 the author observes that in some cases sins as well as good works become apparent only after a period of time.⁶⁸⁵ Unfortunately, no guidelines are provided in the PE to suggest what an appropriate period of time might be to avoid overly hasty commissioning, what form the observation might take (although cf. 1 Tim 3:1-15), or who should render judgement regarding suitability of the candidate. This fluidity and lack of prescription seem in keeping with what has been observed of Pauline and PE practice related to leaders in general. Later commentators such as Chrysostom attempt to define this more closely, stating that ‘suddenly’ means ‘not upon a first, nor a second, nor a third trial, but after frequent and strict examination and circumspection’.⁶⁸⁶

⁶⁸³ Oberlinner, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 260, states that ‘die Allgemeinheit der Anweisungen deutet sodann darauf hin, daß der Verfasser nicht nur etwas über die Presbyter sagen wollte, sondern daß er mit den Presbytern ein Paradigma für all Amtsträger der Gemeinden gewählt hat’.

⁶⁸⁴ Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 314.

⁶⁸⁵ The remark is not itself an instruction to Timothy regarding leadership and hence is not a part of the current study, but it does offer a rationale against overly hasty installation of leaders.

⁶⁸⁶ Chrysostom, *Homily 16 on Timothy*, v. 22. *NPNF¹* 13:464.

The text implies that Timothy is the one who would lay hands on those being commissioned. This need not mean that Timothy was to act unilaterally.⁶⁸⁷ In 1 Tim 4:14 the author refers to the πρεσβυτερίον, a collective group which laid its hands on Timothy. In 2 Tim 1:6 the author himself laid hands on Timothy. In both references there is mention of a gift given through the act of laying on of hands, as well as encouragement to refresh that gift. This suggests that one event rather than two is referred to. It seems most likely that one primary leader performed the rite, but that the recognized leadership of the group participated in the ceremony as well. 1 Tim 5:22 suggests that Timothy should take the lead in this rite, but the text does not mention nor exclude the other elders as co-participants. The implication seems to be that Timothy was to bear the primary responsibility for ensuring proper practice in this matter.

The author of the PE does not claim for Paul that his authority as an apostle was gained through such a ritual, either through the laying on of Ananias' hands (Acts 9:12, 17) or through the prophets and teachers in the church in Antioch who are recorded by Luke as commissioning Paul (Acts 13:1-3). The apostolic role and authority claimed for Paul are by command or will of God (1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; Titus 1:3), and his appointment is from God (1 Tim 1:12; 2 Tim 1:11). The author instructs Timothy to entrust his deposit, the good teaching, to 'faithful men' who would in turn teach others (2 Tim 2:2). Titus is reminded that a part of his task was to 'appoint elders in every town' (Titus 1:5). The source of the commission is ultimately seen as God, as the language of 'gifting' suggests, but human agency is involved in seeing that the commissioning is done. The gift came from God; the hands laid on Timothy were those of the elders and Paul (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6).⁶⁸⁸ Other than the instructions of 1 Tim 5:22, little detail is given regarding the actual procedure of commissioning someone for

⁶⁸⁷ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 621.

⁶⁸⁸ The variation between 1 Tim 4:4, where the elders laid hands on Timothy, and 2 Tim 1:6, where Paul did so, argues against the initiation of an apostolic succession: if that were the intent, then the author would have stressed that Paul was the one laying on hands in all instances.

the task of governing, teaching and preaching. Much more attention is paid to ensuring that the individual is worthy and is likely to function well.

4.2.2 – μηδὲ κοινώνει ἀμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις

This passage warns against sharing or partaking in others' sins.⁶⁸⁹ The use of κοινώνειν with the dative of the shared characteristic or item is common in the NT.⁶⁹⁰

On a first reading of this passage, hasty laying on of hands would in effect make Timothy a partaker in the sins of unworthy elders.⁶⁹¹

Another option, proposed by Fee, is that this is a warning to Timothy regarding the sorts of sins committed by erring elders.⁶⁹² This phrase is thus cautioning him against becoming involved in the types of sins which have necessitated the discipline of others. In favour of this interpretation is the instruction which follows: 'Keep yourself pure.' Lips expands the context, so that the warnings regarding foreign sins and purity (v. 22b) relate to the total message of 1 Tim 5, as the passage regarding widows also contains instructions for Timothy regarding appropriate actions (1 Tim 5:9, 11), albeit without warnings of shared guilt.⁶⁹³

Arguing against Fee's interpretation, the conjunction μηδέ, 'nor' or 'and not', connects the 'foreign sins' to the preceding phrase with its use of the related term μηδενί, the instruction against overly hasty laying on of hands, (and perhaps even to the μηδέν used in the instruction against favouritism in v. 21) rather than to the following instruction to maintain purity. The standard uses of κοινώνω and its cognates, while ranging across this range of nuance, generally indicate responsibility and fellowship more than direct participation, so that while the latter is not precluded,

⁶⁸⁹ Elsewhere in the PE, related words are used to speak of a shared faith (Titus 1:4) and the wealthy are instructed to share their resources (1 Tim 6:18).

⁶⁹⁰ Bernard, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 88.

⁶⁹¹ Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, pp. 201-3.

⁶⁹² Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 132. Cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 317, who considers and rejects this interpretation. Cf. also BDAG, pp. 551-54. 1 Tim 5:22 and 2 John 11 (p. 552) are cited as examples of equal responsibility for the deeds of others. The context of both passages makes it clear that the origin of this responsibility is some form of welcoming of unworthy individuals.

⁶⁹³ Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, p. 177.

the former is more likely. Furthermore, the following instruction to maintain personal purity can also easily be understood in terms of shared responsibility. Other expressions of concern for Timothy's personal spiritual status (cf. 1 Tim 1:19; 4:16) show little indication that the author believes that Timothy may be falling into sin.⁶⁹⁴ In the light of the stress on examination of diaconal candidates (1 Tim 3:10) it seems best to understand this as a warning to Timothy that he would share in culpability if he laid hands on an unworthy candidate for installation.⁶⁹⁵ This is further reinforced by the use of μηδέιν in 1 Tim 5:21, where it is used to enjoin against favouritism. It may be that Timothy is being warned against favouritism, shown in hastily ordaining someone, thus gaining culpability for this individual's wrongdoing.⁶⁹⁶ It seems less likely that the Pastor has in mind here also the context of the widows from earlier in the chapter. Given the concern for correct teaching and transmission of received tradition in the PE, the Pastor's concern may well be with the installation of orthodox rather than heterodox teachers and leaders.⁶⁹⁷ There would then be a contrast here between those elders who govern well and labour in (orthodox) preaching and teaching and are thus worthy of enhanced honour (v. 17) and those who are inadequate to the task, bringing disrepute not only on themselves but also their fellows (vv. 20, 22).⁶⁹⁸ Leaders should be participants together in the honour of a task well done, not in the shame of transgressions. While in this case the shared transgression is placed on the one

⁶⁹⁴ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 317. 1 Tim 6:11-15, while warning Timothy against 'these things' (probably false doctrines and the desire for wealth – vv. 3-10), seems cautionary rather than corrective. 2 Tim 2:22, where Timothy is urged to 'flee youthful lusts', does not suggest that Timothy is having difficulty with these, but rather urges Timothy to negative ('flee evil') and positive ('pursue good') holiness. Cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 533.

⁶⁹⁵ Cf. L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe: Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief*, HTKNT 11/2 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994), p. 259, who refers to 'die Verantwortung, die der Gemeindeleiter in allen denkbaren Situationen hat...in der Sorgfalt der Auswahl und der Übertragung der amtlichen Funktion' (emphasis added).

⁶⁹⁶ Yet another option would be to connect this warning regarding participation in sin back to 1 Tim 5:20, so that failure to appropriately rebuke a sinning elder would amount to sharing in their sin. This is the least problematic approach theologically: culpability for sins not yet committed presents problems, while negligence in dealing with established sin is clearly wrong. However, this makes the argument of the entire passage confusing and needlessly jumbled. It would be better in this case to split 1 Tim 5:22, perhaps associating the favouritism of v. 21 with hasty ordination, and then seeing the remainder of v. 22 as a general exhortation toward purity.

⁶⁹⁷ Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, pp. 211-12.

⁶⁹⁸ This corresponds somewhat with Schwarz's perspective on μάλιστα, discussed in 2.2.3.

imposing hands, the fear induced in ‘the rest’ (the other elders) suggests that the act of installing someone brings them into a sodality, whereby what one does affects the others.

Chrysostom understood this as responsibility for future as well as past sins, for the one ‘placing him in that station’ becomes a partaker of good actions as well as sins.⁶⁹⁹ Such responsibility for future sins is rejected by Quinn.⁷⁰⁰ Adler also points out that the use of *κοινωνεῖν* in the NT always carries a sense of participation in something current rather than future.⁷⁰¹ At the same time, in other leadership passages there is a stress on examination (1 Tim 3:10). Characteristics such as the raising of one’s children are understood as predictors of future performance in leadership (1 Tim 3:4-5). In the same way, this warning against haste must be intended to serve the purpose of offering opportunity for examination, presumably with observation of characteristics which would predict the future deportment of these prospective leaders. A candidate for commissioning who was known to be unworthy (presently sinning) would clearly not be installed in leadership. The purpose for delay was so that tendencies could be identified which might in the future manifest themselves in sins.⁷⁰² Failure on Timothy’s part to do this would make him complicit in the sins of those he neglected to properly investigate.⁷⁰³ It is in fact a possibility, though the text does not explicitly state it, that participating in the sins of others consisted of showing favouritism by failing to

⁶⁹⁹ Chrysostom, *Homily 16 on Timothy*, v. 22. *NPNF'* 13:464.

⁷⁰⁰ Cf. Quinn and Wacker, *1 and 2 Timothy*, pp. 471-73. The primary argument is linguistic: the other uses of *κοινωνεῖν* and its cognates in the NT refer to participation in past and present events or characteristics (1 Tim 6:18; Titus 1:4; Rom 12:13; 15:27; Gal 6:6; Phil 4:15; Heb 2:14; 1 Peter 4:13; 2 John 11). It should be noted that the items shared (faith in Titus 1:4; resources in 1 Tim 6:18) would inherently be shared in the past and/or present, rather than the future. Even there, the command to the rich to share their resources presupposes obedience in the future (after receiving the command), and the sharing of faith does not presuppose that this faith will cease and become something which was only previously shared. There is every expectation that the faith will continue to be shared in the future. The positive attribute of faith could be shared, and so also the author states that sin can be shared. This argument seems weak, in that reference or meaning can only be determined by context.

⁷⁰¹ Adler, ‘Bußritus’ (p. 5).

⁷⁰² Although the injunction against appointing a recent convert to leadership in 1 Tim 3:6 is relevant, the concern there is over the potential to cause harm to the convert. In this case the stated concern is with the harm done to the one installing the leader. The context here suggests the need for time to investigate rather than to allow the convert to become more mature.

⁷⁰³ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 622; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, pp. 314-15.

properly investigate certain prospective leaders. The one laying hands on someone to install them in leadership has a responsibility to ensure that the latter's life matches the requirements for such a position. Unfortunately, the Pastor offers no guidance as to what constitutes an adequate period of examination.

4.2.3 – σεαυτὸν ἀγνὸν τήρει

The closing phrase of this set of instructions related to leadership is a general directive to Timothy to maintain his own purity.⁷⁰⁴ This is somewhat abrupt and seems to signal a change from instructions regarding Timothy's treatment of leadership to his own conduct, especially as this word is often used in the sense of sexual purity.⁷⁰⁵ In this case, however, the warning probably relates to Timothy's conduct in relation to leaders, which is directly addressed in vv. 19-20, as well as the solemn charge of v. 21. Careful consideration is to be given before accepting an accusation against an elder (v. 19). Likewise, prospective leaders should not be hastily installed (v. 22). The instruction to remain pure in the process of appointing elders to leadership is most likely related to the instruction to avoid partiality and favouritism in their discipline.⁷⁰⁶ Upright and honourable behaviour is being called for.⁷⁰⁷

4.2.4 – Installation of Leaders in the Remainder of the Pastoral Epistles

The greatest concentration of material related to installation of leaders in the NT is to be found in the PE. Three passages (1 Tim 4:14; 5:22, and 2 Tim 1:6) expressly

⁷⁰⁴ Cf. the discussion regarding the unity of 1 Tim 5:17-22 (rather than 17-25) in the introduction. The criterion chosen for the parameters of this study relate to instructions given by the author regarding treatment of leaders.

⁷⁰⁵ Cf. 1 Tim 5:2; Titus 2:5; Chrysostom, *Homily 16 on Timothy*, v. 22. *NPNF¹* 13:464; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 318. Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 281, points out that 'the insistence on Timothy's staying pure, especially in the context of the situation with the younger widows, again raises the suspicion that both financial and sexual improprieties were the basis for charges against elders'. This speculation would, however, work best if Timothy were being warned against similar sins as those being brought against the elders, which does not seem likely and is not held by Johnson.

⁷⁰⁶ Merkel, *Pastoralbriefe*, p. 46, relates the call to purity directly with the selection and installation of leaders, stating that 'von solcher Mitschuld soll er sich reinhalten'. Cf. also Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 318.

⁷⁰⁷ Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 120.

mention the laying on of hands, which is the specific practice in view in this study. In addition to these, 1 Tim 3:10 and Titus 1:5 instruct that qualified leaders be appointed (deacons and elders) without specifying any surrounding ritual. Other passages which refer to practices which are considered by some to have connection to installation of leaders include 1 Tim 1:18 (reference to the prophecy made over Timothy); 2 Tim 1:13 and 2:2 (instructions regarding the transmission of tradition); and 1 Tim 6:12 (reference to Timothy's 'good confession' made before witnesses, as well as a listing of Timothy's obligations).⁷⁰⁸ None of these elements is convincing, however, as evidence for a context of installation, and they remain in the realm of possibility rather than probability. In particular, 1 Tim 6:12 seems much more likely to be a baptismal confession of Jesus Christ as Lord rather than an oath offered at ordination or installation.⁷⁰⁹

The act of laying on of hands is attested twice in the PE in addition to 1 Tim 5:22, namely in 1 Tim 4:14 and in 2 Tim 1:6. The practice described in these passages is probably related to an acknowledgement of Timothy's ministry, but it is anachronistic to label it 'ordination'.⁷¹⁰ Discussion of 'ordination' in the PE generally focuses on these two passages rather than 1 Tim 5:22.⁷¹¹ Do these two passages

⁷⁰⁸ Cf. Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, pp. 17-18. Lips also cites 2 Tim 2:2 as an example of carrying out of leadership obligations before witnesses, but in that case it is the author's action of teaching before witnesses (rather than anything Timothy had done) which is the subject of interest. By contrast, 1 Tim 6:12 refers to the 'good confession' which Timothy made before witnesses. However, cf. the following discussion on the context of this confession.

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 660-61; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 356-57; Roloff, *1. Timotheus*, p. 349. As Marshall observes, 'there are no known contemporary parallels for a confession at ordination', and indeed, it is not certain that modern-day ordination carries the same meaning as what was understood in the installation of leaders in the Pauline churches.

⁷¹⁰ Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 70; Lea and Griffin, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 139. This is not to say that there are no parallels between NT commissioning practices and modern-day ordination practices, but simply that while 'laying on of hands' was used in this period, a set formal ritual of ordination arises much later. Cf. A. J. Chupungco, 'Ordination Theology in the *Apostolic Tradition*', in *Mysterium Christi: Symbolgegenwart und theologische Bedeutung: Festschrift für Basil Studer*, ed. B. Studer, M. Löhrer, and E. Salmann, SA 116 (Roma: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1995), pp. 107-30.

⁷¹¹ Cf. Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, p. 18.

describe the same event, and what is the relationship of that event to the practice described in 1 Tim 5:22?⁷¹²

Viewed on its own, without the context of the other two references, 2 Tim 1:6 would easily be read as a reference to a private laying on of hands for purposes of imparting a spiritual gift. It seems more akin to the situation of Ananias and Saul in Acts 9:17, which makes mention of no other participants or spectators, than to the imposition of hands on Barnabas and Saul in Antioch in Acts 13:3, which involved a larger group of participants. Unlike 1 Tim 4:14, there is no prophetic context mentioned in 2 Tim 1:6 and the hands are laid on by one person, identified as the author. Of the three references in the PE to laying on of hands, this one seems to be the most distant from any ritual connected with office or title. Johnson suggests that the context for 2 Tim 1:6 may have been Acts 16:3, ‘Timothy’s initial enrollment as a worker in the Pauline mission’.⁷¹³ This personal giving of authority could then have been followed by an occasion where such authority was ‘confirmed or legitimated by a local assembly’.⁷¹⁴ If these passages describe discrete events, then it is unlikely that both were rituals akin to ordination, as most of the scholars suggest. The later instruction to ‘guard the deposit’ (2 Tim 1:14) suggests that Timothy’s ministry is in view, but the instruction to Timothy was that a rekindling or maintaining of a gift rather than an assertion of authority was needed, notwithstanding 2 Tim 1:7.⁷¹⁵ The gift itself is not identified, but the context of ministry is clear in the Pastor’s encouragement. In 2 Tim 1:6, the laying on of Paul’s hands seems to have an instrumental role in the impartation of the gift. While the gift is διὰ the laying on of hands in 2 Tim 1:6, it is μετά laying on

⁷¹² Lea and Griffin, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 139, speculate that this impartation together with laying on of hands occurred either as Paul left Ephesus, appointing Timothy to deal with the heresy, or during Paul’s second visit to Lystra (Acts 16:1-5).

⁷¹³ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 345.

⁷¹⁴ Johnson, *Timothy*, p. 354.

⁷¹⁵ Cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 476, who argues that Timothy’s position as Paul’s ‘right-hand man’ suggests a reading of ‘keep in flame’ rather than ‘rekindle’. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 226, states that the verb is ‘a metaphor for rekindling a waning fire’ but ‘does not necessarily imply an actual wavering or dying faith on Timothy’s part’. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 696, also agrees, stating that ‘the implication is not that the fire is extinguished or nearly so, but that it must be kept brightly burning’.

of hands in 1 Tim 4:14 and *διὰ* prophecy.⁷¹⁶ Marshall states that the gift for ministry ‘is conveyed to Timothy by God as the necessary accompaniment to the laying on of hands which conveyed Paul’s authority to him (cf. Num 27.18-23)’.⁷¹⁷

While 1 Tim 4:14 also refers to a gift and the laying on of hands, there are some significant differences from 2 Tim 1:6, most notably a setting which was clearly corporate. As was the case in 2 Tim 1:6, the author’s core issue was a reminder to Timothy of the gift which was imparted to him. Here that impartation was together with or through an accompanying prophecy (cf. 1 Tim 1:18). The participants in this event are stated to have been Timothy as the recipient and the ‘body’ or ‘council’ of elders (*πρεσβυτέριον*) as the ones laying their hands on Timothy.⁷¹⁸ While it is possible (and even probable) that these are two descriptions of one event, the account in 1 Tim 4:14 evokes a more formal and official occasion, and is clearly set within a context of instruction to Timothy as a teacher and leader (1 Tim 4:6-16).⁷¹⁹

The presbyters’ laying hands on Timothy is specified here not as the central subject of the reminder, but only as an identification of the specific circumstances surrounding this impartation.⁷²⁰ At first reading the prophetic ministry seems to be the agent, with the laying on of hands as an accompanying act. Marshall suggests, however, that the sense here is that ‘because prophecy pointed (beforehand) to

⁷¹⁶ Cf. Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, pp. 250-53, 258-59.

⁷¹⁷ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 697. Marshall notes, however, that 2 Tim 1:6 ‘is not focused on ordination to an office but on the reception of the Spirit to enable witness to the gospel’ (p. 697 n. 33). Cf. also the discussion in Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, pp. 240-48, on the role played by the prophecy, prayer, and the imparted gift.

⁷¹⁸ This is the only usage of this term in the NT which refers to a discrete body of Christian rather than Jewish elders. Luke 22:66 and Acts 22:5 refer to a Jewish council in Jerusalem. Meier, ‘*Presbyteros*’, considers 1 Tim 4:14 to refer to a ‘college of elders’ (p. 342), while the usage in 1 Tim 5:17-25 is more general, focusing on several sub-categories of elders, all leaders but with differing roles and abilities (pp. 326-27). Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 567-68, sees this as ‘a Christian group of elders’, seemingly stopping short of seeing this as a formal body.

⁷¹⁹ Another possible context would be that of baptism, but the prophecy, imparted gift, context of teaching and leading, and participation of the ‘presbytery’ suggests an occasion somewhat later than the beginning of Timothy’s Christian life. This would also violate the injunction against placing recent converts in leadership (1 Tim 3:6).

⁷²⁰ Cf. the discussion in Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, pp. 248-54, regarding the role played by the laying on of hands in these passages.

Timothy, therefore people laid hands on him and so he received the charisma'.⁷²¹

Both the prophecy and the laying on of hands thus accompanied the central concern: the imparted gift. As observed by Lips, the prophecy and laying on of hands are 'vermittelnd', facilitating the reception of the gift.⁷²² Behm considers the imposition of hands a 'wirksames Symbol (symbolum efficax)', something which is more than merely a symbol.⁷²³ The reader is not offered an identification of the gift or details regarding the content of the prophetic message. The references to teaching in vv. 11, 13, and 16 may indicate that teaching was the spiritual gift which was imparted.⁷²⁴ The emphasis on Timothy's ministry and leadership (1 Tim 4:11), the rejection of Timothy's youthfulness as a valid obstacle to his functioning (v. 12), and the expectation that Timothy's proper execution of his task would result in the salvation of others (v. 16) suggest that the impartation was connected with spiritual leadership in the congregation. The act of laying on of hands by the presbytery in some way validated Timothy in this role. Whether it was understood in that context as a durable commissioning, the laying on of hands had a confirming function and was seen as accompanying the impartation of some gift that brought fitness for ministry.⁷²⁵

Another question to be resolved is to what extent these passages should be understood in terms of succession. In one way, Paul is presented as having laid hands on Timothy (2 Tim 1:6), who is in turn to lay hands on others (1 Tim 5:22). On the

⁷²¹ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 566. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 567 n. 129, and Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 245, 262, both favour the NRSV reading of 'through prophecy with the laying on of hands' over the NIV reading of 'through a prophetic message when the body of elders laid their hands on you'.

⁷²² Lips, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, p. 253. Cf. also pp. 258-60.

⁷²³ J. Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum: Nach Verwendung, Herkunft und Bedeutung in religionsgeschichtlichem Zusammenhang untersucht*, 2nd. unaltered edn (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), p. 198.

⁷²⁴ Lea and Griffin, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 139, state that 'the "gift" likely represented an aptitude for teaching and preaching together with an ability to understand the gospel and discern error', but this remains only a reasonable assumption. The immediate context of v. 13 mentions reading, exhortation, and teaching, and these certainly suggest the function of leading a congregation. Cf. also Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 558-64, who states that 'the charisma is manifestly the gift of the Holy Spirit who empowers people for the functions of ministry' (p. 564), placing the emphasis on general empowerment rather than a specific gift or sub-gift.

⁷²⁵ This is probably not the initiation of Timothy into the rank of the elders as Timothy is not labelled an elder anywhere else. Cf. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 111; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 569. Fee, *Timothy, Titus*, p. 111.

other hand, what was to be transmitted from Paul to Timothy and then to others is never identified in the PE as some form of authority, office, or ecclesial privilege: the concern is over the proper transmission of doctrine (2 Tim 2:2), and to this end individuals who are able to teach (1 Tim 5:17) are to be recognized and commissioned for this role.⁷²⁶ This is a succession of the deposit, the entrusted words.

The Greek text of Sinaiticus and MS 69 eliminate the iota from τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, giving a reading of ‘by an elder’ rather than ‘by a council of elders’. While this reading eases the reconciliation of 1 Tim 4:14 with 2 Tim 1:6 so that Paul was the one laying on his hands in both cases, the attestation for πρεσβυτέριον in 1 Tim 4:14 is strong.⁷²⁷ The term chosen, as well as the context, the confirmation of Timothy’s ministry, make it most likely that acknowledged congregational leaders were involved in this action, along with Paul himself. The two texts thus most likely represent differing representations of a single event.⁷²⁸

The instruction to Timothy in 1 Tim 5:22 differs from the other two passages in the PE mainly in that 1 Tim 5:22 consists of instructions to the one performing the laying on of hands, while the other passages were intended to stress the significance of this action to one who had received it. All three passages emphasize the meaningfulness of the ritual, but 1 Tim 5:22 is alone in stating that the laying on of hands is significant not only for the one being acted upon, but also for the one acting. The admonition to Timothy (rather than the presbyters) as the one who is to take care regarding the laying on of his hands brings to mind the apparently solo action of the author in 2 Tim 1:6.

