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EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Fredrick J. Long

Was the Apostle Paul “a prisoner of his date” like every other writer? This question was posed by Howard T. Kuist in Chapter 5 (p. 88) of The Pedagogy of St. Paul while introducing his summary of Paul’s views of women as teachers. Kuist then quoted first 1 Tim 2:11-12 and then 1 Cor 11:33-36 as statements that “suggest his attitude.” We should consider “suggest” and observe footnote 33, attached to this opening question, where Kuist correctly states the practice within Judaism: “No woman was permitted to teach in Hebrew schools or synagogues.” Indeed, and the same is true for the Greco-Roman world at the time of Paul.

This issue of JIBS begins with two articles that demonstrate the importance of collecting evidence to answer interpretive questions arising from careful observation. In the first article “A Wife in Relation to a Husband: Greek Discourse Pragmatic and Cultural Evidence for Interpreting 1 Tim 2:11-15,” I tackle the difficult passage that would appear to forbid women from teaching and possibly even speaking in churches. At least, this is how the passage is commonly interpreted and applied. However, Paul was concerned for social and ethical decorum for effective evangelistic outreach (1 Tim 2:1-10). Moreover, careful consideration of social-cultural views of women, and specifically wives in relation to husbands, sheds light on Paul’s argumentation. Altogether, when attending to discourse pragmatics (contextual language in use), considerable evidence exists that Paul’s admonitions in 2:11-12 are rather restricted to the wife-husband relationship for the sake of the spread of the Gospel in the Greco-Roman world. What implications does this have for today?

In the second article, Benjamin J. Snyder collects co-textual literary evidence from Luke-Acts to interpret “The ‘Fathers’ Motif in Luke–Acts.” Interpreters have struggled to understand the relevance of the switching between “Our Fathers” and “Your Fathers” in Stephen’s Speech for the broader message of the Book of Acts. But Snyder has “observed” a way forward, by recognizing that these distinctions occur elsewhere within polemical contexts. Moreover, these reoccurrences contribute to a “Fathers Motif” that spans the entirety of Luke-Acts, from the very beginning to the very end. Here, Snyder concludes convincingly that Luke constructed
the Fathers Motif to show how the Messianic People of God laid claim to Abraham and the Patriarchs (much like the Apostle Paul), but in such a way that is not supersessionistic against the Jewish people. At issue was Luke’s recognition of two contrasting “families” in terms of beliefs, values, actions, and responses to God’s self-revealing initiatives and the renewal of God’s people. Snyder affirms and contributes to the views of David W. Pao (e.g. Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000]), to whom the article is dedicated.

We are pleased to continue making available chapters from Kuist’s The Pedagogy of St. Paul, presently his Chapters 5 (cited above) and 6. In Chapter 5 “St. Paul’s Educational Views,” Kuist adopts a taxonomy of home, school, (societal) vocation, (governing) state, and church as “agencies” of civilization, about which he then offers brief summaries of Paul’s views of pedagogy. Indeed, each agency deserves its own separate dissertation, and numerous dissertations and monographs have addressed or touched on each of them, attempting to locate Paul among Jewish contemporaries and Greco-Roman philosophers and rhetoricians. Yet, Kuist’s perspective and identification of core passages remains valuable.

Chapter 6, “Psychological Elements in St. Paul’s Appeal” is a goldmine, collecting various data that reveals how Paul garnered “interest and attention,” used “perception,” appealed to “memory,” engaged “imagination” especially in his use of metaphor and figures of speech, before concluding with brief comments on his skill in judgment and reason, which is the focus of the next chapter. Once again, Kuist anticipates waves of research that are still reverberating through Biblical Studies, e.g. on rhetorical style, memory, and mental perception. Then, too, surveying Kuist’s list of Paul’s metaphors reveals Paul’s breadth of knowledge, which included Imperial Warfare, Architecture, Agriculture, Roman Law, Medical Science, Seafaring, Commerce, and Hunting. If one were to survey more recent scholarship, there is no doubt in my mind that this list could easily be tripled; and so Kuist has helpfully contextualized such aspects of ancient life to the Apostle Paul’s pedagogy.

Fredrick J. Long
Ordinary Time, 2015
A WIFE IN RELATION TO A HUSBAND:
GREEK DISCOURSE PRAGMATIC
AND CULTURAL EVIDENCE FOR
INTERPRETING 1 TIM 2:11-15

by

Fredrick J. Long

Professor of New Testament
Asbury Theological Seminary

INTRODUCTION

The difficulties and questions surrounding the interpretation of 1 Tim 2:11-15 are perennial and numerous, even apart from issues of authorship and pseudonymity.¹ One approach is to excise these verses as being an interpolation, since they do not align with the views of Jesus and Paul.

¹ This article has developed in stages from my class notes, then as a presentation for my colleague Dr. Stacey Minger’s class on Women in Ministry (2009), and then most recently as a paper presented April 10, 2015 at the Stone-Campbell Conference, Indianapolis. After this conference, I have continued to enhance the arguments and to add more social-cultural data as well as to interact more carefully with Stephen H. Levinsohn’s notes on information structure and discourse features of 1 Timothy. I thank everyone who has contributed to its final form by providing feedback, pushback, and correction. I very pleased to have this published in JIBS; I dedicate this article to wives in every culture who seek to be faithful disciples of the Risen Christ.

elsewhere about the equality of women. Alternatively, one may view 1 Timothy as Deutero-Pauline and not written with Paul’s authorization and therefore as having limited or no value to inform one’s view of the role of women within the church. However, neither excising these verses from the letter nor deciding against the Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy will remove 2:11-15 from our Bibles; so we are left to wrestle with these verses.

Below is a translation from the RSV (any translation could have been chosen), with the more important proposed changes of mine placed in italics inside of brackets […].

11 Let a woman [wife] learn in silence [quietly] with all submissiveness.
12 I permit no woman [wife] to teach or to have authority over men [a husband (singular)]; she is to keep silent [quiet].
13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman [wife] was deceived and became a transgressor.
15 Yet [moreover] women [she =the wife] will be saved [delivered] through [the] bearing [of] children, if she [they (plural)] continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty.

Modern translations assume that women and men in general are being addressed. However, considerable evidence exists that 2:11-15 has restricted referents in view: a wife in relation to a husband. Because of the complexity of the issues surrounding 1 Tim 2:11-15 and our frequently entrenched current pre-commitments and preconceptions of how women should or should not behave in (and outside) the church, it is not surprising that no consensus exists among Christ-followers on the proper interpretation of this pericope. The complexity is seen in the following list of interpretive questions that merges my own exegetical queries with the eleven posed by Linda Belleville:


3. I will assume Paul’s authorship in this article.

4. Linda Belleville, *Women Leaders in the Church: Three Crucial Questions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 164-65. My questions were independently arrived at, but I have added her questions within the list of questions.
1. What is the context and setting envisioned for the chapter? Worship or Mission setting? Implications?
2. Is there a literary structuring of 2:11-15 that might help guide our interpretation of it?
3. Who is being addressed at 2:11-12, 15 as a γυνή (sg.)? Any woman or a wife? Correspondingly, who is the ἄνήρ (sg.) in 2:12? Any man or a husband? (Cf. Belleville’s question #1)
4. “In verse 11 does Paul command a woman to learn in silence (i.e., she is not to speak out in public) or to learn quietly (i.e., she is not to disrupt worship)?” (Belleville’s question #2)
5. “To whom or what is she to be in ‘full submission’?” (Belleville’s question #3)
6. “Is the verb in verse 12 to be translated ‘I am not permitting’ (i.e., a temporary restriction) or ‘I do not permit (i.e., a habitual practice)?’” (Belleville’s question #4) What is the force of Paul “not permitting”? How universal is “permitting”?
7. “Does to teach carry official or unofficial connotations?” (Belleville’s question #5)
8. What is the meaning of the verb αὐθεντέω in 2:12? Is it “to have authority over” or more negatively “to domineer”?
9. Do the verbs to teach and to have authority/domineer refer to one or to two actions? (Cf. Belleville’s question #6.)
10. Do both verbs have to be either positive or negative because of the construction οὐ … οὐδέ? (Cf. Belleville’s question #7.) What implication does the answer to this question have for interpreting the passage?
11. To what extent is Paul writing 2:11-15 to address a particular problem at Ephesus, like heresy, social-disturbance, and/or Artemis cult influence, etc.?
12. Why is the story of Genesis 1-3 used in 1 Tim 2:13-14 to support 2:12? What is communicated and/or implied by this? Is Adam more important since he is “formed first”? Is Eve more flawed in nature than her husband, since she was “deceived”? (Cf. Belleville’s questions #8-10.)
13. What is “the childbirth” (ἡ τεκνογονία) in 2:15? Is this a veiled reference to Mary’s birth of Jesus? Does it refer only to childbirthing? Or, does it include with this also child-rearing?
14. How will the woman be “saved/delivered/kept safe” (σῴζω) through the childbirth in 2:15? (Cf. Belleville’s question #11.)
15. Finally, who are the “they” who “continue in faith, love, and holiness with modesty”?
It would be impossible to survey the immense interpretive literature on 1 Tim 2 in a single journal article. What I hope to accomplish, however, is to bring new data to bear on the well-known questions while at the same time correlating such data with important and well-established exegetical findings from a variety of interpretive perspectives.

Integral to any interpretation is the consideration of a proper hermeneutics, i.e. one’s interpretive assumptions and approach for studying texts. The approach taken here is inductive, in that I have begun with detailed observations of the underlying structure of the Greek text, which then led me to ask certain questions (such as are provided above) that need answering for the overall interpretation of the passage. Some questions are more difficult and thus more necessary to answer than others. After asking these questions, one’s answer to those that can and should be answered is based upon the consideration (collecting and weighing) of evidences, which will here particularly include Greek discourse-pragmatic and social-cultural data. By discourse-pragmatic, I mean the use of the Greek language (pragmatics) to convey meaning through discourse constraints as communicated by conjunctions or their absence (asyndeton), the presence and absence of the article, marked and unmarked word order, and specialized constructions denoting focus, emphasis, and prominence.


In this regard, specifically, I have been influenced by the discourse studies of Stephen H. Levinsohn (cited throughout); more generally, I have been influenced by the relevance theory of pragmatics proposed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, who enumerate that communication is purposeful and efficient, assumes maximum relevance, yet contains explicatures and evokes implicatures to guide audiences to make proper inferences about the meaning of the communication. Critical here is their notion of a Shared Cognitive Environment between communicator and recipient that allows for the communication to be efficient; yet, it is precisely this shared environment for 1 Tim 2 that we don’t have ready access to. So, in the absence of this environment, we naturally (and too readily at times) supply our own context and create our own relevance, merging printed (ancient) text with our (modern) culturally located situations. This is quite natural. The problem with this, however, is that we may very well end up being oblivious to the purposeful intent of the original communiqué in its original shared cognitive-cultural environment. Out of respect for the text under interpretation, then, we ought to attempt to understand it on its own terms and not first and foremost on our own terms.

The social-cultural data that I am supplying pertain mainly to how (married) women were viewed, scrutinized, and treated with respect to their social and public roles as wives in relation to their husbands and education. Such an approach differs from typical interpretations of the passage that either ignore such backgrounds or emphasize primarily either the heresy context and the pro-women influence of the Artemis cult, backgrounds that indeed mitigate the injunctions to control women’s speech in 2:11-15. However, the influence or relationship of the heresy and the Artemis cult and their ideology of women on 2:11-15 remains uncertain and somewhat speculative; and, even apart from the possible or even likely influence of the heresy and/or the Artemis cult, the admonitions in 2:11-15 are readily understood against the more widespread and established influence of Greek views of married women in relation to their husbands in public social venues and at home. So, although I give some attention to the heresy and the cult of Artemis, this is a minor focus of my presentation, and I think, would only provide a further context in support of the interpretation proposed here.

BROADER HERMENEUTICAL AND CANONICAL CONSIDERATIONS

At the outset, it may be hermeneutically helpful to consider what Nils Dahl has rightly said, after first quoting Oscar Cullmann speaking of the canonization of the Pauline letters:

‘It was easy to grasp the fact, that Paul had written to a number of Churches.’ It was, however, not equally easy to see why letters written to particular churches on particular occasions should be regarded as canonical and read in all churches. The theological problem raised by the Pauline Epistles was not their plurality but their particularity. As canonicity meant much the same as catholicity, this problem was by no means an imaginary one.\(^8\)

The particularity of Paul’s statements, as he was speaking to and issuing commands to early church assemblies in a variety of and vastly different cultural settings than our own, should give us pause for our immediate and uncritical application and appropriation. This is especially so, given that even Jesus himself must properly contextualize Moses’ statements in Torah “permitting” divorce in Deut 24:1-4 (Matt 19:6-8); Jesus said it should not be so, but that Moses permitted this practice because of the hardness of their hearts. This same verb “to permit” (ἐπιτρέπω) is also found in 1 Tim 2:12 (“I do not permit…”) and in context suggests that the admonition is mitigated (see further below). That Paul’s comments here and elsewhere must be interpreted in social-cultural context then and there, and then evaluated for cultural application here and now can be shown, e.g., in the case of “head coverings” in 1 Cor 11:2-16. A wife’s head covering reflected a social convention in Greco-Roman culture of married women in public: indeed, Bruce Winter has said, “The veil was the most symbolic feature of the bride’s dress in Roman Culture. Plutarch indicated that ‘veiling the bride’ (τὴν νύμφην κατακαλυπτόμενη) was, in effect, the marriage ceremony” (138D).\(^9\) Winter also rightly questions our contemporary inconsistent application of 1 Tim 2: Why, if we do not prohibit women braiding their hair, wearing gold and pearls, and


9. Quoted in and discussed by Bruce Winter, Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 78.
wearing expensive clothing (2:9), do we selectively enforce the injunction of 2:12 for women not to teach?\textsuperscript{10} Indeed. So, then, to the extent that the admonitions in 2:11-15 are either directed to particular social-cultural standards, especially the monitoring and controlling of behaviors of wives, or to contextual problems (like false teaching spreading through poorly educated women or wives), then the injunctions become less normative for all Christian practices in all cultural settings, of course, depending on the particular needs of contemporaneous cultural re-contextualization. The following chart reflects this consideration for appropriation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To the extent that 2:11-15 addresses ancient social-cultural issues or particular contextual problems,</th>
<th>To the extent 2:11-15 is \textbf{not} addressing ancient social-cultural issues or particular contextual problems,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\downarrow</td>
<td>\downarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then the more likely the admonitions contain culture-bound precepts</td>
<td>then the more likely the admonitions contain transcultural principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My research presented here is prompted by a footnote in an earlier essay, “Christ’s Gifted Bride: Gendered Members in Ministry in Acts and Paul,” that I presented at a Wheaton conference on Women in Ministry.\textsuperscript{11} In that essay I argue that Paul’s discussion of God’s gifting of the church in the gift lists evinces no restrictions whatsoever based on gender—they are entirely gender neutral and thus even gender inclusive. Moreover, Paul’s teachings occurred amidst a growing participation rate of women in societal voluntary associations, so that one cannot assume a restricted application and participation to males.\textsuperscript{12} Indeed, the outpouring of the


\textsuperscript{12} In addition to my essay, see especially James M. Arlandson, \textit{Women, Class, and Society in Early Christianity: Models from Luke-Acts} (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997). Participation rates were increasing also in diaspora Judaism; see Bernadette J. Brooten, \textit{Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues}, BJS 36 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).
Holy Spirit in Acts 2 was explained by Peter by quoting Joel 2 that affirms prophesying by both men and women. Importantly, Joel’s vision of the Spirit coming and allowing men and women to prophesy was inspired by the event of Moses’ requests for leadership assistance and God’s sending his Spirit upon these chosen male leaders who prophesied (Num 11:16-30). Prophecy is a leadership gift that consequently the prophet Joel foresaw extending more broadly among God’s people—men and women, young and old—that was realized in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Also in this same essay, I made a passing statement, “there are very substantial reasons to think that in 1 Timothy 2:12 Paul is restricting a wife’s (public) role in relation to her husband.” In a supporting footnote, I provide some preliminary evidence: “the correspondence of ‘submission’ language with the household codes where wives and husbands are addressed (1 Cor 14:34-35; Eph 5:21-33; Col 3:18; 1 Pet 3:1-7), the change from plural (women generally) to singular (a wife) at 1 Tim 2:11, Paul’s appeal to the creation order and the first married couple (Adam and Eve, the first husband and ‘wife’) in 1 Tim 2:13-14, and the matter of ‘childbearing’ in 1 Tim 2:15.”

So, at present, I would like to extend my research with more evidence in the form of general social-cultural data to be added to important contextual and discourse-pragmatic considerations. In general, I will not attempt to reconstruct the particular heretical teaching (whether arising from the Artemis cult or elsewhere) that was probably circulating especially among women, but rather more generally to contextualize and thus mitigate Paul’s admonition in 2:12. Such attempts have not always been convincing, since they have not adequately answered the function of οὐκ ... οὐδὲ that indicates both “teaching” (διδάσκειν) and “having authority/domineering” (αὐθεντείν) must both be positive or negative, and, since “teaching” is never negative, thus “having authority” must be positive and so then Paul is making a generalized admonition (i.e. a transcultural principle and universal application) rather than correcting a problem (i.e. a culture-bound principle and restricted application). However, as I will show, a wife teaching a husband was never acceptable nor was domineering a husband.

