

DISCIPLINING PERFORMANCE AND 'PLACING' THE CHURCH:
WIDOWS, ELDERS AND SLAVES IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD (1 TIM 5.1-6.2)

David G. Horrell

After 1 Tim 2.9-15, the most infamous passage about women in the Pastorals, 1 Tim 5.1-6.2 ranks among the more controversial and frequently discussed texts in 1 Timothy, at least in recent scholarship.¹ The author's treatment of widows, as well as his instruction to slaves, generates contrasting reactions among readers, depending, at least in part, on where their own sympathies and commitments lie. Indeed, one might broadly characterise a good deal of work on this text as exhibiting either sympathy for the author and suspicion for his opponents, or sympathy for the opponents and suspicion for the author.

For some scholars, then, 'Paul' – whether seen as an authentic designation of the author or a pseudonym² – is clearly right to restrict the activities of younger widows and to protect the church from the heresy they embody and promote. False teaching is a real and present danger, such that appropriate action to guard against it, and to safeguard the church's respectable reputation, is both warranted and required. Philip Towner, for example, sees emancipatory aspirations deriving from 'over-realized eschatology' on the part of women and slaves as underpinning their 'perverted conduct, which included a tendency to engage in behaviour that challenged the given social structure'. Such behaviour 'would do nothing but engender criticism and disgust among outsiders' so the

¹ See e.g. U. Wagoner, *Die Ordnung des "Haus Gottes". Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe* (WUNT 2, 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), whose study of women in the Pastorals focuses on 1 Tim 2.9-3.1a and 5.3-16. Among the many publications that indicate the intense interest in 2.9-15 I mention only one example: A. Köstenberger, T. Schreiner, and H.S. Baldwin (eds.), *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1995).

² The authorship of the letter remains an issue of scholarly debate, though a weighty tradition of scholarship regards it as pseudonymous, a position I find persuasive. See, e.g., the lengthy discussion in I.H. Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) 57-92.

‘appropriate solution... was to be found in adherence to social structures such as the family’.³

For other scholars, by contrast, the author’s strategy is a regrettable attempt to use a position of power to exclude and to stigmatise those who represent a different ‘take’ on the Christian gospel, a different vision of what the church should be like. The widows, on this reading, are not dangerous heretics who threaten the church’s integrity and continuity, but rather representatives of an alternative, even egalitarian, Christianity, marginalised by the machinations of patriarchal power. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza has influenced much subsequent feminist scholarship with her depiction of the Pastorals as evidence of ‘patriarchalisation’ in the early church, a transformation away from the early model of ‘the discipleship of equals’.⁴ Deborah Krause, for example, takes a critical stance towards the author of 1 Timothy’s use of power to shape the church in a particular way, and shows explicit sympathy for those, notably the widows of 1 Timothy 5, who ‘do not serve his approved social structure and ecclesial purposes’.⁵

To a considerable extent the contrasting reading stances are reflections of different theological stances and views of biblical authority. For evangelicals committed

³ P.H. Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles* (JSNTSup, 34; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) with phrases from pp. 43, 198, 42 respectively. See also, e.g., A. Padgett, 'The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1-10', *Evangelical Quarterly*, 59 (1987) 39-52, A. Padgett, 'Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Tim 2:8-15 in Social Context', *Interpretation*, 41 (1987) 19-31; W.D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC, 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000). Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* and F. Young, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: CUP, 1994), in different ways, offer a positive and nuanced view of the Pastorals’ stance and value (on the question of treating the three Pastoral letters as a group or individually, see n. 35 below).

⁴ E.S. Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1983).

⁵ D. Krause, *1 Timothy* (Readings; London: T&T Clark International, 2004) 104. Cf. also J.M. Bassler, 'The Widows' Tale: A Fresh Look at 1 Tim 5:3-16', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 103 (1984) 23-41; L.M. Maloney, 'The Pastoral Epistles', in E.S. Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures, Volume 2: A Feminist Commentary* (New York/ London: Crossroad/ SCM, 1994) 361-80; L. Fatum, 'Christ Domesticated: The Household Theology of the Pastorals as Political Strategy', in J. Ådna (ed.), *The Formation of the Early Church* (WUNT, 183; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 175-207.

to a particular construal of the authority of scripture, for example, a stance which opposes the author's teaching as repressive, and finds in the opponents' position a potentially positive and emancipatory theology is simply incompatible with a Christian reading of the Bible. Those of a more radical persuasion, by contrast, are happy to see the text's value precisely in its preservation, albeit partially, of voices and perspectives that go against the grain of the author's convictions. Krause, for example, sees this as 'one way to hold such texts as sacred and yet resist their prescriptions and pretensions about God's intentions for human social relations within the life of the church'.⁶

Yet the readings are also noticeably different in terms of the extent to which they trust the author's rhetoric. William Mounce, for example, places the Pastorals against the background of the threat posed by an Ephesian heresy – a heresy largely constructed, of course, given our lack of other evidence, on the basis of what the author says his opponents are doing. Furthermore, he takes at face value the author's statements about those whom he opposes in the letter. Mounce is not *quite* persuaded that the widows are actually engaging in Satan-worship (cf. 5.15), but nonetheless sees this reference as 'a euphemism for acceptance of the demonic Ephesian heresy'.⁷ These widows, many of whom had 'been won over to the Ephesian heresy' are 'self-indulgent, self-centered, physically alive but spiritually dead'.⁸ The result of this reading strategy is clear: if what 'Paul' is counterattacking is so dangerous, then he is fully justified in calling for restrictions and limitations on the activity of widows. A comparable strategy is apparent in Bruce Winter's recent treatment of this text and of the ancient evidence regarding 'new women' – that is to say, women who defied traditional restrictions and were regarded as promiscuous and disturbing to the *status quo*.⁹ The widows addressed in 1 Timothy, similarly, are engaging in a 'promiscuous lifestyle' made possible by the opportunity 'to be idle at the expense of the Christian community'.¹⁰

⁶ Krause, *1 Timothy* 118.

⁷ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 297.

⁸ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 299.