⁷²⁶ Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum*, pp. 124-25. Cf. A. Sand, ‘Anfänge einer Koordinierung verschiedener Gemeindeordnungen nach den Pastoralbriefen’, in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), pp. 215-37 (pp. 235-36), who states, ‘Es gibt nur eine Ordnung, die der Gemeinde auferlegt wird, um die überlieferte Predigt zu bewahren. Und die Autorität, die den zu diesem Dienst beauftragten Personen verliehen ist, ist keine Amtsautorität, sondern eine Autorität, die sich aus der treuen Erfüllung des auferlegten Dienstes ergibt. Autorität hat allein das Wort, die Botschaft, denn “das Wort ist treu”: 1 Tim 1,15; 3,1; 4,9; 2 Tim 2,11; 3,8; vgl. 1,9.’ Cf. also Schweizer, *Church Order*, who argues that Luke’s stance is that since the apostles (the Twelve) had to be witnesses to the facts of Christ’s life (in the legal sense of having observed it themselves), they could logically not have successors (pp. 69-70). In the PE as well, Schweizer argues against succession of *Amt* and for guarding the deposit (pp. 80-85).

⁷²⁷ Elliott, *Greek Text*, pp. 71-72.

⁷²⁸ Cf. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 568-69; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 262-63.

The need for prior qualification of the candidate for installation is very much congruent with the instruction in 1 Tim 3:10 regarding prior testing of those who aspire to be deacons. Additionally, the injunction against acceptance of a recent convert as an ἐπίσκοπος (1 Tim 3:6) corresponds with the warning against haste in 1 Tim 5:22.

The warnings to Timothy regarding overly hasty laying on of hands make it clear that this is an important event. Given the warnings regarding sharing in the sins of others and the need to retain purity, this was no casual act. Similarly, the reminder to Timothy as recipient of this act of its validating function in 1 Tim 4:14 argues that neither occasion of imposition of hands should be regarded as trivial.

Whatever the role of laying on of hands in the PE, the Pastor makes it clear it had a real connection with the impartation of a charisma which enabled or enhanced one's fitness for ministry, it was expected to remind its recipient of his or her calling, it was expected to validate that calling before the congregation, and it was an act which identified the one laying on his hands with the recipient, bringing with it some form of responsibility. It may not have been ordination as this is understood today, but the installation process in the PE, in which laying on of hands played a significant role, included many of the elements which are understood as a meaningful part of the modern ordination ritual.

4.3 – Installation of Leaders in the Pauline Corpus

The existence of individuals in leading roles in the churches connected with Paul is indisputable. The method by which such leaders were commissioned in their roles is less clear.

4.3.1 – Installation of Leaders in the Undisputed Pauline Texts

There are no passages in the undisputed Pauline texts that hint at a specific procedure to be used in commissioning a leader for service. Paul refers to his apostolic

role as being by the calling of God (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1), by the will of God (2 Cor 1:1), and by the commission of God rather than any human authority (Gal 1:1). The theme of being appointed, commissioned, or sent from God is consistent in Paul.⁷²⁹ His strong defence of his apostolic authority in Gal 1:11-2:10 is based largely on the absence of substantiating contact with other leaders. His gospel is not of human origin (Gal 1:11-12), he did not confer with anyone, including those who were already apostles before him (Gal 1:16-17), and when he did go up to Jerusalem after three years he only saw Peter and James (Gal 1:18-19). When Paul finally had an apparently official (but private) meeting with the Jerusalem leadership, he argues afterwards that they have changed nothing and added nothing to him, merely confirming the divine calling which was already in place (Gal 2:1-10, esp. v. 6). When challenges arose to Paul's apostleship, his defence did not go back to a ritual procedure of commissioning, but rather to his contact with Christ and the fruits of his labour – the churches (1 Cor 9:1, 2; 2 Cor 3:2).⁷³⁰ He made no appeal to any outside human agency or process for his authority or commission.

The existence of leaders in the churches (other than Paul) is clearly attested. 1 Cor 4:17; 16:10 refer to the sending of Timothy in Paul's place, doing the same work which Paul did.⁷³¹ Paul suggests that the Corinthian community should be able to render judgement on its own matters, suggesting that there are members of some standing within the community (1 Cor 6:4).⁷³² As mentioned in the discussion

⁷²⁹ Cf. Rom 15:15, 16; 1 Cor 4; 2 Cor 2:17; 2 Cor 11:5-12:21.

⁷³⁰ M. E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 1*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), pp. 218-29, discusses the Greek letter of introduction (2 Cor 3:1-3), which was a distinct epistolary type, and would normally have come from some official agency. In this passage, Paul is arguing that this piece of evidence, often used in substantiation of one's position, was not needed in respect to the Corinthians.

⁷³¹ Paul refers to factions in the church, claiming to 'belong to' various individuals, including himself (1 Cor 1:10-17; 4:1-21), and rejects such divisions. These passages focus on the followers rather than the 'leaders': the mention of the factions of Peter and of Christ (1 Cor 1:12) makes this clear. It is not certain that Peter ever visited Corinth, and Christ was clearly not attempting to set up a political clique in Corinth! Cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 107-33.

⁷³² Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 432-33, discusses the various interpretations of 'those with no esteem among you' (1 Cor 6:4). Some scholars see this as a reference to Greek magistrates who are unbelievers, hence having no esteem, while others see this as a statement that even the lowest

regarding the reward of leadership, there is also explicit discussion of leadership roles and giftings in Rom 12:3-8; 1 Cor 12:27-31; and Phil 1:1, with various titles used in these three contexts. A number of individuals who function with these gifts and in these roles are named along with others who are acquaintances and friends.⁷³³

While Paul makes no mention of human agency in his own commissioning, he does refer to the commissioning (or at least selection) of others for specific tasks. Besides his commendation of various co-workers, including Timothy and Titus, he refers to ‘a brother who is famous among all the churches for his proclaiming the good news’ who has been ‘appointed by the churches to travel with us’ (2 Cor 8:18-19). This reference is significant in that it confirms the appointment of individuals who are now performing a leading function, whose ministry in the word was significant enough to merit mention.⁷³⁴ The specific role here is to travel with and help administer the collection. The attention paid to this appointment argues for the importance of the function performed.

The appointment is referred to by the technical term χειροτονεῖν, which has its etymological roots in the process of electing individuals to a task by the raising of hands in an assembly.⁷³⁵ This may have been a somewhat formal process, and probably reflects a procedural preference on the part of the church rather than Paul. Paul does not use this word elsewhere, and it does not seem that Paul advocates the election of leaders or envoys by the congregation.⁷³⁶ This passage is not about a commissioning for

believer could do a better job. The reference to esteem or standing in the community does suggest that there were people available to fill the role of judge.

⁷³³ Cf. Rom 16:1-15, 21-23; 1 Cor 4:17; 16:10, 15-19; 2 Cor 8:16-23 (here including a ‘famous unnamed brother’ as well as Titus); Phil 2:19-30; 4:2, 3.

⁷³⁴ Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, p. 547, points out that while Paul requests of Titus that he go (v. 17), this brother is sent (v. 18), suggesting that he is in a subordinate position to Titus. Additionally, Thrall understands the designation ὁ ἀδελφός with the mention of proclamation as stating that this individual has a ‘specific function as a missionary or as a church worker of some other, particular, kind’.

⁷³⁵ BDAG, p. 1083. This was, literally, ‘to stretch out one’s hand’ in voting. A connection between ‘stretching out one’s hand’ and ‘laying on of hands’ is tenuous at best, especially since it is not known whether the etymological background of this term was reflected in the manner of the appointment of this specific individual.

⁷³⁶ H. D. Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), pp. 74-75; Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 2, p. 549.

ongoing leadership, but rather about selection of an individual for a specific task – an ad hoc appointment, as it were. As such, the passage is of interest for its confirmation that leaders existed, but is not directly analogous to the procedure offered in 1 Tim 5:22 as part of an apparently long-term commissioning of such a leader, given the caution regarding haste and possible ongoing shared culpability.⁷³⁷

This passage is also significant because of a reference to a second un-named individual, ‘our brother whom we have often tested’ in v. 22, as well as of Titus in v. 23, who is mentioned as a partner and co-worker ‘in your service’, implying that his ministry is also proven and needs no external confirmation. The interest in establishing a track record and proving one’s ministry is not an innovation in the PE, but is also found here in the undisputed Paulines. The word used for testing, δοκιμάζω, is the same root word as the one used for the qualification of a deacon in 1 Tim 3:10. While 1 Tim 5:22 does not command the testing of a prospective leader, the proscription of haste and danger of shared sin suggest that some form of confirmation of fitness is to be carried out. What is not recorded in 2 Cor 8 is that a specific action of confirmation or installation was to be carried out.

The concept of sharing in positive and negative attributes by association is seen in the undisputed Paulines, as is the concept of guilt by association.⁷³⁸ The idea that the one commending or appointing an unworthy individual becomes a participant in their misdeeds is not present, however. The complementary concept, that of confidence in one’s associates and therefore shared credit, seems to be present in 2 Cor 8:16-24. The

Against this, one should consider 1 Cor 16:3, where Paul refers to tested and proven delegates, trusted and selected by the congregation, who are to accompany the funds to Jerusalem (presumably further referred to in 2 Cor 8). Paul does not speak unfavourably of this process of selection by the congregation. This raises the question of whether one of these delegates was the ‘famous brother’ of 2 Cor 8. The text of 2 Cor 8:16-24 reads awkwardly enough that Paul may be speaking ironically in praising this individual. This is not likely, as the purpose of this passage seems to be to insure the delegation’s success.

⁷³⁷ Additionally, Timothy is told to rekindle his gift, not instructed to have hands laid on him again (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6).

⁷³⁸ 1 Cor 5:6-8, 11-13; 7:14; 2 Cor 8:4, 23; Gal 5:9; 6:1, 6; Phil 1:5; 3:10; 4:15; Phlm 1:6 indicate such sharing by association, both positive and negative. In 1 Cor 10:20, participation in idol worship is sharing or partnering with demons; in 2 Cor 1:7, the Corinthians are sharers in suffering and comfort; while in 2 Cor 6:14, light and darkness are presented as so antithetical that partnership is unthinkable.

context is the sending of funds from Corinth to Jerusalem, and the three envoys (Titus and two un-named brothers) are there to ensure that all is done correctly. Their proven integrity and track record as they fulfil their task reflect on Paul (2 Cor 8:20).

The concern for appointment or confirmation of suitable leaders is evident.

What is entirely absent is any indication of a ritual or practice which might be used in such an appointment procedure. It may be that there was none. It seems more likely that if one existed, it was considered normal enough that there was no need for Paul to specify that one act (such as laying on of hands) was to be chosen over another (such as anointing with oil). This is, however, conjecture.

4.3.2 – Installation of Leaders in the Disputed Pauline Texts

Passages which refer to leaders and commissioning for leadership include Col 1:1, 25; and 4:7-17. None of these gives any guidance as to the process or practices related to the installation of leaders. Instruction regarding guilt in association is found in Eph 5:7, where a warning is given not to associate (συμμέτοχος) with those who deceive with empty words (v. 6). This is not, however, analogous to 1 Tim 5:22, as this passage does not have leaders in mind or a context of their installation. In addition, the word used is different, and rather than indicating fellowship in sins it indicates an active participation in lifestyle, an ‘accomplice in a plot’.⁷³⁹

4.4 – Installation of Leaders in the Other NT Writings

Material related to installation of leaders in the NT with the accompanying action of the laying on of hands is found in Acts 6:6 and 13:3.⁷⁴⁰ Other contexts for the

⁷³⁹ H. W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), pp. 668-69.

⁷⁴⁰ Additionally, hands are laid on for the receiving of the Holy Spirit in Acts 8:17-19; 9:17; and 19:6, and for healing in 9:12, 17 and 28:8. Of these, the laying on of Ananias’ hands for Paul’s healing in 9:12 and 17 is particularly interesting, as a previously unknown disciple is used in the healing of Paul. As observed by J. B. Polhill, *Acts*, NAC 26 (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992), p. 237, this was in no way involved with the legitimacy of Paul or a “succession” through the laying on of his hands’. Bürki, *Erste Brief an Timotheus*, p. 182, is incorrect in asserting that this action ‘sprach ihm dadurch die Vergebung der Sünden und die Berufung zum Verkündiger im Namen Jesu zu’.

laying on of hands involved blessing, healing, and the impartation of a spiritual gift in a context apart from the installation of a leader.⁷⁴¹ It should also be noted that accounts of the calling of the Twelve to become followers of Christ are without any reference to ceremony or laying on of hands (cf. Mark 1:17, 20; 2:14). In the original context this was not an appointment to a position of leadership, but if anything, to discipleship.⁷⁴² Even so, at least some of his followers are depicted as seeing their relationship with Christ as a path to power and authority (cf. Mark 10:35-45). The ends of the gospel accounts similarly lack reference to an installation ceremony or laying on of hands, so that it would seem that Jesus' use of laying on of hands was reserved for healing and blessing.⁷⁴³ There is no recorded incident of Jesus laying hands on anyone in an act of commissioning.

There is little indication in the passage that such was the understood intent, although filling with the Spirit could certainly function to indicate the receiving of salvation and the forgiveness of sins (Acts 10:44-48). Bürki does, however, correctly point out that this act on the part of an otherwise unknown individual illustrates that the laying on of hands was not restricted to a chosen few, albeit in this case the context was that of healing, not of installation of leaders.

⁷⁴¹ Cf. Mark 5:23; 6:5; 7:32; 8:23, 25; 10:16; 16:18 and parallels in the other synoptics; Acts 6:6; 8:17-19; 9:12, 17; 13:3; 19:6; 28:8; Heb 6:2. In Heb 6:2, the reader is encouraged to grow beyond a list of 'basic teaching about Christ', including 'repentance from dead works and faith toward God', 'instruction about baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment' (NRSV). What is understood here by the laying on of hands is varied. W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, WBC 47A (Dallas: Word Books, 1991), p. 140, considers it not in terms of a specific act but rather the basic catechetical instruction on rites as opposed repentance and faith. H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), p. 164, sees it not as a ritual act (healing, commissioning, or ordination) 'but rather the "confirmation" with the gift of the spirit that followed baptism'. S. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, NTCO (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 155, offers the rather implausible suggestion that this refers to the rite of laying hands on children in confirmation, following Calvin. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Rev. edn, NICNT (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 142-43, and P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1993), p. 316, both lean toward a reference to the imposition of hands in connection with the impartation of the Holy Spirit, but do not entirely reject a meaning connected with commissioning for office. This theme of commissioning also shows up in Maurer's treatment of τίθημι in the TDNT (8.161), where he states that 'Hb. 6:2 probably has the transmission of office particularly in view as well', a meaning which lacks any corroboration in the context. Probably the best explanation is found in C. R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), p. 305, who connects baptism (6:2) and receiving the Spirit (6:4) with the laying on of hands, and suggests that this was probably 'part of their rite of initiation'. This fits well with the context of 'basic teaching'.

⁷⁴² France, *Mark*, p. 96, points out the significant differences between Jesus' calling of his followers and that of the rabbis, who 'did not call their followers; rather, the pupil adopted the teacher'.

⁷⁴³ Cf. N. Adler, *Taufe und Handauflegung: Eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung von Apg 8, 14-17*, NTAbh 19/3 (Münster Westfalen: Aschendorf, 1951), pp. 76-80, who argues that the origin of apostolic imposition of hands, including in commissioning, is to be found in Jesus' knowledge of OT and rabbinic imposition of hands, and that this must have been commanded to the apostles. The existence of such a command remains conjecture, and significant doubt regarding the rabbinic usage must also be noted.

The use of laying on of hands is recorded near the beginning in the story of the early church. Acts 6:1-6 recounts the selection of seven men to take care of the distribution of food to the widows.⁷⁴⁴ Although their task would be to serve tables (v. 2), nonetheless they were to be selected on the basis of good standing and because they were ‘full of the Spirit and wisdom’, criteria not unlike those listed for Joshua (Num 27:18; Deut 34:9). It should also be noted that although διακονέω, the verb used in v. 2, is the root for the office translated ‘deacon’, the Seven were not formally identified as deacons by Luke.⁷⁴⁵ The congregation chose seven men (v. 5) who were then brought before the Apostles, who prayed and laid hands on them (v. 6).⁷⁴⁶ No details are offered for the method by which the Seven were chosen or for the content of the prayer, nor is a rationale offered for the laying on of hands. Fitzmyer considers it as ‘denoting installation in a role or office’ here as well as in Acts 13:3, and the 3 PE passages. ‘Those so installed are considered the recipients of divine assistance for their work, what later theologians called *gratia gratis data*, “a grace freely given”, the grace

⁷⁴⁴ Cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles: I-XIV*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), pp. 304-7, for a discussion of sources and issues related to the historicity of the specific narrative presented by Luke. Barrett’s conclusion is that Luke’s version is ‘not necessarily incorrect’ and that it is probably omission of details rather than changing of the facts which is involved (p. 306).

⁷⁴⁵ Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, pp. 304, 316; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, Rev. edn, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), p. 122; I. H. Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*, 1st American edn, TNTC (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1980), p. 126; Polhill, *Acts*, pp. 182-83. It should be noted that the cognate noun in v. 4, διακονία, refers to ‘service of the word’, or preaching and ministry, so that in this context ‘service’ is not just reserved as a term for waiting tables, nor does the account in Acts of the activities of Stephen and Philip suggest that these were individuals with purely administrative roles. Stephen’s activity in miracles, evangelism, and martyrdom are reported in Acts 6:8-7:60. Philip’s miracles and evangelism are reported in Acts 8:5-13 and 26-40, and in Acts 21:8-9, he resurfaces, now identified as an evangelist but still identified as ‘one of the Seven’.

⁷⁴⁶ However, cf. Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, pp. 315-16, who argues on the basis of the grammar here that ‘the whole company of believers, not the apostles alone, laid their hands on the seven men’ (p. 315). There are obvious difficulties with several thousand people (Acts 4:4) laying their hands on seven men, leading to the common understanding of the Twelve doing this on behalf of the congregation. As Barrett observes, however, ‘this is the grammatical meaning of Luke’s words’ and ‘if he meant something different he failed to express what he meant’ (p. 315). Cf. also G. Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte: I. Teil: Einleitung, Kommentar zu Kap. 1, 1-8, 40*, HTKNT 5/1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1980), p. 429, who expresses doubt regarding whether hands were actually laid on (‘auch hinsichtlich der Handauflegung wird die Erzählung kaum den historischen Sachverhalt treffen; sie spiegelt eher die Weise wider, in der zur Zeit des Lukas Amtsübertragungen erfolgten’). Part of his argument seems to be the unlikelihood of the whole of the congregation laying hands on the Seven. In response, it is not clear whether it was the congregation or the Twelve performed the laying on of hands, and it also does not seem that the action was intended to be understood as a succession of office. Other than Stephen and Philip, the remainder of the Seven play an unspecified further role in the church, other than the presumed successful fulfilment of their task, perhaps implied by Acts 6:7.

to carry out an ecclesial function.⁷⁴⁷ Fitzmyer is probably correct in seeing the passage as one setting out the carrying out of a function rather than conveying gravity and importance related to official titles. The account simply reports that it was done, which probably indicates that the laying on of hands was considered by the writer to be a practice which needed neither defence nor explanation for the then-current audience. This matter-of-fact presentation also fits well with the explanation offered by Polhill, who cautions against reading modern-day ordination practices back into the text, identifying this rather as a commissioning, a ‘designation for a task’.⁷⁴⁸ It is most probable that the account in Acts 6:6 should not be regarded as relating to an appointment to an office.⁷⁴⁹ The absence of the technical term ‘deacon’ may indicate the antiquity of this portion of the text, suggesting that it was intended as an act of dedication.⁷⁵⁰

Acts 13:1-3 recounts the commissioning of Barnabas and Saul ‘for the work to which I (the Holy Spirit) have called them’ (v. 2), namely, mission work (cf. v. 4).⁷⁵¹ Acts 13:1 sets the stage with a group of prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch, identified as Barnabas, Simeon (also called Niger), Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen, and Saul (later, Paul: cf. v. 9).⁷⁵² In the process of their worshiping and fasting, the Holy Spirit instructed them to set aside (ἀφορίζω) Barnabas and Saul, who had just completed a relief mission to Jerusalem (Acts 11:30; 12:25).⁷⁵³ This was followed by

⁷⁴⁷ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), p. 351.

⁷⁴⁸ Polhill, *Acts*, p. 182.

⁷⁴⁹ J. Zmijewski, *Die Apostelgeschichte: Übersetzt und erklärt*, RNT (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1994), pp. 288-89, suggests that if the congregation as a whole performed the laying on of hands, then this is delegation to a task, while if it was performed by the Twelve, then this should be viewed as an act of ordination. Given the difficulty of determining who performed the act and the lack of other information suggesting that an office is involved or that a gift was conferred, it seems unlikely that ordination is in view, even if indeed the twelve performed the laying on of hands.

⁷⁵⁰ J. Roloff, *Apostolat, Verkündigung, Kirche: Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen*, 1st edn (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1965), p. 156.

⁷⁵¹ Cf. Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, pp. 598-601, for the placement of Acts 13 & 14 in the narrative flow.

⁷⁵² The text fails to distinguish between the individuals, and so does not enable identification of which of these were prophets or teachers or both. Cf. Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, p. 602.

⁷⁵³ It seems most likely that the Spirit’s instruction was revealed through prophetic utterance, probably by one of those prophets listed. Cf. Bruce, *Acts*, pp. 245, 244 n. 1.

fasting and praying and then a laying on of hands.⁷⁵⁴ Marshall identifies this as an act of blessing ‘in which the church associated itself with them and commended them to the grace of God (14:26), and not an ordination to life-time service, still less an appointment to the apostolate’.⁷⁵⁵ Polhill also speaks against understanding this as ordination, as ‘no one in Antioch had any rank exceeding that of Saul and Barnabas’, probably basing this on the lack of distinction made in the listing in v. 1.⁷⁵⁶ This assumes that ordination must involve hierarchical authority, reading back into early Christian practice more modern understandings. Against this, Fitzmyer argues that ‘the attempt to describe the laying on of hands solely as a blessing and not an ordination... is meaningless. It is not a question of a transfer of power, but of a Spirit-guided commission’.⁷⁵⁷ His perspective seems correct: it was a Spirit-guided commission, and in that sense was an ordination. This is not to suggest however that it was like a modern act of ordination. Bruce states that this act served to express fellowship, but more than that, ‘recognized them (Barnabas and Saul) as its delegates or “apostles”’.⁷⁵⁸ In saying this, Bruce is using ‘apostle’ in its non-technical sense of an emissary. Saul was already regarded as a teacher (rabbi), so this could not be a ‘rabbinic ordination’.⁷⁵⁹ Both

⁷⁵⁴ Marshall, *Acts*, p. 215, argues that the entire church was fasting and worshipping and thus it was revealed to the entire church that Barnabas and Paul were to be set aside (v. 2), while the list of prophets and teachers (v. 1) represents the roster of those available for missionary service. Against this it should be noted that the grammatical subject of v. 1 is the prophets and teachers, and most English translations correctly imply that the antecedent for ‘they’ in v. 2 is the list of prophets and teachers in v. 1 rather than the church, as ἐκκλησία here is singular. Bruce, *Acts*, p. 244 n. 1, holds a view contrary to that of Marshall and cites a Latin work from the early fourth century which unequivocally has Simeon, Lucius, and Titus (instead of Manaen, although some scholars suppose the text should read Titus and Manaen) acting in the laying on of hands as well as the reception of the Spirit’s directive. The work is called *Prophecies Collected from All the Books*, and this reading may be the original Western text of the passage. Given the grammatical construction here, it seems most likely that the other leaders were the ones who were praying and fasting and also acted in the laying on of hands, doing so on behalf of the whole church. In another work F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 3rd. rev. and enl. edn (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990), p. 294, states that ‘after προσευξάμενοι D adds πάντες, which is probably a true interpretation. The whole church sent them forth, and it was to the whole church that they gave their report when they returned (cf. 14:26f.)’. This confuses the issue, and it seems more likely that this is a reference to each of the other three prophets and teachers praying over Barnabas and Saul rather than demanding that each member of the church prayed and laid hands on them.

⁷⁵⁵ Marshall, *Acts*, p. 216.

⁷⁵⁶ Polhill, *Acts*, p. 260.

⁷⁵⁷ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, p. 497.

⁷⁵⁸ Bruce, *Acts*, p. 246.

⁷⁵⁹ E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951). p. 73.

Barnabas and Saul were identified in v. 1 as belonging to the ranks of the teachers and/or prophets. Instead, this was an installation performed by individuals who were similarly ranked, in which a person is placed in a new particular sphere of service,⁷⁶⁰ and this is certainly one of the senses of ‘ordination’. The difficulty comes when modern hierarchical concepts of installation to office are imposed on early Christian practice.