THESIS AND OUTLINE OF THE PAPER

In brief, the interpretation set forth now is this: Paul’s not permitting a wife to teach or assume (domineering) authority over a husband was situated

13. This exegetical discussion is treated in the final section of the paper.
within his concern for evangelistic outreach to all people due to broadly understood conceptions of “proper” social decorum. The major obstacle for this interpretive view has been the common working assumption that Paul gave these directions in the context of “church worship,” as a survey of most modern Bible translations reflects (see chart below). However, such a view ignores the clear, broad societal scope and scale of 2:1-7, which is logically connected to 2:8-15 with an οὖν therefore, marking continuity and development.\footnote{Runge, \textit{Discourse Grammar}, 43-48, 57 and Long, \textit{Koine Greek Grammar}, 65.} In 2:1-7, we observe a call to prayer for the gospel’s extension both to the broader society and to the fundamental building block of society, the home. Importantly, at the intersection of home and public, the behavior of women was being scrutinized. Such scrutiny was especially directed to religious activities of various kinds; a “new” religious group like the early Christ-followers was not exempt from scrutiny from these mores, but, if anything, was more vulnerable to social stigmatization, if not even suspicion of political subversion. Traditionally, the Romans were suspicious of new cults and their satirists and moralists (like Plutarch and Juvenal) blamed the gullibility of women for the spread of such cults.\footnote{Craig S. Keener, \textit{Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and Women’s Ministry in the Letters of Paul} (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992), 139-42.}

This view—that 1 Tim 2 addresses husband and wife—has had a number of supporters dating back to important Medieval translations of the 13th and 14th centuries, and Martin Luther’s in the 16th century.\footnote{A review and discussion is found in Leland Edward Wilshire, \textit{Insight into Two Biblical Passages: The Anatomy of a Prohibition: I Timothy 2:12, the TLG Computer, and the Christian Church; the Servant City: The Servant Songs of Isaiah 40-66 and the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC/BCE} (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010), 69, 78-79.} Robert Young in his literal translation (1898, 3rd ed.) indicates the marriage relationship: “a woman I do not suffer to teach, nor to rule a husband.”\footnote{Robert Young. \textit{Young’s Literal Translation}, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1898). I could not determine if this third edition was the same as the first edition in 1862.} The grammarians Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor state regarding ἄνδρος in 2:12 “her husband, though anarthrous.”\footnote{A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament} More recently we can add interpreters E. Earle Ellis, Sharon H. Gritz, Gordon
P. Hugenberger, B. Ward Powers, Philip Towner, and Bruce W. Winter.\textsuperscript{19} So, this interpretation is not new, nor conditioned by current feministic hermeneutics, even if such might be deemed negative by some evaluators.\textsuperscript{20}

Philip Towner presents a nuanced, yet equivocating, position by simultaneously describing “woman/wife” and “man/husband” (or the like), while understanding that husbands and wives are primarily in view beginning at 2:8.\textsuperscript{21} For this reason, I mention Towner here in support of husbands/wives, but also because he directs interpreters in two other helpful directions. First, he acknowledges Paul’s broader concern for Christian social respectability by maintaining decorum for evangelistic witness; and second, he takes seriously and attempts to integrate Bruce Winter’s proposal of the emergence of the “new woman” in the first century that caused social disruption and raised concerns among governing authorities, Greco-Roman moralists, and the apostle Paul. Thus, we must take seriously Towner’s conclusion as he moves to consider the application of the passage:

If the teaching of 1 Tim 2:11-15 is set properly within the broader frame that includes vv.8-10, then the public dimension of the circumstances is more easily seen. If, moreover, the teaching is set equally within the discourse initiated at 2:1, from which point Paul’s mission and the church’s participation within it (see also v.8) assumes a place of priority within his treatment of community matters, then the public nature of the instructions to wives/women


\textsuperscript{20} Indeed, Hugenberger indicates, “The reason for indicating something of the earlier pedigree of this approach is to help safeguard it against the charge that it is merely an accommodation to late-twentieth-century societal pressures in favor of ‘women’s liberation’” (“Women in Church Office,” 350 n.39).

\textsuperscript{21} Towner, \textit{Letters}, 201.
reflects a mission and witness coloration.²²

A problem exists, however, in that Towner falters in his interpretation of 2:12 due an inconsistency, because he takes Paul’s not permitting a wife to teach a man within a worship setting context, despite recognizing that the reference to submission there is related to the language of the house code relations, which would then delimit the referents to a wife in relation to a husband.²³

In the remainder of this article, I would like to set forth foundational perspectives for interpreting 2:11-15, attempting to work evidentially from discourse-pragmatic observations from the Greek text and by reconstructing a broader social-cultural context that would have been a part of the shared cognitive environment informing 1 Tim 2. These perspectives will include:

1. The Missional Context of 1 Tim 2:1-7 as not Restricted to a Christian Worship Setting;
2. The Social Respectability of Believers;
3. Social-Cultural-Religious Views of Men as Husbands and Women as Wives; and

With this information, I will conclude by providing a translation and a brief discussion of the oft-debated aspects of 2:11-15 and how these foundational perspectives provide a fairly simple and consistent reading of these verses.

²². Towner, Letters, 237. This statement occurs in Towner’s opening remarks concerning “Methodology and Application” (236-39).

²³. Towner falters in relation to the meaning of “in all submission” (ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ), acknowledging its relation to the house code tradition, but then (oddly) concluding: “Its application in the present context is something of an adaptation of the tradition, however, since it is not the wife’s submission to the husband that is in view (cf. 1 Cor 14:34), but rather her submission either to the instructor or generally the instructional setting” (Letters, 215; cf. 212). See also 216, where it is clear that Towner understands the teaching setting “in the worship assembly” or “in the worship setting” (n.68).
THE MISSIONAL CONTEXT OF 1 TIM 2:1-7 AS NOT RESTRICTED TO A CHRISTIAN WORSHIP SETTING

One of the first hurdles for our interpretation of 1 Tim 2 is the uninspired, interpretive sectional titles that most recent English translations place within the biblical text. Included below are the most common translations and the titles they supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Text Span</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KJV, AV 1873, Darby 1890, ASV 1901, RSV 1971</td>
<td>2:1-15</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKJV 1982</td>
<td>2:1-7</td>
<td>Pray for All Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:8-15</td>
<td>Men and Women in the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV 1989</td>
<td>2:1-15</td>
<td>Instructions concerning Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News 1992</td>
<td>2:1-15</td>
<td>Church Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB 1995</td>
<td>2:1-8</td>
<td>A Call to Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:9-15</td>
<td>Women Instructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV 2000</td>
<td>2:1-15</td>
<td>Prayer and Submission to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESV 2001</td>
<td>2:1-15</td>
<td>Pray for All People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET 2006</td>
<td>2:1-8</td>
<td>Prayer for All People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:9-15</td>
<td>Conduct of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holman Christian Bible 2009</td>
<td>2:1-7</td>
<td>Instructions on Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:8-15</td>
<td>Instructions to Men and Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLT 2013</td>
<td>2:1-15</td>
<td>Instructions about Worship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Especially problematic are titles that are unjustified by discourse considerations. For example, Stephen H. Levinsohn comments that titles should be avoided “where the argument continues” and includes 2:8 as one such place; instead, justification for a title exist for 1:3, 12; 2:1; 3:1
etc. Most unhelpful are those titles that restrict the context to Worship and/or that generalize the materials to be about Men and Women more broadly (in gray highlight). Instead of uncritically being directed by these headings, we need to understand the argumentative progression of 1 Tim 2 in order to observe the major themes and movements of 2:1-15 and so arrive at a more accurate “heading” for the material. I hope to demonstrate that 2:1-15 is not restricted to a worship setting, but rather envisages a broader missional context with an acute concern for social respectability for the sake of effective witness.

First, the recurrences of πᾶς indicate a broad, inclusive scope especially at the beginning of 1 Tim 2.

v.1a “I exhort foremost of all [πρῶτον πάντων]…”

v.1b “petitions, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all persons [ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων]”

v.2a “for kings and all that are in authority” (ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων)

v.2b in order that we would live a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and reverence [ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι].”

v.4 God “desires all persons to be saved” (πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωτηρίαν).

v.6 Christ is “the one that gave himself as a ransom for all” (ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων)

v.8 Paul wants “the men to pray in every place” (προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἀνδρὰς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ)

v.11 Paul wants a woman/wife to learn “in all submission” (ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ)


25. Most problematical are the NASB95 and NET, which single out instructions for the conduct of women in 2:8-15, as opposed to men, which may reflect and perpetuate the mistaken male interest to control women’s behavior.

26. In support of this broad scale, we could also add from v.7 Paul’s identity and purpose to be “herald, apostle, and...teacher of the nations” (κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος ... διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν).]

27. William Mounce’s translation captures the significance well: “above everything else” (Pastoral Epistles, WBC 46, [Dallas: Word, 2000], 78).
I. Howard Marshall correctly summarizes: “In vv.1-7 the need for prayer is inculcated and stress is laid on its universal scope, embracing all kinds of people. Then follows an extended justification based on the implications of the gospel.”

Second, structurally 2:1-15 moves from broad and general scope to particular scope, from social organization at the broadest scale of “all people,” “kings and all in authority” (2:1-2, 4) to the smallest scale and entry point of social organization, “the bearing of children” (2:15). Now, a logical step is needed before arriving at children, namely, the existence of a husband-wife relationship, which I argue is present in 2:11-15 and possibly even beginning as early as 2:8-10.

Third, the οὖν in 2:1 reflects an underlying information structure so that 2:1-15 continues and develops the main theme-line found at 1:18-19a located prior to the digression of 1:19b-20. Additionally, in 1:18-19a Paul makes a generalizing statement about entrusting “this instruction” (Ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν) to Timothy, which anaphorically recalls an earlier use of the cognate verb in 1:3, and especially the same noun as is defined in 1:5: “the goal of the instruction is this: love from a pure heart and a good conscience and an un-hypocritical faith” (τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου). The intervening elaborative material in 1:6-17 works to show both the real (possible) context of unfaithfulness (1:6-11) but then also shows in 1:12 the faithfulness of God to establish Paul as “faithful for ministry” (πιστόν με ἡγήσατο θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν). Paul himself thus exemplifies receiving love and faith in Christ Jesus, who came into the world to save sinners, among whom Paul was the worst (1:15); Jesus’ entering into the world to save sinners is explained: “the word is faithful, worthy of all acceptance.” The fronting of the genitive “all acceptance” before “worthy” (πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος) “emphasises the

28. Marshall, Pastorals, 415. Problematic, however, is Marshall’s view in his next sentence: “A fresh start is made with a statement of the moral requirements for prayer first in respect of men (v.8) and then (v.9) in respect of women; the two are treated as separate categories, which must reflect something about the relationships within the church.” The οὖν therefore initiating vv.8-10 and the continued themes of prayer and ethical conduct indicate clearly that these verses precisely are not a “fresh start.”

29. Levinsohn, Discourse Features of 1 Timothy, 10.
extent to which the word should be accepted.”

The quantitative emphasis on “all” here should also be noted, since it further underscores the need for complete acceptance. So, if 2:1 resumes the main theme-line in 1:18-19a and Paul’s instruction to Timothy, such instruction concerns urging followers of Christ to good character and faithfulness in view of Christ’s mission to save sinners.

In 2:1 this ethical-missional context is carried forward with Paul’s exhortation (Παρακαλῶ) that all manner of prayer be made “for all people, for kings and all that are in authority, that [ίνα] we would live a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and reverence” (2:1b-2). Emphasis attends this prayer, apart from the natural prominence of describing the social-religious interface of humanity and the Divine, since four types of prayers are abutted in 2:1: δεήσεις προσευχὰς ἑντεύξεις εὐχαριστίας. This list of “supplications, prayers, requests, thanksgivings” with no intervening conjunctions “produces a vivid and impassioned effect.”

Verse 3 is connected with asyndeton and an evaluative verbless clause of what is “good and acceptable” (καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον) before God. Verse 4 contains a non-restrictive continuative-descriptive relative pronoun clause that elaborates God’s will to save all people and bring them to “a knowledge of the truth.” Verses 5-6 contain a creedal affirmation of God as Savior, the One God, and the One mediator between God and Humanity, the person Christ Jesus who gave himself as “a ransom for all people,” which is “the timely testimony” (τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις). Verse 7 then concludes by elaborating on this testimony with a non-restrictive continuative-descriptive relative pronoun clause that highlights Paul’s missionary roles of “herald and apostle” with the emphatic subject pronoun ἐγώ and then


31. For an extensive discussion on quantitative emphasis, see Long, Koine Greek Grammar, 221-23.

32. BDF §460. For asyndeton and polysyndeton and the interpretation of lists, see Long, Koine Greek Grammar, 281-86.

33. Evaluation is one possible significance of asyndeton (Levinsohn, Discourse Features, 119-20; Long, Koine Greek Grammar, 281).

34. Such affirmations are counter-Imperial. See Malcolm Gill, Jesus as Mediator: Politics and Polemic in 1 Timothy 2:1-7 (Oxford; New York: Peter Lang, 2008).
a sentence end, final emphatic appositional statement, “a teacher of the nations in faith and truth” (διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ), this final affirmation is preceded and offset by a metacomment “I speak the truth; I do not lie” probably as “a slowing-down device to highlight this final constituent.” In 2:1-7, the constituents “a tranquil and quiet life” (ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον, 2:2b), “all people” (2:4a), and “to a knowledge of the truth” (2:4b), and “truth” (2:7b) have been preposed (i.e., placed before their respective verbs) for “focal prominence.”

Next, in 2:8 the connective οὖν marks new development with continuity between 2:1-7 and 2:8-15. We observe Paul’s role as herald, apostle, and teacher enacted in his disclosing his will (βούλομαι, “I want”) for the conduct of the men/husbands (2:8) and the women/wives (2:9-10). Some question exists what exactly Paul “likewise also” wanted of the women, although the elliptical grammar would have us only to resupply βούλομαι to be complemented by the infinitive κοσμεῖν “to adorn” and not to resupply the whole of βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι “I want them to pray,” which is too difficult grammatically. On the one hand, apart from the initial orienter βούλομαι, there are no remarkable aspects of word order in Paul’s exhortations to the men/husbands at 2:8; normal word order obtains. However, there is quantitative emphasis in the phrase “in every place”; also, the description of “uplifted holy hands” appeals to broad social practices. On the other hand, Paul’s extended exhortation for women in 2:9-10 shows significant discourse-pragmatic features, including focal prominent word order in 2:9b (the preposing of “with decency and propriety”) and the point/counterpoint set of μή ... ἀλλά “not . . . but” emphasizing its final constituent “through good deeds” (δι’ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν), which is set off and highlighted by the prior non-restrictive continuative-descriptive relative pronoun clause (“which is proper for women making a claim to godliness”); thus prominence attends these good deeds, which also stand in

---


37. Ibid, 10.

a final sentence position.\textsuperscript{39} It should be pointed out here that the virtuous behavior of decency, propriety, godliness, and good works are socially and broadly recognized virtues (see further below).

After reviewing 2:1-10, we should ask, What indications exist that Paul intends a restricted location of concern to Christian Worship or a church setting? I don't see any whatsoever.\textsuperscript{40} The one item that interpreters will point to is Paul's statement in 2:8 “for the men/husbands to pray in every place” (προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ). However, this expression is found elsewhere in Paul only three times, each with a clear sense of missionary or evangelistic import:

1 Thess 1:8 “The word of the Lord has sounded forth from you, not only in Macedonia and Achaia but also in every place your faith towards God has gone out, so that I have no need to say anything” (NASB95).

1 Cor 1:2b “called saints, which all that are calling upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in very place…” [We must note that Paul wants the Corinthians to think of the gospel spreading to others throughout the epistle; see esp. 14:36; cf. 2 Cor 10]

2 Cor 2:14 “God…is triumphing…and manifesting through us a knowledge of Christ in every place.”

J. N. D. Kelly rightly considers this phrase ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ “in every place” to be a technical term for Paul to mean “wherever the gospel is preached” and relates the statement to that found in Mal 1:11:\textsuperscript{41} “For from the rising of the sun even to its setting, My name will be great among the nations, and in every place incense is going to be offered to My

\textsuperscript{39} In support of the focal prominence and final highlighting, see Levinsohn, Discourse Features of 1 Timothy, 11. On point/counterpoint sets, see Long, Koine Greek Grammar, 83 and the sources cited there.

\textsuperscript{40} Indeed, J. M. Holmes, investigating Paul’s explicit purpose statements with ἵνα in 1:18 (that Paul exhorts Timothy to fight the good fight) and 3:15 (“that you know how one must behave oneself in the household of God”), rightly concludes: “Neither stated goal limits the context to worship or prayer meetings” (Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2.9-15, Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 196 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 50).

name, and a grain offering that is pure; for My name will be great among the nations,” says the Lord of hosts” (NASB95).

So, in 2:1-10 we certainly have praying occurring, but we must acknowledge that the prayer is focused to support God’s knowledge of God’s salvation in Jesus Christ spreading to all people. There are many instances in the NT where praying takes place in a variety of locations, not even primarily in a (formal) church worship setting.42 Taken together, then, we can conclude that 1 Tim 2 is framed by a concern for evangelistic-missional outreach in broad societal perspective to save all persons.

THE SOCIAL AND ETHICAL RESPECTABILITY OF BELIEVERS

Part and parcel with this mission, moreover, is Paul’s description of the goal of the prayer, namely in 2:2, the community’s peaceableness and quietness in view of rulers and authorities. Additionally, in 2:8-10 Paul’s description of the husband’s/men’s prayer and conduct and the wives’/women’s appearance and conduct both reflect broadly-held social virtues of Paul’s day. This has been well-documented, described, and summarized in commentaries and specialized studies. Commenting on 2:2, Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann rightly conclude that believers “should live a peaceable and quiet life” (ἠρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν) “is described in terms which, to be sure, stand out as peculiar in the context of the NT, but which are frequently used in the environment of early

42. Jesus encouraged praying in secret (the Lord’s prayer), perhaps even in the water closet (Matt 6:6); Jesus was praying while being baptized at the Jordan (Luke 3:21); he was praying in the wilderness (Mark 1:35) and on a mountain (Luke 9:29); the disciples are praying in Gethsemane (Matt 26:41) and at the temple during the prayer hour (Acts 3:1). Jesus also anticipates the disciples to be praying “whenever” (ὅταν, Mark 11:25) and “at all times” (πάντοτε [Luke 18:1]; ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ [21:36]). Cornelius “was praying to God continually” (δεόμενος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ παντός, Acts 10:2). Paul prays at a house possibly alone (Acts 9:11) as does Peter (Acts 11:5). Paul went to a riverside looking for a place of prayer (Acts 16:13) and prays and sings hymns in prison (16:25). It is likely, although not specified, that Paul was praying as “his spirit was provoked” walking through Athens and observing all the idols. Prayer occurs on a beach at Paul’s departure (Acts 21:5). Certainly, corporate “church” praying occurred regularly in houses (Acts 1:14; 2:42; 6:6; 12:12) but also for special needs and occasions (4:31; 8:15, 22; 9:40; 12:5; 20:36). However, praying seems to be a continuous practice anywhere expected of ministers (Acts 6:4). To this brief summary, we should remember Paul’s example and admonitions about continuously praying (1 Thess 5:18; Eph 6:18; Col 1:3; 4:2; Phil 4:6; 1 Tim 5:5). So, we should not envision a (formal) worship setting at every mention of praying.
Christianity.” The assertion here about the “peculiarity” is problematic, since similar notions are found in 1 Thess 4:11-12; 2 Thess 3:11-12 (cf. Eph 4:28; 1 Pet 4:14-16). Nevertheless, the broad environment is well documented by Dibelius and Conzelmann. So too, concerning 2:2 these interpreters say, “‘Piety’ (εὐσέβεια) and ‘dignity’ (σεμνότης) are obviously intended to illustrate the ideal of good, honorable citizenship….”

Likewise, regarding Paul’s admonitions to women in 2:9, Gary G. Hoag can summarize: “the consensus reads 1 Tim 2:9 as consistent with Jewish moralists and respecting Roman codes for female decorum.”