⁹ See B.W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003) 17-38, *et passim*.

¹⁰ Winter, *Roman Wives* 133, 139.

An immediate contrast may be noted with Jouette Bassler's much earlier treatment of the same text, in which she sees the changes in the position of women at the time as an instance of 'liberation' for women, a form of proto-feminism which raised 'egalitarian hopes' and widened the opportunities for women's participation in society.¹¹ At issue here is not only whether one regards the changes positively or negatively but also how one reads the rhetoric with which these women are described.¹² Winter takes the hints of sexual promiscuity at face value, it seems, as a description of the widows' activities, while Krause sees this as an indication of 'the letter writer's fear of women's sexuality'.¹³ Bassler, along with Krause and many others, is more inclined to see the widows as representatives of an ascetic lifestyle, such as is promoted as ideal in the apocryphal Acts (see below n. 66).

There are good reasons, it seems to me, to read the author's rhetoric (and every author's rhetoric!) with a degree of suspicion, and to resist taking (often stereotypical) polemic at face value.¹⁴ It is relevant, for example, to note that various so-called Gnostic sects were accused of sexual promiscuity and licence, while their own writings reveal an ascetic tendency.¹⁵ Furthermore, one text in the Pastorals should make the need for such a stance abundantly clear: Tit 1.12. Notwithstanding the fact that the author is quoting 'one of their own prophets', the notion that all people native to Crete were actually 'liars, evil

¹¹ Bassler, 'Widows' Tale', 25, 28.

¹² See, e.g., the comments on Winter's approach by H.K. Bond, 'Review of Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*', *Conversations in Religion and Theology*, 4 (2006) 17-20 (at 18-19); S. Matthews, 'Review of Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 67 (2005) 162-63. Cf. more broadly J.A. McNamara, 'Gendering Virtue', in S.B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* (New York, Oxford: OUP, 1999) 151-61.

¹³ Krause, *1 Timothy* 102.

¹⁴ On the stereotypical polemic of the Pastorals, see R.J. Karris, 'The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92 (1973) 549-64; L.K. Pietersen, 'Despicable Deviants: Labelling Theory and the Polemic of the Pastorals', *Sociology of Religion*, 58.4 (1997) 343-52, L.K. Pietersen, *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity* (JSNTSup, 264; London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

¹⁵ See M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996) 139-88.

beasts, lazy gluttons' would hardly count as sober historical assessment.¹⁶ Similarly, the author's depiction of the dangers posed by the widows should be read with a due sensitivity to the particular stance from which the author writes and the strategies of power implied in his polemic.

However, in this paper I want to draw on some theoretical ideas from recent anthropology and geography which may help to take us beyond the options of sympathy and suspicion. The first such idea is that of performance. Recent anthropological studies have found it valuable to approach culture as something that is *performed*.¹⁷ This is not to say that *everything* I do, privately or individually, is performance, but that human interactions, including activities in public or community settings, are performances in which culture is 'kept alive'. This approach, then, implies a broad – though not all-inclusive – understanding of 'performance'.¹⁸ The ways in which we do things, from the mundane and trivial to the spectacular and momentous, are shaped by cultural scripts, which we reproduce and sustain in our performance of them. Roles, among other things, are performed in ways shaped by certain rules and expectations, and our text deals with three roles in particular: elders, widows and slaves. Our author, we may suggest, is attempting to shape – or, more specifically, to *discipline* – the ways in which these roles are performed by members of the church. One advantage of this approach is that it offers an alternative conceptualisation to one which casts the author in the role of either defender of orthodoxy or power-wielding patriarch. The author of 1 Timothy does, it seems, differ from others, including at least some of those whose conduct he discusses here, in terms of how he thinks the roles of elder, widow, or slave, should be performed. But his opponents equally are engaged in shaping or disciplining the performance of such

¹⁶ Though it is interesting to notice commentators' reluctance to say this directly. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, commenting on the striking use of the term 'prophet' to denote a 'pagan' poet, says that 'the point might be that, like Caiaphas (Jn 11.51), this man spoke the truth without realising that he was God's mouthpiece' (p. 199). He does suggest, however, that the *aei* in Tit 1.12 'was not taken *au pied de la lettre*' (p. 203).

¹⁷ G.B. Palmer and W.R. Jankowiak, 'Performance and Imagination: Toward an Anthropology of the Spectacular and the Mundane', *Cultural Anthropology*, 11 (1996) 225-58.

¹⁸ The issue of how broadly or specifically to define performance is a matter of some discussion; see Palmer and Jankowiak, 'Performance and Imagination', 225-27.

roles, whether that involves the performance of the slave-master relationship in ways shaped by the notion of a sibling-relationship (6.2) or the performance of the role of widow outside the boundaries of marriage and household. Like the author's own stance, asceticism too may be understood as an attempt to discipline performance, in specific ways.¹⁹

The second theoretical idea is that of space, and specifically the idea that space is not merely a container within which things happen but is rather *constructed* or produced in particular ways, socially and ideologically – such that power is thus intrinsically bound up in the making of 'place'.²⁰ Stephen Barton, for example, has insightfully examined 'Paul's sense of place' as expressed in 1 Cor 11.17-34 and 14.33b-36.²¹ Barton notes the importance of time and space in the production of social worlds and the significance of boundaries – a category of space.²² What Paul is doing in these texts, Barton argues, is distinguishing *oikos*-space from *ekklesia*-space, thus 'restricting the intrusion of household-based power'; while the Corinthians 'seem intent on collapsing the two spheres altogether'.²³

A comparable approach, though pursued in much greater detail and with sophisticated theoretical discussion, is taken by Jorunn Økland, who examines the ways in which Paul structures and genders 'the Christian gathering [at Corinth] as a particular kind of space constructed through ritual'.²⁴ Like Barton, Økland sees Paul drawing a distinction between *oikos* and *ekklesia* space, despite the fact that they occupy the same

¹⁹ Cf. R. Valantasis, 'Constructions of Power in Asceticism', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 63 (1995) 775-821. Valantasis makes the notion of performance central to his definition of asceticism:

'Asceticism may be defined as performances within a dominant social environment intended to inaugurate a new subjectivity, different social relations, and an alternative symbolic universe' (797, italics original).