As Schweizer observes, ‘the account is especially interesting, because in it a man whose apostolic status the later Church (unlike Luke himself) has never doubted, is the recipient, not the giver, of the laying on of hands’.⁷⁶¹ It should also be noted that Paul uses ἀφορίζω, ‘set apart’, to refer to his calling in Rom 1:1 and Gal 1:15, which is not to say that Paul viewed his calling as originating on this occasion in Antioch, but that this event confirmed the setting apart of Saul and Barnabas in the eyes of the congregation. In any case, the account stresses that the true legitimiser of this mission is the Spirit (vv. 2, 4).⁷⁶² The account of the Spirit’s direct intervention offers protection against charges of unauthorized action on the part of the church.⁷⁶³

The account also is interesting in that whether or not the setting apart was intended for a specific journey or mission, Paul’s life-work, his ἔργον, was to be wrapped up in mission work, as was first revealed in the words of Ananias shortly after Saul’s conversion (Acts 9:15). This event was not the ‘ordination’ of Barnabas and Saul, but in the case of Saul, the sort of task which he and Barnabas set out to do became his life-work. What may have been intended primarily as a blessing and an act of solidarity of the congregation with the Spirit set the stage for Paul’s future and was also surely a commissioning of some sort. Common to some of these early Christian acts of commissioning with accompanying laying on of hands is the theme of response

⁷⁶⁰ Zmijewski, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 289.

⁷⁶¹ Schweizer, *Church Order*, p. 25c.

⁷⁶² Cf. S. G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*, SNTSMS 23 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 182, who argues against the thesis that this mission was somehow legitimised by Jerusalem.

⁷⁶³ Barrett, *Acts 1-14*, p. 606.

to a situation. In the choice of the Seven (Acts 6:6) and of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:3), as well as in the earlier scriptural appointment of the seventy judges (Exod 18:13-27), the seventy elders (Num 11:16-25), and of Joshua (Num 27:18-23), Polhill sees common elements: a problem, a proposed solution, the qualifications for the candidates, and the installation of new leaders.⁷⁶⁴

While the terminology of fellowship and sharing certainly fits the Pauline tradition, the specific idea of sharing in the sins of others by association, encountered in the PE, is found most clearly elsewhere in 2 John 10-11, where anyone bringing a heterodox teaching is not to be welcomed into one's house. To do so would be to take a share in their evil works.⁷⁶⁵ The question is not one of outright rejection of the errant individuals, but that the church is not to encourage them and provide them with a base for their propaganda through provision of hospitality. Marshall suggests that this instruction is directed toward the church as a body rather than to individual members of the congregation: while individuals might justifiably unilaterally provide hospitality, the church was not to do anything which would suggest agreement with the false teaching and enable its dissemination.⁷⁶⁶ The text seems, however, to indicate that the instructions are being intended to be followed by individual members as well as the church as a body. The context of this example of shared responsibility is, however, quite different from that of 1 Tim 5:22. In 2 John 10-11, the situation is assumed to be evident so that no probationary period is necessary: this is a clear case of 'aiding and abetting'. Even though the letter itself was sent to the church and its members (2 John 1), the instruction here makes the most sense in terms of individual response by members of the congregation rather than by an officer or leader of the church as was the case with Timothy in 1 Tim 5:22. While issues of influence are at the core of both sets of instruction, 2 John 10-11 deals with preventing a known bad influence and has

⁷⁶⁴ Polhill, *Acts*, p. 182. Polhill includes Acts 13:3 in this list without qualification, which may not be appropriate, as will be seen.

⁷⁶⁵ S. S. Smalley, *1, 2, 3 John*, WBC 51 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), pp. 334-35.

⁷⁶⁶ I. H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 74-75.

no connection with the installation of leaders, while 1 Tim 5:22 deals with the need to detect a potentially bad influence and not allowing such a person to be installed as a leader.

4.5 – Installation of Leaders in the Apostolic Fathers

The passages of some level of interest here are found in the writings of Ignatius, the *Didache*, and the *Shepherd* of Hermas. The other writings contain what are at best only very generally related concepts, but none of these is specific to the practices involved in the installation of leaders.

4.5.1 – Ignatius

Mention is made of the selection or appointment of leaders in Ign. *Phld.* 10:1; Ign. *Smyrn.* 11:2; and Ign. *Pol.* 7:2. With the Philadelphians, it is the ‘church of God’ which is to elect a deacon, who will visit the church in Syrian Antioch as an ambassador. Ignatius states that it is an honour to be considered worthy of this ministry, and the church (‘you too’) will be glorified in its association with this ministry.⁷⁶⁷ The Smyrneans are to do the same (although it is not specified that the individual appointed be a deacon, but simply ‘an ambassador of God’), with similar honour reflected upon the church. In the letter to Polycarp, Ignatius’ instruction is that Polycarp ‘call a council that is pleasing to God’ and elect (ΧΕΙΡΟΤΟΥΝΕΩ) someone to go to Syria. The type of individual is not specified, but he is to be one who is held ‘most dear and resolved’, and when this work is done, it will belong ‘to both God and you’ (Ign. *Pol.* 7:3).

There is in the writing of Ignatius some concept of shared attributes, but not of sin.⁷⁶⁸ There is no mention of shared guilt in the faulty selection of a leader, but the reference to the work belonging to the church as well as to the one fulfilling it implies

⁷⁶⁷ Other churches, nearer to Syrian Antioch, ‘have even sent bishops, while others have sent presbyters and deacons’ (Ign. *Phld.* 10:2).

⁷⁶⁸ Ignatius makes reference to the shared name and hope of believers (Ign. *Eph.* 1:2; hope only in Ign. *Eph.* 21:2; Ign. *Phld.* 5:2; 11:2).

solidarity of responsibility. There is mention of selection of leaders, but no detail on the process and no reference to laying on of hands. No formal process of examination and qualification is proposed, but the mention of one who is worthy, dear, and resolved suggests that there is sufficient knowledge to be able to predict performance. In the matter of installing leaders, there is no explicit connection in practice between the letters of Ignatius and the PE.

4.5.2 – *Didache*

The concept of shared guilt and the need for purity are seen in *Did.* 14:1-3. The context is that of participating in the eucharist on the Lord's day, and the purity of the sacrifice is mentioned in each verse. The onus is placed upon the congregation: 'Let no one quarrelling with his neighbor join you until they are reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled.' Thus, the misdeeds of a portion of the congregation affect (defile) the rest of the congregation. The commands to maintain purity and avoid associating oneself with the sins of others have similarity to 1 Tim 5:22, but the context is not that of leadership or its installation.

In *Did.* 15:1 a command is given to 'elect for yourselves bishops and deacons who are worthy of the Lord, gentle men who are not fond of money, who are true and approved. For these also conduct the ministry of the prophets and teachers among you'. The word used for 'elect' is χειροτονῆσαί. The instructions are similar to 1 Tim 3:1-13 in terms of the qualifications as well as the titles given to the leaders. The reference to selection, to teaching, and the qualification of the individuals has relevance to 1 Tim 5:17-22. There is again no trace, however, of an installation ceremony or practice which involved the laying on of hands for the installation of selected leaders.

4.5.3 – *Shepherd of Hermas*

The *Shepherd of Hermas* offers a more developed discussion of the concept of shared guilt. The reader is instructed not to ‘listen gladly’ to anyone who is a slanderer. ‘Otherwise, you the hearer will share the sin of the slanderer—if you believe the slander you hear. For when you believe it you also will hold something against your brother. And so you will share the sin of the one who slanders’ (Herm. *Mand.* 27:2).⁷⁶⁹ This concept of sharing in sin is further developed in the Fourth Commandment of Hermas, which deals with sexual purity (Herm. *Mand.* 29:4-9). If a man’s wife is having an adulterous affair and the husband is unaware of this, he is not sinning when he continues to live with her. If, however, he becomes aware of the affair, she does not repent, and he continues to live with her, ‘he becomes guilty of her sin and a partner in her immorality’ (Herm. *Mand.* 29:5). In such a situation, he is to divorce her and live alone, accepting her back if she repents (vv. 6, 7). The situation is expanded beyond sexual conduct in Herm. *Mand.* 29:9, as ‘whoever behaves like the outsiders commits adultery. And so, if anyone continues doing such deeds and does not repent, you should avoid him and not allow him to live in your midst. Otherwise you also share in his sin.’ This clearly relates to the congregation in general and is not specific to leaders nor to the activity of selecting or installing such leaders. It is, however, the most extensive discussion in the Apostolic Fathers regarding sharing in guilt and responsibility by association.

The maintaining of purity is an important theme in Hermas.⁷⁷⁰ Reference is made to apostles and teachers who ‘taught the word of the Lord with reverence and holiness’ and avoided misappropriating money (Herm. *Sim.* 102:2) The bishops (ἐπίσκοποι) who were hospitable, ministering in providing shelter and conducting themselves ‘in a holy way’ are commended in Herm. *Sim.* 104:2. This is not, however,

⁷⁶⁹ Herm. *Mand.* 27:2 = Herm. *Mand.* 2.2 = verse 2 of Hermas’ Second Commandment. Cf. previous footnote regarding numbering system for references to the Apostolic Fathers.

⁷⁷⁰ Herm. *Mand.* 32:3, 4; Herm. *Sim.* 60:4; Herm. *Sim.* 102:2; and Herm. *Sim.* 104:2.

in the context of the selection or installation of leaders, nor does the *Shepherd* of Hermas offer any discussion of the process of choosing or installing leaders, let alone the laying on of hands.

4.6 – Contemporary Approaches to Installation of Leaders

Was there any group in the immediate context of the Pauline communities which practised installation of its leaders through the laying on of hands? To what extent were those installing others as leaders understood to be culpable for their choice or for the actions of those installed?

4.6.1 – Installation of Leaders in Jewish Literature: pre-70 C.E.

The laying on of hands in the installation of leaders in Jewish practice is a contentious issue in terms of prevalence and significance. This is not helped by the paucity of material available, in particular outside of references found in the Jewish Scriptures.⁷⁷¹ Even the execution of the act (pressure involved, one or both hands) is disputed.⁷⁷² Any distinction is not made in the NT, so that ‘leaning’ and ‘laying’ simply become ‘laying on of hands’.⁷⁷³

⁷⁷¹ Cf. Newman, *Semikhah*, p. viii, who observes that ‘even in the heyday of Semikhah, at the time of the Sanhedrin, comparatively very little mention is made of it in the Talmud’. The available extra-biblical data is sparse and comes from a much later period and is thus suspect.

⁷⁷² As pointed out by A. Noordtzi, *Leviticus*, trans. R. Togtman, BSC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), p. 32, ‘laying on’ is not quite correct, as the Hebrew carries the idea of exertion of pressure and is probably more correctly ‘leaning on’. J. Milgrom, *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPSTC (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), pp. 235, 326 n. 38 for chapter 27, confirms that the ‘rabbis state explicitly that the act of *samakh* must be “with all one’s strength”’. This is confirmed by *b. Hag. 16b, m. Menah. 93b*, and *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Num 27:18. The same author, J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), p. 150, makes a distinction between ‘placing the hand’ in blessing on a human head (Gen 48:18), when the hand may rest lightly, and exerting pressure, as in the sacrificial imposition of hands (‘hand-leaning’) on an animal. Therefore, the Tannaites disputed that this hand-leaning could be done during festivals, as ‘pressure on a live animal constitutes work and is, hence, forbidden on a holy day’, citing *b. Zebah. 33a* in addition to the previously mentioned sources.

⁷⁷³ J. Ysebaert, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche: Eine lexikographische Untersuchung* (Breda: Eureia, 1994), pp. 151-55. Cf. also D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, JPHRL (New York: Arno Press, 1973), pp. 225-45, who attempts to classify NT imposition of hands in terms of leaning or laying. E. Ferguson, ‘Jewish and Christian Ordination: Some Observations’, *HTR*, 56 (1963), 13-19, pp. 13-15, disagrees with this categorization, as there is ‘no trace of the distinction either in terminology or circumstantial

4.6.1.1 – The Jewish Scriptures

The act of laying on of hands (in Hebrew, *semikhah*) is recorded in Exod 29:10, 15, 19; numerous times in Leviticus, including Lev 1:4; 4:15; 16:21; 24:14, in Num 8:10-13; 27:18-23, and in Deut 34:9.⁷⁷⁴ In most of these cases, either the owner of the animal or the priests laid their hands on the head of an animal sacrifice to symbolize the transference of the people's sins, yet some of these references are specifically connected with the installation of leaders.⁷⁷⁵ Exod 29:1-46 is concerned with the consecration (AV, ASV) or ordination (RSV, ESV, NASB, etc.; cf. vv. 9, 26-27) of Aaron and his sons. The passages which refer to the laying of Moses' hands on Joshua in what was clearly a significant commissioning ritual are Num 27:18-23 and Deut 34:9.⁷⁷⁶ Of interest also in connection with the installation of leaders are Exod 18:13-27 and Num 11:16-18, 24-25, which give an account of the appointment of seventy judges (Exod 18) and elders (Num 11) to assist Moses, albeit without any laying on of hands,

description' (p. 14). In the later terminology of the Syriac church, where such a distinction can easily be made, a term is uniformly used which corresponds to 'laying' rather than 'leaning'.

⁷⁷⁴ This term, *semikhah*, is ambiguous, in that it literally means 'the laying on of the hands', and is used in this sense in this passage. Later, however, even when there was no actual laying on of hands involved, the term was still used as a technical term for rabbinical ordination. N. M. Sarna, *Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, 1st edn, JPSTC (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), p. 188, explains the term as follows: 'Immediately before the slaughtering of each of the three animals listed in verse 1 [of Exod 29], the priests are to perform "the laying on of the hands" (Heb. *semikhah*). The text clarifies neither the manner in which this is to be done nor the meaning of the ceremony. According to rabbinic tradition, it applies, with only rare exceptions, to the sacrifices brought by individuals and not to communal sacrifices, and it is always done by the owner of the animal, who presses down on the head with bare hands. In certain circumstances the rite is also performed on persons, and no single explanation accounts for all the occasions that require it. It sometimes seems to designate the animal or person for a specific role or fate; at other times it serves to identify and affirm ownership of the sacrificial animals. And in the case of the installation of the Levites prescribed in Numbers 8:10 and of the appointment of Joshua as Moses' successor recorded in Numbers 27:18. 23 and Deuteronomy 34:9, the action seems to signify the transfer of authority. It is this last interpretation that gave rise to the use of the Hebrew term *semikhah* for rabbinical ordination.' B. A. Levine, *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, 1st edn, JPSTC (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), p. xviii, notes that 'the verb *samakh*, "to lay upon, lean upon," has a technical meaning in the context of ritual and law' and that it was a 'widespread practice both in biblical Israel and in the ancient Near East generally. Extensive Hittite evidence is available on this practice'. As the present work is restricted to those writings and inscriptions which were generally contemporaneous (either in production or in explicit use) with Pauline writings, these more ancient examples will not be explored.

⁷⁷⁵ Cf. Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 3-4, for a discussion of a secondary meaning for Lev 4:15: not just the expression of communal guilt offering, but also the laying on of hands 'by a teacher when ordaining a candidate as Rabbi' (p. 4).

⁷⁷⁶ Num 8:10-13 also has the laying on of the people of Israel's hands on the Levites (v. 10), but this is followed by the Levites laying their hands on the heads of the bulls (v. 12). This passage therefore should be regarded as referring to a sacrificial rather than commissioning rite.

indicating that this practice was not necessarily a normal component of the investing of leaders.

Exod 18:13-27 gives an account of the origins of the Jewish legal system without a good deal of detail regarding the process. Moses is instructed by his father-in-law Jethro to find seventy judges who are able to judge the people in small matters and refer the great matters to Moses (v. 22). These were to be chosen for their character: they were to be able men, fear God, be trustworthy, and honest (v. 21). No ceremony of any sort is recounted nor is any language used which would imply the laying on of hands.

A similar account is given in Num 11:16-25, where Moses is instructed to gather seventy of the elders of Israel to stand with him after the people's rebellion over food. God informed Moses that he would take some of the spirit which is upon Moses and put it on the elders, and they shall assist Moses in bearing the burden of the people (v. 17). These elders, selected by Moses on the basis of their known status and leadership (v. 16), apparently were to have spiritual responsibilities, unlike the judges of Exod 18:13-27, whose work was administrative.⁷⁷⁷ The elders were to be given some of Moses' spirit, referring most likely to the Spirit of Yahweh which was upon Moses.⁷⁷⁸ This language is probably chosen so that it is made clear that there is a distinction between Moses and all others, including these elders (cf. Lev 12:6-8). As with the seventy judges, little detail is given regarding any ceremony surrounding the installation of the seventy elders. The people were informed regarding God's word, the seventy elders were gathered and placed around the tent (v. 24), and then God came down in the cloud, spoke with Moses, 'took some of the spirit that was on him and put

⁷⁷⁷ T. R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 211; G. J. Wenham, *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*, 1st edn, TOTC 4 (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), p. 108. Cf. however B. A. Levine, *Numbers 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), pp. 323-24, for a discussion of the similarity between the term here translated as 'official' and the synonymous use of 'scribe' in 2 Chron 26:11. This later usage, implying a more administrative role, may indicate development of the title over time.

⁷⁷⁸ Moses himself confirmed that the source of the ensuing prophetic activity was the LORD's Spirit (Lev 11:29).

it on the seventy elders; and when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied. But they did not do so again' (v. 25 - NRSV). Exactly what is meant here by 'they did not do so again' is not known. It seems that their choosing was validated by having them prophesy, but this was the only occasion on which they did so, thus distinguishing them from Moses. It is to be presumed, however, that the spiritual leadership for which they had been selected continued.⁷⁷⁹ Even with these unusual circumstances, little detail is given regarding specifics of this appointment, perhaps because it was intended to be ad hoc. As with the seventy judges, there is no mention of any laying on of hands.

Presenting much more detail is Exod 29:1-46, which refers to the consecration of Aaron and his sons.⁷⁸⁰ This passage has the laying of hands upon a bull (v. 10) and two rams (vv. 15, 19) which are then sacrificed as part of the ritual. In addition, Exod 29:9b, which is rendered 'you shall then ordain Aaron and his sons' by the NRSV, literally states that 'you shall fill the hands of Aaron and the hands of his sons'.⁷⁸¹ This is followed by the first of three layings of Aaron's and his sons' hands upon sacrificial animals: a bull in v. 10, and two rams in vv. 15 and 19.⁷⁸² The animals were then to be slaughtered and their portions used in various ways. Included in this were the daubing of the bull's blood on the horns of the altar (v. 12), dashing of the first ram's blood against the sides of the altar (v. 17), and the daubing of the blood of the second ram on

⁷⁷⁹ Ashley, *Numbers*, p. 214.

⁷⁸⁰ A parallel passage is found in Lev 8:1-36. Cf. the discussion in B. S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1974), pp. 393-94, regarding the possible evolution of these rites, their origin, as well as which account is based on the other.

⁷⁸¹ Childs, *Exodus*, p. 528, identifies this as 'the usual Hebrew idiom for the ordination of priests. The original meaning reflects some part of the ancient ceremony which is no longer clear'. Cf. also Sarna, *Exodus*, p. 185, who offers the suggestion that this term originated in a ritual where 'some object was ceremoniously placed in the hand of the novitiate'. Similar usage is found in Exod 28:41; Lev 21:10; Num 3:3; Judg 17:5, 12; 1 Kings 13:33; and 2 Chron 13:9.

⁷⁸² Regarding the use of the singular and the plural ('hand' and 'hands'), Sarna, *Exodus*, p. 188, observes that 'the plural is always employed when the object of the rite is a person [Lev 24:14; Num 8:10; 27:18, 23; and Deut 34:9 – Sarna notes the use of the singular form in Num 27:18, but points out that 'the account of its fulfillment in v. 23 has the plural' (p. 259 n. 14)]; the singular is mostly used in connection with an animal [Sarna notes that exceptions are found in Exod 29:10, 15, 19; Lev 4:15; 8:13, 18, 22; 16:21; Num 8:12; and 2 Chron 29:23 (p. 259 n. 16)]. However, on the basis of the cardinal number "two" defining the singular form of the Hebrew consonantal spelling of the noun (*shetei ydw* not *ydyv*) in Leviticus 16:21, rabbinic exegesis inferred that two hands are required in all cases [Sarna cites *m. Menah. 9:8*; *m. Menah. 93b*; *Sifra 'Aḥarei Mot.*, and points out that *Tg. Ps.-J.* to Lev. 1:4 'specifies the use of the right hand only.' (p. 259 n. 17)]

the right ears, right thumbs, and right big toes of Aaron and his sons, followed by sprinkling of some of the remaining blood on Aaron and his sons and their vestments (vv. 20-21).⁷⁸³ It is precisely this act which sets Aaron, his sons, and their vestments apart for their ministry (v. 21).⁷⁸⁴ The vestments worn by Aaron are to be used for anointing and consecrating ('ordained' NRSV) ceremonies for his sons after him, as well as to be worn by the priest who enters the holy place (vv. 29-30). In all of these complex instructions there is no direct reference to Moses laying his hands on the heads of Aaron and his sons. The thoroughness of the recorded instructions strongly suggests that the installation of Aaron and his sons (the priests of Israel) did not involve the laying of hands upon those being installed, although hands were laid on sacrificial animals and there was physical contact made between Moses and those being installed. Instead, it is the sprinkling with blood and oil of anointing which is the decisive act in this installation ritual.

In the passages where hands are laid on a sacrificial animal (e.g., Lev 1:4; 3:2, also 2 Chron 29:23), the laying on of hands is generally performed by the one offering the animal. The meaning behind this act is not made clear by the text, and explanations vary from transfer of sins from the person to the animal to some form of identification with the sacrifice and surrender of one's self.⁷⁸⁵ While the case of the scapegoat (Lev 16:21) specifically mentions the transfer of sins, in the other cases the laying on of hands in sacrifice seems to perform the function of identifying the owner so that the sacrifice is credited to him or her.⁷⁸⁶ Numerous references to this act in Leviticus detail the type of animal to be used for different circumstances without explaining the theological basis for the act itself. A variation is found in Lev 4:15, where the elders of

⁷⁸³ This is most likely an act of purification, similar to Lev 14:14-16, where it is performed for those with leprosy.

⁷⁸⁴ Childs, *Exodus*, p. 395.

⁷⁸⁵ J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, WBC 4 (Dallas: Word Books, 1992), pp. 19-21. Cf. also Noordtzij, *Leviticus*, p. 33.

⁷⁸⁶ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 151-53.

the congregation were instructed to lay their hands on the head of a bull in a sacrifice for the whole congregation of Israel, acting in proxy for the congregation.

Another significant ritual is seen in Lev 16:1-34 which recounts the events to be observed on the Day of Atonement. A variety of sacrifices were performed and a significant ritual of the day was the laying of Aaron's hands on a goat for Azazel, thus transferring all the iniquities, transgressions, and sins of the people onto that goat before it carried them off into the wilderness (vv. 21-22).⁷⁸⁷ This imposition of Aaron's hands was accompanied by a prayer, stating the specifics of the people's transgression.⁷⁸⁸ This act of riddance served the people by carrying their sins into a land of no return.⁷⁸⁹ In this case, the language used makes it clear that the reason for the laying on of hands and confessing of sins is that they be put 'on the head of the goat' (v. 21) and that the 'goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region' (v. 22), language that implies a transfer of the iniquities.

Lev 24:10-16 deals with the situation of an individual who misused the Name and thus cursed. He was to be led outside the camp, all those who heard him curse were to lay their hands on his head, and then all the congregation was to stone him (v. 14).⁷⁹⁰ The reasons offered for this laying on of hands vary. Wenham suggests that the blasphemy of the individual had brought guilt on those who heard his cursing as well as on the blasphemer himself, and their laying of their hands on the blasphemer's head transferred this guilt back to him, and 'his subsequent death then atoned for his own

⁷⁸⁷ Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 229. Cf. also Excursus 4 in Levine, *Leviticus*, pp. 250-53, where the rituals of *Yom Kippur* are analyzed in terms of similarities to other rituals of the ANE. Cf. also the discussion in Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 1020-21, regarding identification of Azazel. Milgrom concludes that this is the name of a demon 'who has been eviscerated of his erstwhile demonic powers by the Priestly legislators', and that the animal is not being offered as a sacrifice to this demon or to God, but that this is simply the 'banishment of evil to an inaccessible place', which is a familiar form of elimination in the ANE (p. 1021). In essence, Azazel has no active role in the matter: he no longer exists, and thus sending the scapegoat to the same place makes a similar statement regarding the transgressions of the people, which also are regarded as no longer existing (pp. 1044-45).

⁷⁸⁸ G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1979), p. 61. Cf. also Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 1042-43, who discusses the use of confession in cases of brazen and presumptuous sins (cf. Lev 5:5; 6:1-7), as well as some possible elements of the confession itself.

⁷⁸⁹ Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 106.

⁷⁹⁰ Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 167, points out that biblical law considered hearing (and not just seeing) as a form of witnessing, especially when vows and oaths as well as audible transgressions were involved.

and the hearers' sin'.⁷⁹¹ Noordtzij offers another idea: that the blasphemer made a magical or ritual statement and that 'through their hearing of the curse, the witnesses had been infected by the potent magical words, and they had thus in a certain sense come to share the guilt'.⁷⁹² This does not, however, seem to be supported by anything in the context. Hartley states that 'their hearing the words of blasphemy made them witnesses to a transgression of one of the commandments in the Decalogue', obligating them to take action against the accused. In laying on their hands, they were acknowledging that the individual was the guilty party and that their action in punishing him or her was appropriate (cf. Lev 20:9).⁷⁹³ In any case, the witnesses of the transgression had an obligation to take care of matters, whether this was in the context of transferring guilt back to the offending party or in confirming the guilt of the individual.⁷⁹⁴ A part of their obligation was discharged by obedience to the command to lay hands on the head of the offender.