In 2:8, Paul’s desire for the men/husbands to lift up “holy hands” (ὁσίους χεῖρας) contains a peculiar adjective ὅσιος. BDAG (728), even before offering its first definition, explains the social import of this adjective: “In the Gr-Rom. world this term [ὅσιος] for the most part described that which helps maintain the delicate balance between the interests of society and the expectations of the transcendent realm.” Although interpreters commonly indicate (with good scriptural support) that praying with hands uplifted was one Jewish posture for prayer which may indicate a worship setting, to raise “holy hands” actually represented a broader Hellenistic idiom, since “Holy hands’ (ὅσιοι χεῖρες) in the Greek tragedians are hands which are ritually pure.” The Roman philosopher Seneca in Naturales Questiones 3.Praef.14 (c. AD 63) speaks of “lifting pure hands to heaven” (puras ad caelum manus tollere) as part of an extended response to the question, “What is the Principle thing to do?”; Josephus describes


44. Ibid., 39.

45. Gary G. Hoag, “Decorum and Deeds in 1 Timothy 2:9-10 in Light of Ephesiaca by Xenophon of Ephesus,” Ex Auditu 27 (2011): 134–60 at 146. Hoag also argues that Paul’s admonitions for the women is particularly appropriate in the environs of Ephesus, since women in cultic attire or otherwise associated with Artemis were identified with the particular negative attributes (adornment, braided hair, and gold) and positive virtues (godliness, piety, and good deeds) as recounted in the literary work of Xenophon of Ephesus, Ephesiaca, which Hoag argues may be dated to the first century CE; he argues, “Nearly every word in 1 Tim 2:9-10 appears in Ephesiaca” (154).


47. Dibelius and Conzelmann, Pastoral Epistles, 44 n.2.
Abraham’s petition to the Lord against Pharaoh to involve lifting hands to God (BJ 5.380); see also 1 QS 9.15.48

In the (public) inscriptions, the lifting up of hands may be associated with cursing and prayers of vengeance. (One wonders whether such would be unholy hands.) At Delos, one reads, “Theogenes … against unholiness raises the hands to Helios and the holy goddess” (Θεογένης κατ’ ἀναγίου αἵρει τὰς χεῖρας τῷ Ἡλίῳ καὶ τῇ ἁγνῇ θεᾷ) to begin to curse a woman who had defrauded him (ID 2531.1-4).49 On the neighboring Island Rheneia, a double-sided Jewish inscription dating to about 100 BC calls for vengeance on the murderer of two Jewish young ladies. The marble stele (shown below) remarkably depicts raised hands calling upon God’s assistance to avenge.50 The inscription was a public display calling for divine justice.

48. These references were found in H. Balz, “ὁσιός” EDNT 2:536.


Additionally, the raising of hands reflects a broader societal practice that is seen in other settings. For example, the raising of both hands in prayer is a type scene on Greek votive reliefs, reflecting the worshipper’s awe and respect towards deity. A votive relief dating to the 4th century BC from Karystos, Greece, shows a “woman venerating Dionysos and Ploutos, raising both hands in prayer (Chalkis, Museum 337).”51 A similar scene is found as a family of worshippers approaches the god Asklepeios and his daughter Hygeia who recline eating, with the snake below Asklepeios, his calling card.52 This relief is located inside a church building at Merbaka near Argos in the Peloponnese. It is an ex-voto scene where supplicants offer sacrifices to fulfill a vow, here a ram sacrifice. The supplicants of family members have hands slightly raised as sign of adoration or prayer (προσεύχη), a word commonly used in the GNT (including 1 Tim 2:1) and cognate to the verb προσεύχομαι found in 1 Tim 2:8.

So, returning to 1 Tim 2, this passage should be interpreted as relating to the larger Christian mission, the proclamation of the gospel to all people. John P. Dickson, investigating Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism


52. The image and description has been edited from Victor Duruy, History of Greece, and of the Greek People, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest, trans. M. M. Ripley, vol. I, sect. II (Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1890), 417 and are also further described in Long, Koine Greek Grammar, 360.
*and in the Pauline Communities*, demonstrates that the Pauline Epistles in numerous places speak of missionary praying (1 Thess 5:25; 2 Thess 3:1; Rom 10:1; Col 4:2-4; Eph 6:19-20; 1 Tim 2:1-10) and encourage attractive behavior for the sake of an “ethical apologetic,” that is, behavior that is becoming and winsome to outsiders (1 Thess 4:11-12; Col 4:5; Phil 4:5; Titus 2:3-10; 3:1-8).Dickson concludes his study of these passages, saying,

it is clear that ‘ethical apologetic’ formed a significant part of Pauline parenesis not simply in his letters but in his foundational instructions also (1 Thess 4:11-12). In Paul’s view, Christians were to be cognizant of the fact that they lived in full view of an unbelieving society and, thus, were to strive for a morally ‘good appearance’ before that audience…. Thus, the ‘wise’ and ‘attractive’ lifestyle of believers was to perform a missionary function.

In other words, in 1 Tim 2, Paul was merging prayer for missionary evangelism with a concern for social decorum and respectability, as reflected elsewhere in the Pauline corpus. Thus, a better heading (if we need one) for 1 Tim 2:1-15 would be “Prayer and Instructions for Missional Living.”

**SOCIAL-CULTURAL-RELIGIOUS VIEWS OF MEN AS HUSBANDS AND WOMEN AS WIVES**

At this point we need to consider a significant aspect of 1 Tim 2, namely, the shared cognitive environment regarding gender roles in the Mediterranean world, especially centered in Greece and Asia Minor. What social-cultural climate existed such that Paul would be so concerned about the men’s or husbands’ activities and the women’s or wives’ activities? What is the shared cognitive environment that informs 1 Tim 2? Let me briefly describe six aspects of gender expectations, customs, and practices that would enforce and perpetuate them.

53. John P. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities: The Shape, Extent and Background of Early Christian Mission*, WUNT 2/159 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 216-19, in which Dickson discusses 1 Tim 2:1-10. Dickson should have spent more time explicating the ethical apologetic of this passage, which is limited to very brief comments in his conclusion (292).

First, the household was generally understood as the foundational political unit of the society; thus safeguards existed for proper maintenance of it (see also further below). Thus, it was understood, “as goes the family, so goes society.” This awareness explains why Paul and Peter, as they describe in broader terms the Christian gospel and the formation and identity of the people of God (1 Peter 2; Eph 1:1–5:14), nevertheless will further relate the Christian community members to the broader society and its kings and authorities (Eph 3:7-9; 6:10-12; Titus 3:1–11; 1 Pet 2:11–17) but then also address matters of the Christian household: husband/wife, parent/child, slave/master or social roles by age/gender (Eph 5:15–6:9; Titus 2; Pet 2:11–3:12). This same movement is observed in 1 Tim 2 and then in its latter chapters.

Second, persons generally were zealous to maintain decorum and proper distinctions among inhabitants of cities. Riet van Bremen summarizes, “In both its male and female versions the ‘ideal’ citizen was, as M. Worrle has memorably described him, a ‘Polisfanatiker’ whose every effort, including his wealth, was at the service of his fellow citizens.” So, genders and ages (men, boys, women, and girls) were distinguished in public. Riet van Bremen summarizes:

In Hellenistic cities divisions within the family extended into the public sphere. The ideology of equality and solidarity, which dominated male civic behaviour and which emerged from a political tradition that gave a central decision-making role to the assembly of male citizens, strongly affected the public personae of women and the young. In the public sphere households regrouped themselves along lines of gender and age, forming

55. Cicero said, “the deterioration of the State by means of boundless freedoms results in the home not having a master, and father fearing sons, old men stooping to the games of the youth for fear of being too serious, wives having the same rights as husbands, and many other evils” (De Res Publica I.67). Correspondingly, Musonius Rufus said, “…it would be each man’s duty to take thought for his own city, and to make of his home a rampart for its protection. But the first step toward making his home a rampart is marriage. Whoever destroys human marriage destroys the home, the city, and the whole human race” (XIV); quoted from Raymond A. Belliotti, Roman Philosophy and the Good Life (Lanham, MA; Lexington, 2009), 200–201.

in a certain sense a collective family of citizens. For civic purposes, families dissolved into collectives of men (neoi: young men, formed a separate and important group), women (referred to as gynaikes or politides), boys of different ages (paides: young boys, epheboi: boys in their upper teens) and unmarried girls (parthenoi). This functional separation affected office-holding, including religious office-holding, and gave structure to civic and religious ritual and to the acculturation and education of (future) citizens.\(^{57}\)

Third, gynaikonomoi “controllers of women” and similar magistracies were ubiquitous in Greek Mediterranean cities. Aristotle described the existence of various magistrate positions to help retain gender and social distinctions. Their provenance extended as far south as Alexandria, as far west as Syracuse, and as far north as Thasos in the Northern Aegean sea.\(^{58}\) Bremen summarizes:

Aristotle, in the Politics, does indeed describe the gynaikonomos, together with the paidonomos and ‘other magistracies exercising similar supervisory functions’…; he also lists the gynaikonomia with the paidonomia, nomophylakia and gymnasiarchia under the heading of magistracies that ‘are concerned with eukosmia (good order, decorum) and specific to cities that have a certain amount of leisure and wealth’ (Pol. 1300a4; 1322b39; 1323a4).\(^{59}\)

And,

In our period, these magistracies had developed from being specific only to certain types of cities to being virtually ubiquitous and characteristic of cities’ concern with acculturating the young and with guarding the public decorum and moral integrity of those groups that were deemed to be in need of supervision precisely because they were essential to the integrity of the citizen body as

\(^{57}\) Riet van Bremen, “Family Structures,” 322.


\(^{59}\) Bremen, “Family Structures,” 323.
Of particular interest here is the role of the *gynaikonomos*. Daniel Ogden in his “Appendix: *Gynaikonomoi*, ‘Controllers of Women’” offers a survey of the evidence, the distribution of this magistrate, and the kinds of roles the *gynakionomos* had:

1. They policed women’s dress and legitimate participation of girls at festivals, e.g., properly distinguishing married from unmarried women and the number of feasters.

2. They policed mourning at funerals, which was normally conducted by women, involving clothing (grey color), cleanliness, and the duration of mourning. However, they may have curbed the womanly behavior of men at funerals (by their excessive mourning).

3. They controlled the women’s exiting of the home; the rules varied slightly, but generally the women were not to go out at night (unless they were going to commit adultery) and were not to travel alone, but could be escorted by female slaves.

4. They regulated their morality and appearances in public, making sure proper distinctions were made between initiated and uninitiated to the mystery cult, married women and young girls, and slave-women. Foremost, however, was making sure women were not too alluringly attractive: “jewellery, rouge, face-powder, hair-bands, plaited hair, shoes, and diaphanous clothes are banned…” They were particularly concerned with proper order (κόσμος and κοσμιος and κοσμέω); these latter two words occur in 1 Tim 2: “At Syracuse the gynaikonomoi policed regulations that forbade women to wear gold ornaments, garments embroidered with flowers, or robes with purple borders, unless they professed they were prostitutes.”

5. They (may have) regulated the amount of feasting generally, not just among women, although this may have been unique to Syracuse.

6. They were concerned with “the curbing of womanish behavior in men” perhaps beyond the funeral in 2nd CE Chaeronea.

---

60. Ibid., 324.


63. Ibid., 370.

64. Ibid., 373.
Ogden concludes by reflecting on the complementary role of the *gynaikonomoi* (attending especially to women) and other magistrates overseeing men and boys. There may have been some relation of the *gynaikonomoi* and the *kosmophylakes* (“keepers of social order”) described at Cyzicus (the leading city in northern Mysia) in the 1st century BC and 1st century AD. At Athens in the first century CE, married couples had “to register ‘the completion of their marriages’ with the *kosmophylax*” either for record keeping or for registering legitimate children who could enter officially into the citizenry. Some relation, too, may exist with “the magistrate set over the good order [εὐκοσμία] of virgins” that existed at Pergamum and at Smyrna.65

However, the fourth aspect of gender expectations and customs in the first century (BC and AD), in spite of carefully watching women and wives and attempting to control their behavior as described just above, was “a feminist movement” (to risk anachronism) of the new woman. This phenomenon is well described by Bruce Winter in his book, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). There were various social and/or legal responses to this phenomenon. Among moralists, there was disdain and censor, appealing to traditions of modesty. As far as legislation, in order to promote progeny and strengthen family cohesion the emperor Augustus enacted a law that encouraged the bearing of children, chastity within marriage, and granted inheritance rights for wives.66

Fifth, the influence of the Artemis Cult likely affected women’s attitudes and conduct towards apparel, marriage, and childbearing. Lynn R. LiDonnici summarizes,

Nearly all of the roles of Artemis of Ephesus suggest that the goddess could be understood as the legitimate wife of the city of Ephesus itself: protectress and nourisher; ‘trustworthy warden’ not only of the things in people’s houses, but also of the financial resources on deposit at the Artemision; guardian of legitimate marriage; overseer of the birth of the next generation, κουροτρόφος. These are categories of power, intimately connected with the stability and continuation of the family, the city, the empire, and,

---

65. Ibid., 373-75.

conceptually, the universe.”

Diodorus Siculus also identified Artemis of Ephesus as κουροτρόφος the nursing mother or child rearer (5.73.5). Sharon H. Gritz summarizes, “Artemis had a special concern with the loss of virginity and with childbearing. Maidens of marriageable age did certain honors to Artemis. Women in travail called on her for aid.”

Sixth, although women’s wives’ roles were expanding to include patronage as benefactresses (cf. Luke 8:1-4; Rom 16:2) and holding magistracies and offices in voluntary associations, social critics still denounced women speaking at public gatherings and banquets; moreover, “there is no record of women undertaking the task of a teacher in a professional sense either in salaried posts in great houses or in running schools as sophists.” This is true despite women having a role in the education of their children and sons at home. In the more traditional Greek understanding, the husband was to be the teacher of his wife, not vice versa. Although daughters were encouraged to learn, ancient philosophers expressed concern that women/wives would be uncontrolled in their speech. For example, the well-known Musonius Rufus (the Roman Socrates), a contemporary of Jesus and Paul, who viewed women as essentially equal to men and favored the education of daughters, encouraged women/wives’ education but warned against their uncontrolled speech.


70. Winter, Roman Wives, 116; this view is summarized and supported by Towner, Letters, 218.

of daughters, nevertheless makes this startling comment concerning wives: “Women who associate with philosophers are bound to be arrogant for the most part and presumptuous, in that abandoning their own households and turning to the company of men they practice speeches, talk like sophists, and analyze syllogisms, when they ought to be sitting at home spinning” (II.54-58). At issue is the abdication of the marriage responsibilities as understood generally in Mediterranean cultures. In this regard, returning to 1 Tim 2:11-15, Towner attempts a reconstruction of why Paul would have prohibited women from teaching: 1) the wealthy women had come under the influence of false teachers (1 Tim 6:20-21; 2 Tim 2:18); 2) women may have been encouraged by those promoting heresy to be teachers, given that the heresy prohibited sexual relations/marriage (1 Tim 4:3); and 3) he showed resistance to the societal currents of the new woman.

THE EVIDENCE FOR A WIFE IN RELATION TO A HUSBAND IN 2:11-15

At this point I present evidence in favor of 2:11-15 having a restricted focus; Paul has a focal concern to address the husband and wife relationship. First, in every other place where Paul uses ἄνηρ and γυνή together, he refers to the husband/wife relationship: Rom 7:2-3; 1 Cor 7:2-4, 10-14, 16, 27, 29, 33-34, 39; 11:3-15; 14:34-35; Eph 5:22-25, 28, 31, 33; Col 3:18-19; 1 Tim 3:2, 3:11-12; 5:9; Titus 1:6. This foundational evidence is quite weighty, and unless there are excellent reasons to reject it, we would be remiss to ignore it. But, in fact, several pieces of evidence support the view that Paul was speaking of a wife in relation to a husband.


73. Towner, Letters, 219-20.

74. This suggestion was made by G. K. Beale (as cited by Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office,” 354) and argued by Robert Mulholland (unpublished paper). Hugenberger adds: ‘Outside the Pauline corpus we may add further examples of anēr and γυνὲ in close proximity with the meanings ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ rather than ‘man’ and ‘woman’: Matt 1:16, 19-20; Mark 10:2; 10:11-12; Luke 1:27; 16:18; Acts 5:1-10; 1 Pet 3:1-7; Rev 21:2, 9. Besides these there are a number of cases where these terms (generally in the plural) occur together, often along with ‘children,’ where they are used to express either a listing or enumeration of individuals, stressing the mixed nature of the group in question: Matt 14:21; 15:38; Acts 5:14; 8:3, 12; 9:2; 17:12, 34; 22:4. A possible exception where anēr
Second, 2:11 shows asyndeton; there is no connecting conjunction with 2:10. This is not inconsistent with a shift in topic in 2:11 to address the behavior of individual wives within the broader social setting established in 2:1-10. The proper determination of referent and subject matter must come from contextual factors, including number, article usage, word order, and adjunctive modifiers (see below). Paul’s move from women plural (γυναῖκας) in 2:9-10 to a singular woman (γυνή) would indicate a narrowing of the focus, a move from general to specific.

Third, a topical shift in 2:11 is indicated by preposing the anarthrous γυνή, which also provides a point of departure for what follows. Since women have already been introduced and are known in the discourse (i.e. the preceding two verses), the anarthrous noun and shift from plural to singular would suggest the introduction of a new participant focus: an (individual) wife. Additionally, the preposed modifier ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ (in quietness) before the verb μανθανέτω (let her learn) is marked for focal prominence; importantly, too, the command form is more potent than either the preceding two verses (2:8-9) or the following verse (2:12), which is quite mitigated and lessened in potency (see further below).

Fourth, by describing the γυνή in 2:11 as needing to act “in all submission” (ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ), Timothy (and the audience) would have readily understood the husband-wife relationship to be in mind, since to discuss γυνή and “submission” topically evokes a husband-wife relationship under the standardized socially-ubiquitous house code regulations. Furthermore, within the Pastoral Epistles, submission language signals house code bears the meaning ‘husband’ while γυνὴ may mean ‘woman’ is John 4:16-19. Even here, however, γυνὴ may have been chosen precisely for its aptness as a designation for a married woman. Cases of coincidental juxtaposition (generally where the terms occur in separate pericopes and so are semantically unrelated) are Mark 6:17-18, 20; Luke 23:49-50; Acts 17:4-5” (354 n.57).

75. See Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 118-20. Alternatively, asyndeton may signal close connection of ideas, thus abutting and connecting 2:11 with 2:10.


77. I partially agree and disagree with Levinsohn here. On this point, he indicates: “The pre-verbal subject γυνη is a point of departure by renewal, introducing a different exhortation directed to the women” (*Discourse Features of 1 Timothy*, 12). The disagreement concerns ignoring the anarthrous γυνή and understanding 2:11 under an exhortation to (all) women generally.