²⁰ Particularly influential is H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); see also D. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990) 211-25.

²¹ S.C. Barton, 'Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth', *New Testament Studies*, 32 (1986) 225-46.

²² Barton, 'Paul's Sense of Place', 226, 227-29.

²³ Barton, 'Paul's Sense of Place', 239, 234.

²⁴ J. Økland, *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space* (JSNTSup, 269; London: T&T Clark International, 2004) 1.

material location, since the assembly meets in a house.²⁵ Recalling our earlier mention of the rhetoric used to describe women's activities, Økland also helpfully shows how ancient descriptions of the appropriate 'places' for women's and men's activities – with the former classically assigned to the home and the latter to the public sphere (e.g. Philo, *Spec Leg* 3.169ff.; *Quaest in Gen* 1.26) – cannot, despite much scholarship to the contrary, validly be read simply as descriptions of social reality²⁶ but are rather reflections of an ideological struggle: 'gendering cannot be read as descriptive, but as a way of making sense of the spaces and legitimizing their structures'.²⁷

Picking up this focus on 'making place', we may ask how the author of 1 Timothy constructs ecclesial space, and how this construction relates to the household space which is also a prominent concern.

5.1-2

Our text begins with instruction to Timothy as to how he 'should relate to people of different ages and genders in the church', which thus 'serves as a transitional passage',²⁸ connected both with what precedes in 4.12ff²⁹ and with what follows.³⁰ Appropriate conduct for Timothy – whom I am inclined to view as part of the device of pseudonymity, rather than the actual addressee of the epistle³¹ – is defined according to the age and gender of those to whom he relates. In terms of disciplining performance, it is

²⁵ Økland, *Women in Their Place* 141-42, 149, 151, etc.

²⁶ See, e.g., J.H. Neyrey, 'What's Wrong With This Picture? John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space', *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 24 (1994) 77-91, esp. 79-82; B.J. Malina and R.L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 348-49; D.A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2000) 33-34.

²⁷ Økland, *Women in Their Place* 58-62, quotation from p. 61.

²⁸ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 268-69.

²⁹ So J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKKNT 15; Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1988) 249.

³⁰ So, e.g., Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 268-71; L.T. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 35A; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 259ff.

³¹ Some scholars have referred to the 'double pseudonymity' of these letters, e.g., Wagener, *Die Ordnung des "Haus Gottes"*, 9; Fatum, 'Christ Domesticated', 176-77.

Timothy's performance (whether historical, fictional, representative, or whatever) that is in view here.

Immediately we are faced with a difficulty: how should we translate *presbuteroj* here? Elsewhere in the letter, indeed in both the preceding (4.14) and the following verses (5.17-19), we clearly have this and similar terms (*presbuterion* in 4.14) used to designate those with a leading role in the church – such that 'elders' would be an appropriate rendering. However, the categories introduced in these verses themselves clearly indicate that age (and gender) is in view here: older men, younger men, older women, younger women. The blurring of age and leadership designations (cf. also *1 Clem* 3.3) that causes exegetes such difficulty is probably explained along the lines set out by R. Alastair Campbell, although I do not find persuasive all the details of his reconstruction.³² Campbell argues that the leadership of the earliest churches was provided by heads of household, who as figures of seniority were appropriately designated *presbuteroi*, a label that came into Christian usage once several house-churches began to group together. This label did not exactly denote an office as such, nor was it simply a statement about age *per se*; rather, it identified those who, by virtue of their senior social position, were the leading figures of the *e0kkhlesi/a*. Certainly Campbell's argument would seem to fit the scenario depicted in 1 Timothy, where approved and acceptable leaders are, and have to be, male heads of household (3.4, 12). Indeed, the clear connections between seniority in the household and in the church already indicate something of the author's tendency to construct the church as *oikos*-space.

The modes of appropriate relating set out here indicate further how the church is regarded as a family, a fictive kin-group or extended household. As Mounce notes, these

³² R.A. Campbell, *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994). For discussion and critique, see D.G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996) 247-48; D.G. Horrell, 'Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity', in D.G. Horrell (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) 309-37 (at 317-18).

verses continue ‘from 1 Tim 3:15 the imagery of the church as a household’.³³ Yet it is also to be noted that the community members are not uniformly designated here as ἀδελφοί, as is frequent in the undisputed Paulines (and see below on 6.2). Those of a similar age to the young man Timothy (4.12) are to be treated like siblings, with a stress on the need to avoid sexual impropriety in the case of his relationship to sisters,³⁴ while those who are senior are to be treated like fathers and mothers. Paul does, of course, alongside his frequent *adelphos*-terminology, also use familial language which expresses relationships of seniority – Paul as father, Timothy as child, etc. (1 Cor 4.15; Phil 2.22; Phlmn 10). But the notable lack of sibling terminology in 1 Timothy (and the Pastorals generally),³⁵ together with the greater prominence of household imagery seem to me to reflect something significant in terms of the developing character and conception of the church, which, as ‘place’, is more like a structured οἶκος than an assembly of siblings.³⁶

³³ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 269.

³⁴ This is the force of the phrase ἐν παῖσι ἀγαπᾷ.

³⁵ The most plausible position seems to me the one traditional in critical scholarship: that the three epistles are pseudonymous and have a common author. Some recent scholarship has, however, urged that each of the letters be treated on its own terms, sometimes arguing for the authenticity of all three epistles (Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 55-99) or of one or other (notably 2 Timothy: M. Prior, *Paul the Letter Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (JSNTSup, 23; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); J. Murphy-O'Connor, '2 Timothy Contrasted with 1 Timothy and Titus', *Revue Biblique*, 98 (1991) 403-18, sometimes not (J. Herzer, 'Abschied vom Konsens? Die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe als Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 129 (2004) 1267-82). For a strong assertion of the common authorship of the three letters, see Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 1-2. Nevertheless, a view on common authorship should not prevent each letter being carefully considered on its own terms.