Another variation on the laying on of hands in sacrifice is seen in Num 8:5-22, this time in a context of the installation of leaders. This passage deals with the dedication of the Levites to their service, which included the feature of having the whole congregation (probably representative leaders) lay their hands upon the Levites (v. 10), who were then offered to God as a wave offering, given for his service, in place of the Jewish first-born (vv. 11, 16-18).⁷⁹⁵ Following this, as human sacrifice was

⁷⁹¹ Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 311. Cf. also Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 1042-43; R. Péter-Contesse and J. Ellington, *A Handbook on Leviticus*, UBS.HS (New York: United Bible Societies, 1992), p. 368. Milgrom argues that the difference between Num 15:32-36 and Lev 24:10-14 is that in the former, a Sabbath violation, there was no pollution of the witnesses, while the cursing of God 'generates pollution that impinges on all who hear it'.

⁷⁹² Noordtzij, *Leviticus*, p. 245. Against this, cf. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3B (New York: Doubleday, 2001), pp. 2107-9, who shows that the event was one of pronouncing God's name and cursing him, pronouncing the divine name in a curse. 'Presumably, the name of God would be used, and one would say something like "may God be damned."' (p. 2109)

⁷⁹³ Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 410.

⁷⁹⁴ Cf. Sus 1:34 in the Apocrypha for a similar context of declaring and/or transferring guilt.

⁷⁹⁵ Milgrom, *Numbers*, p. 62, states that 'the hand leaning performed by the Israelites (v. 10) combined with the elevation offering of the Levites performed by Aaron on behalf of the Israelites together form the ritual whereby the Levites are transferred from the ranks of the Israelites to the property of the Lord'. For a syntactic structural analysis of the passage, cf. G. A. Klingbeil, 'The Syntactic Structure of the Ritual of Ordination (Lev 8)'. *Bib*, 77 (1977), 509-519.

repugnant to God, the Levites were to lay their hands on the heads of the two bulls who were then to function as a burnt offering and a sin offering to God (v. 12). While this passage incorporates the laying on of hands on individuals who perform an official function in the community, it is not done as an expression of their installation or of the confirmation of their authority. Rather it is an affirmation of dedication to service, as a ‘pass-through’ sacrifice which culminated in the actual sacrifice of the bulls. The Levites acted as a substitute for the firstborn, and the bulls acted as a substitute for the Levites, and this was symbolized through the laying on of hands.⁷⁹⁶ The purpose was one of the identification of the substitute and the sacrifice rather than a transfer of some leadership gifting, title, or authority.

It is the commissioning of Joshua as Moses’ successor in Num 27:18-23 and Deut 34:9 which seems most similar to Christian laying on of hands as seen in the PE. Moses requested of God that a leader might be appointed over Israel (vv. 15-17). God responded to Moses that he was to take Joshua, lay his hand upon him (v. 18), cause him to stand before Eleazar the priest and the whole congregation and commission Joshua before them (v. 19), and thus transfer some of Moses’ authority to Joshua (v. 20).⁷⁹⁷ Unlike Moses, who spoke with God face to face (12:6-8), Joshua would rely on the priests to discover God’s will, and thus he was not to have all of Moses’ authority.⁷⁹⁸ At the same time, unlike the seventy elders of Num 11, Joshua already has the spirit in him and is thus endowed for leadership (v. 18). This endowment is neither new (to be given through the laying on of hands) nor temporary (Num 11:25). The ‘spirit’ here could be wisdom, but Deut 34:9 suggests that wisdom came to Joshua

⁷⁹⁶ Ashley, *Numbers*, p. 170; Wenham, *Numbers*, pp. 96-97.

⁷⁹⁷ Ashley, *Numbers*, p. 552, points out that although the singular ‘hand’ is used in v. 18, the plural ‘hands’ is used in v. 23, and ‘the number may not be relevant’. However, Milgrom, *Numbers*, p. 235, states that ‘transfer of authority and power can only be performed by the laying of both hands’. This laying of both hands (Milgrom uses ‘laying’ to make it clear that significant pressure is applied) ‘became the rite for rabbinic ordination’ in Jewish tradition. The single hand was used in cases of sacrifice, where the owner of the animal identified himself or herself as such.

⁷⁹⁸ Wenham, *Numbers*, pp. 194-95.

through the laying on of Moses' hands.⁷⁹⁹ It could be a prophetic gift, as in Num 11:25, but there is no mention of Joshua fulfilling a prophetic role before or after this act of commissioning. The two most likely options are that this 'spirit' was a reference to enhanced leadership and military skill, seen in Joshua's military success, or his courage (cf. Josh 2:11; 5:1).⁸⁰⁰ Both of these elements were already present before the laying on of Moses' hands (cf. Exod 17:9-14 for military prowess, and Num 14:6-10 for courage).

The investiture or identification of Joshua as Moses' successor involved several distinct elements. Moses' hands were laid on Joshua, recognizing him before the people as the chosen successor. Moses also placed Joshua before Eleazar the priest in a formal act of presentation (cf. e.g., Gen 47:7; Lev 14:11; Num 3:6; 5:16, 18, 30; 8:13).⁸⁰¹ This was followed by a charge to or commissioning of Joshua by Moses (v. 19), elements of which may be recorded in Deut 31:7-8, 23.⁸⁰²

The succession of Moses by Joshua is confirmed in Deut 34:9, where Joshua is said to have been 'full of the spirit of wisdom, because Moses had laid his hands on him'. Was the laying on of Moses' hands effectual and not simply a symbolic identification of the next leader? Milgrom suggests that the repetition of 'on him' (vv. 18, 20) indicates either the establishment of 'a physical conduit for the transfer of his *hod* [authority]' or possibly that Moses has him invested by the hand leaning, while the actual transfer is performed by God (cf. 1 Chron 29:25). Alternatively, the *hod* may refer to the spiritual powers of Moses, in which case only God could transfer them, although he does so via Moses' hand leaning.⁸⁰³ The result in either case is that the text affirms that something was transferred to Joshua by the laying on of Moses' hands.

⁷⁹⁹ For different views, cf. McConville, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 475, 477; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 339.

⁸⁰⁰ K. Mattingly, 'The Significance of Joshua's Reception of the Laying On of Hands in Numbers 27:12-23', *AUSS*, 29 (2001), 191-208, p. 197; Milgrom, *Numbers*, p. 235.

⁸⁰¹ Cf. Ashley, *Numbers*, pp. 552-54; Wenham, *Numbers*, pp. 194-95, who stress the new cooperative, shared leadership which is to exist between the military leader (Joshua) and the religious leaders (the priests, represented here by Eleazar).

⁸⁰² Ashley, *Numbers*, p. 553.

⁸⁰³ Milgrom, *Numbers*, pp. 235-36.

McConville hedges on this, stating that the 'commissioning had the effect of transferring Moses' wisdom to him, as well as his authority among the people', but then cites the grammatical structure of the phrase as indicating a situation that already exists, so that Joshua's filling with wisdom was already true before the laying on of Moses' hands.⁸⁰⁴ It is certainly possible that both a symbolic transfer of some of Moses' authority and an actual endowment of wisdom were involved in the laying on of Moses' hands.⁸⁰⁵ Mattingly's suggestion is that 'not only was Joshua a man with an indomitable and courageous spirit, but YHWH had given him a special gift of the Spirit that changed him and endowed him for leadership. Hand-laying is thus associated with a spirited man as well as with a man filled with the Spirit of YHWH.'⁸⁰⁶ Those in the Pauline communities familiar with the accounts of Moses' installation of Joshua as his successor could well have seen these as providing a precedent for the use of the ritual of laying on of hands for installation of leaders, both for the confirmation of the individual and an impartation of some charisma.

The laying on of hands in Jewish scriptural writings is similar to that found in the early Christian writings in that there was not just one meaning for this act. However, many of the Jewish events occurred in the context of sacrifice. Hands were typically laid on an animal which was to be sacrificed for its owner's sins, and in one account, on an individual who was to be executed for his wrongdoing. In the Christian writings the context is always one of blessing, healing, impartation, or appointment to a task.⁸⁰⁷

Another difference is that while in the Pauline communities laying on of hands to commission individuals and appoint leaders seems to be somewhat common-place, in the Jewish writings it is only Joshua whose appointment specifically involves a

⁸⁰⁴ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 475, 477. Cf. also Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, p. 339, who similarly is uncertain as to whether a transference event occurred.

⁸⁰⁵ Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, p. 872.

⁸⁰⁶ Mattingly, 'Joshua's Reception of the Laying On of Hands', p. 204.

⁸⁰⁷ Cf. Mark 5:23; 6:5; 7:32; 8:23, 25; 10:16; 16:18 and the parallels in the other synoptics; Acts 6:6; 8:17-19; 9:12, 17; 13:3; 19:6; 28:8; 1 Tim 4:14; 5:22; 2 Tim 1:4; Heb 6:2.

laying on of hands for the purposes of appointment, designation of a successor, and perhaps impartation.⁸⁰⁸ Although there is laying of hands on the Levites (Num 8:10), this is not done in the case of the installation of Aaron and his sons (Exod 29; Lev 8) nor of the seventy judges (Exod 18) or seventy elders (Num 11). And in the case of the Levites the significance is clearly that they are in effect a living sacrifice for the Jewish first-born, and they then lay their hands on bulls that are sacrificed for them. This is not a laying on of hands exclusively for appointment.

Although the Jewish Scriptures give instruction for the laying on of hands in a variety of situations without defining just why this should be done (other than in Lev 16:21), the best explanation for these varied contexts seems to be one of dedication to God. Levine states:

It is important to emphasize that the requirement of *semikhah* for some expiatory sacrificial victims should *not* be interpreted as indicating that the essential function of laying on the hands was necessarily the transferal of impurity or guilt to the victim. In the cult, *semikhah* assured that sacrifices intended for specific rites would be used solely for that purpose. Once assigned in this way, the offering was sacred and belonged to God.⁸⁰⁹

This would explain the use of this rite for sacrifices, identifying guilty parties (Lev 24:10-16), as well as for the appointing of Joshua as Moses' successor (Num 27:18-23; Deut 34:9). In all cases the recipient of the laying on of hands was being dedicated and set apart for God's use or punishment, as applicable.⁸¹⁰

⁸⁰⁸ It should also be pointed out that Acts 6:6 and 13:3 are very clearly not situations where successors are designated, and the passages in the PE which refer to the laying on of hands also do not have a stated or implied context of succession.

⁸⁰⁹ Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 6. Levine also believes that 'the act of *semikhah* was probably accompanied by a recitation that has been lost to us' (p. 6). In a later period, the Mishnah offers formulae which 'assigned the animal, in a legal sense, to a specific sacrifice' (p. 201 n. 16). Cf. *m. 'Arak. 5:6; 8:7;* and *m. Menah. 3:9*. Cf. also Wenham, *Leviticus*, pp. 53, 61.

⁸¹⁰ This concept of dedication to God is also a plausible component of the Christian laying on of hands on leaders, but there is no text which explicitly establishes this.

The issue of culpability for the installation of inadequate leaders is not directly addressed in the Jewish Scriptures.

4.6.1.2 – Qumran Literature

There is no specific mention made of the ritual used in installing leaders in the Qumran community or communities. There are a few occasions where hands are laid on sacrificial animals. One mention of the laying on of hands is made in a fragment in 1Q22 IV, 9, and this is in a context of the sacrifice of two male goats.⁸¹¹ Another mention is found in 11QT XV, 15-XVI, 1 (11QT^b), where hands are laid on the head of a bullock in offering for the sins of the priests.⁸¹² A more extensive piece, which relates to the scapegoat ('to Azazel') is found in 11Q19 XXVI, 3-15. While it makes reference to confessing the people's sins over the head of that goat before sending it off (lines 11-13), the document does not mention laying on of hands, and is complete enough in this portion to preclude such mention having been in the document originally.

A statement made by Hippolytus regarding the Essenes claims that 'they do not use oil, regarding it as a defilement to be anointed. And there are appointed overseers, who take care of all things that belong to them in common, and they all appear always in white clothing'.⁸¹³ As a late second-century writer commenting on a Jewish 'sect' and acting in essence as a hostile witness, his testimony should not simply be accepted without question. However, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, his characterization of the Essenes as avoiding rituals other than those associated with purity in ablutions, washing, food, and drink seems plausible. It seems more likely that

⁸¹¹ There is no clear parallel to this in the Torah. The context is that of Moses climbing Mount Nebo and proclaiming the law to the Israelites together with Eleazar (1Q22 I-III), but the description of the sacrifice (1Q22 IV) seems most akin to that of Lev 16:1-22, while maintaining significant differences. This fragment is found in F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume One, 1Q1-4Q273* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 63, and not in Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, who does not have Columns III and IV.

⁸¹² This passage is also significantly different from passages in the Torah describing sacrifices. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume Two, 4Q274-11Q31* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), has this as 11Q20 I, 23-24.

⁸¹³ In A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, and A. C. Coxe, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. American reprint of the Edinburgh edn, ANF 5 (New York: Scribner's, 1926). p. 134, from Hippolytus, *The Refutation of All Heresies*, Chapter 14.

the lack of mention of laying on of hands in the installation of leaders in the Qumran materials is due to its absence rather than that it was so commonplace that it does not merit mention.

This lack of ceremony may be due in large measure to the method by which leaders seem to have been chosen in the Qumran community, namely, by lot. While Vermes renders 1QSa (=1Q28a) I, 15-16 as ‘every head of family in the congregation who is chosen to hold office’, García Martínez renders the same passage as ‘every {chief} /head/ of clans of the congregation, for whom the lot comes out, to take his pl[ace] in the duties’.⁸¹⁴ This translation, which is more literally correct and specifies the method of choosing, implies that the selection was understood to be by the hand of God. Given this state of affairs, it may well be that further ceremony was considered superfluous, but this is speculation, and no clear indication is given to state that the laying on of hands was not employed, and if not, why it was not used.

The concept of culpability in installing an inappropriate leader is absent in the Qumran material, although a good deal of discussion of incurring sin because of a failure to accuse others known to be sinning is present in the texts. This may largely be due to the selection of leaders by lot: in essence, God is the one who made the choice, and he cannot of course incur sin, nor would he choose improperly. There is nothing which corresponds to the culpability warnings of 1 Tim 5:22.

4.6.2 – Installation of Leaders in Jewish Literature: post-70 C.E.

The issue of laying on of hands in rabbinic ‘ordination’ or commissioning is significantly disputed, with scholars such as Daube, Lohse, and Mantel arguing for rabbinic ordination with laying or leaning on of hands. The broad consensus on the

⁸¹⁴ Compare Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 160, with García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: 1Q1-4Q273*, p. 101. Similarly, in the matter of decision making in the community (1QS v, 3), Vermes has ‘every decision concerning doctrine, property, and justice shall be determined by them’ (p. 103), while García Martínez renders the same passage ‘by their authority, decision by lot shall be made in every affair involving the law, property and judgement’ (p. 79). Cf. 1QS IV, 26, which García Martínez translates as having God ‘cast the lots of every living being according to his spirit in [...until the time of] the visitation’ (p. 79).

other side (Ehrhardt, Ferguson, and most current scholars) argues that the rabbinic materials are not to be trusted in their witness in this area: other methods of designation for office or function took the place of the laying on of hands, even if the term *semikhah* ('leaning on of hands') continued in usage.⁸¹⁵ In regard to comparison with Christian practice, a significant problem is that even where there is laying on of hands in both the Jewish and Christian usage, it was done for varied reasons, including blessing, designation of ownership in sacrifice, designation of guilt, transference of sin, commissioning, healing, and impartation of a spiritual gift. It is also clear in the later rabbinic materials that the laying on of hands was replaced by a number of other practices in rabbinic ordination, if indeed it ever was used. A considerable body of literature deals with these issues and primary attention will be given in this work to material which has a bearing on the PE discussion.⁸¹⁶

Who had the right to ordain in rabbinic practice? The later account by R. Abba (y. *Sanh.* 1, 19a – ca. 290 C.E.) states that R. Johanan b. Zakkai ordained or appointed two of his disciples, R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, who in turn appointed others (supposedly before 70 C.E.). The Nasi, or prince of the Sanhedrin, soon became the one who selected and ordained the one being installed, but by the fourth century this became the prerogative of the whole Sanhedrin.⁸¹⁷ Thus the material suggests a range from private to autocratic to communal authority in rabbinic ordination.

What was the role to be filled by those ordained? There were a number of privileges which were reserved for those who had undergone rabbinic ordination. Those judges who were to settle financial disputes were to be three in number, and had to be

⁸¹⁵ Cf. Ehrhardt, *Framework*, pp. 132-50, for an extensive discussion and refutation of the arguments presented by Lohse and Daube. Cf. also his earlier article, 'Jewish and Christian Ordination', *JEH*, 5 (1954), 125-38.

⁸¹⁶ For material on rabbinic ordination, cf. Daube, *NT and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 225-45; A. A. Ehrhardt, 'Jewish and Christian Ordination', *JEH*, 5 (1954), 125-38; Ehrhardt, *Framework*, pp. 132-50; E. Ferguson, 'Selection and Installation to Office in Roman, Greek, Jewish and Christian Antiquity', *TZ*, 30 (1974), 273-84; E. Ferguson, ed., *Early Christianity and Judaism*, SECh 6 (London: Garland, 1993); Lohse, *Ordination*; H. Mantel, 'Ordination and Appointment in the Period of the Temple', *HTR*, 57 (1964), 325-46; Mattingly, 'Joshua's Reception of the Laying On of Hands'; Newman, *Semikhah*; Ysebaert, *Amtsterminologie*, pp. 151-55.

⁸¹⁷ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 13-23.

ordained in Palestine (*m. Sanh.* 1:1), although the requirement of three judges seems to have been replaced quite early (*m. Sanh.* 3:1).⁸¹⁸ An exclusive right of ordination was the power to inflict fines and penalties, and this also was to be settled by three judges ordained in Palestine (*m. Sanh.* 1:1). Eventually (after the destruction of the temple) it became necessary to allow the Babylonian sages to act as agents for the Palestinian judges.⁸¹⁹ Another right was the intercalation of months and years in the Jewish calendar (insertion of extra days to make the seasons come out correctly). The literature suggests that three, five, or seven ordained rabbis were to render judgement on this (*m. Sanh.* 1:1; *y. Sanh.* 1:2).⁸²⁰ Several other rights, including that of releasing first-born clean male animals from sacrifice for reasons of blemish, the annulment of vows, and of excommunication seem not to have had a requirement of being ruled upon by ordained judges.⁸²¹ Until about 30 C.E., the Sanhedrin had the right to decide on cases involving corporal or capital punishment, and these were to be decided by either three (*m. Sanh.* 1:2) or twenty-three (*m. Sanh.* 1:4) ordained judges. For Jewish courts outside Palestine, their power was considered based on the temple and they also had the right to judge cases, as long as this was permitted by the government of the country in which they sat.⁸²² These preceding rights and roles were largely of a legal nature, but it can effectively be argued that many of these judges were priests and Levites, and in a number of legal situations (for instance, matters of purity – Lev 10:10) it was required that a priest be the one who judged.⁸²³

The requirements placed on those wishing to be ordained were numerous, to the extent that it was thought that no one could meet all of them.⁸²⁴ There were, in fact,

⁸¹⁸ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 24-25.

⁸¹⁹ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 32-38.

⁸²⁰ Cf. Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 38-51.

⁸²¹ Cf. Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 51-60.

⁸²² Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 60-61.

⁸²³ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 65-81.

⁸²⁴ Cf. Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 83. Cf. the discussion on the requirements on pp. 84-93, which included being tall (anointing oil was thought to increase the height of a shorter person – *Yal. Ps.* 45), a man of wisdom, of mature age, having knowledge of sorcery (for purposes of identification), conversant

individuals who chose to evade ordination when it was offered to them (*y. Bik. 3.3*, IX.H; *b. Sanh. 14a*), perhaps for fear of the responsibility as well as fear of unworthiness.⁸²⁵ In one case, R. Zera refused to accept appointment as a judge (*semikhah*), but accepted it on being told that ‘A man rises to an exalted position after all his sins are forgiven only’ (*Midr. Sam 17:1*).⁸²⁶ It was also held that ordination could not be nullified, because “since you have ascended, you need not descend.” R. Zera said: We may infer from this that once a great man is ordained, he remains so’ (*b. Sanh. 30b*).⁸²⁷

Given these variations in how, when, and who was ordained, it will be no surprise that the actual ceremony employed in the ordination of rabbis and judges was also subject to change in interpretation and manner. The original source for the ceremony of *semikhah* was Moses’ imposition of his hands on Joshua.⁸²⁸ The word generally used in rabbinic ordination, *semikhah*, derives from this, and ‘the oldest and, in fact the original ceremony of Semikhah is, undoubtedly the laying on of the hands of the ordaining authority on the ordinand’.⁸²⁹ What is not clear, and seems unlikely because of the lack of mention, is whether this practice continued from the time of Moses through the rabbinic era.⁸³⁰ Of interest here is the silence of Philo (20 B.C.E.-40 C.E.), who discusses the laying on of hands in blessing on Ephraim and Manasseh, but does not mention the imposition of Moses’ hands on Joshua.⁸³¹ In fact, Newman avers that

after the ordination of Joshua by Moses, there is no record of the
laying on of hands ever being practised on the occasion of an

with seventy languages (!), and able to declare a reptile to be clean (argue a point which is unsupportable).

⁸²⁵ Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 93.

⁸²⁶ Translation and reference given in Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 94.

⁸²⁷ *The (Babylonian) Talmud: Seder Nezikin III*, London: Soncino Press, 1935, p. 188.

⁸²⁸ Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 6.

⁸²⁹ Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 102.

⁸³⁰ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 10, 12. The story of R. Jehuda b. Baba (*b. Sanh. 13b = 14a*), who is said to have sacrificed himself in the era of Hadrian (117-138 C.E.) in order to preserve the chain of rabbinic ordination is open to a good deal of dispute (pp. 14-16). Cf. also Ehrhardt, ‘Ordination’, pp. 135-36.

⁸³¹ Cf. Philo, *Leg. 3.90-91* for Ephraim and Manasseh and Philo, *Virt. 66-67* for Joshua.

ordination. This is true not only in respect of Biblical times,—incidentally, no second instance of ordination during this period is recorded in the Scriptures,—but is equally so of the Rabbinical age, during the whole of which Semikhah was considered as being one of the most essential foundations upon which religious life of the Jewish people was built.⁸³²

About 380 C.E. a discussion on the ordination of elders includes this exchange: ‘R. Aḥa the son of Raba, asked R. Ashi: Is ordination effected by the literal laying on of hands? – [No,] he answered, it is by the conferring of the degree: He is designated by the title of Rabbi and granted the authority to adjudicate cases of *kenas* [fines]’ (*b. Sanh.* 13b).⁸³³ It may, in fact, be true that rabbinic ordination was never actually performed by laying hands on the ordinand, as this standard text in the Talmud suggests.⁸³⁴ In theory, rabbinic ordination had to be performed in Palestine, but after the Destruction ordinations were performed ‘long distance’, in some cases with the ordinand outside Palestine while the one ordaining was in Palestine, thus excluding actual imposition of hands.⁸³⁵ A stronger argument is found in *y. Yoma* 1:1, where R. Hiyyah b. Josef declares (ca. 280 C.E.) that proclamation is the correct procedure for appointment of the Deputy High Priest.

Why was the laying on of hands either abandoned or never implemented in rabbinic ordination, if indeed it ever played a role after Joshua’s time? The suggestion that the adoption of this practice by the Christian church led to its abandonment by the rabbis does not offer sufficient cause, for other practices were adopted without a

⁸³² Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 102.

⁸³³ *BTalmSP*, 12, p. 63

⁸³⁴ Mantel, ‘Ordination’, p. 327; Newman, *Semikhah*, p. 103. Mantel points out, however, that the existence of the debate in the Talmud suggests that there was doubt, and that the possibility of manual ordination existed.

⁸³⁵ Cf. discussion of *y. Bik.* 3:3 in Mantel, ‘Ordination’, pp. 327, 335; Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 103-4; H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte: Erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Str-B 2 (Munich: Oskar Beck, 1924), pp. 659-61.

rabbinic ban.⁸³⁶ A temporary decree by the Roman authorities forbidding *semikhah* in the wake of the destruction of the temple gives cause for the suspension of the laying on of hands, but there is no information to explain why the laying on of hands was not restored once the decree was lifted.⁸³⁷ Moreover, this supposed decree is not mentioned in non-Talmudic sources, and indeed would have largely been unenforceable.⁸³⁸ Newman's solution is that Moses designated Joshua as the religious leader of Israel, while rabbinic ordination conferred judicial authority rather than religious leadership.⁸³⁹ This argument is based on several items, with a key statement found in the Palestinian *Sanhedrin* 1:2 (= *y. Sanh.* 1, 19a): 'There [in Babylon] they call appointment to a court "ordination."⁸⁴⁰ In Palestine, thus, appointment to a court (as a judge) was not called *semikhah* (ordination, literally 'leaning on of hands') as it is in Babylon, but rather was now called *minnuv*, or appointment.⁸⁴¹ It was therefore considered inappropriate to either practise the laying on of hands or to refer to the ceremony any longer as *semikhah* in Palestine. By contrast, in Babylon, where *semikhah* had never had the force it had in Palestine (those who were 'ordained' acted as agents of the Palestinian judges rather than being in essence autonomous) the term continued to be used.⁸⁴²

Even later, especially in Babylon, *semikhah* came to indicate the qualification of a scholar.⁸⁴³ If this is indeed the case it would also be expected that the ceremony would have undergone change, and this is borne out by the sources. To the cited sources which indicate appointment by proclamation, there can be added the wearing of special garments donned by scholars at *semikhah* and worn thereafter (*B. Meṣi'a* 85.a;

⁸³⁶ Mantel, 'Ordination', pp. 327-28.