78. So Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of 1 Timothy*, 12; on potency of exhortations, see Long, *Koine Greek Grammar*, 501-6 and the sources cited there.
regulations.\textsuperscript{79} It must be said again, too, that the submission language speaks to social respectability. “Submission is used to characterize relationships when there is a concern about ensuring that the church not be discredited with people in the wider society (1 Tim. 3:4; Titus 2:5,9-10; 3:1-2).”\textsuperscript{80} Between a γυνὴ and an ἀνήρ, elsewhere in Paul submission for wives is only to be given to their own husbands: Col 3:18 (ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν); Eph 5:24 (τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντὶ); 1 Pet 3:1, 5 (τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνδράσιν) and Titus 2:5 (τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνδράσιν). In these places, which are all in the plural, one will find the article and often ἱδίος. But here in 2:12 the anarthrous and singular ἀνδρός may relate to the singularity of the situation: a wife in relation to a husband. Otherwise, the lack of article on ἀνδρός may introduce a husband onto the scene as a new participant (as occurs with γυνὴ), stress the qualitative nature of the noun, and/or emphasize the role of the ἀνήρ as an agent.\textsuperscript{81} (These anarthrous nouns contrast with the articular ἡ γυνὴ in 2:14, referring anaphorically back to Eve in 2:13.) Hugenberger indeed argues that the anarthrous ἀνδρός does not need an article or pronoun to mean “(her) husband.”\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{79} In 1 Tim 3:4, “in submission” is described of fathers in relation to children (τέκνα ἐχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ); in Titus 2:5, wives are to be submissive to their own husbands (ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνδράσιν); in Titus 2:9 slaves are to submit to their own masters in everything (Δούλους ἱδίους δεσπόταις ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν); in Titus 3:1-2 the people of God are to submit to rulers, to authorities (Ὑπομίμνῃσκε αὐτοὺς ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι). See Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office,” 355-57.


\textsuperscript{81} For a discussion of these options generally, see esp. Levinsohn, Discourse Features, ch. 9 and Long, Koine Greek Grammar, 416-18.

\textsuperscript{82} “Limiting ourselves to biblical usage, a number of examples readily suggest themselves where anēr means “(her) husband” and yet appears without either the expected article or possessive pronoun: Luke 1:34, “since I have not had relations with my husband (ἐπεὶ andra ou ginōskō)”; 2:36, “she was of a great age, having lived with her husband (meta andros) seven years from her virginity”; 16:18, “and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband (apo andros) commits adultery”; 1 Cor 7:10, “To the married I give the charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband (gynaika apo andros)” (Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office,” 353).
Fifth, in 2:12 the δέ signals a new development with the point of departure being teaching (διδάσκειν) performed by the γυνή. Both words are preposed; since διδάσκειν is likely the point of departure (assumed from the previous context of “learning”), the anarthrous preposed dative γυναικὶ marks her emphatically as an agent. Instead of teaching or domineering a husband, the wife was to remain quiet; it was not her “station” to teach her husband. “Quietness” too was a social virtue for wives in public in relation to their husbands. In 1 Cor 14:34-35 the concept of “quietness” (σιγάω) with the specific words of “learning” (μανθάνω) and “submission” (ὑποτάσσω) is used to refer to wives (γυναῖκι) in relation to their husbands (ἄνδρες) in the view of evangelism/witness (14:36; cf. 12:1-2) and societal orderliness (14:33; then too in 14:35 Paul evokes the notion of “shame” which is a public conception).

83. That δέ here signals a new development differs from the view of Levinsohn, who sees 2:12 as a parenthetical remark (Discourse Features of 1 Timothy, 12). However, would such a prominent parenthetical remark receive such extensive supporting statements with γάρ in which reference is made to Adam and Eve? This seems unlikely. Instead, 2:12 advances the argument of 2:11 about the social behavior of individual wives “learning” so as to address the flip-side of a wife’s learning “in submission (to her husband),” namely, “not teaching nor domineering him.” The difficulty for Levinsohn, I believe, is the ordering of the preposed elements; he understands διδάσκειν “teaching” to have focal prominence, and not to be a point of departure. The issue is how to account for the coordinative complex (διδάσκειν ... γυναῖκι) both being preposed; he thus appeals to how both constituents may be preposed in a coordinative phrase when only one is focally prominent (citing his Discourse Features, 39); but his discussion there is restricted to the preposing of attending pronominal constituents, which would not apply here to γυναῖκι. Two alternatives present themselves: 1) Only διδάσκειν is preposed (as a point of departure), with then the focal prominence falling on the constituent placed in final position οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω “I do not permit”, leaving γυναῖκι only one place to go, after διδάσκειν and immediately preposed before οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω; 2) alternatively, Levinsohn generally acknowledges that preposed constituents receive more prominence than not being preposed and that complements will follow the verb when they are off the theme line (Discourse Features, 38), which would not be the case here, since γυνή is still presented as (potential) agent (of teaching). And so, consequently, both διδάσκειν and γυναῖκι are preposed for prominence, with διδάσκειν providing the point of departure while γυναῖκι remains prominent and on the main theme line or topic.

84. The authenticity of these verses is questioned by notable interpreters (see review and rejection of this view in Keener, Paul, Women & Wives, 74-75), and perhaps most importantly, by Philip B. Payne, who first noticed the presence “Distigme-Obelos Symbols in Codex Vaticanus B Marking the Location of Interpolations, including 1 Cor 14:34–35” (Handout for ETS paper presentation); his views are
Clement of Alexandria indicates:

The wife and the husband [τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα] should go to church decently attired, with natural step, clinging in silence, possessing ‘genuine love,’ being pure in body and pure in heart, and fit to offer prayers to God. All the more, let the wife [ἡ γυνή] observe this: let her be completely veiled unless she happens to be at home. For this manner of dress is solemn and inaccessible to view. Never will she err who holds before her eyes modesty and a shawl; nor will she entice another to fall into sin by uncovering her face. For the Logos wishes this, seeing that it is ‘fitting’ for her to pray veiled [cf. 1 Cor 11:13]…. (Paedagogus 3.II (79.3-4).)

Sixth, in 2:13–14 Paul’s appeal to Adam and Eve (“the wife” [ἡ γυνή] in 2:14) narrows the scope of reference of 2:11–15 to a husband and a wife. Adam and Eve were the first husband and wife. In each instance where Paul refers to Eve in his writings (1 Cor 11:8–9; 2 Cor 11:1–3; Eph 5:31), he does so in the context of marriage. Towner aptly merges the horizon of the social emergence of the new woman here with his interpretation of the passage: “In such an atmosphere of enthusiasm and innovation, where the operative concept was ‘reversal of roles,’ if wives/women were usurping the public role of husbands/men and exerting authority in a way that disrespected their male counterparts, v.13 is a reminder that the Genesis story properly read in no way legitimizes the reversal or the behavior.”

Seventh, Paul makes reference to “the childbearing” (τῆς τεκνογονίας), which is articular. Importantly, the type of noun that τεκνογονία is by formation (an incorporated noun complement formed with its verb) is “used

found in detail in his Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 225–67.


to designate an ‘institutionalized activity’” thus Levinsohn, does not refer to the singular unique event of Christ coming into the world, as has been proposed by commentators. But what, then, is the significance of the article with the noun? It would indicate the specificity of an entity that is known or knowable in the immediate discourse context, which would most naturally be the childbearing that would occur from a marriage relationship. In this respect, Moyer Hubbard has recently compiled evidence (convincing in my view) that 2:15 should be translated, “But she will be kept safe through the ordeal of childbearing.” Among the evidence he sets forth is the likely high mortality rate among women. Craig Keener, too, argues, “The most natural way for an ancient reader to have understood ‘salvation’ in the context of childbirth would have been a safe delivery, for women regularly called upon patron deities (such as Artemis and Isis) in childbirth.”

88. Levinsohn, Discourse Features of 1 Timothy, 12-13. He here cites in support of this latter claim, Marianne Mithun, “The Evolution of Noun Incorporation,” Language 60 (1984): 847–94 at 848. Particularly relevant is Mithun’s summary of the functions of IN (incorporated nouns): “Since IN’s do not refer to specific entities, these constructions tend to be used in contexts without specific, individuated patients. They may be generic statements; or descriptions of on-going activities, in which a patient has been incompletely affected; or habitual activities, in which the specific patient may change; or projected activities, in which the specific patient is not yet identifiable; or joint activities, where an individual agent incompletely affects a particular patient; or activities directed at an unspecified portion of a mass” (856).

89. E.g., George W. Knight III. The Pastoral Epistles. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 147-48 and Witherington, Letters and Homilies, 229-30. Witherington indicates this interpretation is as old as Justin Martyr, and even Ignatius.

90. Such a principle of article usage corresponds with the descriptions in Levinsohn (Discourse Features) and Read-Heimerdinger, The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism, JSNTSS 236 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 116-44.


1 TIM 2:11-15 IN TRANSLATION AND FINAL INTERPRETIVE STATEMENTS

11 Let a wife continue learning quietly with entire submission [“to her husband” implied].

12a Moreover [δέ], I do not [οὐκ] permit a wife to be teaching [διδάσκειν], nor [οὐδὲ] assuming domineering authority [ἀὐθεντεῖν] over a husband. [The δέ indicates a new development, 93 and is not marked for continuity with the preceding material, but other contextual indicators may show continuity; both activities for a wife are viewed negatively in society]

12b but instead to be quiet [the οὐκ ... οὐδὲ ... ἀλλ’ is a correction; Paul does not mean to be completely silent, but not to be disruptive, as was the more conservative social expectation]

13 For [γάρ] Adam was formed first, then Eve. [The γάρ marks support; The first married couple; there is a creation order for husband and wife]

14 And Adam was not deceived, but the wife being deceived has entered into transgression.

15 Moreover [δέ], she [the wife] will be delivered through the bearing of children, if they [wives] remain in faith and love and sanctification with self-control. [The δέ indicates a new development 94 and is not marked for continuity with 2:14; also, the final virtue σωφροσύνη refers back to a virtue the women were to display in 2:9]

In the end, then, this proposed interpretation addresses several perennial questions of the passage. First, in 2:12, the force of the οὐκ ... οὐδὲ ... ἀλλ’ construction and the negative or positive meaning of ἀὐθεντεύω can be satisfactorily resolved. Andreas Köstenberger has argued that the οὐκ ... οὐδὲ construction must present both verbs as positive or both as negative. Since διδάσκειν is positive, therefore ἀὐθεντεύω must be positive and mean simply “have authority.” Since he explains the exegetical dilemma well and the options, let me quote him at length:

[D]etailed analyses of the NT and extrabiblical Greek literature conducted by the present writer have shown that διδάσκειν and ἀὐθεντεύω are linked in 1 Tim 2:12 by the coordinating conjunction οὐδὲ in a way that requires them to share either a positive or negative force. Thus 1


94. Levinsohn, Ibid., 112-18.
Tim 2:12 could either be rendered as “I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man” (both terms share a positive force) or “I do not permit a woman to teach error nor to usurp a man’s authority” (both terms share a negative force). Moreover, since διδάσκειν in the Pastorals always has a positive force (cf. 1 Tim 4:11; 6:2; and 2 Tim 2:2), αὐθεντείν, too, should be expected to have a positive force in 1 Tim 2:12, so that the rendering “I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man” is required. Other instances of διδάσκειν in the Pastorals indicate that if a negative connotation or content is intended, the word ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν or other contextual qualifiers are used (cf. 1 Tim 1:3–4; 6:3; Tit 1:9–14).95

However, since Köstenberger fails to understand the negative cultural valuation of a wife teaching her husband, he also fails to acknowledge the negative implication of αὐθεντείν to mean “domineer/usurp” and not simply “have authority.” So, in the context of a husband–wife relationship, both concepts are negative, since it was not acceptable for a wife to be in a teaching relationship over her husband, let alone in a domineering one. Such a conclusion—that αὐθεντείν ἄνδρός carries a negative connotation like “to domineer/take undue authority over a husband”—aligns well with careful research on the verb in the closest temporal and literary contexts to that of 1 Timothy. At a minimum, I. Howard Marshall is correct when, after summarizing and carefully working through the research and options in context, he insists that “the whole phrase is pejorative.”96

More specifically, however, investigating the most relevant ancient sources, Leland E. Wilshire concludes: “The many uses of the words from literary koine along with the more professional style of Greek in the Pastorals gives added weight to look for the meaning of AUTHENTEO as it is used by writers of literary koine such as Apollonius Rhodius, Polybius, the LXX

---


Book of Wisdom, Diodorus Siculus, Flavius Josephus, and Philo Judeaus. All of these authors use the word to apply to some sort of criminal behavior or murder.\textsuperscript{97} Clearly, the verb \textit{αὐθεντεῖν} carried an inherently negative sense in the first century, especially regarding a wife in relation to a husband, and corresponds to the negative social-cultural valuation of a wife teaching a husband.

Second, Paul's admonition in 2:12 using “I do not permit…” (οὐκ \textit{ἐπιτρέπω}) employs a form of admonition that is less “potent” than an imperatival form such as was just used in the previous verse: “let a wife learn…” (Γυνὴ [...] \textit{μανθανέτω}). Using such an indirect statement as “I do not permit….” is what Levinsohn calls a “mitigated” exhortation. Surveying exhortations along a scale of most potent to least potent while discussing verbal mood, person, directness, contextual orienters, social factors, etc., Levinsohn turns to consider 2:12: “A very indirect form of exhortation is found in 1 Timothy 2:12. By using the orienter οὐκ \textit{ἐπιτρέπω} I do not allow, Paul is indirectly exhorting Timothy to follow his example….”\textsuperscript{98}

Indeed, excepting the occurrence in 1 Cor 14:34, Philip B. Payne concludes, “the verb ‘to permit’ (ἐπιτρέπω) never refers to a universal or permanent situation in any of its uses in the LXX or NT. Especially its use in the first person singular present indicative makes it unlikely that Paul intended 1 Tim 2:12 as a universal or permanent prohibition.”\textsuperscript{99} Moreover, this present article has provided the social-cultural context to explain why Paul would give such an indirect exhortation, since Paul's practice was conditioned according to societal standards. Such a mitigation of the injunction provides a clue for our contemporary interpretation and appropriation of Paul's teaching. In fact, in a Western context, women commonly hold teaching positions “over” men in a variety of settings; and for a wife to hold such a teaching position “over” a husband would not be a breach of social decorum generally. However, it would be problematic if she would teach domineeringly over her husband. However, the converse would also be true: Any husband who was “over” a wife in some teaching position and held such a position domineeringly would also be acting inappropriately and un-Christ-like.

\textsuperscript{97} Wilshire, \textit{Insight}, 31.

\textsuperscript{98} Levinsohn, \textit{Non-Narrative Discourse Analysis}, 76–81 at 79.

\textsuperscript{99} Payne, \textit{Man and Woman}, 395.
Third, Paul appeals to Genesis in 2:13, since Paul has a married couple in mind. Thus, in 2:14 the articular “the child birth” refers to a birth of a child within the marriage relationship. This follows the article principle of the entity already known or assumed as known from the context, since Paul has been speaking of a husband and wife. So also, then, the verb of “salvation” (σῴζω) indicates being delivered from the ordeal of child birthing, a fearful event, in which often appeal was made to a goddess (such as Artemis) for deliverance.

CONCLUSION

Let me conclude by relating two circumstances in which contemporary believers have found themselves while engaged in evangelistic mission, in order to help us properly envision the circumstances of the early Christian movement. I understand that in the 19th century, as Christian missionaries worked in China, a good number of missionaries were women. A problem arose, however, since cultural norms prohibited a woman from teaching men, which, if it occurred, would have stigmatized the Christians as against Chinese culture and truly foreigners to be rejected outright, apart from any consideration of the truthfulness of the Gospel. This impasse was bridged, however, by physically erecting a room divider with all the women sitting with the female missionary teacher, while the men sat in the “other room” overhearing the teaching. Consider also how missionaries today must navigate the cultural mores present within strict Islamic countries—would such missionaries teach that newly converted Christian women/wives throw off their veils in public and by doing so, disrespect their husbands, because in Christ there is neither “male nor female”? If the women did so, they would do so at peril to their very lives and the lives of other Christians in their house churches. I would maintain that the Early Christian movement is much nearer to both these cultural scenarios than to our own in Western contexts, and this has large implications for understanding the shared cognitive environment between Paul and Timothy as he writes 1 Tim 2. So, given the careful scrutiny of the marriage relationship and the management of the household as the central organizational unit within the larger political climate in the Mediterranean world, Paul does not permit practices that would be damaging to the marriage relationship (domineering), nor that would jeopardize the extension of the Gospel to all persons by stigmatizing the Way of Christ as socially disruptive (a wife teaching a husband).
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Scholars have noticed the subtle shift from “our fathers” to “your fathers” in both Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:51–52) and Paul’s closing “judgment” on Jewish unbelievers in (Acts 28:25). What has remained unnoticed is that these texts participate in a much larger literary motif throughout Luke–Acts. This paper demonstrates the presence of this motif which is one of several ways used by Luke to define who the Messianic people of God are. Moreover, it argues that when interpreted in light of this motif, Acts 28:25 cannot be taken as “final” or as a blanket judgment against the Jewish people in general. Finally, the implications of this paper may point to greater rapprochement between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles.

Key Words: Luke–Acts, Stephen, Paul, Fathers, Literary motif, redaction criticism

INTRODUCTION

Scholars have long noted that Luke–Acts presents the Εἴκοσικαὶ as the “true” or “redefined” people of God. Examples of exactly how Luke does this

* This paper is presented in honor of Dr. David Pao, current Chair of NT Department at TEDS. It was in his PhD seminar on Acts that this paper first took shape. His frequent encouragement to think creatively in research is a blessing that will remain for years to come.

include the following: 1) the use ὁδός terminology to describe the ἐκκλησία; 2) the portrayal of the ἐκκλησία as the rightful heir and correct interpreter of Hebrew Bible (HB); 3) the portrayal of the Jesus movement as the fulfillment of the prophecies of the HB; 4) the use of anti–idol polemic; and 5) the use of the “table fellowship motif.” While sharing general agreement with these observations, it is the goal of this paper to consider another means by which Luke defines the people of God. We will do this by exploring Luke’s use of what may be called the “Fathers” Motif.