³⁶ See D.G. Horrell, 'From *adelphoi* to *oikos theou*: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 120 (2001) 293-311; also P.R. Trebilco, *The early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (WUNT, 166; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004) 561-65; R. Aasgaard, 'Brothers and Sisters in the Faith: Christian Siblingship as an Ecclesiological Mirror in the First Two Centuries', in J. Ådna (ed.), *The Formation of the Early Church* (WUNT, 183; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 285-316 (at 301-303). Some criticisms of my argument in this regard have been made by Andrew Clarke and Margaret Mitchell; see A.D. Clarke, 'Equality or Mutuality: Paul's Use of "Brother" Language', in A.D. Clarke et al. (eds.), *The New Testament in its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 151-64 and M.M. Mitchell, 'Why Family Matters

5.3-16

The most substantial section of our text addresses the subject of widows. As is frequently noted, the purpose of the instruction set out here is not to introduce or establish some new notion of the church's responsibilities in regard to widows. Such responsibility is presumed; the concern is much more to regulate and limit this charitable practice.³⁷ The author's primary aim is to establish who should count as a 'genuine widow' (οἰκτιρωμένων), a term repeated three times in this section of text, including, significantly, in its opening and closing phrases (vv. 3, 5, 16).³⁸ Indeed, his definition is in some respects highly restrictive, indicative of the need to reduce the number of widows under the church's care and to reintegrate as many as possible into household relationships, whether of care by relatives or marriage.

Penetrating much further into the intentions and details, however, rapidly brings one face to face with a series of difficult questions: What kind of responsibility is the church taking for widows? Are widows being enrolled into an 'order' or 'office', and, if so, does this constitute a 'ministry', with specific 'duties'? Crucial in the opening verse, a summary headline for the whole passage,³⁹ is the translation of τιμα.⁴⁰ The question, of course, is whether this imperative means simply, 'honour', or rather, 'give material

for Early Christian Literature', in D.L. Balch and C. Osiek (eds.), *Early Christian Families in Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 345-58 at 350 n. 5). I remain convinced, however, that the changing patterns of use of the term αἰτιολογία (even comparing letters addressed primarily or ostensibly to individuals, such as Philemon and the Pastorals) indicate something significant about the changing emphases in constructions of the οἰκτιρωμένων/a. Moreover, while a wide range of familial and household terms are used in the Pauline corpus to describe the οἰκτιρωμένων/a, their senses and impacts, though often overlapping, should not simply be regarded as univocal.

³⁷ E.g., Roloff, *Timotheus* 283; Bassler, 'Widows' Tale', 34; B.B. Thurston, *The Widows: A Woman's Ministry in the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998) 40, 53-54; B.W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (First-Century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994) 63; Winter, *Roman Wives* 128.

³⁸ Cf. Roloff, *Timotheus* 283.

³⁹ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 277.

⁴⁰ Cf. Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 260: 'The translation of *tima* is critical to the entire discussion of 5:3-16'.

and financial support'. There are good reasons to follow most recent commentators in arguing that financial support is in view here.⁴¹ Compassion and material care for the needy, of whom widows are a prominent category, is a Jewish practice evidently followed since its earliest days by the church.⁴² Jens Uwe-Krause notes that a considerable proportion of the urban poor in the Roman empire 'wurde von Witwen und Waisen gestellt, die den Familienvorstand verloren hatten'.⁴³

In distinguishing genuine widows from others, then, the first consideration is that those who have children or grandchildren should find their support there, so that only those who are truly alone (and who are models of piety, 'praying night and day', as opposed to those who live 'for pleasure', 'self-indulgently' [spatalw~sa]) rely upon the church (vv.4-8). This is a question of responsibility placed upon a widow's family, rather than on a widow herself; it is her family members who must learn (manqane/twsan) to show due piety in this matter.⁴⁴ The exhortation of v. 7, then, as with the warning of v. 8, most likely relates to households/families, and concerns their

⁴¹ Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 261-62; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 278-79; Roloff, *Timotheus* 287; Thurston, *Widows* 44-45. Cf. Sir 38.1; BDAG, 1005.

⁴² Cf., e.g., Exod 2.22; Deut 14.28-29; Mal 3.5; Acts 6.1; Jas 1.27. See K. Nickle, *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy* (London: SCM, 1966) 93-95; Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City* 66; Winter, *Roman Wives* 127-28; Thurston, *Widows* 18-35, though Thurston is inclined to maximise the evidence for 'the possibility that widows served the early church as founders and sustainers of house churches, as deaconesses, and as assistants of Paul' (p. 35) and thus to argue for the early emergence of an order or ministry of widows (see below).

⁴³ J.-U. Krause, *Witwen und Waisen im römischen Reich*, 4 vols. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994-1995) II: 161; on 'Armut von Witwen', see 161-73.

⁴⁴ This is open to dispute. It is unclear whether the subject of the verb manqane is the widow (as is clearly the understanding in the texts which have manqane/tw rather than manqane/twsan) or her descendants. Roloff, *Timotheus* 287-88, argues for the opposite interpretation to that given above, suggesting that the passage as a whole is orientated towards the actions of the widows, and that this verse indicates that 'ihre erste Pflicht ist die Familie, nicht der Dienst in der Gemeinde'. I find this unconvincing, both here and in v. 8, and see the passage as much concerned to identify those widows who genuinely need the church's support – i.e. those without families to support them – as to specify those actions which constitute piety on the part of a widow.

duty to care for their own members, in this case specifically widows.⁴⁵ This concern is repeated again at the close of the section on widows (v. 16).