⁸³⁷ Mantel, 'Ordination', pp. 327-28; Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 105-7.

⁸³⁸ Ehrhardt, *Framework*, pp. 135-36. Ehrhardt rejects the report regarding the ordination by R. Jehuda b. Baba of five of his pupils in 135 C.E. as 'purely legendary'.

⁸³⁹ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 110-12.

⁸⁴⁰ Translation taken from Neusner's *The Talmud of the Land of Israel*, vol 31 (Sanhedrin and Makkot), Chicago, 1984, p. 42.

⁸⁴¹ Mantel, 'Ordination', pp. 326, 342.

⁸⁴² Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 112-14.

⁸⁴³ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 113-14. Cf. Ferguson, 'Ordination', p. 14, who suggests that the use of '*samakh* as a technical term, "to ordain," in Rabbinic literature, therefore, may be derived from its sense of relying upon an authority rather than from its usage of leaning upon with the hands'.

Midr. Lev 2; B. Bat. 57b, 98a; Zebah. 19a; etc.), as well as the delivery of a maiden speech (*b. Sanh. 7b*), and an ordination certificate (*y. Bik. 3:3*).⁸⁴⁴

It is in this context of scholarship that some try to find the existence of manual ordination in the temple period. Mantel suggests that there were two separate forms of ordination in the temple period: the public ‘appointment of official urban judges’ (*minnuv*) and the private ‘manual ordination authorizing an advanced student to teach in public, to decide matters of a legal and ritual nature, and perhaps also to judge financial cases not involving fines’ (*semikhah*).⁸⁴⁵ Mantel’s ‘proof’ for this rabbinic manual ordination of scholars he finds in early Christianity: ‘In the Gospels we are told a number of times that the elders and leaders of the sect placed their hands on their students. The twelve disciples of Jesus laid their hands on seven young men who were to be the officials of the community (and, it would seem, the propagators of Christianity).’⁸⁴⁶ Even beyond the inaccuracies of his observations,⁸⁴⁷ Mantel’s thesis that the Church borrowed this practice from Judaism and there is ‘no room for doubt that it (the laying on of hands) existed (in Judaism) during temple times’ is not supported by anything in the rabbinic literature confirming such manual ordination.⁸⁴⁸ In addition, it seems unlikely that Jewish ordination before 70 C.E. was a casual or private affair. One matter, which runs counter to such private ordination and also has

⁸⁴⁴ Newman, *Semikhah*, pp. 114-28. In the Geonic age (seventh century and beyond), there is reference to three and then seven rows (with twenty-three in each row) of ‘learned men’ who advance toward the front and are thereby designated as in ordination (cf. pp. 139-143), while still retaining the term *semikhah* to indicate such designation.

⁸⁴⁵ Mantel, ‘Ordination’, p. 328. To some degree, Ehrhardt, *Framework*, agrees, considering the ministry of the Synagogue a ‘legal, not a spiritual, ministry’ and the rabbis ‘functionaries’ (p. 133). He carries this idea further, drawing a contrast between the Seven being set apart to serve at the tables and the rabbinic idea of enthronement (pp. 146-47).

⁸⁴⁶ Mantel, ‘Ordination’, p. 340.

⁸⁴⁷ In the gospel accounts hands are laid on small children in blessing and on the sick in healing, not on students in ordination, and there is nothing in Acts 6:6 to suggest that the Seven were to be officials or propagators of Christianity, even if some indeed become evangelists. In addition, the designation of ‘officials’ is in conflict with Mantel’s own thesis of appointment of officials by advancement and pronouncement, and ordination of scholars by laying on of hands.

⁸⁴⁸ Mantel, ‘Ordination’, p. 341. Interestingly, Mantel is adamant that ‘this (manual) ordination had nothing whatever to do with R. Johanan b. Zakkai’s innovation in the appointment of judges’ (*y. Sanh. 1, 19a*), although this much later rabbinic statement would have placed manual ordination into the Temple era. Mantel seems to reject this because the ordination involved was that of judges rather than scholars, and Mantel agrees that judges were not manually ordained.

significant bearing on Christian practice, is the name or title applied to the ordinand. Ehrhardt states that the ordained scholars were called *z^eqenim*, or *πρεσβύτεροι*, to distinguish them from those who were called ‘rabbi’ but were not duly ordained.⁸⁴⁹ There are several texts which support this. The text which denies ordination outside Palestine (*y. Bik.* 3) refers to it as the ordination of elders, and there are also two later references to the ‘appointment of elders’ (*y. Meg.* 1, 72b; *y. Hag.* 76c).⁸⁵⁰

If the physical laying on of hands was not the actual rite at rabbinic ordination in the period corresponding to the PE, then what was? It seems that a system of advancement related to seating may in fact have been the key. The *Mishnah* explains that the Sanhedrin ‘sat in a semicircle in order that they might see one another’ (*m. Sanh.* 4:3) and ‘three rows of disciples of the Sages sat before them, and every one knew his own proper place. If they had need to appoint [another judge], they appointed one from the first [row], one from the second [row] came to the first [row]’ and so on, with someone from the congregation taking place in the third row, in the last position as the others moved up.⁸⁵¹ Thus the action involved was not one of laying on of hands, but one more akin to enthronement, the elevation (*hoshebh*) of the rabbi to the vacant chair, even though the term *semikhah* was used for ordination in this context.⁸⁵² The *Sifre* (§140) on Num 27:18 has Moses placing Joshua on the stool next to him, in essence enthroning him, thereby reading back later rabbinic custom as present in the text.⁸⁵³

⁸⁴⁹ Cf. Ehrhardt, *Framework*, pp. 140-41, who believes that what was involved was the admission to one of the seats in the Jerusalem Sanhedrin, a solemn and public affair.

⁸⁵⁰ Ferguson, ‘Ordination’, p. 17.

⁸⁵¹ P. Blackman, *Mishnayoth: Pointed Hebrew Text, English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Supplement, Appendix, Indexes, Addenda, Corrigenda*, 2nd: rev., corr., enl. edn, 7 vols (New York: Judaica Press, 1963-1990). vol 4, *Nezikin*, p. 253.

⁸⁵² Ehrhardt, *Framework*, pp. 138-39. Of course, it must be noted that the use of the term ‘enthronement’ is no less anachronistic than ‘ordination’.

⁸⁵³ Ehrhardt, *Framework*, p. 139; Mantel, ‘Ordination’, p. 339. Later Christian practice moved the central act of installing the bishop from the laying on of hands to the enthronement of the bishop. Cf. Chupungco, ‘Ordination Theology’; Ferguson, ‘Ordination’, p. 18; Ferguson, ‘Selection’, pp. 279-80. A related item of interest is the mention in Ignatius (*Magn.* vi) and Hermas (*Vis.* iii. ix. 7) that the presbytery had the privilege of occupying the ‘first seats’ at the liturgy. Is this the beginning of a change from imposition of hands to status-based seating on the way to the bishop’s throne?

This well-attested practice of advancement and its designation as *semikhah* suggest that references to *semikhah* should not automatically be read as involving imposition of the hands.⁸⁵⁴

On the matter of responsibility for the ordination of someone, *b. Sanh. 7b* records that ‘Resh Lakish said: He who appoints an incompetent judge over the Community is as though he had planted an *Asherah* in Israel’.⁸⁵⁵ While this indicates responsibility, it does not indicate that the appointer of the judge has somehow become a participant in the incompetent judge’s misdeeds.

There are some significant differences between rabbinic and early Christian ordination, appointment, or commissioning. While the NT offers accounts of laying on of hands, there is significant doubt this was practised with a purpose of appointment in any Jewish context in this period of time. Another difference suggested by Ferguson is that ‘Rabbinic ordination conferred an equal status and had a legal rather than spiritual significance in that it conferred judicial functions’.⁸⁵⁶ Certainly, the legal rather than spiritual connotation seems substantiated, but the role of equality in the Christian understanding needs exploration. The issue of commonality of guilt for hasty installation in the text of 1 Tim 5:22 suggests that some level of equality between the ordainer and the ordained was understood as being present. Whether the Christian act involved elevation to equality or whether those installed or commissioned were understood as already being equal (cf. Acts 13:1-3) is not explicitly addressed by the text of the PE. In its purpose, Jewish ordination, whether of judges or of students, largely served to designate a successor or successors.⁸⁵⁷ This is not present in Acts 6:6

⁸⁵⁴ Cf. L. A. Hoffman, ‘Jewish Ordination on the Eve of Christianity’, *StLi*, 13 (1979), 11-41, p. 17, who concludes that there never was any laying on of hands in Jewish appointment rituals, but also that the term ‘ordination’ (*semikhah*) appears in Babylonian rabbinic usage, while ‘appointment’ (*minnuv*) is the correct term in the Palestinian tradition (pp. 33-35).

⁸⁵⁵ *BTalmSP*, *Nezikin III*, p. 29.

⁸⁵⁶ Ferguson, ‘Ordination’, p. 16.

⁸⁵⁷ Ferguson, ‘Selection’, p. 274.

or 13:3, and is not at all obvious in the ordination passages of the PE.⁸⁵⁸ The bestowal of a blessing accompanied the Christian acts of laying on of hands (including in commissioning) and the consistent accompaniment of prayer in acts of commissioning render the Christian installation of leaders more akin to the benedictions of Jewish life rather than rabbinic ordination.⁸⁵⁹ It appears that ‘in the matter of ordination the Church and the Synagogue appear not in the relation of son and mother, but as half-brothers, like Isaac and Ishmael (Gal.4:22f.) both in their way appropriating the Old Testament example’.⁸⁶⁰ While both have basis in the Jewish Scriptures, the mode and meaning of installing leaders in rabbinic and Christian practice were divergent rather than congruent.

4.6.3 – Installation of Leaders in Græco-Roman Civil Life

The use of laying on of hands in the installation of a leader in a context other than the Judæo-Christian one is attested at least once, in Livy’s record of the inauguration of Numa Pompilius.⁸⁶¹ Supposedly the second king of Rome, succeeding Romulus, Numa Pompilius (d. 673 B.C.E.) is spoken of by Livy as having ‘a great reputation for justice and piety’ and being ‘deeply versed... in all law, divine and human’ (1-2). An augur, later made a priest of the state, led him to the citadel in Rome

⁸⁵⁸ The charge to entrust the teaching to ‘faithful men’ in 2 Tim 2:2 suggests continuity rather than formal notions of succession in the sense in which this was interpreted in later Christian churches. Furthermore, neither Timothy nor Titus are referred to as ‘elders’, so the instruction to ‘appoint elders’ (Titus 1:5) can hardly be an instruction to find successors. However, cf. E. Käsemann, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen; 1. und 2. Band* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), p. 129, who considers the ordination passages in the PE to be addressed to a monarchical bishop in the later church. ‘Unter der Adresse des apostolischen Delegaten wird also in Wirklichkeit der monarchische Bischof angeredet und an seine Pflichten gemahnt. Seine Aufgabe ist die Fortführung des apostolischen Amtes in nachapostolischer Zeit. Er steht mit andern Worten in der apostolischen Sukzession, genauso wie der Rabbi in der Sukzession des Moses und Josua die Lehrtradition und Rechtsprechung erhält und jure divino, nämlich durch die Geistmitteilung bei der Ordination bevollmächtigt, handhabt.’ Käsemann also finds transmission of office in the commissioning of the Seven (Acts 6:6 – p. 131). Against this, there is nothing in the text of Acts 6 to suggest succession, and indeed the rabbinic practice seems not to have been the laying on of hands in ordination, most plausibly because rabbinic ordination was understood to be of a different character than the commissioning of Joshua by Moses.

⁸⁵⁹ Ferguson, ‘Selection’, p. 284.

⁸⁶⁰ Ehrhardt, *Framework*, p. 150.

⁸⁶¹ Livy, *Livy, Books I and II*, trans. B. O. Foster, LCL114 (London: William Heinemann, 1952), pp. 63-67. The specific passage is found in Book I, 18. For ease of reference, line numbers from this edition will be used in the text, so that (1) following a citation should be understood as a reference to Livy, Book I, 18.1.

and ‘caused him to sit down on a stone, facing the south’ (6-7). The further description is as follows:

The augur seated himself on Numa’s left, having his head covered, and holding in his right hand the crooked staff without a knot which they call a *lituus*. Then, looking out over the City and the country beyond, he prayed to the gods, and marked off the heavens by a line from east to west, designating as ‘right’ the regions to the south, as ‘left’ those to the north, and fixing in his mind a landmark opposite to him and as far away as the eye could reach; next shifting the crook to his left hand and, laying his right hand on Numa’s head, he uttered the following prayer: “Father Jupiter, if it is Heaven’s will that this man Numa Pompilius, whose head I am touching, be king in Rome, do thou exhibit to us unmistakable signs within those limits which I have set.” He then specified the auspices which he desired should be sent, and upon their appearance Numa was declared king, and so descended from the augural station. (7-10)

This combination of laying on of hands together with prayer in the installation of a leader is a significant witness to the use of this ritual in settings other than Jewish or Christian contexts. While Livy’s record comes more than 600 years after the event and could thus be suspect, his account establishes that this ritual was not considered inappropriate within the context of the inauguration of a political leader in early Roman practice.⁸⁶² At the same time, the imposition of hands is not mentioned elsewhere in the installation of leaders in Roman civil life. Instead, taking the ‘auspices’ (augury to show the assent of the deity), laying an oath in the hands of the quaestors, usurpation (performing the functions of one’s office, such as sacrificing and teaching), enthronement, and porrection (offering of the instruments of office, such as a sword for

⁸⁶² Livy is considered to have lived from 59 B.C.E. to 17 C.E. Cf. Livy, *Livy I & II*, p. ix.

prefects) all seem to play a role, but not the laying on of hands. Silence on this matter does not demand its absence, but could indicate that something was so banal as not to deserve notice. It seems wiser to conclude, however, that while the concept of laying hands on someone being installed in office was not completely foreign to Roman civil practice, it was not a usual rite.

The selection of leaders was done in variety of ways. Civil rulers would have under-officers whom they had themselves selected.⁸⁶³ Magistrates were selected by election, with some variation on specific method (written vote or show of hands).⁸⁶⁴ The filling of important positions by lot seems to have been a Greek characteristic, with magistracies and priesthoods both being filled in this way.⁸⁶⁵

The concept of shared guilt is not entirely foreign to Roman law, as seen in the rules of noxal surrender related to slaves.⁸⁶⁶ As stated in the *Digest*, 'If a slave kills with the knowledge of his master he makes the master liable for the total sum because the owner himself is regarded as having killed. But if he killed without the master's knowledge the action is noxal because the master ought not to be liable for a slave's wicked deed in more than that he surrender him for the harm.'⁸⁶⁷ No guilt whatsoever was attached to the owner if the slave-owner had directly forbidden the action or was not aware of the intent to commit the transgression.⁸⁶⁸ This was, however, still very different from being responsible for the actions of an equal after appointing that person to a post.

No installation ritual is recorded for those who were leaders in the philosophical schools, and no context for the laying on of hands is found in any records.

⁸⁶³ Ferguson, 'Selection', p. 274.

⁸⁶⁴ Ferguson, 'Selection', p. 275.

⁸⁶⁵ Ferguson, 'Selection', p. 276. Cf. also Poland, *Geschichte*, p. 416.

⁸⁶⁶ Cf. Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, pp. 67-89. 'Noxa' refers to harm done by wrongdoing. The rules of noxal surrender limited the liability of the master for the wrongdoing of his or her slave to the person of the slave himself or herself. In other words, the maximum penalty was the loss of the slave.

⁸⁶⁷ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 68, citing *Dig.* 9.4.2 (based on Ulpian, book 18 on the *Edict*). Watson notes that a system for such shared guilt 'was already in operation by the mid-fifth century B.C. under a provision of the Twelve Tables' (p. 68).

⁸⁶⁸ Watson, *Roman Slave Law*, p. 70.

4.6.4 – Installation of Leaders in the Inscriptions of Voluntary Associations/Collegia

There is no mention of installation of officials and leaders in the voluntary associations and *collegia* through a ritual of the laying on of hands. Membership was typically restricted and controlled, and oaths and fees were used to control the composition and behaviour of the group, but there is little or no mention of specific rituals and practices related to the installation of the leaders. The selection of officers seems to have been modelled after the patterns of civil life, so that appointment, election, and the casting of lots were all used.⁸⁶⁹ Leaders of the *collegia* were generally selected from within the group, and a distinction was made between the patron and the leader.⁸⁷⁰

The concept of shared guilt is suggested in the society of the Iobacchoi, where the Sergeant-at-Arms was required to act to enforce discipline, with a fine levied at his failure to do so.⁸⁷¹ This is, however, quite different from the situation in 1 Tim 5:22, for the Sergeant-at-Arms is charged with reacting to violations, while the PE emphasize guilt on the part of those who may have acted with favouritism in failing to adequately investigate those leaders they were installing.

The Code of the Labyadai offers an example of the members of an association holding their leaders accountable.⁸⁷² What is particularly of interest here is that this is in relationship to the swearing-in oath of the *tagoi*: ‘If they (the members) do not act according to what has been written or do not make the *tagoi* swear the oath, each of them is to pay a fine of 10 drachmas for each offence. Anyone who does not swear may not be a *tagos*. If someone serves as a *tagos* without swearing he is to pay a fine of 50

⁸⁶⁹ Ferguson, ‘Selection’, pp. 273-77. Cf. also Poland, *Geschichte*, p. 416, on the use of lots. Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, p. 43, states that ‘die eigentliche Vollmacht in allen Vereinsangelegenheiten liegt aber bei der Versammlung: Sie gibt dem Verein ein Statut, sie regelt laufende Angelegenheiten durch Dekrete, sie wählt die Amtsträger’ but fails to offer conclusive proof for this. In reality, there seems to have been great diversity between associations in how leaders were chosen, so that no one system (such as election) was consistently used.

⁸⁷⁰ Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 36-37.

⁸⁷¹ Danker, *Benefactor*, p. 159. [Lines 94-96]

⁸⁷² Rhodes and Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 4-5. [Lines B.4-34]

drachmas' (lines B.25-34). While this is closer to the situation of 1 Tim 5:22, it is still quite distant. This instruction among the Labyadai is not related to guilt for having chosen an inadequate leader, but rather for not enforcing the association's rules for that leader: the guilt is for improper enforcement rather than improper selection of leadership. It is arguable whether the imposition of a fine bespeaks a contamination which must be cleansed, but the text does not suggest that the members themselves have somehow become impure. Thus, on the matter of responsibility, there is nothing directly analogous to the instructions to Timothy in 5:22 in the inscriptions of the voluntary associations.

4.7 – Installation of Leaders: Summary

The instructions given to Timothy by the Pastor in 1 Tim 5:22 regarding Timothy's imposition of hands on others best fit a context of the installation or commissioning of leaders. The warnings which follow the injunction against hasty action suggest that doing so would bring attendant participation in (and not just guilt for) the sins of others. In contrast to those elders who serve well and thus deserve double honour (v. 17), those who sin bring dishonour to their fellows and especially to the one who showed favouritism (v. 21), perhaps by failing to make adequate examination (1 Tim 3:2-13). The disciplining of those who sin is to bring fear to their fellows (1 Tim 5:20), but it is far better to remain pure, unsullied by the hasty installation of a leader who brings disrepute on the work of Christ and his or her co-workers.

In this situation, the imposition of hands stands alone as the ceremonial marker: no mention is made of accompanying prayer, prophecy, or the impartation of a spiritual gift. That is not to say that these would not be expected to be present, but this text focuses on the responsibility of the one installing the leader with the imposition of hands. The act of laying hands on someone carries with itself an implication of

fellowship and mutual identity, and those who impose hands on others in installation should do so with forethought. In this case, the responsibility rests with Timothy.

While the gravity of the act of imposing hands and its possible consequences is clear, less obvious is the end result of the act. No mention of a title is made, although the context implies that this is the installation of a governing elder. It seems that titles were not the major issue here, but rather the shared work, which was to be worthy rather than flawed.

In its instructions and warnings 1 Tim 5:22 is close to the remainder of the NT material. Although Paul nowhere else gave instructions about a ritual to be employed in installing resident leaders, he refers to Christian workers in several passages, including ones who were appointed by the church (2 Cor 8:18-19). The method of indicating commissioning (the imposition of hands) and the associated events (prayer, prophecy, and the impartation of a gift) are generally similar to those found in Acts, as also the vagueness in resulting title or office, if any. There are distinct differences, in that greater caution regarding such installation is expressed in the PE, and the movement is away from plenary/ensemble installation (either the Twelve or the congregation in Acts 6:6; the other prophets and teachers in Acts 13:3) to ensemble/solo installation (the elders in 1 Tim 4:14; the Pastor alone or with the elders in 2 Tim 1:6; Timothy only addressed in 1 Tim 5:22, although probably not to act autonomously). In all of these cases the commissioning or installation seems to be to a task rather than an office: even in situations where it would seem natural to give a formal title (Acts 6:6, 'deacons') this is not done. Similarly, in 1 Tim 5:22, although the context is one of leadership and governing elders are mentioned in v. 17, the focus is on the task and not the title.

The writings of the Apostolic Fathers show much more interest in titles and definition of roles. They do not, however, define how the installation of leaders should

proceed. Also, while these have discussion of association in honour and guilt, this is not in the context of selecting and installing leaders.

The context which one might expect to offer examples of similar practices, that of Judaism, gives both an historical precedent in the Jewish Scriptures and significant departures in the era of the NT. The imposition of hands in Jewish pre-Christian practice was employed with varied meanings, just as was also the case in Christian practice. Several acts of commissioning in the OT (the judges, elders, Aaron and his sons, and Joshua) provide information on the installation of leaders, and several of these include imposition of hands. In those situations which included the laying on of hands (Aaron, Joshua) a concept of succession is clearly present, and this is absent in the NT passages, including those in the PE. In the era of the PE the issue of Jewish practice becomes decidedly murky, as commissioning for succession (either called ‘ordination’ or ‘appointment’) clearly occurs, and is given a title related to the laying or leaning on of hands. At the same time, there is significant doubt that the imposition of hands was the method by which new leaders were commissioned, as proclamation and advancement in seating seem to have become the dominant markers of this installation act. Furthermore, it is apparent that the sphere of installation was different: Jewish installation was concerned with judicial leaders, Christian installation with individuals who would serve, go on a mission, and labour in teaching and preaching.

The installation of leaders in non-Jewish and non-Christian Græco-Roman contexts offers very little directly analogous practice. One report given just before the start of the Christian era relates an installation of a civil ruler some six centuries previous with imposition of hands and an accompanying prayer. There are no other similar analogues, nor is there indication of guilt assigned to those who select improper leaders.⁸⁷³

⁸⁷³ As discussed, guilt is associated with improper enforcement of the Code of the Labyadai in relation to leaders, but not with the selection of an improper or inadequate leader.

The scriptural installation accounts are diverse and cannot be easily equated.

It could be argued that the accounts of the installation of Aaron and his sons (Exod 29:1-46) and of the Levites (Num 8:5-22) are more similar to Acts 13:3 and the PE installation passages, while the installations of the seventy judges (Exod 18:13-27) and the seventy elders (Num 11:16-25) are more similar to the situation of Acts 6:6 in that they were ad hoc. While the acts of selecting the judges and the Seven were expressly initiated because of a perceived need within the community, the elders were selected in response to a directive of God (Num 11:16). This was also an action in response to a perceived need, however, in response to the complaint of Moses that he could not bear the burden alone (Num 11:14). By contrast, the installations of Aaron and his sons and of the Levites, and the sending of Barnabas and Saul are recounted as being in response to God's directive, and either were intended or ended up being commitments to essentially life-long service. The commissioning of Joshua is less clearly in either category (God-directed or congregation-requested; durable or ad hoc). It comes in response to a request by Moses (Num 27:15-16) rather than a directive by God, but it is not simply for a current need but rather a life-long commitment. If it is necessary to resolve this hybrid character, it is appropriate to note that Moses' request came in response to a message from God informing him that he would not be entering the Promised Land because of his rebellion in the wilderness of Zin (Num 27:12-14), which would logically necessitate the appointment of a successor. To this God responded with the selection of Joshua, along with a prophecy regarding what Joshua would do (v. 17) and clear instructions (including for the laying on of hands) regarding the appointment of Joshua in the presence of Eleazar and the whole congregation (vv. 18-21). Thus God established the need for a successor and then directed the choice as well as the manner of accomplishing the ceremony.