What exactly is the Fathers Motif? In short, Luke intentionally employs terminology throughout Luke–Acts that pertains to ancestry. At the basic level, this terminology is neutral since one’s ancestry is normally not chosen. However, Luke is knowledgeable of two types of Israelite ancestors as portrayed in the HB, those who respond to God in faith and obedience and those who reject Him and his word. By shaping this motif throughout Luke–Acts, he portrays contemporaries as being descendants either of the “family


5. Pao, Isaianic New Exodus, 208.


8. This same dichotomy is appealed to by the author of Hebrews as well in chapters 3 and 4. Moreover, it is not exclusive to the Jesus movement since Qumran recognized a similar polarity. E.g., one had to be a member of the community to experience atonement from sin (1Q5 2.25–3.12; 1Q14 f8_10.2–9).
of God” or of “that generation” which regularly opposes the work of God. For Luke, the determining factor hinges on one’s acceptance or rejection of Jesus.

To illustrate this, consider Acts 7 where Stephen employs the phrase “our fathers” (οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν) multiple times in his summary of Israelite history;” we have numerous examples of such historical synopses. At first glance, it appears Stephen is attempting to gain solidarity with the audience. Yet, at a key rhetorical turning point that precipitates his death we find the phrase “your fathers” (οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν) used twice (7:51–52) in combination with accusatory labels such as “stiff-necked” and “uncircumcised in heart and ears.” Such a juxtapositioning of phrases is potent; if Stephen intended to build solidarity with this audience, why the switch to “your” (ὑμῶν)? If he was not attempting to build solidarity, then what was his intention in using “our” (ἡμῶν) throughout the rest of the speech?

Additionally, although we do not find the same switch repeated by Paul, he also uses the phrase “your fathers” before announcing his “judgment” on the Jewish unbelievers at Rome. Such observations raise further questions: Is this a fragment of stock rhetoric against Jewish unbelievers? Who intends the impact of this phrase, Stephen and Paul or Luke? Who are the “fathers” referred to by the phrase οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν? Is the phrase intended as an anti–Jewish remark? Is it found elsewhere in Luke–Acts, and if so, what literary function does the phrase have?


11. All translations are the author’s unless otherwise noted.

12. While Bart Ehrman is correct to observe that interpreters should be attentive to the potential impact the social context of scribes may play in transmitting scripture, Philip Maertens demonstrates contrary to his theory that the exemplar to Bezae’s text of Acts shows evidence of Jewish–friendly transmission (Maertens, “Vos pères,” 401–15).
Returning to Stephen’s speech, one could (and should) try to answer these questions by analyzing the phrase in its immediate context. Yet, as David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina point out, “Most readers . . . can observe details much more easily than they can see the major dynamics of broad units, such as the biblical book” and they “often have great difficulty in transcending the details in such a way as to see the whole.” Examining each pericope in isolation, then, only offers a partial response to the questions. Since the phrase οἱ πατέρες is part of a larger literary motif, this invites the exegete to consider its role at the book level, a foundational principle of Inductive Biblical Study (IBS).

The reason we are able to apply book level analysis to both Luke and Acts is because scholars believe with good reason that Luke originally completed these two books as a single work and that they were separated sometime after this.

Thus, this paper shows the explanatory power of combining attention to textual, episodic detail with thematic, book–level analysis. It will demonstrated that Luke employs the Fathers Motif in Luke–Acts as one of the means by which he defines who are the Messianic people of God. First, I will note the assumptions and methodology accompanying and guiding the analysis. Second, I will demonstrate the presence of the motif while explaining how it illuminates the interpretation of the passages in which it is found. Finally, we will draw some conclusions and suggest implications of this research.

ASSUMPTIONS & METHODOLOGY

In an argument of this nature, the literary unity of Luke–Acts is obviously assumed and unfortunately there is not space to respond to


objections. It is important to note that while demonstrating the presence of a motif and arguing for literary unity are two different arguments, the former supports the latter. Second, assuming this unity, it follows that the author will choose when to employ the Fathers Motif and thereby define the identity of the “fathers” to whom he refers. Third, the terminology related to the motif is intentionally used by the author to refer to both physical descendants on the one hand and spiritual descendants on the other; context will indicate which is in view. The terms “parentage” and “ancestry” are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

Before moving to analysis, we must first define a motif and the criteria used for its identification. A motif may be defined as “a pattern that appears in a written text” and is “made up of a set of conventions” that form the expectations of the reader and that lead the reader to realize that repeated elements are not intended by the author to be understood in isolation but as a “familiar landscape.” This would fall under “literary observations” in IBS that “may strike the reader as potentially significant in the communication of the sense of the passage.”

Horst Daemmrich offers the following seven criteria as typifying a motif:


17. As correctly noted by Maertens (“Vos pères,” 405).


20. He does not specify whether all criteria must be present at the same time (“Themes and Motifs in Literature: Approaches—Trends—Definition,” German Quarterly [1985]: 566–75).
**Seven Criteria Typifying a Motif**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) semblance</th>
<th>must have recognizable traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) positional alignment</td>
<td>shifts the narrative in a new direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) polar dimension</td>
<td>highlights extremes in a given scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) tension</td>
<td>contributes to the creation of tension and requires reflection on the part of the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) schematization</td>
<td>creates standardized, repetitive and recognizable characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) supporting themes</td>
<td>do not stand alone but are attached to themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) textual organization</td>
<td>“contribute to the textual arrangement” and their “early introduction raises anticipation.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, a motif involves the “major structural relationship” of recurrence that conveys emphasis, thematic development, and descriptive depth and richness. Yet, the motif is not always repeated verbatim, but rather is strategically located at key places and is integrally connected to the overarching purposes of the text.

The criteria we are using for identifying the Fathers Motif is that it must include language that implies parentage (e.g. “fathers” or “sons of”) and occur in a polemical or confrontational context. As with any literary device, there can be “false positives” that do not relate to the motif (e.g., “John, son of Zechariah” in Luke 3:2). Likewise, a seemingly “normal”

21. These three effects of recurrence are described in Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 95.

22. In Daemmrich’s words, “their arrangement, distribution, repetition, and variation . . . guide the reader’s perception of organization and signification” (“Themes and Motifs,” 573).

23. One could also consider the texts dealing with “this generation.” E.g., Luke 7:31; 9:41; 11:29–32, 50–51; 17:25; 21:32. Unfortunately, this article does not include analysis of these due to space.
use of a term may play into the hand of the author developing the motif, while alone not drawing any attention by itself. So, contextual indicators are evidential clues for identifying the presence or absence of the theme in such cases.

2. The Fathers Motif

In the following survey, I identify and discuss those passages meeting the above criteria for the presence of the Fathers Motif, first in Luke then in Acts. This will allow one to see progressive development in the motif. Commentators generally treat these texts as independent from one another or may notice “parallels” between certain characters or phrases, but the presence and significance of the Fathers Motif has not yet been identified to my knowledge.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Luke 2:41–51

Ancient historians and biographers often provided anecdotal stories about significant people or child prodigies.\(^{24}\) It is clear that Jesus’ wisdom is underscored,\(^{25}\) but this pericope’s connection to the preceding material raises the interpretive question, Why here?\(^{26}\) Fitzmyer finds the pericope “ill-suited” suggesting that it “could be dropped without any great loss to the narrative.”\(^{27}\) But why would Luke needlessly include this section or go to the pains of adding it later as Fitzmyer suggests? Prior to the Temple account, Simeon (2:25–28) and Anna (2:36–38) both prophesy about Jesus. Simeon is specifically “waiting for the consolation of Israel” and was promised that he would not die before he sees the Messiah. Anna joins Simeon “at that very hour” and begins to “speak of [Jesus] to all who

---


26. Bauer and Traina discuss the importance of this question in ch. 11 “The Survey of Books—as—Wholes” (*Inductive Bible Study*, 126).

were waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem" where his parents find him a few verses later. In other words, the identity of Jesus is being laid out vis-à-vis his ancestry.

How so? Despite the fact that the readers are aware of the virgin birth (1:26–38) and that Joseph is not technically his “father,” Luke refers to Jesus’ “parents” (2:41, 43, 48), the search among the “relatives” (2:44), and has Mary refer to Joseph as Jesus’ “father” (2:48). Note the confrontational context. Moreover, it is Mary who speaks in the place of Joseph which serves to “make the opposition of the two fathers graphic in the dialogue.” 28 When juxtaposed with Jesus’ response, “Did you not realize that I must be concerned with the things of my Father?” (2:49), Luke downplays Jesus’ human parentage while elevating his spiritual Father; note also the provoked response (2:50). The importance of this development at the beginning is due to the fact that one’s acceptance or rejection of Jesus is directly related to whether one is “related” to him, not by blood, but by recognition of who he is and obedience to him. This sets the stage for the inadequacy of one claiming Abraham as one’s father.

_Luke 3:7–9_

John was the first to be introduced by Luke in the “infancy narratives” and here maintains his role as forerunner to Messiah. Note the polemical context. There are two phrases pertinent to our discussion in Luke’s description of his prophetic message and call to repentance. The first is “brood of vipers.” 29 By this, John makes an evaluative statement about their parentage that is based on their past conduct. That he intended this accusation as a veiled reference to being offspring of the Devil may be inferred by his admonition in the second phrase, “do not begin to say to yourselves ‘Abraham is our father.’” Frédéric Godet also notes the “allusion à un autre


29. “Brood” is defined as the “product of the activity expressed by γεννάω that which is produced or born” (BDAG, γέννημα, emphasis original).

père, celui que Jésus désigne expressément ailleurs (Jean 8:37–44).”

What the Temple scene in Luke 2:41–51 implies is now made explicit by John. On this, Fitzmyer does not go far enough: “Lucan concern for the universality of salvation surfaces, as it is made clear that physical descent from Abraham is not the only way that one can become his ‘children.’”

John’s point rather is that it is not enough to be a physical descendant of Abraham, which is reinforced by the phrase that follows (3:8), a perspective also shared by Qumran. A true “son of Abraham” is one who walks in the ways of God and is baptized by the one mightier than John. Again, note the provoked response that is L material or unique to Luke (3:10–14).


These texts that concern Jesus’ baptism, genealogy, and temptation all relate to his identity as “Son of God.”

His identity as God’s Son has already been foreshadowed in the Temple scene and he is now officially commissioned to act as the Isaianic Servant, fulfilling the role prophesied by Simeon and Anna.

Luke’s genealogy differs from Matthew’s in placement, form, and content. While it resonates with Luke’s theme of Jesus as the cosmic Lord and savior, he likely chose the Greco–Roman convention for his

31. Godet, *Commentaire*, 1:210 [“allusion to another father, the one whom Jesus expressly identifies elsewhere (John 8:37–44)”].


34. “L material” or “L” refers to texts in the Gospel of Luke that are not found in any other Gospel.


genealogy\textsuperscript{38} to intentionally emphasize “son of God,” a trait absent from all other known HB and Rabbinic genealogies.\textsuperscript{39} In the Temptation account (4:1–13), his identity as “Son of God” is twice a source of attack by Satan (4:3, 9). Note the confrontational context. Luke’s point is that the previous two “sons of God,” Adam\textsuperscript{40} and Israel,\textsuperscript{41} have both failed.\textsuperscript{42} But now, a new son—the Isaianic Servant\textsuperscript{43} with whom God is “well pleased” (Isa 42:1)—is “enthroned” in Luke 3:22 as Ps 2:7 is invoked over Jesus.\textsuperscript{44}

The importance of Jesus’ identity in relation to the Fathers Motif is precisely that he is the one commissioned to carry out the New Exodus, the salvation of the world from sin. This deliverance is obtained exclusively through the new work of God underway in Jesus. Children of faith understand this, whereas those who merely claim “Abraham is our father” do not.


\textsuperscript{40} Fitzmyer (Luke I–IX, 499) follows Johnson (Biblical Genealogies, 234–35) in dismissing the Adam–motif suggested by Joachim Jeremias (“Ἀδάμ,” TDNT 1:141–43). Jeremias, however, does not make an “elaborate argument” as Fitzmyer accuses. Moreover, Fitzmyer appears to criticize him on the basis of a false dichotomy. Luke’s possible dependence on Pauline theology is not the basis for Jeremias’ Adam–motif.

\textsuperscript{41} Exod 4:22; Hos 11:1.

\textsuperscript{42} That Luke is evoking both Adam’s and Israel’s failures as “son of God” is confirmed by the placement of “Adam, son of God” immediately before Jesus’ temptation as well as the details included in the temptation narrative (40 days, wilderness setting, and citations from Deut 4:4, 8, 12).

\textsuperscript{43} Fitzmyer, Luke I–IX, 481.

\textsuperscript{44} Garland, Luke, 169.
Luke 6:21–26

Immediately preceding this text, Jesus has called the twelve disciples (6:13) and a large group from Jerusalem, Judea, and even Tyre and Sidon has gathered (6:17). As mentioned above, “polar dimension” is a characteristic of a motif and a trait present in this text. On the one hand, we have the “Son of Man” and his followers who stand in the prophetic tradition by suffering their same fate (6:22–23). On the other hand, we have “their fathers” who kill the prophets (rejecting God’s word and purposes) while embracing the false prophets (6:26). At issue is one’s ancestry. One is the “inside” group who walk in alignment with God by following Jesus, while the other is the “outside” group, descendants of “their fathers” who reject Jesus and his followers. Here, the defining feature for one’s ancestry is not the physical line, but whether one receives and obeys God’s word.

The evidence for this line of reasoning is seen in (1) Luke’s modification of Q and (2) the additional L material that follows (cf. Matt. 5:12). First, in Q it is generically “they” who killed the prophets. Luke, however, adds οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν in place of the implied 3rd person subject.

Q 6:23 – οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ύμῶν
L 6:23 – κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν

On this, Fitzmyer suggests, “The addition of ‘their fathers’ may have another nuance for Luke: The rejection of the Christian name by descendants of prophet–persecutors undoubtedly insinuates in yet another way the continuity of Christianity with Judaism.” In line with our argument, this is evidence that Luke is using the Fathers Motif to advance this point.

---

45. Q is a source hypothesized to have been used by Matthew and Luke in the writing of their Gospels. See John Kloppenborg for a thorough treatment in support of it (Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000]). Cf. Mark Goodacre, The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2002).

46. Luke I—IX, 636. It can no longer be maintained that “Christianity” constituted a distinct religion vis-à-vis Judaism at this early stage.
Second, the “woes” of 6:24–26 reinforce the point.47 “Their fathers” (repeated for the second time) accompanies the transition to the woes. It is also uniquely Lucan material, suggesting that he intends a connection between “their fathers” and the recipients of the woes.48 Thus Luke presents this blessing–woe diptych to underscore the “polar dimension” of the motif.49

**Luke 8:19–21**

This text presents a clear juxtaposition of physical parentage with spiritual parentage. Why Luke places this account after the parable of the sower instead of before it, as Mark does, is due to the different emphasis of the two authors. Luke is making the point that “one can only define a right relationship with the word of God (8:19–21) after reflecting on the nature of the word (8:4–18).”50 Bovon later comments:

> In the sequence of the Lukan version, there is a first scene telling the arrival of Jesus’ mother and brothers, who cannot achieve their goal . . . because of the crowds. Two groups are thus juxtaposed. But where the narrative (v. 19) underscores the external obstacles, the message (v. 20) emphasizes the inner purpose. Thus v. 20 does not merely repeat v. 19, but presents the two possible attitudes with which people can crowd around Jesus. The first is characterized by “seeing” (v. 20), and the second by “hearing” (v. 21). The first contents itself with the visible figure of the man Jesus on the level of human kinship, and the second recognizes, in the figure of Jesus, a God

47. The editors of *The Critical Edition of Q* note the possibility of Luke 6:24–26 ultimately deriving from Q in the form of a doublet but ultimately decide against this and give it a {C} rating (James M. Robinson et al., eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas With English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas* [Leuven: Peeters, 2000], 54–55). Even if it were part of Q, this would only strengthen our point since it would indicate more extensive redaction.


(or the Word of God) who has graciously approached humankind. *Thus a new definition of family is developed.* The contours of the opposition between spirit and flesh are here illustrated narratively.\(^{51}\)

As in the Temple scene in Luke 2:49, we again find a contrast between physical and spiritual parentage to the point that it does not even matter if one is physically related to Jesus.

**Luke 11:14–28**

Following the Lord’s prayer (11:1–4) and an exhortation (11:5–13), Luke records an exorcism (11:14–26) that provokes a debate about his identity (11:15–16). The entire pericope is confrontational and polemical. While the episode primarily appears to concern authority, at least three pieces of evidence indicate that parentage is actually in view. First, Jesus interprets this question not simply as one of authority but as one of ancestry when he says “every *household* divided against household is laid to waste” (17). Moreover, he asks, “if I by Beelzebul cast out demons, then *your sons* [οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν], by whom do they cast them out?” (19).\(^{52}\) The proleptic placement of οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν before its clause is a left (dis)located topic that is emphasized and indicates both immediate local *discontinuity* (i.e. to Jesus’ activity and identity) and also discourse *continuity*, here contributing to the Fathers Motif.\(^{53}\) Thus, in Lucan understanding, there are two ancestries represented, that of God and that of Beelzebul. Second, we have Jesus’ response to the anonymous woman who suddenly and oddly exclaims her praise of “the womb” that bore him. She may have been offering a sincere

---


compliment to Jesus but Luke’s choice of including it at all—for it is inserted between the Q material—and the way Jesus redirects the blessing to Divine Parentage communicates once again that one’s physical ancestry is not sufficient ground to experience the blessing that Jesus brings. One must be “with” Jesus (i.e. follow him) by hearing and keeping the Word of God (11:28).

**Luke 11:45–52**

The scene changes as Jesus is invited by a Pharisee to dinner (11:37). When confronted by the fact that Jesus does not ceremonially wash before eating, the scene rapidly turns confrontational as Jesus pronounces multiple woes on the Pharisees and the Lawyers. During this time period, tombs were constructed in memorial of the prophets killed by Israel (11:47). Jesus, however, turns this gesture of honor on its head calling them descendants of “your fathers” who killed the prophets, i.e. “sons of prophet-murderers.” The parallel is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Ancestry</th>
<th>Rejected Messengers</th>
<th>Rejected Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“your fathers”</td>
<td>the prophets</td>
<td>repent and return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus’ audience</td>
<td>Jesus and his disciples</td>
<td>repent and return (in Jesus’ name)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was intended to be viewed as a memorial of honor is actually a memorial to a family line known for their rejection of God. Because Jesus (and his followers) stand in the tradition of the prophets, their rejection of him is thereby logical.

To verify this, we need only look ahead to Acts 7:58 and 22:20 that describe the murder of Stephen in the same terms. Just as the lawyers here in Luke 7:48 are witnesses (μάρτυρες) and approve (συνευδοκέω) of the deeds of “their fathers,” so we find those rejecting the Gospel and stoning Stephen described as οἱ μάρτυρες (Acts 7:58) and Saul approving (συνευδοκέω) of the deed (Acts 22:20). Moreover, Luke’s use of ἀπόστολος in conjunction with προφήτης in Luke 11:49 looks forward to Acts and

---

54. Keener remarks that “It was customary to praise the child by blessing the mother” as is evidenced in both Greco–Roman and Rabbinic texts such as Syr. Bar. 54:10; m. Abot 2:8 (Bible Background NT, Luke 11:27–28).