The second consideration to determine genuine widows concerns the status and conduct of the widow herself; three criteria are listed (vv. 9-10). The first is one of age: she must be at least sixty (v. 9), that is to say, ‘the age associated with becoming old’.⁴⁶ Given average life expectancy and the tendency of women to marry older men, this criterion must have excluded very large numbers of widows. Winter notes an estimate ‘that forty percent of women between the ages of forty and fifty were widows and that, as a group, they comprised some thirty percent of women in the ancient world’.⁴⁷ The second is her former marital status: she must have been *e9no\j a0ndro\j gunh/*, ‘a one-man woman’,⁴⁸ a phrase which corresponds exactly to the requirement that an *e0pi/skopoj be mia~j gunaiko\j a!nhr* (3.2). It is difficult to decide whether this means that she must have been chaste and faithful in marriage, or that she must only have been married once. The customary honouring of women who had been *univira/mo&nandroj* makes the latter a real possibility – note also Livy’s comment that the women who sacrificed at the altar of Pudicitia had to be *uni vira nupta* (10.23.9) – though strong arguments have been made for the former interpretation, which is perhaps on balance to be preferred.⁴⁹ It may even have been the case that the circle of widows had

⁴⁵ Cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 284; Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 263. For the idea that failure to fulfil this responsibility amounts to a denial of the faith cf. Jas 1.27, where true religion is defined in similar terms.

⁴⁶ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 286. See *m. Abot* 5.21; Plato, *Laws* 759D; Str-B 3: 653.

⁴⁷ Winter, *Roman Wives* 124. For a hugely detailed discussion of the likely population statistics, see Krause, *Witwen* I: 7-73, who concludes as follows: ‘Der größere Teil der Frauen, die das 50. Lebensjahr erreicht hatten, lebte als Witwen, und selbst in den Altersgruppen von 30-50 Jahren dürften mehr als 40% der Frauen verwitwet gewesen sein; der Anteil der Witwen an der Gesamtzahl erwachsener Frauen betrug rund 30%’ (p. 73).

⁴⁸ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 287.

⁴⁹ See esp. S. Page, ‘Marital Expectations of Church Leaders in the Pastoral Epistles’, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 50 (1993) 105-20. The meaning of the phrase is a matter of debate among the commentators. One difficulty with the ‘only once married’ interpretation is the resulting tension with the author’s advice that younger widows remarry (v. 14), since this would rule them out from ever meeting this criterion for enrollment – though perhaps this would not have unduly troubled the author, given his concern

expanded to include virgins who had committed themselves to the unmarried life in a pledge to the church.⁵⁰ If so, it is possible that the author is also taking steps to exclude the unmarried from the circle of genuine widows, though the use of *mia~j*, which seems ‘intended to indicate “one” in distinction from “more than one” rather than “none”’, speaks against this.⁵¹ The third criterion is that she must have demonstrated her worthy character by good works, specified with a range of examples, which again imply a previous life in marriage and child-rearing.

The use of the verb *katale/gein*, a NT *hapax*, indicates that in some sense the widows are being enrolled, or included in a list.⁵² This does not mean, however, that what is envisaged here need involve registration in a church ‘office’ (*Amt*), such as some scholars see here.⁵³ But it does indicate that the identification of ‘true’ widows is regarded as part of the process whereby such widows enter a category which involves ‘some type of formal relationship with the church’.⁵⁴ Those who see here enrolment to a formal office tend to read the list of requirements as specifying ‘duties’.⁵⁵ However, it is hard to see that the text really constitutes anything like a list of formal duties, or even reflects an already established set of duties, since, as Johnson points out, the list here (in other respects comparable with that in 3.1-13) ‘focuses on what the women have done in the *past*’.⁵⁶ As Mounce argues in some detail, the passage is mostly concerned with criteria which indicate whether a widow should or should not be enrolled, and some of

sharply to restrict the number of ‘real’ widows. In favour of the ‘only once married’ interpretation, see e.g., Roloff, *Timotheus* 293-94. For the other view, as well as Page, see M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972) 75; Winter, *Roman Wives* 136-37.

⁵⁰ See Bassler, ‘Widows’ Tale’, 34-35; Ign. *Smyrn* 13.1

⁵¹ Page, ‘Marital Expectations’, 107.

⁵² The basic meaning is clear enough: to enroll, or include in a list, sometimes in a technical sense for registration or enlistment, e.g., of soldiers (see Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 75; LSJ; BDAG, 520. J.D. Quinn and W.C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000) 418, take it to mean ‘enroll on the official roster’.

⁵³ E.g., Wagener, *Die Ordnung des "Haus Gottes"*; Thurston, *Widows*.

⁵⁴ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 286.

⁵⁵ E.g., Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 73, 75; Thurston, *Widows* 50-53.

⁵⁶ Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 264.

these criteria – such as being sixty years of age – can hardly be described as a ‘duty’.⁵⁷ The ‘good works’ listed as a criterion for enrollment (v. 10) are not the specific functions of a defined office, but rather the kind of hospitable and charitable deeds that one would expect from Christians, specifically from women functioning in the context of their household. Furthermore, only by a somewhat precarious mirror-reading of the text can some of the activities supposed to be duties be found in the text – such as house-to-house visiting (v. 13).⁵⁸

We need not doubt that ‘real’ widows would serve the church in practical ways, and by being models of prayerful piety (cf. Pol *Phil* 4.3), but there seems little to indicate a formal office, a *Witwenamt*, with set duties, despite the attractiveness of this reconstruction to those for whom this then constitutes a women’s ministry in the early church.⁵⁹ A helpful distinction, I think, is the one Roloff draws when he distinguishes between *Stand* and *Amt*:⁶⁰ widows constitute a *Stand* in that they form an institutionalised group with specific conditions of entry and patterns of life, but not an *Amt*, or office, for which established functions would be appropriate.

The statements concerning the qualities that must be displayed by a ‘true’ widow in order to qualify for enrolment in the church’s list are followed by a discussion of the other side of the coin: the problematic behaviour of those who are not genuine widows (vv. 11-15). The most obvious issue is that of age: younger widows should not be enrolled (v. 11; cf. v.14). Two reasons are given for this. First (vv. 11-12), they are likely to experience the kind of desire (*katastrhnia&swsin*)⁶¹ that makes them want to

⁵⁷ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 273-74.

⁵⁸ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 75: ‘The context [of v. 13] clearly indicates that such calls were among widows’ duties’; similarly, Thurston 1998: 51.

⁵⁹ Thurston, *Widows* .

⁶⁰ Roloff, *Timotheus* 286.