The PE installation passages seem to have greater affinity to these more durable installations (Aaron and his sons, the Levites, Joshua, Barnabas and Saul).⁸⁷⁴ They have in common with them that God is seen as in some way directing the action, as seen in the prophecy accompanying Timothy's own installation (1 Tim 4:14). While no information is offered as to why certain elements of the process were engaged in, the accounts make it clear that there is laying on of hands by leaders (Paul in 2 Tim 1:6; the elders in 1 Tim 4:14; Timothy in 1 Tim 5:22). In addition, there is an element of durable nature to these installations in the PE. Timothy is not instructed to have hands laid on him again, but rather not to neglect the gift (1 Tim 4:14) and, more positively, to rekindle the flame (2 Tim 1:6). The caution regarding overly hasty laying on of hands and thus becoming a partaker in others' sins suggests an expectation of an ongoing task, although this certainly should not be pressed, and especially not into some notion of apostolic succession or modern concepts of ordination.

The closest analogue, then, to the practice of 1 Tim 5:22 is found in the other NT writings. It is possible that the tradition of Jesus using the imposition of hands in acts of blessing and healing formed a pattern for the practice of the early Church, and that this was extended to commissioning for a task (Acts 6:6; 13:3), but no such connection is implied in the NT. That there was knowledge of Moses' imposition of hands on Joshua is very likely, but this event is also not cited by the early church as justification for its practice, nor is there a developed doctrine of succession in early Christian imposition of hands. It seems most unlikely that contemporary Jewish practice involved the laying on of hands in commissioning and that therefore the church would have been able to observe and copy this.⁸⁷⁵ The imposing of hands as a central

⁸⁷⁴ It must be noted that the setting apart of Barnabas and Saul is not presented in the text as a commitment to life-long service, although in Paul's situation this certainly was a decisive first step on a continuing journey. In addition, Paul is not recorded as ever citing this event as a basis for his authority, but this absence fits a recurring theme in his writing (cf. esp. Gal 1:1, 12, 16-24, but also in Paul's usual opening to his letters: his apostleship is from God, not humans).

⁸⁷⁵ Hoffman, 'Jewish Ordination'.

rite of the ceremony surrounding the installation of leaders was a distinctive of the early Christian congregations.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study of 1 Tim. 5:17-22 has examined the instructions of the Pastor and the practices of reward, discipline and installation of leaders reflected in this text, attempting to understand them within the development of the early Christian movement and by comparison with what can be known about leadership practices in other groups in the ancient world. A summary of the study's main findings follows.

5.1 – The Reward, Discipline, and Installation of Church Leaders

The instructions of the Pastor to Timothy on the proper care of church leaders provide insight into how things were expected to be done in the early church. The first concern is the proper care of leaders who do their work well and indeed work hard at it. Their work is specified as governing the congregation, preaching, and teaching. Such good leaders are worthy of double honour, which raises the question of how one might offer such increased honour. The author uses common rather than lofty examples – those of a threshing ox and of a hired labourer – to indicate a very practical method of honouring the worthy elders: that of supporting them financially.

Unfortunately, rewarding leaders is not the only aspect of care from the congregation: in some cases accusations may be brought against leaders. Timothy is reminded to protect leaders against spurious accusations by ensuring that the scriptural rule of two or three witnesses is followed. Consistent with the original instruction in Deut 19:15, at least two witnesses must have seen the same event and be able to testify regarding the transgression before an accusation can be considered valid so that a proper investigation and case follow. If the necessary witnesses are present and the case is thus established the errant leaders are to be disciplined. While other disciplinary passages indicate private reproof and attempts at restoration within the body, the prominence of the leader means that established guilt is followed by appropriate action

(‘reproof’) before the entire congregation. The intent of this public act of discipline is to cause the other leaders to take care about their own behaviour. The Pastor considers this instruction so urgent that he calls God, Christ Jesus, and the elect angels to witness that he has charged Timothy to conduct proper discipline. There is to be neither pre-judging nor favouritism, which might result in either permitting cases to proceed without proper evidentiary support or not disciplining when this is needed. Good leaders are to be protected and supported to allow them to get their work done; bad leaders are to be disciplined so that the leaders as a group are able to safeguard the entrusted message.

It is much more desirable to deal with good leaders than with bad ones. Therefore Timothy is to be careful in the process of installing leaders for their tasks. Instructions for leadership selection have been given previously, and Timothy is advised not to hurry the process. If he disobeys, he will become a partner in the sins of those he installs. This does not mean that Timothy will bear blame for characteristics which first become apparent much later. He is cautioned to make every reasonable effort to remain pure and without blame. The best way of doing this is to follow the process laid out by the Pastor.

5.2 – The Place of these Practices in the Developing Christian Movement

The best resource for determining the place of these practices in the developing Christian movement remains the literature of that movement itself.⁸⁷⁶ The instructions offered in 1 Tim 5:17-22 suggest that the community reflected in 1 Timothy is in relatively early stages of its development. It is sufficiently established to have leaders. The author considers it necessary to give instructions and make provision for the reward and discipline of present leaders and the installation of further leaders. These provisions are fundamental and would not likely be urged on a mature and well-

⁸⁷⁶ The inscriptions of the voluntary associations with cognate elements to the instructions of the PE are not directly contemporaneous with the early Christian movement.

established community. Most of the instruction stresses the need to do these things rather than providing developed guidelines. The details of the processes are somewhat sketchy, suggesting these have not yet been refined through a great deal of application and testing.

The concern of the author is not with titles and offices but rather with functions crucial to the survival of the group. Hence the leaders are identified in terms of what they do rather than with an assigned title. If there is a concept of succession, it concerns itself with transmission of the teaching rather than impartation of authority. The congregation itself has significant power, in that public exposure of the failure of a leader is viewed as a potent deterrent for the other leaders.

The concept of rewarding congregational leaders by paying them is seen by many as indicating a later date for the described community. However, the idea of supporting itinerant apostles and Christian workers is well-represented in the authentic Pauline material, so that the development of the concept of paying resident leaders does not demand a date indicating a second- or third-century community. The author is urging Timothy to do something which could very easily be derived from that which Paul considered normal when he wrote to the Corinthian congregation. There is quite certainly none of the concern with titles and offices seen in the writings of Ignatius (died ca. 98-107 C.E.). The PE material and its setting are either earlier or may represent a tradition different from that of Ignatius. The latter is unlikely, as both the PE material and Ignatius are considered to stand in the Pauline tradition.

The directives regarding discipline of the leader may indicate a more developed community. While the instructions are basic and elementary rather than exhibiting the detail of those of more established groups (cf. the rabbinic materials), there are enough leaders present that some would err and some would deserve honour. However, it would be foolhardy to suggest that the presence of error indicates a long period of development: this is simply not borne out by human experience. The mode of discipline

may offer the most help here. The disciplinary instructions in the Pauline corpus stress community and commonality. When discipline or correction occurred, it happened openly and involved the whole congregation, for the benefit of all (1 Cor 5:4-5, 11-13; 2 Cor 2:6). In the same way, the core event in the disciplinary response to an erring leader in 1 Tim 5:20 is a rebuke before the congregation, which was to cause the others to fear. This implication that potential transgressors in the group would mend their ways in response to peer pressure and the public disclosure of another may also suggest a group which has not yet become jaded through routinization.

The instructions related to the installation of the leader are the shortest of the triad. If it could be shown that there was rabbinic 'ordination' in Palestine or in the diasporan Jewish communities during the first centuries of the church, one might be able to find some aspects of common practice which assist in placing the development of this practice. This is not the case, and the best known precedents for the imposition of hands would have been knowledge of Moses' appointment of Joshua and the oral traditions of Jesus' imposition of hands in acts of healing and blessing. The early church carried on this same practice, adding to it the laying on of hands in commissioning (Acts 6:6; 13:3), and 1 Tim 5:22 seems to be no more than an extension of this, investing it with further gravitas. There is no hint that the act of laying on of hands conveyed authority or was an act expressing succession. Rather, it seems to have been an act of solidarity and well-wishing generally accompanied by prayer and prophecy. There is definite development of understanding by the time of writing of the PE, for the warnings regarding rushing into such an installation do not appear in the earlier material. At the same time, the very simple instructions do not look at all like the developed, complex, and meaning-laden activities of later ordination rituals, such as those seen in the *Apostolic Tradition*.⁸⁷⁷

⁸⁷⁷ Cf. Chupungco, 'Ordination Theology', also P. F. Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1990); J. F. Puglisi, *The*

The community reflected in the PE, whatever the time of writing of the actual documents, seems to have been one in relatively early stages of its development. Organization was occurring, but some rudimentary practices were still being defined. There is no reason why the instructions for itinerant ministers would not have been applied to resident leaders as soon as these were present. Indeed, as seen later in the *Didache*, regular provision was made for resident leaders while restrictions were placed on the support for itinerant ministers. The seeds of all three of these practices were present in the undisputed Paulines (up to ca. 58 C.E.) and may well have issued in the instructions seen in the PE before another decade had passed.

5.3 – The Relation of these Practices to Quasi-Cognate Groups

The church has no option but to face contact with the world: withdrawal renders the disciple-making process difficult at best. To what extent do these instructions regarding reward, discipline, and installation of leaders reflect those societies in the world of the communities of the PE? The nuanced approach suggested by J.Z. Smith has been useful in identifying practices in the surrounding quasi-cognate groups which show points of compatibility with those of the PE.⁸⁷⁸ At the same time, there is no directly or closely parallel group in either the Jewish or Græco-Roman contexts.

The instructions regarding discipline show the greatest affinity between the PE and the literature of the rabbis. The Pastor interprets the Jewish Scriptures regarding evidence and punishment in traditional rather than innovative fashion, and his conclusions do not differ markedly from those of the rabbinic scholars contemporary with the first-century Christian movement. Other groups, including the Qumran community, differed on the need for concurrent witnessing as well as on some of the disciplinary actions themselves. The Qumran community and some of the associations

Process of Admission to Ordained Ministry: A Comparative Study (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996).

⁸⁷⁸ As discussed in section 1.3, these groups are not truly cognate, primarily because they are not demonstrably contemporaneous with the communities of the PE.

made provision for accusations against a leader. Discipline in the associations could only be imposed against a leader when that leader left office and again became a regular member of the group. There was thus effective immunity during the time of office, which is very different from the PE. In the non-Pauline portions of the NT the disciplinary instruction also differs (established guilt is first dealt with privately), reflecting a different context and goal.

The presence of specific and consistent rituals for the installation of leaders is not prominent in the cognate groups, other than a fairly consistent swearing of an oath by the office-taker. The act of imposing hands in appointing or commissioning was not unknown in the ancient Græco-Roman context or in the Torah. It does not, however, seem to have played a role in the practice of any group contemporary with the early church. The church seems to have invested a formerly known practice with new meaning. The laying on of hands in a context of sacrifice was probably still being performed in the Jewish temple practice in the time of the very early church but this was a rite concerned with a reminder of sins and the need for atonement rather than installation. Whether the early church simply added new meaning to its tradition about Jesus' laying on hands in blessing and healing or whether something else led to this practice is not known.

The honourable reward of leaders is essentially absent from the cognate groups. While the Jewish priests and Levites were supported by the tithe, this was involuntary and was given by the people to God rather than to the priests and Levites, and this distinction was considered important.⁸⁷⁹ Although Paul cited this precedent as justification for the tangible support of itinerant apostles and teachers in the early Christian movement, it was not understood in rabbinic circles as justifying compensation for the rabbis who taught the law. Some philosophers were supported by

⁸⁷⁹ It was this understanding that, in effect, God provided the priests and Levites their support which was used by Philo to argue that there should be no disrepute associated with being supported by the tithe rather than supporting oneself by working (cf. the earlier discussion in 2.6.1.1).

their students, but this was definitely not viewed as honourable by all of their peers. The voluntary associations, while honouring leaders with reduction of fees and other benefits, generally expected that leaders would provide for the group rather than be provided for. Græco-Roman society particularly expected those with wealth and position to support others. The use of ‘honour’ language in connection with the support of leaders implies that social standards of respect were not summarily ignored. This is reinforced by the general concern displayed in the PE for a peaceful life, a good reputation with outsiders, and general affirmation of social structures. This creates a tension between the apparent need to support leaders and to do so without dishonouring them or damaging their reputation.

A possible resolution of this and other tensions, including those related to the discipline of leaders, might possibly be found within contemporary concepts of equality. Both bestowed equality and exchanges among status equals were known in Græco-Roman society. These latter egalitarian transactions permitted mutual support and also enabled discipline.⁸⁸⁰ The community of the PE was not made up of actual status equals, but may have been viewed by its participants as bestowing a unity and perhaps a level of equality in Christ on group members.⁸⁸¹ This is not to say that the congregations were egalitarian. The dominant model seems to have been the more hierarchical one of the ‘household of God’ (1 Tim 3:15; 2 Tim 2:20-21). Even here, the entire household is subject to the ‘owner of the house’, who is God (2 Tim 2:21). The general structure of voluntary associations, with a patron corresponding to Christ, the head, and leaders chosen from among the members, is instructive here.⁸⁸² There is no

⁸⁸⁰ Cf. especially the restriction on discipline of leaders in the voluntary associations while they were leaders. This was lifted once they reverted to common membership (became equals with the others).

⁸⁸¹ Cf. the picture of the church as members of Christ’s body, which argues for the importance and interdependence of all members (1 Cor 12:12-30). Note the inclusion of leaders in Paul’s discussion in vv. 27-30. Cf. also Livy’s similar use of a body analogy: Livy, *Livy I & II*, II.32.9-12. Livy’s analogy was used to argue against revolt, while Paul’s analogy argues for unity in diversity.

⁸⁸² Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität*, pp. 36-37. Cf. Ascough, *Paul’s Macedonian Associations*, pp. 59-61, who observes that the associations tended to be hierarchical in respect to their patrons and leaders, and egalitarian in respect to the common membership. Cf. also D. C. Duling, ‘Matthew 18:15-17: Conflict, Confrontation, and Conflict Resolution in a “Fictive Kin” Association’, *BTB*, 29

indication that Pauline communities, including those in the PE, were deliberately based on a model of bestowed equality, but it does appear that people who had been a part of such an association would not have considered the arrangement of the congregations to be unfamiliar.

In the three practices examined in this study it is apparent that no clear genealogical connection exists between the quasi-cognate groups and the community described in the PE. While discussions of all three practices could be considered to have some Scriptural precedent, none of them seems to be taken unaltered directly from the practices of contemporary or near-contemporary groups of the PE congregations. One of the most striking aspects to be found when comparing the instructions to practices in quasi-cognate groups is the diversity of analogy. Some elements, such as the demand for multiple independent witnesses to a single event and the provision of support for ministers (though voluntary in the PE), find their closest analogue in Jewish practice. Others, such as the concern with honour and the bestowal of equality, are more similar to Græco-Roman practice.

For the Pastor, the gospel—which is God’s work—is of paramount importance (e.g., 1 Tim 1:4, 11, 15-16; 2:1-7; 4:10, 16). In this setting, if the support of leaders enables the work to move ahead, then this is to be provided. But these leaders are not to be dishonoured in the process so as to make them ineffective. Spurious accusations and harassment of leaders are to be prevented. If the leaders are harming the work, they are to be disciplined as necessary ‘pour encourager les autres’. Timothy is urged to guard the deposit, the message. That may not change, and all attempts to subvert it are to be rebuffed.

The approach of focusing on individual aspects of practice has helped to shed light on the reward, discipline, and installation of leaders as taught in the PE.

(1999), 4-22, p. 8, who comments on the generally egalitarian and poor membership of the associations, but also notes that ‘voluntary associations tended to become hierarchical and thus mirror social stratification in the macrosociety’.

Inevitably, as more inscriptions and primary documents become available, it may well be that the findings of this study can be further nuanced. It has, however, become clear that there is one major area in particular that would merit fuller investigation in a further study, and that is the relationship between the household model for the church in the PE, possible notions of equality inherited from the Pauline tradition, and surrounding views of honour attached to leaders in Græco-Roman society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, N., *Taufe und Handauflegung: Eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung von Apg 8, 14-17*, NTAbh 19/3, ed. M. Meinertz (Münster Westfalen: Aschendorf, 1951)
- _____, 'Die Handauflegung im NT bereits ein Bußritus? Zur Auslegung von I Tim 5, 22', in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss and F. Mußner (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963), 1-6
- Aejmelaeus, L., 'The Question of Salary in the Conflict Between Paul and the "Super Apostles" in Corinth', in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*, ed. I. Dunderberg, C. M. Tuckett and K. Syreeni, NovTSup103 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 343-76
- Agrell, G., *Work, Toil and Sustenance: An Examination of the View of Work in the New Testament, Taking into Consideration Views Found in Old Testament, Intertestamental, and Early Rabbinic writings*, trans. S. Westerholm (Stockholm: Verbum - H. Ohlsson, 1976)
- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 26, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971)
- Aleshire, D., 'Ordination and the Minister's Personhood and Character', *RevExp* 78, no. 4 (1981): 539-47
- Alexander, L., 'IPSE DIXIT: Citation of Authority in Paul and in the Jewish and Hellenistic Schools', in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 103-127
- Alexander, P. S., 'Hellenism and Hellenization as Problematic Historiographical Categories', in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 63-80
- Allen, L. C., *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976)
- Andersen, L., 'Heresy and Church Discipline: What are the Limits of Tolerance in the Church?' *EuroJTh* 10 (2001): 13-23
- Anderson, H., 'Jesus: Aspects of the Question of His Authority', in *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*, ed. J. Neusner et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 290-310
- Asano, A., *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological and Socio-Historical Studies*, JSNTSup 285, ed. M. Goodacre (London: T&T Clark, 2005)
- Ascough, R. S., 'Translocal Relationships among Voluntary Associations and Early Christianity', *J ECS* 5, no. Summer (1997): 223-41

- _____, *What Are They Saying About the Formation of Pauline Churches?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1998)
- _____, 'Benefaction Gone Wrong: The "Sin" of Ananias and Sapphira in Context', in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson*, ed. M. R. Desjardins, P. Richardson and S. G. Wilson, SCJud 9 (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000), 91-110
- _____, 'Matthew and Community Formation', in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson, S.J.*, ed. W. G. Thompson and D. E. Aune (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 96-126
- _____, *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians*, WUNT 2/161, ed. J. Frey, M. Hengel and O. Hofius (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003)
- Ashley, T. R., *The Book of Numbers*, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993)
- Attridge, H. W., *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia, ed. H. Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989)
- Auffarth, C., and L. T. Stuckenbruck, *The Fall of the Angels*, TBN 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2004)
- Banks, R. J., *Paul's Idea of Community*. Rev. edn (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994)
- Barclay, J. M. G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996)
- _____, 'Matching Theory and Practice: Josephus' Constitutional Ideal and Paul's Strategy in Corinth', in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 139-63
- Barclay, W., *Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon*, DSBS. rev. edn (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975)
- Bardtke, H., 'Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften', *TLZ* 86, no. 2 (1961): 92-103
- Barker, K. L., and D. W. Bailey, *Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah*, NAC 20, ed. E. R. Clendenen, K. A. Mathews and D. S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999)
- Barnett, P., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, ed. G. D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997)
- Barrett, C. K., *The Pastoral Epistles in the New English Bible*, NCB.NT, ed. H. F. D. Sparks (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963)
- _____, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC. 1st edn, ed. H. Chadwick (New York: Harper & Row, 1968)

- _____, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC, ed. H. Chadwick (London: A. & C. Black, 1973)
- _____, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles: I-XIV*, ICC, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994)
- _____, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles: XV-XXVIII*, ICC. Repr. with corrections edn (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002)
- Barton, S. C., and G. H. R. Horsley, 'A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches', *JAC* 24 (1981): 7-41
- Bartsch, H. W., *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen: Studien zu den Pastoralbriefen* (Hamburg: Evangelischer Verlag, 1965)
- Bassler, J. M., 'Limits and Differentiation: The Calculus of Widows in 1 Timothy 5.3-16', in *Feminist companion to the Deutero-Pauline writings*, ed. A.-J. Levine and M. Blickenstaff, *FCNT* 7 (London: Continuum, 2003), 122-46
- Bauckham, R., *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, *BAFCS* 4, ed. B. W. Winter (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995)
- Bauernfeind, O., and V. Metelmann, *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*, *WUNT* 22, ed. J. Jeremias et al. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1980)
- Baumgarten, A., 'Graeco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Ancient Jewish Sects', in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 93-111
- Beasley-Murray, P., *Anyone for Ordination? A Contribution to the Debate on Ordination* (Tunbridge Wells: MARC, 1993)
- Beavis, M. A., "'If Anyone Will Not Work, Let Them Not Eat": 2 Thessalonians 3.10 and the Social Support of Women', in *Feminist Companion to the Deutero-Pauline Writings*, ed. A.-J. Levine and M. Blickenstaff, *FCNT* 7 (London: Continuum, 2003), 29-36
- Beckwith, R. T., *Elders in Every City: The Origin and Role of the Ordained Ministry* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2003)
- Behm, J., *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum: Nach Verwendung, Herkunft und Bedeutung in religionsgeschichtlichem Zusammenhang untersucht*. 2nd. unaltered edn (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968)
- Bennett, D. W., *Metaphors of Ministry: Biblical Images for Leaders and Followers* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993)
- Benoit, P., *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, trans. B. Weatherhead (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1969)
- Berger, M. S., *Rabbinic Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

- Bernard, J. H., *The Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899)
- Berthoud, P., 'Heresy and Church Discipline: What are the Limits of Tolerance in the Church?' *EuroJTh* 10 (2001): 3-12
- Bertinoro, O., *Seder Zeraim, 5: A New Translation with an Anthologized Commentary*, trans. M. Rabinovitch, MishAS. 1st edn (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Mesorah Publications, 2004)
- Best, E., *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, HNTC. 1st U.S. edn, ed. H. Chadwick (New York: Harper & Row, 1972)
- Betz, H. D., *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979)
- _____, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul*, Hermeneia, ed. G. W. MacRae (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985)
- Binder, D. D., *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*, SBLDS 169, ed. M. V. Fox and M. A. Powell (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999)
- Blackman, P., *Mishnayoth: Pointed Hebrew Text, English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Supplement, Appendix, Indexes, Addenda, Corrigenda*. 2nd: rev., corr., enl. edn, 7 vols (New York: Judaica Press, 1963-1990)
- Blank, J., and K. Kertelge, *Der Prozess gegen Jesus: Historische Rückfrage und theologische Deutung*, QD 112 (Freiburg: Herder, 1988)
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. R. W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961)
- Blinzler, J., *Der Prozess Jesu*. 4th edn (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969)
- Blinzler, J., O. Kuss, and F. Mussner, *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963)
- Boring, M. E., K. Berger, and C. Colpe, *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995)
- Bornkamm, G., 'πρέσβυς, πρεσβύτερος, πρεσβύτης, συμπρεσβύτερος, πρεσβυτέριον, πρεσβεύω', trans. G. W. Bromiley, in *TDNT*, ed. G. Kittel, G. Friedrich and G. W. Bromiley, 6 (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1968), 651-83
- Borse, U., *1. und 2. Timotheusbrief, Titusbrief*, SKKNT 13, ed. P.-G. Müller (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985)
- Bovon, F., *Studies in Early Christianity*, WUNT 161, ed. J. Frey et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003)

- Bradshaw, P. F., *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1990)
- _____, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 1992)
- Brandon, S. G. F., *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1968)
- Brandt, W., *Apostolische Anweisung für den kirchlichen Dienst: Eine Einführung in die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (Berlin: Im Furche=Verlag, 1941)
- Bratcher, R. G., *A Translator's Guide to Paul's Letters to Timothy and to Titus, UBS.HT* (London: United Bible Societies, 1983)
- Brooks, J. A., *Mark*, NAC 23, ed. D. S. Dockery et al. (Nashville: Broadman, 1991)
- Brooten, B. J., *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*, BJS 36, ed. J. Neusner et al. (Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1982)
- Brown, R. E., *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (London: Chapman, 1984)
- Brox, N., *Die Pastoralbriefe: Übersetzt und erklärt*, RNT 7/2. 4th edn, ed. O. Kuss (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969)
- _____, 'Historische und theologische Probleme der Pastoralbriefe des Neuen Testaments', *Kairos* 16, no. 1 (1969): 81-94
- _____, 'Lukas als Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe?' *JAC* 13 (1970): 62-77
- _____, *Falsche Verfasserangaben: Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie*, SBS 79 (Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1975)
- Bruce, F. F., *Paul & Jesus* (London: S.P.C.K., 1974)
- _____, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, WBC 45 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982)
- _____, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, ed. W. W. Gasque and I. H. Marshall (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982)
- _____, *The Book of the Acts*, NICNT. Rev. edn, ed. G. D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988)
- _____, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd. rev. and enl. edn (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990)
- _____, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT. Rev. edn, ed. G. D. Fee (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1990)
- Burkert, W., *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987)
- Bürki, H. F., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an Timotheus*, WSB. 2nd edn, ed. F. Rienecker, W. de Boor and A. Pohl (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1976)