57. Godet, Commentaire sur l’Évangile de Saint Luc, 2:118.
the ministry of the apostles.  

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

The Fathers Motif that begins in Luke’s Gospel is made even more explicit in Acts. Like the first chapter of Luke’s Gospel, there is a somewhat positive nature to the Fathers Motif in Acts 1 – 6 until Stephen’s speech (Acts 7). This change coincides with a fresh offer of repentance following Pentecost. As rejection mounts, however, it takes on a sharply negative tone in Stephen’s speech.

Acts 3:11–26

Peter’s appeal to appeal to ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν in 3:13 echoes the opening of Luke’s gospel, where the birth of Jesus is understood by Mary and Zechariah (two witnesses) as a fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant. Peter tells the onlookers that faith in Jesus, who stands in concert with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (or ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν), has accomplished this healing. Another important dimension to this phrase as it relates to the Fathers Motif is its connection with the Exodus. Acts 3:13 is an inverted citation of Exodus 3:6, 15.


61. Luke 1:72: ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ. Zechariah first prophesies in light of God’s visitation (1:68) and the raising of the horn of salvation “in the house of his servant David” (1:69), and then prophesies over his son John (1:76–79).

Moses was concerned that the Israelites would not know who he was nor why they should listen to him. His instructions were to tell them that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had sent him. The Exodus text thus aligns this “new” leader with the purposes of God. Luke’s appropriation of it here in Acts does likewise. They, like Moses, are agents in effecting the New Exodus that Jesus continues to carry out through the healing of this man.

Additionally, later in the speech (3:25) Peter tells the audience that they are “sons of the prophets and of the covenant” (οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης), which God has given “to your fathers” (πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν). The rhetorical shift felt here contrasts with the Gospel of Luke where the Jewish leaders were “sons of prophet-murderers” (Luke 11:47–52) and serves a double emphasis: (1) to convince the audience that the Jesus movement is the fulfillment of their Jewish heritage (i.e. Abrahamic covenant) and (2) to persuade them that as heirs of the prophetic tradition they should accept this proclamation of good tidings. The audiences’ and the rulers’ “ignorance” (3:17) that caused this sin can now be overcome by God’s grace in this fresh offer of forgiveness in Jesus name (cf. Luke 23:34). The

63. Qumran also spoke of their community members in a similar way (1QM 17:8; 4Q501 1 i 2; 4Q503 7–9 iv 3; CD 12:11).


consequence of refusal is to be cut off from the Messianic people of God (3:23). Despite the interruption by the Jewish leaders, Luke notes that many who heard the message believed (4:4).

There is one further evidence that Luke is drawing upon the Fathers Motif here and that concerns Barabbas, whose name ironically means “son of the father.” Peter does not name Barabbas but only refers to him as “a murderer” (3:14) drawing a contrast between the “destroyer of life” and the “Author of life” (3:15). In so doing, he contrasts the two ancestries: that of God and that of those opposed to God, and probably Satan is in view.

As evidence of Luke’s intentionality here, consider that in the Gospel accounts involving Barabbas, Mark mentions that he is a murderer but consistently refers to him by Barabbas (three times) throughout the pericope (15:6–15). Matthew (27:15–26) not only follows Mark in referring to him by name (five times), but does not even bother to mention that he is a murderer, preferring the epithet, “notorious prisoner.” Luke (23:18–25), although he mentions his name once, refers to him as a “murderer” twice. What is Luke’s intention here? In light of the Fathers Motif, it may be summarized as this: The “sons of prophet-murderers” welcome not the Messiah but, in line with their parentage, a murderer! For the moment, however, all of this was done in ignorance and can be remedied if they will only realize that they should be “sons of the prophets” and so now welcome their Messiah (Acts 3:20). Read in light of his quotation of Hebrew Scripture that combines Deut 18:15–16a, 19, and Lev 23:29 (Acts 3:23), Peter is saying that despite their involvement in Messiah’s death, they can remain as members of the people of God, yet their refusal of him now would equate to their removal from the Messianic people of God.


67. The precise meaning of ἀρχηγός is not clear here, though author or originator of life seems best to stand in contrast with “murderer” i.e. a destroyer of life. Other translations use Author (NIV84, DOUAY), Originator (NET), Prince (NASB, NKJV, WEB, NEG).

68. Matt 27:26 “Then he released for them Barabbas.” Mark 15:15 “So Pilate, wishing to satisfy the crowd, released for them Barabbas.” Luke 23:25 “He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder.”


In 5:30 we find the same phrase used as in 3:13, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν. On its own, we might be inclined to view this as simply traditional language as in 3:13;71 however, as we have seen thus far, there is more attached to the phrase for Luke. In light of the polemical setting,72 “our fathers”—which as we know from 3:13 refers to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and invokes the Abrahamic covenant—is again appropriated to the Jesus movement. This was a key foundation for its validity when it was first prophesied by Mary (Luke 1:46–55) and Zechariah (Luke 1:68–75). The ancestral recipients of the Abrahamic covenant are the “fathers” of the Jesus movement, whereas the “fathers” of those who reject Jesus are of a different type.

Additional evidence that Luke is appealing to the Fathers Motif can be adduced from the broader context of ch.5 as well. We note the initial response of the leaders: “When they heard this, they were enraged and wanted to kill them” (Acts 5:33). What other response could one expect from those whom Luke labels as “sons of prophet-murderers” (Luke 11:47–52)?73 Moreover, Gamaliel’s comments (Acts 5:38–39) are also pertinent, “if this plan or this undertaking is of man, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them. You might even be found opposing God!” One can easily note the polar dimension of motif development here. Although we have no reason to believe that Gamaliel was having second thoughts about the Jesus,74 he nonetheless leaves open the possibility that God may be behind the movement.75 On this several commentators believe that Gamaliel’s advice is guided by Deut 18:20–22 (on the testing of a prophet).


Stephen's speech is replete with the language of the Fathers Motif and its polemical nature ultimately leads to his death. He refers to τὸ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβράαμ in 7:2; he repeats οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν eight times; he cites the phrase ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ (7:32) while quoting Exod 3:15; and he mentions οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν twice in 7:51-52. The obvious challenge is determining the significance of each phrase. However, there are at least three reasons that suggest that Luke skillfully uses this language as part of the Fathers Motif.

First, Thomas Römer and Jean–Daniel Macchi confirm that when Stephen refers to “fathers” he does not generically mean “all our Israelite ancestors.” Bart Koet also notes, “In Israel's history there are, thus, two trends: a positive one which is modelled upon the promise to the fathers and a negative one, modelled upon their obduracy.” Stephen first appeals to “our father Abraham” (7:2) who is for Luke the “ideal father,” i.e. he who responds by faith to God’s word and who receives the covenant of promise that forms the basis for this Jesus movement. He then explains that Abraham begat Isaac who begat Jacob, the father of the patriarchs. Why does he include this brief linear genealogy that would be common knowledge to his audience? Following genealogical conventions, he

76. Cf. n. 59.

77. Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 19, 39, 44, 45 (twice).


79. Five Studies, 132–33.


81. We did not find any commentator exploring the function or significance of the genealogy. The most common explanation (if one is provided) is to speed along to Joseph. E.g., Hans Conzelmann, Acts of the Apostles, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 181.

does so to introduce and discuss the “persons” of interest, οἱ πατριάρχαι. But, from 7:9 on, “our fathers” does not generically refer to the Israelite ancestors beginning with Abraham but instead delineates a particular subgroup of Israelites. Thus, in 7:11, 12, and 15, the πατριάρχαι of 7:9 are referred to as οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, a group that excludes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This bifurcation continues throughout the passage as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob cannot be included in the group of “our fathers” who (1) were forced to expose their infants in Egypt (7:19), (2) refused to obey Moses (7:39), and (3) served other gods despite possession of the Tabernacle (7:44) and Temple (7:47). For Stephen, “our fathers” in this context represents a specific group from which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are intentionally excluded.

Second, Stephen is careful to differentiate how he speaks of Abraham, the leaders God raised up, and “our fathers.” What does Stephen say about them? Abraham is one who obeyed (7:3–4, 85) by faith though he did not receive “a foot’s length” of the promise nor even have a child at the time the promise was made (7:5). The implication is that Stephen’s audience has at their disposal far more than Abraham did and yet they do not believe. In Acts 7:9, the patriarchs are identified as Jacob’s sons and those whom Stephen uses to describe his audience’s true (spiritual) ancestry.86 The audiences’ “fathers” were jealous (ζηλόω, cf. Acts 17:5) of God’s appointees (7:9, 27, 35), rejected them (7:9, 27, 35), never understood His work (7:25), refused to obey (7:39), and turned to idol worship (7:39–43) all despite having God’s presence among them (7:44–50). This is the reason they are

83. So Koet, Five Studies, 132–33. Wilson helps to clarify an important point: While it is true that the singular function of the linear genealogy in the HB is to “ground a claim to power, status, rank, office, or inheritance in a an earlier ancestor,” it is also true that, “just as a genealogy can take on new functions as part of a larger narrative, so also a narrative can help to interpret a traditional genealogy” (“Genealogy, Genealogies,” ABD 2:931–2, emphasis mine).

84. Bruce Malina incorrectly assesses this text (Social–Science Commentary on the Book of Acts [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008] 59–60). We are not arguing that they are not physically related but that “our fathers” as used in 7:9–16 is spiritually oriented and does not include Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

85. Note that Stephen connects circumcision, rightly, with the Abrahamic covenant.

86. Conzelmann notes that Luke’s readers must have been familiar with the patriarchal review such that “The purpose is not to report the events, but to interpret them” (Acts, 52).
both “stiff-necked” and “uncircumcised in heart and ears.” Richard Pervo notes that “Uncircumcised’ (v. 51) recalls v. 8 (covenant of circumcision)\(^87\) which underscores once again that they are not of the “ancestry” of Abraham but from that of “their fathers.” In contrast, the leaders appointed by God grow in favor and wisdom (7:10, cf. Jesus in Luke 2:40, 52), lead God’s people to salvation (7:14, cf. Luke 5:32), are mighty in word and deed (7:22, cf. Jesus in Luke 24:19), are rejected by the people (7:9, 27, 35, cf. Jesus in Luke 18–25), and perform signs and wonders (7:36, cf. Jesus in Acts 2:32; 4:30). The main point of Stephen’s review then is not on God’s work or presence outside the land of Israel\(^88\) (though it does not exclude that element), but on demonstrating that those opposed to the Jesus movement are living up to their pedigree.\(^89\) The focus is people not places: “The purpose of Stephen’s recent indictment of their ‘ancestors’ becomes obvious as Stephen climaxes the challenge that they have repeated their ancestors’ crime of rejecting a deliverer.”\(^90\)

Third and finally, Luke fashions Stephen in the role of a prophet and the leaders as “sons of prophet-murderers.”\(^91\) He accomplishes the latter through (1) calling them as such (7:52), and (2) narrating the murder of Stephen (7:54, 57–58). Note that they were enraged (διαπρίω, cf. Acts 5:33), stopped up their ears in the spirit of Isa 6:8–10, and that they, like their pagan counterparts in Ephesus (19:28), “cry out” (κράζω) with a loud (μέγας) voice at the offense taken over their idol (χειροποίητος), the

\(\text{\textsuperscript{87}}\) Acts, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 192.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{88}}\) The view of J. Julius Scott, Jr., “Stephen’s Defense and the World Mission of the People of God,” JETS 21 (1978): 131–41. Keener notes that this is a significant element to the speech, but also recognizes the “rejected ruler” motif is also dominant (Acts 3:1—14:28, 1345, 1362, 1364, 1373, 1392, 1399–1401, 1403).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{89}}\) Pervo observes, “It appears normal for God’s people to oppose the prophets” (Acts, 180).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{90}}\) Keener, Acts 3:1—14:28, 1423.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{91}}\) So Pervo, Acts, 192. Cf. Luke 13:34–35 where Jerusalem is referred to by Jesus as “the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it!” He grimly adds “your house is forsaken.” That the leaders did not keep the Law (7:53) is demonstrated by the fact that they murdered Jesus to whom the Law testified (7:52).
Temple (7:48). They have once again rejected the deliverer–redeemer raised up by God and stand stubbornly against His new work in Jesus. That Stephen is a prophet is evidenced by (1) his prophetic stance in identifying them as “stiff–necked” and “uncircumcised in heart and ears,” (2) by his “vision” in which he uses the stock prophetic phrase ἰδοὺ, θεωρέω (a common feature in Daniel’s visions as is the title τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and τοὺς οὐρανοὺς διηνοιμένους (cf. Ezek 1:1).

Thus, Stephen’s speech robustly brings together some important elements of the Fathers Motif, i.e., Abraham as “ideal father,” the polarization of “ancestries” (Abraham vs. the obdurate), and the centrality of following Jesus over being physical descendants of Abraham. While some have noted this polarization they have not understood its relationship to the Fathers Motif throughout Luke–Acts.

---

92. Schnabel disputes the view that χειροποίητος indicates idolatry (Acts, 384–6). Pao has sufficiently demonstrated the presence of the anti–idol polemic (Isaianic New Exodus, 206–8). He rightly observes (n. 74) that the accusations are leveled against the people, not the Temple. Thus, the “Hellenistic” versus “Judaistic” Christianity theory is suspect wherein the former supposedly viewed the move from Tabernacle to Temple as a mistake (c.f. Fitzmyer, Acts, 383–84; Pervo, Acts, 191; Scott, “Stephen’s Defense,” 133–34). The Temple is an idol only to the people who prefer allegiance to it over the Messiah. Cf. Keener, Acts 3:1—14:28, 1405–6, 1417.

93. Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9; Deut 9:6, 13.


95. Schnabel notes the error some make (e.g., Tannehill) in thinking that 7:56 is somehow disconnected from the main speech (Acts, 362). It is Luke who interrupts Stephen to make an editorial comment (7:54–55). In light of the thrust of the speech 7:56 is the climax of Stephen’s argument about the identity of Jesus. Whether it is “an alternate state of consciousness” is difficult to say (Malina, Book of Acts, 60).

96. Dan 3:27; 4:13; 7:2, 4, 6–7, 9, 11, 13; 8:15.
The ending of Acts has always troubled interpreters, but this is generally based on the assumption that the focus was on Paul. Luke 1:79, 2:32, 24:47 and Acts 1:8 all anticipate the spread of the word to the “ends of the earth,” which, as Pao has demonstrated, is equivalent to “the Gentiles.” Now that the Gospel has reached “the end of the earth” (i.e. Gentiles) and that it has finished its “conquest” of the Roman world, Luke has finished his task. In this light, the final occurrence of the Fathers Motif and its prominent place at the end of Acts should not be surprising. In keeping with his missional practice of “to the Jew especially, and also to the Gentile” (Rom 1:16) throughout Acts, he goes first to his people. In what ways does the Fathers Motif manifest itself here?

First, we can again discern the polar dimension in Luke’s description that “some were being persuaded” (7:24) while others “were disbelieving”; the two “ancestries” are again made manifest. Second, Paul’s “judgment” is leveled against those who disbelieved, not against the Jewish people as a whole. That is, Paul’s use of your fathers must refer to a subgroup or he would be included in his own judgment and elsewhere in Acts, he is

97. Armin Baum raises some new objections arguing on the basis of ancient historiographical conventions that should be taken seriously. However, he assumes too much regarding the fate of Paul after his trial and posits a “martyrdom culture” on the part of his readers (“Rhetorik des Schweigens? Der unvollständige Schluss der Apostelgeschichte (Act 28, 30–31) im Licht antiker Literaturtheorie und historiographischer Praxis,” ETL 88 [2012]: 95–128).


100. Marguerat, First Christian Historian, 205–30.

101. “In the LXX version this passage is not a judgment, but a description of the obduracy of the fathers” (Koet, Five Studies, 138; cf. Fitzmyer, Acts, 790–91). Marguerat describes it as “the author’s theological diagnosis about the relation between Church and Synagogue” (First Christian Historian, 221).

perfectly comfortably in identifying with his ethnic identity as Jewish.\(^\text{103}\)

As has been made clear by the previous survey, however, Paul (or rather perhaps Luke\(^\text{104}\)) has in mind not physical ancestry, but spiritual. Since this critique of “unbelievers” has its roots in the Jewish prophetic tradition it can not be taken as anti–Jewish.\(^\text{105}\) Like Stephen’s speech, those who believe in Jesus as Messiah are “sons of Abraham.” Those who reject Jesus as Messiah are like the leaders of Luke 11, “sons of the prophet–murderers.”\(^\text{106}\) This suggests that it is incorrect to conclude that Paul is issuing a blanket judgment against Jews collectively\(^\text{107}\) or that Luke is anti–Jewish.\(^\text{108}\)


\(^{104}\) Cf. n. 59.

\(^{105}\) Butticaz’s observation on this point is spot on. Not to mention that Qumran was equally critical of their own people and would not be viewed as anti–Jewish (L’Identité de l’église dans les Actes des Apôtres: de la restauration d’Israël à la conquête universelle, BZNW 174 [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011], 468).

\(^{106}\) Marguerat observes that Paul’s use of the “Holy Spirit” in speaking to “your fathers” implies that he continues to speak to their descendants, i.e. Paul’s audience (Les Actes des Apôtres (13–28), CNT 5b (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2015), 385–86).


CONCLUSION OF THE FATHERS MOTIF IN LUKE–ACTS

Now that our survey of the Fathers Motif in Luke–Acts is complete it is appropriate to revisit the criteria of a motif as they compare to our findings. They are as follows:

(1) Semblance

We find the use of similar vocabulary or phrases related to the issue of ancestry that has recognizable traits. Examples include “our fathers,” “their fathers,” “your fathers,” “sons of,” etc.

(2) Positional alignment

The motif nearly always occurs in a confrontation or polemical situation in which a response is sought. In the case of John the Baptist’s ministry, and Peter’s and Stephen’s speeches in particular, there was a definite shift in the narrative.

(3) Polar dimension

This was perhaps the most significant characteristic of our findings; there are always two “ancestries” in view.

(4) Tension

Luke’s employment of this motif was intended to cause the reader to reflect at length as to who comprised the people of God. This reflection is provoked by the use of the terms mentioned above in conjunction with the polemical context.

(5) Schematization

The amount of repetition speaks for itself.

(6) Supporting themes

This motif is associated with several themes in Luke–Acts. Examples include salvation, the acceptance or rejection of the Word of God, reversal of expectation, repentance–conversion, the restoration of Israel, God’s purposes, the

109. A notable exception is the “Sermon on the Plain” where the audience was presumably all “insiders.”
Holy Spirit, the inclusion of the Gentiles, and the Isaianic New Exodus.