⁶¹ This *hapax* is found only here in Greek literature, and once in a dependent use in Ps-Ign, *Ad Antioch* 11 (BDAG, 528, which offers the translation ‘when they feel sensuous impulses that alienate them from Christ’. Cf. LSJ: ‘behave wantonly towards’; Louw-Nida: ‘to experience strong physical desires’). The verb *strhnia&w* (to live wantonly, in luxury, in sensuality) appears in Rev 18.7, 9, along with the noun *strh~noj* (18.3). The *kata&* plus genitive here indicates that the wantonness is directly opposed to Christ (BDF §181; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 290; Roloff, *Timotheus* 296 n. 373).

marry (gamei=n qe/lousin). Winter sees the verb katastrhnia&w as indicative of the widows' promiscuous lifestyle,⁶² but this seems unlikely, given that the depicted outcome is a desire to marry. What is more difficult to determine is precisely why this is depicted as taking them away from Christ (tou~ Xristou~) and as representing an abandonment of their first pi/stij. The author can hardly be objecting to the desire to marry *per se*, since this is exactly what he urges younger widows to do (v. 14). Most likely is the idea that enrolment as a widow involves a pledge or oath not to remarry (i.e., of celibacy) and instead to be devoted to and dependent on the church, which is also a particular form of dedication to Christ.⁶³ To want to marry is incompatible with having made this commitment to living as an enrolled widow. Whether this implies some notion of 'betrothal to Christ' or spiritual marriage, as developed later, is open to question, but one can certainly see the idea *in nuce* here.⁶⁴

⁶² Winter, *Roman Wives* 132-33.

⁶³ Taking pi/stij in the sense of 'oath' or 'solemn promise'; see Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 75 ('an agreement'); BDAG, 818 (1b); Quinn and Wacker, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 442; G.W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992) 227: 'a "pledge" to serve Christ as an "enrolled widow".'. Of the other main options canvassed by the commentators, the idea that a pledge not to remarry is in effect a pledge of faithfulness to one's first husband seems unlikely, not least in view of v. 14. Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 600-601, and Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 291-92, argue that the issue is women marrying non-Christians, and thus abandoning their Christian faith, while v. 14 concerns marriage to Christians. However, there is nothing here to indicate any explicit concern about marrying non-believers, and this view is perhaps too influenced by the desire to avoid a notion of spiritual marriage to Christ here. Marshall comments that 'the concept of an individual relationship to Christ of this kind is unparalleled in the NT and developed much later' (Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 600). But there is NT evidence for the idea of the church as the bride of Christ (2 Cor 11.2; Eph 5.25-32) and Paul regards the unmarried woman as holy and devoted to the Lord in a special way (1 Cor 7.34). The strong language about abandoning the faith, etc., which Marshall and Mounce see as unlikely in connection with breaking a commitment not to remarry and as more appropriate for something so drastic as abandoning the faith altogether, can reasonably be seen as reflecting the author's stern and serious concern about the problems caused by wayward young widows and his evident sense that enrollment of genuine widows is a matter for very careful consideration; it is not simply a case that someone can join and then leave the list!

⁶⁴ Cf. Roloff, *Timotheus* 296-97; Wagener, *Die Ordnung des "Haus Gottes"* 202-204.

A second problem concerns the way in which young and idle widows fill their time (v. 13). The author is clearly disturbed not only by their going round from house to house (perierxo&menai ta\j oi0ki/aj) but more particularly by the things they say when they do so. There is good reason to affirm the widely held view that these widows are not merely gossiping about the weather, but are promoting a version and interpretation of the Christian faith that the author finds objectionable and heretical.⁶⁵ Only this can adequately explain the strong terms in which their activity is censured, as ‘going after Satan’ (v. 15; cf. 1.20). Glimpses of the kind of Christianity which such women might have professed may well be found in the apocryphal Acts, notably the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, a Christianity with tendencies towards asceticism and celibacy (cf. 1 Tim 4.3) and in which women refuse to submit to the (sexual) domination of their husbands, in some cases separating from their spouse and home.⁶⁶

One question, of course, is whether this view of the young widows as ascetics is incompatible with the author’s first reason not to enroll younger widows – that they will later want to marry. The author is evidently suspicious and sceptical of these women’s

⁶⁵ E.g. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 295. Harry Maier has recently highlighted the prominence of the topic of right speaking and listening in the Pastorals, and has shown how the author’s contrast between ordered, regulated speech and immoderate, undisciplined speech reflects the broader pro-family ideology of the Roman Empire and the author’s own sense of the ideal ordering of the household of God (H.O. Maier, ‘Family Quarrels: The Politics of Discord and the Representation of Household Division in Greco-Roman Literature and the Pastoral Epistles’, paper given at SBL Annual Meeting, San Antonio, November 2004). Winter’s suggestion (Winter, *Roman Wives* 135) that lalou=sai ta_ mh_ de/onta evokes ‘the semantic field of sexuality’ here and thus confirms the picture of the widows as promiscuous seems to me somewhat tenuous. In any case, even if the author depicts the widows in this way, one needs to ask whether this is ideological polemic rather than trustworthy description (cf. above).

⁶⁶ See D.R. MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983); S.L. Davies, *The Revolt of the Widows: The Social World of the Apocryphal Acts* (Carbondale and Edwardsville/ London and Amsterdam: Southern Illinois University Press/ Feffer and Simons, 1980). Davies comments that ‘[t]he Acts do not condemn marriage per se, but they do condemn the sexual intercourse entailed by marriage; and they encourage women to assert themselves to refuse to submit to the desires of their husbands. If their husbands object, and refuse to allow their wives to live continently, then the flight of women from home and spouse is urged’ (p. 110). See e.g., *Acts of Paul and Thecla* 5-25, *Acts of Andrew* B.4-8, *Acts of Peter* 33-34, etc.