- Burkill, T. A., 'The Trial of Jesus', *VC* 12 (1958): 1-18
- Burtchaell, J. T., *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Campbell, R. A., *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity*, SNTW, ed. J. Riches (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994)
- Campenhausen, H., *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, BHT 14, ed. G. Ebeling (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953)
- Capper, B., 'The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods', in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. R. Bauckham, BAFCS 4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), 323-56
- Catchpole, D. R., *The Trial of Jesus: A Study in the Gospels and Jewish Historiography from 1770 to the Present Day*, StPB 18 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971)
- Charlesworth, J. H., ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1983)
- _____, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985)
- _____, and L. Novakovic, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002)
- Childs, B. S., *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*, OTL, ed. P. Ackroyd et al. (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1974)
- Chow, J. K., *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSOT, 1992)
- Christensen, D. L., *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9, revised*, WBC 6A, ed. B. M. Metzger et al. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001)
- _____, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, WBC 6B, ed. B. M. Metzger et al. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002)
- Chrysostom, J., and P. Schaff, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, NPNF¹ 13 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976)
- Chupungco, A. J., 'Ordination Theology in the Apostolic Tradition', in *Mysterium Christi: Symbolgegenwart und theologische Bedeutung: Festschrift für Basil Studer*, ed. B. Studer, M. Löhrer and E. Salmann, SA 116 (Roma: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1995), 107-30

- Clarke, A. D., *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*, AGJU 18 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993)
- _____, *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers*, FCGRW, ed. A. D. Clarke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999)
- Clement, *The Apostolic Fathers: Part 1: S. Clement of Rome: A Revised Text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations*, by J.B. Lightfoot. 2nd edn (London: Macmillan, 1890)
- Cohen, B., 'Evidence in Jewish Law', in *RSJB 16* (Brussels: Editions de la librairie encyclopédique, 1964), 103-115
- Collins, R. F., 'The Image of Paul in the Pastorals', *LTP* 131, no. 2 (1975): 147-73
- _____, *Letters that Paul Did Not Write: The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Pseudepigrapha*, GNS 28, ed. R. J. Karris (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988)
- Conzelmann, H., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. 11th edn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969)
- _____, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, trans. J. Bowden, NTL (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969)
- Coppens, J., 'Imposition of Hands', in *NCE 7*, ed. Catholic University of America (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 401-3
- _____, 'L'imposition des Mains dans les Actes des Apôtres', in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, ed. J. Kremer, BETL 48 (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1979), 405-38
- Cotter, W., 'The Collegia and Roman Law: State Restrictions on Voluntary Associations', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 74-89
- Coxe, A. C., J. Donaldson, and A. Roberts, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers*, 7. Authorized edn, 10 vols (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989)
- Craigie, P. C., *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976)
- Cremer, H., 'Handauflegung', in *RE*, 3rd edn, ed. J. J. Herzog, A. Hauck and H. Caselmann, 7 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1896), 387-89
- Crook, J. A., *Law and Life of Rome*, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life, ed. H. H. Scullard (London: Thames & Hudson, 1967)
- Cross, F. M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd edn (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995)
- Culpepper, R. A., 'The Biblical Basis of Ordination', *RevExp* 78, no. 4 (1981): 471-84

- Danker, F. W., *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis, MO: Clayton Publishing House, 1982)
- _____, 'Paul's Debt to the *De Corona* of Demosthenes: A Study of Rhetorical Techniques in Second Corinthians', in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. G. A. Kennedy and D. F. Watson, JSNTSup 50 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 262-80
- Danker, F. W. et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000)
- Daube, D., *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, JPHRL (New York: Arno Press, 1973)
- Davies, P. R., *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*, JSOTSup 25 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983)
- Davies, W. D., and D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol I: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*, ICC, 1, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton, 3 vols (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988)
- _____, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol II: Commentary on Matthew VIII-XVIII*, ICC, 2, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton, 3 vols (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991)
- _____, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Vol III: Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII*, ICC, 3, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton, 3 vols (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997)
- de Vos, C. S., *Church and Community Conflicts: The Relationships of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with Their Wider Civic Communities* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999)
- Demosthenes, *Demosthenes, Private Orations*, trans. A. T. Murray, LCL 346, 2, 4 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949)
- Derrett, J. D. M., *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1970)
- _____, 'Judgement and 1 Corinthians 6', *NTS* 37, no. Jan (1991): 22-36
- DeSilva, D. A., *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000)
- Dibelius, M., and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, trans. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro, Hermeneia, ed. H. Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972)

- Dix, G., 'The Ministry in the Early Church', in *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy*, ed. K. E. Kirk (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946), 183-303
- Dombrowski, B. W. W., *Ideological and Socio-Structural Developments of the Qumran Association as Suggested by Internal Evidence of Dead Sea Scrolls*, QM 11, ed. Z. J. Kapera (Kraków: Enigma Press, 1994)
- Donelson, L. R., *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*, HUT 22 (Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986)
- Donfried, K. P., *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002)
- Donfried, K. P., and I. H. Marshall, *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*, NTTh, ed. J. D. G. Dunn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Dornier, P., *Les Épîtres pastorales*, SB (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1969)
- Douglas, M., *Constructive Drinking: Perspectives on Drink from Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- Downing, F. G., *Cynics, Paul and the Pauline Churches: Cynics and Christian Origins II* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Driver, S. R., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, ICC. 3d edn, ed. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer and C. A. Briggs (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973)
- Duff, A. M., *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1958)
- Duling, D. C., 'Matthew 18:15-17: Conflict, Confrontation, and Conflict Resolution in a "Fictive Kin" Association', *BTB* 29, no. 1 (1999): 4-22
- Dungan, D. L., *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971)
- Dunn, J. D. G., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC, ed. H. Chadwick (London: A & C Black, 1993)
- _____, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998)
- _____, '1 and 2 Timothy and Titus', in *The Second Letter to the Corinthians, the Letter to the Galatians, the Letter to the Ephesians, the Letter to the Philippians, the Letter to the Colossians, the First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians, the First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus, the Letter to Philemon*, ed. L. E. Keck, NIB, 11 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), 773-880
- Durham, J. I., *Exodus*, WBC 3, ed. D. A. Hubbard et al. (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987)

- Ebel, E., *Die Attraktivität früher christlicher Gemeinden: Die Gemeinde von Korinth im Spiegel griechisch-römischer Vereine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004)
- Ehrhardt, A. A., *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953)
- _____, 'Jewish and Christian Ordination', *JEH* 5 (1954): 125-38
- _____, *The Apostolic Ministry*, SJTh.OP 7 (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958)
- _____, *The Framework of the New Testament Stories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964)
- Ehrman, B. D., *The Apostolic Fathers: Vol 1: I Clement, II Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache*, LCL 24 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003)
- _____, *The Apostolic Fathers: Vol 2: Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas*, LCL 25 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003)
- Ellingworth, P., *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, ed. I. H. Marshall and W. W. Gasque (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1993)
- Elliott, J. H., 'Disgraced Yet Graced: The Gospel According to 1 Peter in the Key of Honor and Shame', *BTB* 25, #4, no. Winter (1995): 166-178
- _____, 'Elders as Honored Household Heads and Not Holders of "Office" in Earliest Christianity', *BTB* 33, no. 2 (2003): 77-82
- _____, 'The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian But Family-Oriented', *BibInt* 11, no. 2 (2003): 173-210
- Elliott, J. K., *The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus* (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1968)
- Ellis, E. E., 'Paul and his Co-Workers', *NTS* 17 (1970-71): 437-52
- _____, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*, WUNT 18, ed. M. Hengel, J. Jeremias and O. Michel (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1978)
- _____, 'Traditions in the Pastoral Epistles', in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987)
- _____, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1989)
- _____, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*, WUNT 54 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991)
- _____, 'The Pastorals and Paul', *ExpTim* 104, no. 2 (1992): 45-47

- _____, 'Pseudonymity and Canonicity of New Testament Documents', in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*, ed. M. J. Wilkins and T. Paige, JSNTSup 87, 87 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 212-224
- Engberg-Pedersen, T., ed., *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*, SNTW, ed. J. Riches (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995)
- Eno, R. B., *Teaching Authority in the Early Church*, MFC 14, ed. T. Halton (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1984)
- Enslin, M. S., *Letters to the Churches: 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, BGd 18 (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963)
- Epstein, I., *The Babylonian Talmud*, 18 vols (London: Soncino Press, 1961)
- Falk, Z. W., *Hebrew Law in Biblical Times: An Introduction*. 2nd edn (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2001)
- Fee, G. D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987)
- _____, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, NIBC. rev. edn (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988)
- _____, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994)
- Ferguson, E., 'Jewish and Christian Ordination: Some Observations', *HTR* 56, no. 1 (1963): 13-19
- _____, 'Selection and Installation to Office in Roman, Greek, Jewish and Christian Antiquity', *TZ* 30 (1974): 273-84
- _____, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993)
- _____, ed., *Early Christianity and Judaism*, SECh 6, ed. E. Ferguson, D. M. Scholer and P. C. Finney (London: Garland, 1993)
- Fine, S., ed., *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. J. Baumgarten et al. (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Fiore, B., *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*, AnBib 105 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986)
- _____, 'Household Rules at Ephesus: Good News, Bad News, No News', in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. A. J. Malherbe et al., NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 589-607

- _____, 'The Pastoral Epistles in the Light of Philodemus' "On Frank Criticism"', in *Philodemus and the New Testament World*, ed. J. T. Fitzgerald, D. Obbink and G. S. Holland, NovTSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 271-93
- Fishwick, D., *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, EPRO 108 (Leiden: Brill, 1987)
- Fitzmyer, J. A., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: G. Chapman, 1971)
- _____, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1998)
- _____, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000)
- Forkman, G., *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community Within the Qumran Sect, Within Rabbinic Judaism, and Within Primitive Christianity*, ConBNT 5 (Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1972)
- France, R. T., *The Gospel According to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC, ed. L. Morris (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985)
- _____, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002)
- Frend, W. H. C., 'The *Seniores Laici* and the Origins of the Church in North Africa', *JTS* 12 (1961): 280-84
- Fuller, J. W., 'Of Elders and Triads in 1 Timothy 5. 19-25', *NTS* 29 (1983): 258-63
- Fung, R. Y. K., 'Function or Office? A Survey of the New Testament Evidence', *ERT* 8, no. 1 (1984): 16-39
- _____, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT, ed. G. D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988)
- Furnish, V. P., *II Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984)
- García Martínez, F., and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume One, 1Q1-4Q273* (Leiden: Brill, 2000)
- _____, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume Two, 4Q274-11Q31* (Leiden: Brill, 2000)
- García Martínez, F., and J. C. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writing, Beliefs and Practices*, trans. W. G. E. Watson (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995)
- Garland, D. E., *2 Corinthians*, NAC 29, ed. E. R. Clendenen (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1999)

- Garnsey, P., *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)
- _____, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
- Gärtner, B. E., *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1965)
- Gavin, F., 'Rabbinic Parallels in Early Church Orders', in *Early Christianity and Judaism*, ed. E. Ferguson, D. M. Scholer and P. C. Finney, SECh 6 (London: Garland, 1993), 159-71
- Gese, M., *Das Vermächtnis des Apostels: Die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie im Epheserbrieff*, WUNT 2/99 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)
- Gill, D. W. J., and C. H. Gempf, *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting*, BAFCS 2, ed. B. W. Winter (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994)
- Goodman, M., *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- _____, 'Jews, Greeks, and Romans', in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 3-14
- Green, G. L., *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, PiNTC (Leicester: Apollos, 2002)
- Green, W. S., 'Reading the Writing of Rabbinism: Toward an Interpretation of Rabbinic Literature', *JAAR* 51, no. 2 (1983): 191-206
- Günther, M., *Die Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Ephesus*, ARGU 1 (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1995)
- Guthrie, D., *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC. 2nd. edn (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990)
- Hagner, D. A., 'Balancing the Old and the New: The Law of Moses in Matthew and Paul', *Int* 51, no. 1 (1997): 20-30
- Hainz, J., 'Amt und Amtsvermittlung bei Paulus', in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), 109-22
- _____, 'Die Anfänge des Bischofs- und Diakonenamtes', in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), 91-107
- Hanson, A. T., *The Pastoral Letters: Commentary on the First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus*, CBC, ed. P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney and J. W. Packer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966)

- _____, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* (London: S.P.C.K., 1968)
- _____, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: S.P.C.K., 1974)
- _____, *The Pastoral Epistles: Based on the Revised Standard Version*, NCB (London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1982)
- Hanson, R. P. C., *Tradition in the Early Church*, LHD, ed. S. L. Greenslade et al. (London: SCM Press, 1962)
- Haraguchi, T., 'Das Unterhaltsrecht des frühchristlichen Verkündigers: Eine Untersuchung zur Bezeichnung ἐργάτης im Neuen Testament', *ZNW* 84 (1993): 178-95
- Harding, M., *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*, SBLit 3, ed. H. Gossai (New York: Peter Lang, 1998)
- _____, *What Are They Saying About the Pastoral Epistles?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2001)
- Harland, P., *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2003)
- Harris, G., 'The Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Corinthians 5', *NTS* 37 (1991): 1-21
- Harrison, J. R., *Paul's Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context*, WUNT 2/172, ed. J. Frey et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003)
- Hartley, J. E., *Leviticus*, WBC 4, ed. D. A. Hubbard et al. (Dallas: Word Books, 1992)
- Harvey, A. E., 'Elders', *JTS* 25 (1974): 318-32
- _____, "'The Workman is Worthy of His Hire": Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church', *NovT* 24, no. 3 (1982): 209-21
- Haslehurst, R. S. T., *Some Account of the Penitential Discipline of the Early Church in the First Four Centuries* (London: SPCK, 1921)
- Hauck, F., 'κόπος, κοπιᾶω', trans. G. W. Bromiley, in *TDNT*, ed. G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1965), 827-30
- Hedrick, C. W., *The Decrees of the Demotionidai*, ACSt 22 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990)
- Helyer, L. R., *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002)
- Hemer, C. J., and C. H. Gempf, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990)
- Hempel, C., *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*, STDJ 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1998)

- _____, *The Damascus Texts*, CQSc 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000)
- Hendriksen, W., *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew*, NTCO (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973)
- Hinson, E. G., 'Ordination in Christian History', *RevExp* 78, no. 4 (1981): 485-96
- Hirsch, S. R., *Deuteronomy*, trans. I. Levy, PTE, 5. 2nd edn, 5 vols (New York: Judaica Press, 1971)
- Hock, R. F., 'Paul's Tentmaking and the Problem of his Social Class', *JBL* 97, no. 4 (1978): 555-64
- _____, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980)
- Hoehner, H. W., *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002)
- Hoffman, L. A., 'Jewish Ordination on the Eve of Christianity', *StLi* 13, no. 2-4 (1979): 11-41
- Holmberg, B., *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980)
- Holmes, J. M., *Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, JSNTSup 196; SNTG 7, ed. S. E. Porter (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000)
- Holmes, M. W., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Updated edn (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999)
- Holtz, G., *Die Pastoralbriefe*, THKNT 13, ed. D. E. Fascher (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965)
- Horrell, D. G., *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*, SNTW, ed. J. Barclay, J. Marcus and J. Riches (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996)
- _____, 'Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity', in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*, ed. D. G. Horrell (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 309-58
- _____, ed., *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999)
- Horst, F., and H. W. Wolff, *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*, NBZJ 12 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1961)
- Houlden, J. L., *The Pastoral Epistles: I and II Timothy, Titus* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976)

- Hübner, H., *Vetus Testamentum in Novo* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)
- Huttunen, P., *The Social Strata in the Imperial City of Rome: A Quantitative Study of the Social Representation in the Epitaphs Published in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, volumen VI* (Oulu [Finland]: University of Oulu, 1974)
- Hyldahl, N., *The History of Early Christianity*, SRHEC 3, ed. G. Lüdemann (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997)
- Instone-Brewer, D., 'Paul's Literal Interpretation of "Do Not Muzzle the Ox"', in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture*, ed. P. Helm and C. R. Trueman (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 139-53
- _____, *Prayer and Agriculture*, TRENT 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004)
- Isocrates, *Isocrates in Three Volumes*, trans. L. Van Hook, LCL 373, 3, 3 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954)
- Jackson, B. S., *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History*, SJLA10, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975)
- _____, 'Damascus Document IX, 16-23 and Parallels', *RevQ* 9, no. 3 (1978): 445-50
- Jacob, B., *The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992)
- Jay, E. G., 'From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters', *SecCent* 1, no. 3 (1981): 125-162
- Jeremias, J., *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*, trans. F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969)
- Jeremias, J., and H. Strathmann, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus: Der Brief an die Hebräer*, NTD 9. 8th edn, ed. P. Althaus and G. Friedrich (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963)
- Johnson, L. A., 'Satan Talk in Corinth: The Rhetoric of Conflict', *BTB* 29, no. 4 (1999): 145-55
- Johnson, L. T., *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP 5, ed. D. J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992)
- _____, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 35A, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2001)
- Jones, N. F., *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*, MAPS 176 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1987)

- Justinian, *Justinian's Institutes*, trans. P. Birks and G. McLeod (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987).
- Joubert, S. J., 'One Form of Social Exchange or Two? "Euergetism," Patronage, and Testament Studies', *BTB* 31, no. 1 (2001): 17-25
- Judge, E. A., 'St. Paul as a Radical Critic of Society', *Interch* 16 (1974): 191-203
- _____, 'The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History', *JRH* 11, no. December (1980): 201-17
- Kaiser, W. C., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985)
- Karrer, M., 'Das urchristliche Ältestenamnt', *NovT* 32, no. 2 (1990): 152-88
- Käsemann, E., 'Die Legitimität des Apostels: Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13', *ZNW* 41 (1942): 33-71
- _____, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen; 1. und 2. Band* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965)
- _____, *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague, NTL (London: SCM, 1969)
- Kee, H. C., *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective: Methods and Resources* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980)
- _____, *Who are the People of God? Early Christian Models of Community* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995)
- Keener, C. S., *Matthew*, IVPNTC 1, ed. G. R. Osborne, D. S. Briscoe and H. Robinson (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1997)
- Kelly, J. N. D., *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles; I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963)
- Kent, H. A., *The Pastoral Epistles: Studies in I and II Timothy and Titus* (Chicago: Moody, 1958)
- Kertelge, K., *Gemeinde und Amt im Neuen Testament*, BiH 10 (Munich: Kösel, 1972)
- Kidd, R. M., *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A "Bourgeois" Form of Early Christianity?* SBLDS 122, ed. D. L. Petersen and C. Talbert (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990)
- Kim, H. B., 'The Interpretation of μάλιστα in 1 Tim. 5:17', *NovT* 46, no. 4 (2004): 360-68
- Kirk, J. A., 'Did "Officials" in the New Testament Church receive a Salary?' *ExpTim* 84, no. 4 (1973): 105-8
- Kirk, K. E. et al., *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946)

- Kistemaker, S., *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, NTCO (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984)
- Kittel, G., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. G. W. Bromiley, ed. G. W. Bromiley and G. Friedrich, 10 vols (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1964-1976)
- Klauck, H.-J., *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions*, SNTW, ed. J. Barclay, J. Marcus and J. Riches (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000)
- Klausner, J., *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching*, trans. H. Danby (New York: Macmillan, 1925)
- Kleist, J. A., 'The Two False Witnesses (Mk. 14:55 ff)', *CBQ* 9, no. 3 (1947): 321-23
- Klijn, A. F. J., 'The Study of Jewish Christianity', *NTS* 20 (1974): 419-31
- Klingbeil, G. A., 'The Syntactic Structure of the Ritual of Ordination (Lev 8)', *Bib* 77 (1977): 509-519
- Kloppenborg, J. S., 'Edwin Hatch, Churches and *Collegia*', in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, ed. J. C. Hurd and B. H. McLean, JSNTSup 86 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 212-38
- _____, 'Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 16-30
- Kloppenborg, J. S., and S. G. Wilson, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1996)
- Knight, G. W., III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992)
- Koch, S., *Rechtliche Regelung von Konflikten im frühen Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004)
- Koester, C. R., *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2001)
- Koester, H., *Introduction to the New Testament: Volume 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity*, Hermeneia.FF, ed. H. Koester et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1982)
- _____, 'Ephesos in Early Christian Literature', in *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, ed. H. Koester, HTS 41 (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995), 119-140

- Köhler, L., *Hebrew Man: Lectures Delivered at the Invitation of the University of Tübingen, December 1952; With an Appendix on 'Justice in the Gate'*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd (London: S. C. M. Press, 1956)
- Kokkinia, C., *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis: Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien* (Bonn: Habelt, 2000)
- Kollmann, B., 'Jesu Verbot des Richtens und die Gemeindedisziplin', *ZNW* 88 (1997): 170-86
- Kraabel, A. T., 'Synagoga Caeca: Systematic Distortion in Gentile Interpretations of Evidence for Judaism in the Early Christian Period', in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs and C. McCracken-Flesher, StHu (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 219-246
- Kruse, C. G., *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1987)
- Kugel, J. L., 'On Hidden Hatred and Open Reproach: Early Exegesis of Leviticus 19:17', *HTR* 80, no. 1 (1987): 43-61
- Lampe, P., and M. D. Johnson, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, trans. M. Steinhauser (London: T & T Clark, 2003)
- Lane Fox, R., *Pagans and Christians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986)
- Lane, W. L., *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, NICNT, ed. N. B. Stonehouse, F. F. Bruce and G. D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974)
- _____, *Hebrews 1-8*, WBC 47A, ed. D. A. Hubbard et al. (Dallas: Word Books, 1991)
- _____, *Hebrews 9-13*, WBC 47B, ed. D. A. Hubbard et al. (Dallas: Word Books, 1991)
- Lau, A. Y., "Manifest in Flesh": *The Epiphany Christology of the Pastoral Epistles*, WUNT 86 (Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996)
- Laub, F., 'Paulus als Gemeindegründer (1 Thess)', in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), 17-38
- Lea, T. D., and H. P. Griffin, Jr., *1, 2 Timothy, Titus*, NAC 34, ed. D. S. Dockery et al. (Nashville: Broadman, 1992)
- Lee, G. M., 'Studies in Texts: I Corinthians 9:9-10', *Theol.* 71 (1968): 122-23
- Lenski, R. C. H., *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and to Philemon* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937)

- Leon, H. J., and C. Osiek, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Updated edn (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995)
- Levine, B. A., 'Damascus Document IX, 17-22: A New Translation and Comments', *RevQ* 8, no. 2 (1973): 195-96
- _____, *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPSTC. 1st edn, ed. N. M. Sarna and C. Potok (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989)
- _____, *Numbers 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 4, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1993)
- _____, *Numbers 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 4A. 1st edn, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2000)
- Levine, L. I., 'Synagogue Officials: The Evidence from Caesarea and Its Implications for Palestine and the Diaspora', in *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, ed. A. Raban and K. G. Holum, DMOA 21 (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1996), 392-400
- _____, 'Synagogue Leadership: The Case of the Archisynagogue', in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 93-111
- Lévy, J.-P., *The Economic Life of the Ancient World*, trans. J. G. Biram (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967)
- Lewis, N., and M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings: Vol. 2, The Empire*, RoC, ed. J. Barzun (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955)
- Liddon, H. P., *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy* (London: Paternoster Row, 1897)
- Lincoln, A. T., *Ephesians*, WBC 42, ed. D. A. Hubbard et al. (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990)
- Lindemann, A., 'Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers', in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W. S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 25-45
- Lips, H. v., *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt: Zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralenbriefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979)
- Livy, *Livy, Books I and II*, trans. B. O. Foster, LCL114, ed. T. E. Page et al. (London: William Heinemann, 1952)
- Lock, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (I & II Timothy and Titus)*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1924)
- Lohfink, G., 'Die Normativität der Amtsvorstellung in den Pastoralbriefen', *TQ* 157, no. 2 (1977): 93-106

- Lohse, E., *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951)
- _____, '»Kümmert sich Gott etwa um die Ochsen?«', *ZNW* 88 (1997): 314-15
- Longenecker, R. N., *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990)
- Looks, C., *Das Anvertraute bewahren: Die Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe im 2. Jahrhundert*, MTB, ed. N. Knoepffler et al. (Munich: H. Utz, 1999)
- Lucian, *Lucian III*, trans. A. M. Harmon, LCL 130, ed. E. H. Warmington (London: William Heinemann, 1969)
- Lüdemann, G., *Paulus, der Heidenapostel: Band I Studien zur Chronologie*, FRLANT 123, ed. E. Käsemann and E. Würthwein (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980)
- _____, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel: Band II Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum*, FRLANT 130, ed. W. Schrage and R. Smend (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983)
- _____, *Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals*, trans. J. Bowden (London: T & T Clark, 2003)
- Lüdemann, G., F. Schleritt, and M. Janssen, *Jesus After 2000 Years: What He Really Said and Did*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 2000)
- Luz, U., *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, trans. J. E. Crouch, Hermeneia, ed. H. Koester (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001)
- MacArthur, J. S., 'On the Significance of ἡ γραφή in 1 Timothy v. 18', *ExpTim* 53 (1941-42): 37
- MacDonald, M. Y., *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*, SNTSMS 60 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)
- MacMullen, R., *Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A.D. 284* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974)
- MacMullen, R., and E. Lane, *Paganism and Christianity, 100-425 C.E.: A Sourcebook* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992)
- Mæhlum, H., *Die Vollmacht des Timotheus nach den Pastoralbriefen*, ThDiss 1 (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommission, 1969)
- Magness, J., *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003)
- Maidment, K. J., and J. O. Burt, *Minor Attic Orators*, LCL 308, 1, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953)