(7) Textual organization

This motif is introduced as early as Luke 1 in Mary and Zechariah’s prophecies regarding Jesus, although these passages were not treated on their own. The motif also occurs significantly at the inauguration of Jesus’ public ministry in Luke 3. It reoccurs throughout Luke–Acts and then occurs prominently at the end of Acts.

4. CONCLUSION

We began this study by considering Stephen’s and Paul’s curious use of “your fathers,” wondering who they might be and the significance of the terminology. As we have shown, their occurrences fit into a larger literary motif. While I have touched on particular ways that the Fathers Motif enlightens our understanding of Luke–Acts, I would like here to highlight four particularly important ways this study may impact Lucan studies.

First, Luke is very careful to distinguish between two sets of ancestors: the “ideal fathers” (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) and the “fathers” who continually resist God’s word and appointed leaders. When Luke uses “your fathers” or “their fathers” or related terminology he is always referring to a specific subgroup of Jews who resist God. When he uses “our fathers” or related terminology, only the context indicates whether he has in mind this former group or that of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Interpreters must pay attention to this distinction to correctly understand what Luke is communicating.

Second, because of its association with the theme of the identity of the Messianic people of God, this Fathers Motif is an objective tool used by Luke in framing his definition. Luke makes clear from the beginning of his Gospel that association to Abraham by physical descent alone is insufficient for salvation and that the Gentile mission was always God’s plan.

Third, with regard to Luke’s “verdict” on the Jewish people, this motif demonstrates that it is in no way “final” nor is it a blanket judgment on the Jewish people in general.†110 Rather, he portrays the Jewish unbelievers

†110. Butticaz also challenges the “finality” of this “judgment” but neither does he conclude very much either: “the pronouncements [of judgment] should not be overdrawn, but neither should they be underestimated” (“Has God Rejected his People?” 163).
as cutting themselves off from God’s people (e.g., Acts 3:23, 13:46). The book certainly ends in tension about the general fate of the Jews or Jewish Nation, but interpreting the meaning of that tension depends on its connection to the larger literary motif.

Fourth, Luke does not portray the Jesus movement as ultimately Gentile. “The reader is not encouraged to repudiate his or her origin, but rather to rediscover it as a lost origin.” Luke’s posture toward the Jewish people includes a call to embrace the faith of Abraham and abandon the obduracy that characterized “their fathers.” He does not call them to leave their Jewish identity, but to experience its fullness in the Messiah. These observations move us forward in answering Pervo’s provocative question, “if those to whom the promises were addressed have said no, can the Jesus movement be legitimate?” We may respond that Luke’s use of the Fathers Motif is in part his answer to that question because the Jesus movement includes Jewish people and always intended Gentile inclusion. The rejection of some unbelieving Jews and the inclusion of some believing Gentiles does not equate to “Jewish rejection.” Furthermore, “Jewish rejection” in the collective sense is anachronistic to apply to the period of Luke’s writings.

5. IMPLICATIONS

The following are a few modest implications of these findings. First, Luke’s emphasis on Abraham as “ideal father” and the primacy of the Abrahamic covenant has a striking resemblance to Paul’s “Abrahamic logic” of the Gospel of Jesus Christ (e.g., Romans 4). Additionally, we can identify a connection between Luke’s relativization of physical ancestry and Paul’s assertion that “a Jew is one inwardly, and circumcision is a matter of the heart, by the Spirit” (Rom 2:29). Moreover, this relativization through the Fathers Motif appears to be his more sophisticated way of stating John’s phrase, “You are of your father the devil” (John 8:44). Without denying differences in theological perspectives among NT writers, these similarities offer clear points of contact between them. Finally, with regard to the status of ethnic Israel, the Fathers Motif suggests that there may not

111. Marguerat, First Christian Historian, 152.


113. “Identifying themes and motifs can help enormously in establishing what a work is about and where its focus lies, and that in turn can be used to eliminate some interpretations and to lend support to others” (Abbott, Narrative, 95).
be such a wide gap between Lucan and Pauline theology on this point.\textsuperscript{114} Pervo, following Conzelmann, suggests, “the contrast between Luke and Paul could not be stronger. Both sought to explain why most Jews had said ‘no’ to the message. For Paul this rejection was provisional; Luke viewed it as final and the grounds for the existence of (in modern terms) a separate religion.”\textsuperscript{115} While there is no disputing that the Judaism and Christianity eventually became separate religions, this present study provides significant counter-evidence to Pervo’s analysis that Luke viewed things as “final.” Furthermore, recent scholarship has pushed the so-called separation much later than Luke’s time.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114.} See Butticaz’s cautious conclusions on this and other ways the Paul of Luke and the Paul of the Epistles share points of contact (“Has God Rejected his People?” 158–63).


\textsuperscript{116.} E.g., Becker, Adam H. and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds, \textit{The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages} (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); James D. G. Dunn, \textit{The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity}, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 2006).
CHAPTER V

ST. PAUL’S EDUCATIONAL VIEWS

In the opening sentence of his Philosophy of Education, Professor Horne\(^1\) says, “There are five great agencies of civilization which conserve the past, preserve the present, and make possible a progressive future. These agencies are the home, the school, the vocation, the state, and the church.” While he was not unmindful of the other agencies, St. Paul recognized and gave primary attention to the first and fifth. His educational views are concerned chiefly with the unit and the foundation of human society: the home and the church.

His views concerning the home reflect the Hebrew domestic training of his boyhood,\(^2\) and are colored by the Christian consciousness of his later life. His views concerning the home as an educational institution are these: The parents are the teachers. The father is the head of the home\(^3\) and the provider of the household.\(^4\) His prerogative is that of authority.\(^5\) The wife is the keeper of the home.\(^6\) Her true dignity is in submission.\(^7\) Their relation

---


2. See Chapter I, under “Domestic Education.”

3. Eph. 5:22 ff.; I Cor. 11:3.

4. I Tim. 5:8.

5. I Tim. 3:4, 5, 12; Eph. 5:22 ff.


7. Eph. 5:22, 24; Col. 3:18.
to each other should be atmosphered by love,\textsuperscript{8} prayer,\textsuperscript{9} and purity,\textsuperscript{10} and be characterized consequently by reverence, sanctity, and intimacy:

\begin{quote}
[83] “Therefore shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, and the pair shall be one flesh; this is a profound symbol, I mean as regards Christ and the Church.” (Eph. 5:31, 32.)
\end{quote}

So St. Paul relates the unit and the foundation of human society to each other. The one is a symbol of the other.

Children are a holy possession.\textsuperscript{11} The aim of instruction in the home is obedience.\textsuperscript{12} Children are to honor their parents, according to the law.\textsuperscript{13} The method of instruction in the home is “discipline” and “admonition.”\textsuperscript{14} The attitude of the teacher to the pupil in the home is “forbearance.”\textsuperscript{15} The content of instruction in the home is religion, and the subject-matter “the sacred writings that can impart saving wisdom by faith in Christ Jesus.”\textsuperscript{16} The result of instruction in the home, thus indicated, should be “faith.”\textsuperscript{17} A typical ideal and product of such Christian domestic education was Timothy, “the gentle boy of Lystra,”\textsuperscript{18} who grew up to be a man of good

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} Eph. 5:28.
\item \textsuperscript{9} I Cor. 7:5.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Heb. 13:4 \textit{et al}. Actual quotations in this chapter are from Moffatt’s tr. unless otherwise specified.
\item \textsuperscript{11} I Cor. 7:14.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Eph. 6:1; Col. 3:20; cf. Prov. 6:20; 23:22; Ecclesiasticus 7:24 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Eph. 6:2. Cf. Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16.
\item \textsuperscript{14} \textit{i.e.}, educated them, bring them up, developing all their powers by the instruction and admonition of the Lord.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Eph. 6:4.
\item \textsuperscript{16} II Tim. 3:15; cf. Psalm 119:98 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{17} I Tim 1:5.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Burrell, \textit{Paul’s Companions}, p. 51 ff.
\end{itemize}
reputation, a fellow-worker and collaborator with Paul, and a trusted teacher.

In fundamental agreement with the Hebrew conception that child nature is irresponsible, foolish and rebellious, Paul considered discipline to be the best means of training the child's will and rightly ordering his life. He applied this idea of human nature to life itself and used his own personal experience as a concrete illustration of it. Taking up the pronouncement of the Psalmist: “There is none righteous, no, not one… There is none that doeth good, no not so much as one,” he interprets his own experience with great intensity of feeling, when he cries:

“I cannot understand my own actions; I do not act as I want to act: on the contrary, I do what I detest … . For in me (that is, in my flesh) no good dwells, I know; the wish is there, but not the power of doing what is right. I cannot be good as I want to be, and I do wrong against my wishes…So this is my experience of the Law: I want to do what is right, but wrong is all I can manage.” (Rom. 7:15, 18, 19.)

The Apostle therefore considered life to be an educative, disciplinary process, and experience one’s own best teacher. His view of “nature” was expressed later in that conception of child nature known as Nativism, a view held by Franke, Palmer, Graser and Schmidt, as over against Rousseau’s Empiricism: “All is good as it comes from the hand of the Creator; all

21. II Cor. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:1; I Thess. 1:1; II Thess. 1:1; Philemon 1:1.
22. I Cor. 4:17; I Cor. 16:10, 11.
24. Beside passages referred to above, see also Gal. 4:1, 2.
degenerates under the hands of man”,27 and contrary also to the Genetism26 of Meumann and Wundt, namely, that the child does not inherit good or bad traits, but only general tendencies which can be developed either way.

The Apostle has less to say concerning the school, the vocation, and the state. Yet this is in keeping with his habit of subordinating everything to his chief aim. What he has to say about the school is rather about teachers, and what he says about teachers is negative, i.e., he characterizes “teachers [85] so-called,” “teachers who are not teachers” –as such individuals who pose as teachers, yet who lack understanding, clarity of thought, and are interested rather in dark speculations than in reasonable things:

“Warn certain individuals against teaching novelties, and studying myths and interminable genealogies; such studies bear upon speculation rather than on the divine order which belongs to faith. Whereas the aim of the Christian discipline is the love that springs from a pure heart, from a good conscience, and from a sincere faith. Certain individuals have failed here by turning to empty argument; doctors of the Law is what they want to be, but they have no idea either of the meaning of the words they use or of the themes on which they harp.” (I Tim. 1:3-7.)

Neither is Paul silent concerning the vocation. He expresses himself here chiefly with the relation of “employer” and “employee.” In Moffatt’s translation such words as these are used to express the relationship Paul says ought to exist between them: Without courting human favor,28 reverence,28 good will,28 singleness of heart,28 justice,29 fairness,29 impartiality,29 modesty,30 gentleness,30 forbearance,30 patience.30 What an ideal for modern industrial relations! To which also may be added:

“If it is practical service, let us mind our service; the teacher must mind his teaching; the speaker his words of counsel; the contributor must be liberal, the superintendent must be in earnest, the sick visitor must be cheerful.” (Rom. 12: 7, 8).

27. First sentence of the “Emile.”


30. Eph. 4:1, 2.
and

“Every one must remain in the condition of life where he was called. You were a slave when you were called? Never mind. Of course, if you do find it possible to get free, you had better avail yourself of the opportunity…Brothers, every one must remain with God in the condition of life where he was called.” (I Cor. 7:21-24.)

St. Paul recognized and taught that each man must learn to perform his particular function in society well, and that in the performing of that function, as he enters into the lives of others, he must learn to give and take as has been described, if he would live the complete life.

Three brief statements suggest Paul’s idea of the relation of the individual to the state, which may be summarized as follows:

1. Civil obedience is a duty:

   “Every subject must obey the government-authorities.”
   (Rom 13:1.)

2. Civil authority derives its source and sanction from God himself:

   “No authority exists apart from God; the existing authorities have been constituted by God.” (Rom. 13:1.)

3. Resistance of and rebellion against civil authority are inexpedient and morally wrong:

   “Any one who resists authority is opposing the divine order, and the opposition may bring judgment upon themselves…You must be obedient as a matter of conscience.” (Rom. 13:3, 5.)

4. The Magistrate is God’s servant for the sake of justice to all:

   [87] “The Magistrate is God’s servant for your benefit,… and for the infliction of the Divine vengeance upon evil-doers.” (Rom. 13:4.)

31. Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Tim. 2:1, 2; Tit. 3:1.
5. The four specifications of civil obedience are the payment of tribute, taxes, respect, and honor, each to whom it is due:

“Pay to them all their respective dues, tribute to one, taxes to another, respect to this man, honor to that.” (Rom. 13:7.)

It is to be noted in the light of the above that he neither recommends nor condemns any particular form of government, but has so framed his language that it is applicable to any or every form. He seems to say nothing concerning patriotism; and yet in a true sense he does, for the law-abiding citizen is really the loftiest patriot, especially so if he follows the Apostle’s injunction:

“Well, my very first counsel is that supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgiving, are to be offered for all men—for kings and all in authority, that we may lead a tranquil life in all piety and gravity.” (I Tim. 2:1.)

St. Paul’s view of the church as an educational institution was of course only part of his conception of the mission of the church in the world. Our present interest is limited by this viewpoint. The Apostle taught that the church is a divinely appointed and animated organism in the world to perform a spiritual service for the world, even as the state is a God-appointed agency to administer justice in the world. “The state and the church,” according to Paul, “each have a place in the world. If God’s appointed and established order is preserved [88] neither will invade the function of the other.”

The educational mission of the church in the world is that of instruction and enlightenment:

“In the church I would rather say five words with my own mind for the instruction of other people, than ten thousand words in a ‘tongue.’“ (I Cor. 14:19.)

“I was called…to enlighten all men upon the new order of that divine secret which God the Creator of all concealed from eternity—intending to let the full sweep of the divine wisdom be disclosed now by the church to the angelic

Rulers and Authorities in the heavenly sphere, in terms of the eternal purpose which he has realized in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom, as we have faith in him, we enjoy our confidence of free access.” (Eph. 3:7, 9, 12.)

For this function of instruction and enlightenment leaders who are qualified and equipped as teachers are appointed in the church. The educative purpose and mission of these teachers as fully described in the previous chapter is to call out the whole man to complete living, in the supreme adjustment of his personal relation to God and man.

May we say that in his attitude toward women teachers, Paul was (as Lowell says of every man) “a prisoner of his date”? The following statements suggest his attitude:

“A woman must listen quietly in church and be perfectly submissive; I allow no woman to teach or dictate to men, she must keep quiet.” (I Tim. 2:11, 12.)

“As is the rule in all churches of the saints, women must keep quiet at gatherings of the church. They are [89] not allowed to speak; they must take a subordinate place, as the Law enjoins. If they want any information, let them ask their husbands at home. It is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church. You challenge this rule? Pray did God’s word start from you? Are you the only people it has reached?” (I Cor. 14:33–36.)

It is quite plain from the foregoing that Paul considered woman’s sphere to be the home. It was here that she might exercise an educative influence among those of her own household. Leaders and teachers in the church were to be men, and the place of the church as an educational influence in the world was to instruct and enlighten men of righteousness.

33. No woman was permitted to teach in Hebrew schools or synagogues. See, Monroe, *Cyclopædia of Education*, article on Jewish Education, and Güdemann, article on Education, in *Jewish Encyclopedia*. 
St. Paul’s educational views may be summarized as follows:

1. The child comes into the world with inborn tendencies toward evil. The home is the educative environment in which it grows. The parents are the natural teachers of the child. The aim of instruction in the home is faith in God and obedience to parents. The method of instruction toward these ends is two-fold: admonition and discipline. The content of instruction is religion, and the subject-matter “the sacred writings.” Timothy was a typical ideal and product of Christian domestic education.

2. St. Paul has practically nothing to say concerning school education, except characteristics of teachers who are not teachers.

3. Each individual must learn to perform his own particular function in society well, and in the performing of that function, he must learn to give and take as he enters into the lives of others.

4. The state and the church each have a Divinely appointed mission in the world: The state for the administration of justice, and the church for enlightenment and instruction of the sons of men in [90] righteousness. Obedience to its laws, submission to its pronouncements, respect of its officers, and support of its necessities are due to the state on the part of every citizen.

5. In fulfilling her educational function the church is to call out the whole man to complete living in the supreme adjustment of his personal relation to God and man. As a prisoner of his age Paul offered no place in the teaching function of the church to women.
CHAPTER VI [91]

PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS IN ST. PAUL’S APPEAL

THE INTELLECT

How did St. Paul teach? That—rather than, What did he teach?—is the guiding principle of this investigation. By necessity the content of his pedagogy must largely serve as the medium for studying the manner of his pedagogy. This does not imply that the present study is an endeavor to read William James into the teachings of St. Paul. It means rather that certain principles recognized by modern psychology are latent in his pedagogy. In this chapter we shall investigate these principles; in a following chapter we shall study the methods he employed which embody these principles. Whether St. Paul intentionally projected his teachings on a psychological basis or not, we may profitably study the psychological elements in his appeal if we would effectually re-teach his teachings.

This is directly in line with what President G. Stanley Hall1 has said concerning Biblical psychology: “It is our great good fortune to live in an age when our Bible is being slowly re-revealed as the best utterance and reflex of the nature and needs of the souls of men, as his great text book on psychology, dealing with him as a whole, body, mind, heart, and will, and all in the largest and deepest relation to nature and to his fellow man, which has been so misunderstood simply because it was so divine.” [92] This study, therefore, is simply an endeavor to recognize and state in modern terminology such psychological principles as are latent in that part of the Bible to which St. Paul contributed. Let us first study his appeal to the intellect. When we speak of perception, memory, imagination, judgment, and reason, we are not dividing the intellect into segments or faculties, but we are speaking of different aspects of consciousness in the acquisitions of knowledge. Attention is that attitude of mind in which any one or more of these powers are fixed on a single object.

1. **Interest and Attention.**

Attention has been appropriately defined as “focused consciousness.” “It may be what is called ‘passive’ or ‘involuntary,’ or it may be ‘active’ and ‘voluntary’ attention.” Fitch has correctly pointed out that the secret of attention is interest. It is the “motive power of attention.” The teacher may attract attention (spontaneously) or he may secure attention by commanding it (voluntary attention). St. Paul did both.

He invited attention:

1. By mingling with people who might give him attention. He availed himself of opportunities to interest people. On the Sabbath it was his custom to attend the synagogue. He frequented the crowded market-places, or sought places where he might interest smaller groups (e.g., by the riverside at Philippi), or associated with those of his own trade (e.g., Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth).

2. There was much about Paul that awakened the [93] interest of others in him. His enthusiasm, his frankness, his courage, his zeal, his poise, his sympathy, all blended into a radiance that made his presence in a group known. Somehow people knew, when he was present, that a man stood among them, for his personality was magnetic. He not only drew others to him, but he had the ability to focus their attention upon his subject-matter.