(all women's?) activity, and may well regard any asceticism, particularly when it results in separation from household relationships, as a dangerous and short-lived pattern of life. We should not ignore the fact that this is a polemical description of the widows' activities, such that accusations of sexual impropriety and desire cannot simply be read at face value (cf. above). The author essentially has two problems with the younger widows' particular performance of their identity, first, that their commitment to the celibate lifestyle will not last (vv. 11-12), and second, that their activities are in any case dangerous (v. 13).

The author's response is therefore to direct (*boulomai* is strong here)⁶⁷ younger widows to reintegrate themselves into the structure and activities of the (male-dominated) household: to marry, bear children, and *oiokodespotein*.⁶⁸ What exactly this last verb implies is significant though also somewhat open-ended. Can it be seen, for example, as evidence of 'the new and improved position which was secured to women by the Gospel'?⁶⁹ Roloff, in my view rightly, dismisses such sentiments as 'modernes Wunschdenken'.⁷⁰ And if Winter is right, then the author is reacting precisely *against* the kind of 'new women' who were emerging around this time.⁷¹ Indeed, the author's teaching elsewhere in the letter indicates clearly enough that the injunction to 'manage their households' does not connote some far-reaching or radical empowerment but rather a conservative ethic concerning women's domestic role.⁷² Men are intended to

⁶⁷ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 604, comments: '*boulomai* is used as in 2.8 (cf. Tit 3.8) to issue a strong directive.'

⁶⁸ Cf. Fatum, 'Christ Domesticated', 188, who, referring to 1 Tim 5.14, writes of 'the re-installation of women of childbearing age as wives and mothers into the patriarchal household under male control'.

⁶⁹ H.P.Liddon, quoted by W. Lock, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles (I & II Timothy and Titus)* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924) 61.

⁷⁰ Roloff, *Timotheus* 299 n. 391: 'Es ist darum modernes Wunschdenken, wenn Ausleger einen dem Evangelium eigenen frauenemanzipatorischen Akzent wiederfinden wollen'.

⁷¹ Winter, *Roman Wives* .

⁷² Cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 609E (*Consolatio ad Uxorem*): 'so soberly had you ordered the household' (*οὐκ ἄνωγες κἀκεῖνον οἶκον*) (tr. D. Russell in S.B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* (New York, Oxford: OUP, 1999) – in Plutarch's absence, it should be noted. Also notable in Plutarch's discussions of marriage and the household, and of the wife's role

exercise authority over their households – this is a criterion for leadership – an activity for which the author consistently uses *proi5sthmi* (three times in 3.4-5, 12), while women, children and slaves are to be quiet and submissive (2.11-15; 3.4; 6.1-2; cf. Tit 2.4-5). Such governance of the household is indeed a criterion for male church leaders. Urging that women manage their households thus indicates, as Howard Marshall rightly comments, that they are ‘to spend their time in family life and domestic pursuits’,⁷³ an ideological stance similar to that expressed by Philo, who sees a woman’s proper sphere as the home. The purpose of this reintegration into a household is not only to prevent their spreading ‘heretical’ views but also to lessen criticism of the church, by censoring activities that might be deemed to threaten the established order of society (5.14b, cf. 6.1b).

There are therefore two ways in which the role of widow can appropriately be performed, two patterns of sanctioned cultural practice, and the author’s first concern is to distinguish the two categories. ‘Genuine’ widows – those who are old, and also qualified for support on other grounds – may be enrolled in the church’s list, such that the church functions as their supporting household, the place in which they are integrated. The remainder of the widows should be reintegrated into actual households, whether this involves their children or grandchildren showing the appropriate care to a member of their *oij koj* (v. 4) or their integration into a new household through marriage (v. 14).

5.17-25

The next section, dealing with the payment, discipline, and installation of elders,⁷⁴ has some structural and substantive parallels with the section on widows,⁷⁵ including another

within them, is an emphasis on *swfrosu&nh*, which, Richard Hawley notes ‘forms a leitmotif in both works’ (i.e., *Advice to Bride and Groom*, and *Consolation to His Wife*; R. Hawley, ‘Practicing What You Preach’, in S.B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch’s Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* (New York, Oxford: OUP, 1999) 116-27, at 117).

⁷³ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 604.

⁷⁴ See W. Kowalski, ‘The Reward, Discipline, and Installation of Church Leaders: An Examination of 1 Timothy 5:17-22’, (PhD thesis; University of Gloucestershire, 2005) for a detailed study of these topics in 5.17-22.

use of the word *timh&* which is again crucial to understanding the sense. Just as most commentators take *ti/ma* in 5.3 to refer to material and financial support, so most also see that sense here (5.17), however the ‘double’ is precisely to be understood.⁷⁶ Two citations, both apparently regarded as ‘scripture’ (*graph&*), are introduced to legitimate this material support of leaders resident in the communities; moreover, both citations, significantly, have previously undergirded the right of travelling missionaries to hospitality and support.⁷⁷ The first is from Deut 25.4, also cited in 1 Cor 9.9;⁷⁸ the second is a saying of Jesus from the synoptic mission charge (Luke 10.7; cf. Matt 10.10; 1 Cor 9.14-15), which evidently influenced early Christian convictions about the support of missionaries and leaders from an early time.⁷⁹ The same legitimations used by Paul to

⁷⁵ So, e.g., Quinn and Wacker, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 458.

⁷⁶ E.g., A.T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982): 101; Campbell, *The Elders* 200-204; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 613 (‘in some tangible form’); Roloff, *Timotheus* 308; Quinn and Wacker, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 460. For the range of interpretations and suggestions on the meaning of ‘double’ here, see Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 612-14. Marshall cautiously favours the suggestion of Georg Schöllgen, that a double portion at the community meal is meant, while Quinn and Wacker, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 460, favour ‘double-pay’, in the sense of a stipend for full-time ‘presbyter-presidents’. Roloff, *Timotheus* 308, rejects the idea that this can be merely a vague reference to a ‘higher honorarium’ and also favours ‘double honorarium’, possibly double that paid to widows but more probably double that paid to the other elders; similarly, J.P. Meier, ‘Presbyteros in the Pastoral Epistles’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 35 (1973) 323-45 (here 327). Also uncertain is the meaning of *ma&lista*, which may mean ‘especially’ here, or, as a number of recent commentators suggest, ‘in other words’, such that are not two distinct groups of elders in view. For a recent discussion, see H.B. Kim, ‘The Interpretation of *malista* in 1 Timothy 5:14’, *Novum Testamentum*, 46 (2004) 360-68.