- Malherbe, A. J., *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987)
- _____, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, SBL SBS 19, ed. B. B. Scott (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988)
- _____, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989)
- _____, 'Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament', in *Religion (vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Neues Testament [Sachthemen])*, ANRW 2.26.1 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1992), 267-333
- _____, *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32B, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2000)
- Malherbe, A. J. et al., *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003)
- Malina, B. J., *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981)
- Mantel, H., 'Ordination and Appointment in the Period of the Temple', *HTR* 57, no. 4 (1964): 325-46
- Marcus, J., *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27. 1st edn, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2000)
- Marshall, I. H., *The Epistles of John*, NICNT, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978)
- _____, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC. 1st American edn, ed. R. V. G. Tasker (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1980)
- _____, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, ICC, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999)
- Marshall, P., *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*, WUNT 2/23 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987)
- Martin, D. B., 'Justin J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival', *JSNT* 84 (2001): 51-64
- _____, 'Paul and the Judaism/Hellenism Dichotomy: Toward a Social History of the Question', in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 29-61
- Martin, D. M., *1, 2 Thessalonians*, NAC 33 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995)
- Martin, R. P., *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986)

- Martyn, J. L., *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st edn (New York: Doubleday, 1997)
- Mason, H. J., *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*, ASP 13 (Toronto: A. M. Hakkert, 1974)
- Mason, S., and T. A. Robinson, *Early Christian Reader: Christian Texts from the First and Second Centuries in Contemporary English Translations including the New Revised Standard Version of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004)
- Matera, F., *II Corinthians: A Commentary*, NTL, ed. C. C. Black, J. T. Carroll and B. R. Gaventa (London: Westminster John Knox, 2003)
- Mattingly, K., 'The Significance of Joshua's Reception of the Laying On of Hands in Numbers 27:12-23', *AUSS* 39, no. 2 (2001): 191-208
- McConville, J. G., *Deuteronomy*, AOTC 5, ed. D. W. Baker and G. J. Wenham (Leicester: Apollos, 2002)
- McLean, B. H., 'The Agrippinilla Inscription: Religious Associations and Early Church Formation', in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, ed. B. H. McLean, JSNTSup 86 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 239-70
- _____, 'The Place of Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 186-225
- Meade, D. G., *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Early Christian Tradition*, WUNT 39 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1986)
- Meeks, W. A., *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983)
- _____, 'Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities', in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": *Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs and C. McCracken-Flesher, StHu (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 93-115
- _____, 'Judaism, Hellenism, and the Birth of Christianity', in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 17-27
- Meeks, W. A., L. M. White, and O. L. Yarbrough, *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995)
- Meggitt, J. J., *Paul, Poverty and Survival*, SNTW, ed. J. Barclay, J. Marcus and J. Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998)

- _____, 'Response to Martin and Theissen', *JSNT* 84 (2001): 85-94
- Meier, J. P., 'Presbyteros in the Pastoral Epistles', *CBQ* 35 (1973): 323-45
- Merkel, H., *Die Pastoralbriefe: Übersetzt und erklärt*, NTD 9/1. 13th edn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)
- Merkle, B. L., *The Elder and Overseer: One Office in the Early Church*, SBLit 57, ed. H. Gossai (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003)
- Merrill, E. H., *Deuteronomy*, NAC 4, ed. E. R. Clendenen, K. A. Mathews and D. S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994)
- Merz, A., *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zue Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*, NTOA 52, ed. M. Küchler, P. Lampe and G. Theissen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004)
- Metzger, B. M., *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*, NTTS 8, ed. B. M. Metzger (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968)
- _____, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*. 2nd edn (London: United Bible Societies, 1994)
- Michl, J., 'Der Spruch Jakobusbrief 4,5', in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss and F. Mußner (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963), 167-74
- Milgrom, J., *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPSTC, ed. N. M. Sarna and C. Potok (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990)
- _____, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1991)
- _____, *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3A. 1st edn, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2000)
- _____, *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3B, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2001)
- Miller, J. D., *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Mitchell, M. M., *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993)
- Moore, G. F., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927)

- Moule, C. F. D., *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959)
- Mounce, R. H., *Matthew*, NIBC 1, ed. W. W. Gasque (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991)
- Mounce, W. D., *Pastoral Epistles*, WBC 46, ed. B. Metzger et al. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000)
- Munck, J., 'Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times', *NTS* 6 (1960): 103-16
- Munro, W., *Authority in Paul and Peter: The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter*, SNTSMS 45, ed. R. M. Wilson and M. E. Thrall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., *Paul the Letter-writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*, GNS 41 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995)
- Murray, R., 'Jews, Hebrews and Christians: Some Needed Distinctions', *NovT* 24, no. 3 (1982): 194-208
- _____, "Disaffected Judaism" and Early Christianity: Some Predisposing Factors', in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs and C. McCracken-Flesher, StHu (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 263-281
- Neste, R. V., *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*, JSNTSup, 280 (London: T & T Clark, 2004)
- Neusner, J., "'By the Testimony of Two Witnesses" In the Damascus Document IX, 17-22 and in Pharisaic-Rabbinic Law', *RevQ* 8, no. 2 (1973): 197-217
- _____, *The Talmud of the Land of Israel*, CSJH.TLI, ed. J. Neusner, 35 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982-1991)
- _____, *Sanhedrin and Makkot*, CSJH.TLI 31, 31, ed. J. Neusner, 35 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984)
- _____, *Orlah and Bikkurim*, CSJH.TLI 10, 10, ed. J. Neusner, 35 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991)
- _____, *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*, ABRL. 1st edn, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1994)
- Newman, J., *Semikhah (Ordination): A Study of its Origin, History, and Function in Rabbinic Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950)
- Newton, M., *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Niederwimmer, K., *Die Didache* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)
- Noonan, J. T., 'The Muzzled Ox', *JQR* 70, no. 3 (1980): 172-75

- Noordtziĳ, A., *Leviticus*, trans. R. Togtman, BSC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982)
- O'Brien, P. T., *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, ed. I. H. Marshall and W. W. Gasque (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991)
- Oberlinner, L., *Die Pastoralbriefe: Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief*, HTKNT 11/2, ed. A. Wikenhauser, A. Vögtle and R. Schnackenburg (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1994)
- _____, *Die Pastoralbriefe: Kommentar zum zweiten Timotheusbrief*, HTKNT 11/2, ed. A. Wikenhauser, A. Vögtle and R. Schnackenburg (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1995)
- Oden, T. C., *First and Second Timothy and Titus*, IBC, ed. J. L. Mays, J. D. Miller and P. J. Achtemeier (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1989)
- Olsson, B., and M. Zetterholm, *The Ancient Synagogue From Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*, ConBNT 39, ed. B. Olsson and K. Syreeni (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003)
- Oppenheimer, A., 'Jewish Penal Authority in Roman Judaea', in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. Goodman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 181-91
- Orr, W. F., and J. A. Walther, *I Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32, ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976)
- Osiek, C., *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* rev. edn (New York: Paulist Press, 1992)
- Parker, R., *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
- Paul, L., *The Deployment and Payment of the Clergy* (London: Church Information Office, 1964)
- Peerbolte, L. J. L., *Paul the Missionary*, CBET 34, ed. T. Baarda et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 2003)
- Penaskovic, R., *Theology & Authority: Maintaining a Tradition of Tension* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987)
- Pesch, R., *Die Apostelgeschichte 1. Teilband: Apg. 1-12*, EKKNT 21/1, ed. J. Blank et al. (Zürich: Benziger, 1986)
- Péter-Contesse, R., and J. Ellington, *A Handbook on Leviticus*, UBS.HS (New York: United Bible Societies, 1992)
- Philo, *Philo*, trans. F. H. Colson, LCL 320, 7, 11 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950)

- Pierce, R. W., R. M. Groothuis, and G. D. Fee, *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2005)
- Pietersen, L., *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity*, JSNTSup 264 (London: T&T Clark, 2004)
- Plato, *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias*, trans. W. R. M. Lamb, LCL 166 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953)
- Plummer, A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC 34 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915)
- _____, *A Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians* (London: R. Scott, 1918)
- Plutarch, *Plutarch's Moralia*, trans. H. N. Fowler, LCL 321, 10, 14 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949)
- Poland, F., *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1909)
- Polhill, J. B., *Acts*, NAC 26, ed. D. S. Dockery et al. (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992)
- Porter, S. E., 'Pauline Authorship and the Pastoral Epistles: Implications for Canon', *BBR* 5 (1995): 105-123
- Poythress, V. S., 'The Meaning of *μάλιστα* in 2 Timothy 4:13 and Related Verses', *JTS* 53, no. 2 (2002): 523-32
- Preuschen, E., *Die Apostelgeschichte*, HNT 4/1 (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1912)
- Prior, M., *Paul the Letter-writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (JSOT Press, 1989)
- Puglisi, J. F., *The Process of Admission to Ordained Ministry: A Comparative Study* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996)
- Quinn, J. D., 'Ordination in the Pastoral Epistles', *Comm* 8, no. Winter (1981): 358-69
- _____, 'Tertullian and I Timothy 5:22 on Imposing Hands: Paul Galtier Revisited', in *Studia Patristica: Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, StPatr 21 (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1987), 268-70
- Quinn, J. D., and W. C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*, ECC, ed. D. N. Freedman and A. B. Beck (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000)
- Raban, A., and K. G. Holum, *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millenia*, DMOA 21 (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1996)
- Rabinovitch, N. L., 'Damascus Document IX, 17-22 and Rabbinic Parallels', *RevQ* 9, no. 1 (1977): 113-16

- Räisänen, H., *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983)
- _____, *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays*, JSNTSup 43 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992)
- Ramsay, W. M., *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965)
- Rankin, O. S., 'The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service Upon Christian Worship', *JJS* 1 (1948): 27-32
- Rapske, B., *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*, BAFCS 3, ed. B. W. Winter (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994)
- Reicke, B. I., *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos, in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier* (Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1951)
- _____, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde: Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7*, ATANT 32, ed. W. Eichrodt and O. Cullmann (Zürich: Zwingli, 1957)
- _____, 'The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents', in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (London: SCM Press, 1958), 143-156
- Remus, H., 'Voluntary Association and Networks: Aelius Aristides at the Asclepieion in Pergamum', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 147-75
- Reumann, J., 'Church Office in Paul, Especially in Philippians', in *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, ed. J. C. Hurd and B. H. McLean, JSNTSup 86 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 82-91
- Rhodes, P. J., and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Richards, W. A., *Difference and Distance in Post-Pauline Christianity: An Epistolary Analysis of the Pastorals*, SBLit 44, ed. H. Gossai (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2002)
- Riesner, R., 'Synagogues in Jerusalem', in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, ed. R. Bauckham, BAFCS 4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), 179-211
- Ringgren, H., and J. H. Charlesworth, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, trans. E. T. Sander, COL. Exp. edn (New York: Crossroad, 1995)
- Roberts, A., J. Donaldson, and A. C. Coxe, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, ANF 5. American reprint of the Edinburgh edn (New York: Scribner's, 1926)
- _____, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, ANF 1. American reprint of the Edinburgh edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989)

- Roberts, C. H., 'Elders: A Note', *JTS* 26 (1975): 403-405
- Robertson, A. T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 4th edn (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934)
- Roetzel, C. J., *Judgement in the Community: A Study of the Relationship Between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972)
- Rohde, J., *Urchristliche und frühkatholische Ämter: Eine Untersuchung zur frühchristlichen Amtsentwicklung im Neuen Testament und bei den apostolischen Vätern*, ThA 33. 1st edn (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1976)
- Roloff, J., *Apostolat, Verkündigung, Kirche: Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen*. 1st edn (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1965)
- _____, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*, EKKNT 15, ed. J. Blank et al. (Zürich: Benziger, 1988)
- _____, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament*, GNT 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)
- Rougemont, G., *Lois sacrées et règlements religieux par Georges Rougemont*, CiD 1 (Paris: de Boccard, 1977)
- Runesson, A., *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study*, ConBNT 37, ed. B. Olsson and K. Syreeni (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001)
- Saller, R. P., *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Sampley, J. P., 'Paul's Frank Speech with the Galatians and the Corinthians', in *Philodemus and the New Testament world*, ed. J. T. Fitzgerald, D. Obbink and G. S. Holland, NovTSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 295-321
- Sand, A., 'Anfänge einer Koordinierung verschiedener Gemeindeordnungen nach den Pastoralbriefen', in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), 215-37
- _____, 'Propheten, Weise und Schriftkundige in der Gemeinde des Matthäusevangeliums', in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), 167-84
- Sanders, E. P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977)
- _____, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (London: SCM Press, 1985)

- _____, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1990)
- _____, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992)
- _____, 'Jesus' Galilee', in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen*, ed. H. Räisänen et al., NovTSup 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 3-41
- Sansom, M. C., 'The Doctrine of Ordination and the Ordained Ministry', *Churchman* 96, no. 1 (1982): 9-22
- Sarna, N. M., *Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPSTC. 1st edn, ed. N. M. Sarna and C. Potok (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991)
- Schiffman, L. H., 'The Qumran Law of Testimony', *RevQ* 8, no. 4 (1975): 603-12
- _____, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*, BJS 33 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983)
- _____, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. 1st edn (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994)
- Schille, G., and O. Bauernfeind, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, THKNT 5. Rev. edn, ed. D. E. Fascher, J. Rohde and C. Wolff (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983)
- Schinzer, R., 'Die Bedeutung des Prozesses Jesu', *NZStTh* 25 (1983): 138-54
- Schlatter, A., *The Church in the New Testament Period [Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit]*, trans. P. P. Levertoff (London: S.P.C.K., 1955)
- Schlatter, A. v., *Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Philipper Timotheus und Titus* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1950)
- _____, *Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus: Eine Auslegung seiner Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*. 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1958)
- Schmeller, T., *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*, SBS 162, ed. H. Merklein and E. Zenger (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995)
- Schmeller, T., and C. Cebulj, *Schulen im Neuen Testament? Zur Stellung des Urchristentums in der Bildungswelt seiner Zeit*, HerBS 30, ed. H.-J. Klauck and E. Zenger (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2001)
- Schmithals, W., *The Theology of the First Christians*, trans. O. C. Dean (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997)
- Schmithals, W., and C. Breytenbach, *Paulus, die Evangelien, und das Urchristentum: Beiträge von und zu Walter Schmithals* (Leiden: Brill, 2004)

- Schneider, G., *Die Apostelgeschichte: I. Teil: Einleitung, Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8,40*, HTKNT 5/1, ed. A. Wikenhauser, A. Vögtle and R. Schnackenburg (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1980)
- Schöllgen, G., 'Was wissen wir über die Sozialstruktur der paulinischen Gemeinden?' *NTS* 34 (1988): 71-82
- _____, 'Die διπλή τιμή von 1Tim 5,17', *ZNW* 80, no. 3/4 (1989): 232-39
- Schürer, E., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 2nd and rev. edn (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901)
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E., *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM Press, 1983)
- Schwarz, R., *Bürgerliches Christentum im Neuen Testament? Eine Studie zu Ethik, Amt und Recht in den Pastoralbriefen*, ÖBS, 4, ed. W. Beilner et al. (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983)
- Schweizer, E., *Church Order in the New Testament*, trans. F. Clarke, SBT 32 (London: SCM Press, 1961)
- Schwertner, S. M., *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*. 2nd edn (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992)
- Sebillotte, V., 'Les Labyades: Une Phratrie à Delphes?' *CCGG* 8 (1997): 39-49
- Seccombe, D., 'Was there Organized Charity in Jerusalem before the Christians?' *JTS* 29, no. April (1978): 140-43
- Seland, T., 'Philo and the Clubs and Associations of Alexandria', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 110-27
- Sharp, G., D. Whitby, and T. Burgess, *Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament: Containing Many New Proofs of the Divinity of Christ, from Passages Which Are Wrongly Translated in the Common English Version*. repr. 1995 edn (Atlanta: Original Word, 1798)
- Smalley, S. S., *1, 2, 3 John*, WBC 51, ed. D. A. Hubbard, J. D. W. Watts and R. P. Martin (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984)
- Smit, J. F. M., "'You Shall Not Muzzle a Threshing Ox": Paul's Use of the Law of Moses in 1 Cor 9,8-12', *EstBib* 58, no. 2 (2000): 239-63
- Smith, J. Z., *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, 14)*, CSJH, ed. W. S. Green and C. Goldscheider (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)
- Snyder, G. F., *Inculturation of the Jesus Tradition: The Impact of Jesus on Jewish and Roman Cultures* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999)

- Soards, M. L., *1 Corinthians*, NIBC 7, ed. W. W. Gasque (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999)
- Söding, T., *Blick zurück nach vorn: Bilder lebendiger Gemeinden im Neuen Testament* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1997)
- South, J. T., *Disciplinary Practices in Pauline Texts* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical, 1992)
- Spicq, C., *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 1. 4th edn, 2 vols (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969)
- Steichele, H., 'Geist und Amt als Kirchenbildende Elemente in der Apostelgeschichte', in *Kirche im Werden: Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*, ed. J. Hainz (Munich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976), 185-203
- Stendahl, K., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1958)
- Stenger, W., 'Timotheus und Titus als literarische Gestalten', *Kairos* 16, no. 3/4 (1974): 252-67
- Stettler, H., *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*, WUNT 2/105 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998)
- Stowers, S. K., 'Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?' in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 81-102
- Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte: Erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Str-B 2 (Munich: Oskar Beck, 1924)
- _____, *Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis: Erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Str-B 3 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1926)
- Strathmann, H., 'μάρτυς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία, μαρτύριον, ἐπιμαρτυρέω, συμμαρτυρέω, συνεπιμαρτυρέω, καταμαρτυρέω, μαρτύρομαι, διαμαρτύρομαι, προμαρτύρομαι, ψευδόμαρτυς, ψευδομαρτυρέω, ψευδομαρτυρία', trans. G. W. Bromiley, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, G. Friedrich and G. W. Bromiley, 4 (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1967), 474-514
- Sullivan, F. A., *From Apostles to Bishops: The Development of the Episcopacy in the Early Church* (New York: Newman, 2001)
- Taylor, V., *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933)
- Theissen, G., 'Legitimation und Lebensunterhalt: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie urchristlicher Missionare', *NTS* 21 (1975): 192-221
- _____, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, trans. J. H. Schütz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982)

- _____, *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM, 1999)
- _____, 'The Social Structure of Pauline Communities: Some Critical Remarks on J. J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival', *JSNT* 84 (2001): 65-84
- _____, 'Social Conflicts in the Corinthian Community: Further Remarks on J. J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival', *JSNT* 25, no. 3 (2003): 371-91
- Thiering, B. E., *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church*, ANZSTR (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983)
- Thiessen, W., *Christen in Ephesus: Die historische und theologische Situation in vorpaulinischer und paulinischer Zeit und zur Zeit der Apostelgeschichte und der Pastoralbriefe*, TANZ 12, ed. K. Berger et al. (Tübingen: Francke, 1995)
- Thiselton, A. C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000)
- Thrall, M. E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 1*, ICC, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994)
- _____, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 2*, ICC, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000)
- Tigay, J. H., *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPSTC, ed. N. M. Sarna and C. Potok (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996)
- Towner, P., *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, IVPNTC 14 (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994)
- Towner, P. H., *The Goal of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles*, JSNTSup 34 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989)
- Trebilco, P. R., *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, SNTSMS 69, ed. G. N. Stanton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Tripolitis, A., *Religions of the Hellenistic-Roman Age* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002)
- Trites, A. A., *The New Testament Concept of Witness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)
- Trocme, E., 'The Jews as Seen by Paul and Luke', in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": *Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs and C. McCracken-Flesher, StHu (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 145-161
- Trummer, P., *Die Paulustradition der Pastoralbriefe*, BBET 8, ed. J. Becker and H. G. Reventlow (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978)

- Urbach, E. E., *Class-Status and Leadership in the World of the Palestinian Sages*, trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1966)
- VanderKam, J. C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994)
- Verhoef, E., 'Pseudepigraphic Paulines in the New Testament'. Unpublished Paper given at SBL International Conference, (Cambridge: 2003)
- Vermes, G., *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th, rev. and extended edn (London: Penguin, 2004)
- Verner, D. C., *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*, SBLDS 71, ed. W. Baird (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983)
- Versnel, H. S., *Ter Unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: Three Studies in Henotheism*, SGRR 6, ed. H. S. Versnel and F. T. van Straten (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990)
- Vliet, H. v., *No Single Testimony: A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 par. into the New Testament*, STRT 4, ed. H. W. Obbink, A. A. v. Ruler and W. C. c. Unnik (Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1958)
- _____, *Did Greek-Roman-Hellenistic Law Know the Exclusion of the Single Witness? The Answer of the Early Christian Writings/The Law of Deut. 19:15 par. and the Early Christian Writings* (Franeker: Wever, 1980)
- Wacholder, B. Z., 'Rules of Testimony in Qumranic Jurisprudence: CD 9 and 11Q Torah 64', *JJS* 40 (1989): 163-74
- Wagener, U., *Die Ordnung des "Houses Gottes": Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe*, WUNT 2/65, ed. M. Hengel and O. Hofius (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994)
- Walker-Ramisch, S., 'Graeco-Roman Voluntary Associations and the Damascus Document', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 128-45
- Wallace, D. B. *Sharp Redivivus? A Reexamination of the Granville Sharp Rule*. 1998. Accessed 1/10/2005. Available from http://www.bible.org/assets/worddocs/wallace_sharp.zip
- Wallace, R., and W. Williams, *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Walton, S., *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*, SNTSMS 108, ed. R. Bauckham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Warkentin, M., *Ordination: A Biblical-Historical View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982)
- Watson, A., *Roman Slave Law* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987)

- Weinfeld, M., *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period*, NTOA 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)
- Wenham, G. J., *The Book of Leviticus*, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1979)
- _____, *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC 4. 1st edn, ed. D. J. Wiseman (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981)
- Wernberg-Møller, P., *The Manual of Discipline*, STDJ, 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957)
- Westerholm, S., *Jesus and Scribal Authority*, ConBNT 10 (Lund: Gleerup, 1978)
- Whelan, C. F., 'Amica Pauli: The Role of Phoebe in the Early Church', *JSNT* 49 (1993)
- White, L. M., 'Social Authority in the House Church Setting and Ephesians 4:1-6', *ResQ* 29, no. 4 (1987): 209-28
- _____, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture: Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation among Pagans, Jews and Christians*, HTS 42, 1 (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996)
- _____, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture: Texts and Monuments for the Christian Domus Ecclesiae in its Environment*, HTS 42, 2 (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997)
- _____, 'Rhetoric and Reality in Galatians: Framing the Social Demands of Friendship', in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. A. J. Malherbe et al., NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 307-49
- Williams, D. J., *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, NIBC 12 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995)
- Wilson, S. G., *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*, SNTSMS 23 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973)
- _____, 'Voluntary Associations: An Overview', in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (London: Routledge, 1996), 1-15
- Winter, B. W., *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*, FCGRW, ed. A. D. Clarke (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994)
- _____, 'The Toppling of Favorinus and Paul by the Corinthians', in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. A. J. Malherbe et al., NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 291-306
- Witherington, B., *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995)

- Wohlenberg, G., *Die Pastoralbriefe: (der erste Timotheus-, der Titus- und der zweite Timotheusbrief)*, KNT 8, ed. T. Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1906)
- Wright, C. J. H., *Deuteronomy*, NIBCOT 4, ed. R. L. J. Hubbard and R. K. Johnston (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1996)
- Wuest, K. S., *The Pastoral Epistles in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader*, WSGNT 12 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952)
- Yadin, Y., *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. 1st edn (New York: Random House, 1985)
- Young, F. M., 'On ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ and ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ', *JTS* 45 (1994): 142-48
- _____, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*, NTTh, ed. J. D. G. Dunn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- _____, 'The Pastoral Epistles and the Ethics of Reading', in *The Pauline Writings*, ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 268-82
- Ysebaert, J., *Greek Baptismal Terminology: Its Origins and Early Development*, GCP 1, ed. C. Mohrmann and J. G. A. Ros S.J. (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1962)
- _____, *Die Amtsterminologie im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche: Eine lexikographische Untersuchung* (Breda: Eureia, 1994)
- Ziesler, J. A., *Pauline Christianity*, OxBS. rev. edn, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and G. N. Stanton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990)
- Zmijewski, J., *Die Apostelgeschichte: Übersetzt und erklärt*, RNT, ed. A. Wikenhauser et al. (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1994)