---


4. Acts 13:14, 42, 44; 17:2, etc.


3. Unwelcome attention was heaped upon him by way of opposition (e.g., at Damascus,14 at Iconium,15 at Lystra,16 at Beraea,17 at Ephesus,18 at Caesarea19), because of jealousy (e.g., at Thessalonica20), and hate (e.g., at Jerusalem21).

St. Paul secured attention by calling for it.

1. In direct address. In addressing himself to others he used such expressions as:
   “Brethren and fathers, hear ye the defense I now make unto you.” Acts 22:1.
   “I beseech thee to hear me patiently.” Acts 26:3.
   “My little children.” Gal. 4:19.
   “O Timothy.” I Tim. 6:20, etc.

2. He utilized posture. (Fitch mentions this as one of the mechanical devices for securing attention.)
   “He sat down” (indicating willingness to speak) … “and stood up” (after being invited) “and said…” Acts 13:14, 16.
   “Then Paul stood forth in the midst.” Acts 27:21, etc.

3. He employed gesture:
“He beckoned with his hand, and said…” Acts 13:16.
“Paul standing on the stairs, beckoned with the hand unto
the people; and when there was made a great silence, he
“Then Paul stretched forth his hand and made his defense.”
Acts 26:1.
We have already noted that his gaze was attention-

4. He used dramatic actions.
“But when the Apostles Barnabas and Paul heard of it they
rent their garments, and sprang forth among the multitude,
crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things?” Acts
14:14, 15.

5. He expressed warning.
“Beware.” Acts 13:40. Did Paul at this point observe any
symptoms of dissent or disapprobation on the countenances
of his hearers?

6. He used language to win attention.
“And when they heard that he spake unto them in the
Hebrew language, they were more quiet.” Acts 22:2.

7. He performed miracles and thus aroused interest.

8. He appealed to the curiosity of his hearers.
In Damascus “All that heard him were amazed.” Acts 9:20-22.
At Athens, in the market-place, where his “strange things”

Before Agrippa, “And Agrippa said unto Festus, I also could wish to
hear the man myself. To-morrow, saith he, thou shalt hear him.” Acts 25:22.
In Rome. “But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as
concerning this sect, it is known to us that everywhere it is spoken against.
And when they had appointed him a day, they came to him into his lodging
in great number; to whom he expounded the matter, testifying the kingdom
of God, and persuading them concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses
and from the prophets, from morning till evening.” Acts 28:22, 23.
The two experiences, at Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13) and in Athens (Acts 17), might be considered as classic instances of securing and holding attention, in fact as complete teaching situations.

St. Paul won attention without effort and used the thing at hand to “focus consciousness.” Professor James says “The genius of the interesting teacher consists in sympathetic divination of the sort of material with which the pupil’s mind is likely to be already spontaneously engaged, and the ingenuity which discovers paths of connection from that material to the matter to be learned. The principle is easy to grasp, but the accomplishment is difficult in the extreme.” St. Paul did this difficult thing naturally. At Antioch of Pisidia it was history; at Athens, the altar; at Jerusalem it was “The [96] Hebrew language”; before Felix his Roman citizenship; before Agrippa, his (Agrippa’s) reputation; and in Corinth his trade that was ingeniously used to win effectual interest.

2. Perception.

In one of his outstanding instructions (Phil, 4:8, 9) the Apostle appealed (whether consciously or unconsciously) both to the inner and sense perceptions of those he taught. Professor Horne says: “The mind looking inward at itself and becoming aware of itself, its thoughts, feelings or intuitions, or the mind becoming aware of any thing, theory or truth, is inner perception.”

One of St. Paul’s favorite words is λογίσμαι, which he uses some 27 times, according to Thayer, 27 times in his epistles, and only 4 times in the rest of the N.T. Some of the most striking instances of its usage from the present point of view are: Rom. 2:3; I Cor. 13:5, 11; II Cor. 10:7, 11; 12:6. In each of these cases it means (in animo conferre) “to reckon inwardly, count up, or to weigh reasons, to deliberate.” —Thayer. Ellicott says in loco, “Use your faculties upon,” quoting Bengel, “Horum rationem habete.”
times in his epistles in the sense (as Thayer says) “to reckon inwardly.” This word is the focus of the passage under discussion:

“Finally, brothers, keep in mind (λογίζεσθε) whatever is true, whatever is worthy, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is attractive, whatever is high toned, all excellence, all merit.”

This, says Vincent, “is an appeal to an independent moral judgment, to thoughtfully estimate the value of these things.” St. Paul is evidently seeking to educate his pupils in a life, “whose mental energies are fully at work, always gravitating towards purposes and actions true, pure, gracious, virtuous, and commendable.” Miss Harrison in her Study of Child Nature says that “the habit of contrasting or comparing in material things leads to fineness of distinction in higher matters. John Ruskin and like thinkers claim that a perception of and love for the beautiful in nature leads directly to a discernment of the beautiful in the moral world.” This makes St. Paul’s instruction which immediately follows the verse quoted above all the more pertinent:

“Practice also what you have learned (ἐμάθετε) and received (παρελάβετε) from me, what you heard me say (ἠκούσατε … ἐν ἐμοί) and what you saw me do (εἶδετε ἐν ἐμοί).”

Is not Paul here appealing to the sense perception of his pupils? Is he not seeking habits of action in those taught on the basis of eye and ear perception, he himself having been the object perceived? According to Chrysostom this is good pedagogy: “This is teaching, in all his exhortations to propose himself for a model; as he saith in another place (3:17) ‘even as ye have us for an example.’”

St. Paul’s instruction in these verses (Phil. 4:8, 9) illustrates a principle reiterated over and over in educational history: “Moral practice is the cause of moral insight.”

---

31. Moule, *Philippians Studies*, p. 239.
32. μανθάνω,”to ascertain,” “to find out,” as in Acts 23:27; Gal. 3:2; Col. 1:7; or as in Phil. 4:11, “to learn by use and practice.”
33. παραλαμβάνω. With reference to knowledge this word is used to refer to that which is received with the mind, either by oral transmission as in I Cor. 11:23, by the transmission of teachers (used of disciples) as in I Cor. 15:1, 3; Gal. 1:9. See references given by Thayer. In connection with the climactic order of the verbs it suggests an active rather than a passive receiving.
34. Chrysostom, *Homilies on Philippians*, XIV, on Phil. 4:8.
insight precedes the practice, yet the insight is based on practice, and his conclusion naturally [98] follows: peace within and harmony without. (See the psychological order of certain “results” named by Paul in Rom. 5:3-5.)

3. Memory.

Sully\textsuperscript{36} defines memory as “the power of retaining and reproducing anything that has been impressed in the mind whether by the way of the senses or through the medium of language.” There are really three factors involved: retention, reproduction, and recognition. Herbart\textsuperscript{37} distinguished three kinds of memory: the rational (secured by association of cause and effect), the ingenious (no essential connection in recall), and the mechanical (impression through repetition). St. Paul made his appeal chiefly to the first of these memories:

1. Through apperception. He used familiar ideas, many of them old and established facts, to prepare for and to interpret the new.

   Teaching in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia\textsuperscript{38} he “studiously conciliated his hearers,”\textsuperscript{39} and prepared them for his message (the new) by retailing the history (the old) they so much loved: the deliverance from Egypt (17), the wilderness experience (18), the inheritance of Canaan (19), the Judges (19), Samuel (20), Saul (21), David (22). The he proceeded point by point \textit{knitting the new to the old}, by proving his thesis (Jesus is the Christ) from the testimony of John the Baptist (24), the prediction of the Prophets (27), and the attestation of living witnesses to the resurrection (31).

   At Athens he used the well-known altar and its familiar inscription to set for the trust he proclaimed (the new) to his hearers. (Acts 17:23.)

   [99] St. Paul’s appeal to “the apperceiving mass” of those taught is especially noteworthy in the salutations and greetings of his Epistles. See the opening verses of his Epistle to the Romans (1-7), Philippians (1-3), Colossians (1-3), I Thessalonians (1-3), II Timothy (1-7), Philemon (1-7).

2. St. Paul appealed to the memory also at Ephesus by \textit{vivid descriptions of previous events} to teach such lessons as:

---


Faithfulness: “Ye yourselves know from the first day that I set foot in Asia, after what manner I was with you all the time, serving the Lord with all lowliness of mind, and with tears, and with trials which befell me by the plots of the Jews.” (Acts 20:18, 19.)

Good conduct: “Wherefore, watch ye, remembering that by the space of three years I ceased not to admonish every one night and day with tears.” (Acts 20:31.)

Generous service: “Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me. In all these things I gave you an example, that so laboring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.” (Acts 20:34-35.)

Consecration: “My remembrance of thee…remembering thy tears…having been reminded of unfeigned faith that is in thee…For which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God that is in thee.” (II Tim. 1:3–6.)

3. He appealed to the memory (ingenious?) to create interest and sympathy: before Felix (Acts 24:10, 11) and before Agrippa (Acts 26:26).

4. He appealed to the memory to win confidence of others in himself and establish prestige: on shipboard in the storm, when he had advised against sailing from Crete. (Acts 27:10, 21, 42–44.)

5. He called for a hearty response to his teachings on the basis of memory. “I beseech you therefore, [100] be ye imitators of me. For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which are in Christ, even as I teach elsewhere in every church.” (I Cor. 4:17.)

6. He appealed through the memory to unite the common interests of a group who could not get along with each other. (See Phil. 1:3–5, and 1:27; 2:4; 4:2, 3.)

7. He instructed a younger teacher to appeal to the memory by way of good pedagogy. (See I Timothy 4:6; II Timothy 2:8–14.)

4. **Imagination.**

Imagination has been described as the picture-forming power of the mind, hence the term mental imagery. There are two kinds of imagination, the reproductive and the productive. The reproductive imagination functions as memory. The productive imagination is to some extent dependent on the reproductive imagination, as it involves recall. It combines past experiences in new form. Strayer and Norsworthy\(^{40}\) classify productive imagery as fanciful, realistic, and idealistic, according to the character of the material used. Dewey\(^{41}\) says that fancy is “characterized by the predominance of

\(^{40}\) Stayer and Norsworthy, *How to Teach*, p. 96.

similes, of metaphors, of images in the poetical sense, of subtile analogies.” This sentence practically summarizes what may be said about St. Paul’s appeal to the imagination.

1. **His use of the simile.** (A formal comparison of two objects.)

“For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office, so we, who are [101] many, are one body in Christ, and severally members of one another.” (Rom 12:4. Cf. I Cor. 12:12.)

“As sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness.” (Rom 5:21.)

Paul’s use of the simile is so frequent that examples might be added indefinitely; for instance, his frequent construction “as—so,”\(^{42}\) is so frequent as almost to be a characteristic of his speech. According to Young\(^ {43} \) there are 7 similes in the teaching situations recorded in the Acts. There are 15 in Romans, 26 in I Corinthians, 23 in II Corinthians, 8 in Galatians, 14 in Ephesians, 5 in Philippians, 7 in Colossians, 8 in I Thessalonians, 4 in II Thessalonians, 4 in I Timothy, 4 in II Timothy, 2 in Titus, 3 in Philemon, (18 in Hebrews); a total (including Hebrews) of 148 (in about 100 chapters).

2. **His use of the metaphor.** (An implied simile.)

“Lest by any means I should be running, or had run, in vain.” (Gal. 2:2; cf. Rom. 9:16; II Thess. 3:1.)

“That the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.” (Rom. 8:4; cf. Rom. 6:4; II Cor. 4:2; Eph. 2:2, 10.)

“For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.” (Gal. 3:27; see also I Cor. 15:53, 54; II Cor. 5:3, 4; Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10.)

\(^{42}\) ὡσπερ … οὔτως or οὔτως καί.

\(^{43}\) Young, *Analytic Concordance*, under “as.”
Farrar finds a barrenness of “color” in St. Paul. Yet Humphries finds a great wealth of imagery simply in his Pastoral Epistles. To his instances a great many may be added from Paul’s other Epistles. His use of the metaphor shows that he drew his imagery from:

[102] Imperial Warfare: “That thou mayest war the good warfare.” (I Tim. 1:18. See also II Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:13-19; II Tim. 2:3, 3:6.)


Ancient Agriculture: “The husbandman that laboreth must be the first to partake of the fruits.” (II Tim. 2:6. See also Rom. 5:5; 11:17; I Cor. 3:9; 9:10, 11; Gal 6:8; I Tim. 4:10; 5:17, 18; 6:10; Titus 1:13; 3:14.)

Greek Games: “And if also a man contend in the games, he is not crowned except he have contended lawfully.” (II Tim. 2:5. See also I Cor. 9:25; Eph. 6:12; I Tim. 4:7; 6:12; II Tim. 4:7.)

Roman Law: “That being justified we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” (Titus 3:7.) “Heirs” is a favorite word with Paul, being used 18 times in his Epistles. Further metaphors of this class are as follows:

“So also we when we were children were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world, that we might receive the adoption (υἱοθεσία) of sons.” (Gal. 3:4 ff. See also Rom. 8:14, 21, Eph. 1:5.)

“But I say that so long as the heir is a child he diuffereth nothing from a bondservant (δοῦλος) being lord of all.” (Gal. 4:1. See also Rom. 3:25; I Cor. 7:21, 22; Rom 6:19; Phil. 2:7, 8.)

Medical Science: “If any man teacheth a different doctrine and consenteth not to sound words (ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις).” (I Tim. 6:3. See also Titus 1:9, 13; 2:1; II Tim. 2:17; 3:17; 4:3. See also καταρτίζω, “restore,” as in Gal. 6:1).

Seafaring Life: “Made shipwreck concerning the faith.” (I Tim. 1:19. See also 6:19.)

Commercial Life: “Supposing godliness is by way of gain.” (I Tim. 6:5. See also II Tim. 1:12, 14.)

Hunting Game: “Recover themselves out of the snare of the


45. Humphries on Pastoral Epistles, p. 262.
devil.” (II Tim. 2:6. See also I Tim. 3:7; 6:9.)

[103] It is interesting to note from what activities Paul drew his figures. His references (as Farrar points out) to the beauties of nature are practically nil. Perhaps this is another illustration of St. Paul’s subordination of everything to the practical.

Other figures St. Paul used are:

**Metonymy.** (Container for thing contained.) “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons.” (I Cor. 10:21.)

“He shall justify the circumcision (the Jews) by faith and the uncircumcision (the Gentiles) through faith.” (Rom. 3:20. See also Rom. 2:26; Gal 2:7 ff.)

**Synecdoche.** (Whole for part or part for whole, etc.) His use of “law,” (νόμος). “But now apart from law χωρίς νόμου a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law υπὸ τοῦ νόμου and the prophets.” See also Rom. 7:2, 3. His use of uncircumsision (ἀκροβθστία) as in Rom. 2:26, and righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) as in Rom. 9:30, 31.

**Personification.** (To give personal form or character to an object.)

“O death, where is thy victory? O Death, where is thy sting?” (I Cor. 15:55.) “For sin shall not have dominion over you.” (Rom. 6:14.) “And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham.” (Gal. 3:8, 22.)

**Apostrophe.** (The absent addressed as present.) “Wherefore thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest.” (Rom. 2:1; cf. 2:3.) “But I speak to you that are Gentiles.” (Rom 11:13; cf. 11:24.)

**Contrast.** (Association of likes or opposites.) “But we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block and unto Gentiles foolishness.” (I Cor. 1:23. See Romans 2:21, 23; II Cor. 4:8, 9; 6:8-10.)

**Paradox and Oxymoron.** (Contradictory terms brought sharply together.) “For when I am weak, then am I strong.” (II Cor. 12:10.) “If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become wise.” (I Cor. 3:9; 8:10. [104] See Rom. 4:18; II Cor. 4:8-10; 6:9; I Tim. 5:6; Rom 1:20, 22; II Cor. 8:2.)

**Irony.** (A form of speech represented in its opposite.) “Did I commit a sin in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I preached unto you?” (II Cor. 11:7. See also Gal. 4:16.) “Already ye are filled, already ye are become rich.” (I Cor. 4:8 ff.)

**Hyperbole.** (Exaggeration for sake of emphasis.) “I thank
my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is proclaimed throughout the whole world.” (Rom. 1:8.)

There is a noticeable lack of hyperbole in Paul. But see II Cor. 2:14; Rom. 16:19; I Thess. 1:8.

This study reveals not only that St. Paul’s mind was rich in imagery but that he used this imagery to project his teachings to others. St. Paul drew his figures, especially his metaphors, from the practical activities of life, rather than from the beauties of nature, as Stalker says, “from scenes of human energy and monuments of cultivated life.” Life and actions were his ends; hence his figures. He was practical rather than poetic. The man was adapted to his mission. As for “subtle analogies,” they are best studied with St. Paul’s dialectics.

St. Paul’s appeal to the realistic imagination is seen in the frequent repetitions of his experience on the way to Damascus (repeated largely for the sake of self-defense). Is not his introduction to his discourse related in II Cor. 12 of this type: “I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not: God knoweth), such a one caught up even to the third heaven,” etc. From this passage he goes on to a very practical discussion of how strength may be found in weakness. (See Acts 16: 6-10.)

One need but survey our past study of the imagination to appreciate the Ideal element running clear through St. Paul. He was an Idealist in a very real sense. The great ideas which he taught are concerning God, Sin, Christ, Redemption, the Christian Life, the Church, and the Future. This type of St. Paul’s appeal to the imagination is seen especially in such passages as I Cor. 12 and Eph. 1:18 ff., which begins “Having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that ye may know,” etc. Of course St. Paul was appealing here to the spiritual sense, far deeper than to any mental response. Perhaps it would be better to say he appealed through the imagination than to it, as a certain wise man once put it: “Your brains will never save you, but you can’t get saved without them.”

5. Judgment and Reason.

Plato called dialectic “the coping stone of the sciences,” and called the Dialectician a person who takes thoughtful account of the essence of each thing. He used the term to suggest that method of discussion by question and answer, the determination of truth and error by a process
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of analysis, a process which “carries back its hypothesis to the very first principle of all, in order to establish them firmly.” Aristotle limited the word to the use of argument for purposes of persuasion. It is in this sense that we speak of the dialectics of St. Paul.

If it is true, as Whipple says, that “skill in dialectics is more an art than an effort of genius,” we may conclude that St. Paul’s ability as a dialectician was largely a result of his training in the rabbinical school under Gamaliel. Storrs says, “Certainly no more expert and splendid dialectical energy than that of Paul is known to have wrought in even the abundant and delicate Greek tongue.” We shall reserve a study of St. Paul’s appeal to the Judgment and Reason in his dialectics for Chapter VIII, in the discussion of his methods, which involves his questions and answers and reasoning.
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