⁷⁷ D.G. Horrell, “‘The Lord commanded. But I have not used.’ Exegetical and hermeneutical reflections on 1 Cor 9.14-15”, *New Testament Studies*, 43 (1997) 587-603, Horrell, ‘Leadership Patterns’, 324.

⁷⁸ Indeed, it was pointed out in discussion that the citation in Tim 5.18 presumes the *interpretation* of Deut 25.4 given in 1 Cor 9.9-10, that is, its application to the topic of support for missionaries/leaders. This forms another indication that the author knew 1 Corinthians, and is engaged in some form of ‘fiktive Selbstausslegung’ or ‘corrective exegesis’ in recalling and representing the Pauline teaching here, on which see Margaret Mitchell’s essay in this volume.

⁷⁹ See A.E. Harvey, “‘The Workman is Worthy of His Hire’: Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church”, *Novum Testamentum*, 24 (1982) 209-21.

justify the support of travelling apostles (cf. 1 Cor 9.1-14) are now applied to the payment of the resident elders.⁸⁰

The second topic regarding elders concerns their discipline, and the way to deal with accusations against them impartially (vv. 19-22). The first point is simply to insist that accusations against elders should only be entertained if they are as well supported as would be required in any case of ecclesial discipline; that is, by more than one witness (Deut 19.15; Matt 18.16; 2 Cor 13.1). Those who are guilty of sin – there is no presumption of immunity from criticism on the part of elders! – are to be publicly reprovved. One exegetical issue here concerns the identity of the ‘all’ (ἐὸν ἅπασαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) and ‘the rest’ (οἱ ἄλλοι). Most likely is that ‘all’ refers to the whole church community, while ‘the rest’ are the other elders, for whom the fear of similar public judgment serves as a strong motive to avoid misconduct.⁸¹ As occurs frequently in this letter, the author firmly reiterates the importance of keeping these instructions, underlining the sense of authority which the letter conveys (v. 21; cf. 2.8; 3.14-15; 4.6, 11; 5.14; 6.2, etc.).

The third issue regarding elders is their appointment, since the ‘laying on of hands’ (ἐπιτίθειν τὰς χεῖρας) here most likely relates to the method of appointing or admitting people to an office or leadership role with particular responsibilities.⁸² The connection with disciplining elders who sin is not immediately apparent – Johnson comments that this section is more loosely structured than that concerning widows⁸³ – but it may be that the laying on of hands pertains not only to initial appointment but also to restoration of elders who have been reprimanded (v. 20).⁸⁴ This would explain the connected injunction to avoid sharing others’ sins and to keep pure.

⁸⁰ See further Horrell, ‘Leadership Patterns’,

⁸¹ So Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 314; Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 279-80, who notes the continuing influence of Deut 19.15-20 here.

⁸² Cf. 4.14; Num 27.22-23; Deut 34.9; Acts 6.6; 13.3; Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 281; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 316; for a detailed discussion see Kowalski, ‘1 Timothy 5:17-22’, 198-257.

⁸³ Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 285.

⁸⁴ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 316.

As many commentators note, the instruction to Timothy to cease drinking only water (mhke/ti u9dropo/tei, v. 23) fits oddly here, and seems something of a ‘strange digression’ at the centre of what has been seen as a chiasmic passage.⁸⁵ The topical connection is probably the idea of keeping pure,⁸⁶ which for some ascetics, represented here by Timothy, entailed abstinence from wine. The verb u9dropote/w, Marshall notes, seems to be used always as the opposite to drinking wine, and Johnson remarks that ‘the drinking of water alone was a sign of asceticism in antiquity’.⁸⁷ This verse is thus significant not only as an indication of the generally anti-ascetic stance of the letter (4.3-5) but also as early evidence that there were some who avoided wine at the eucharist, like those later ascetics who celebrated bread-and-water eucharists, as explored by Andrew McGowan. McGowan suggests that here Timothy, or (rather) those like him whom the author has in view, is exhorted to stop being a ‘water-drinker’, a practice which relates (though not, of course, exclusively) to eucharistic contexts.⁸⁸ There is no direct hint here that the practice of the eucharist is under discussion; but if there were those in the community committed to being ‘water-drinkers’, one can only conclude that their practice also encompassed community meals – though none of the commentaries I have consulted makes any explicit reference to the connection between this verse and eucharistic practice.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Meier, 'Presbyteros', esp. 325-336 (with the phrase quoted above from p. 334; an overview of the chiasmic structure on p. 336).

⁸⁶ Cf. Roloff, *Timotheus* 315: ‘Angeregt wohl durch das Stichwort “rein”...’; cf. Meier, 'Presbyteros', 334.

⁸⁷ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 624; Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 281, citing Dan 1.12 (LXX); Pirke Aboth 6.4; Epictetus, *Diss.* 3.13.21.

⁸⁸ A.B. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999) 231. Cf. also Rom 14.21, which also implies that some among the Roman churches avoided wine; D.G. Horrell, 'Pauline Churches or Early Christian Churches? Unity, Disagreement, and the Eucharist', in A. Alexeev et al. (eds.), *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Ecclesiology* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

⁸⁹ Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, Quinn and Wacker, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*; Knight III, *Pastoral Epistles*; Roloff, *Timotheus*; Hanson, *Pastoral Epistles*; J.N.D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles: I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus* (BNTC; London: A&C Black, 1963); Krause, *I Timothy* (who does, however, comment that 5.23 ‘seems to indicate a context in which the community practised abstinence from drinking anything but water’ [113]).

Finally, we return to the theme of others' sins (cf. vv.20-22), which may be more or less evident at first, but cannot remain hidden forever (vv.24-25). Again in this section we see a concern with what we have labelled the disciplining of performance, whether of 'Timothy', in some kind of exemplary role, or – more prominently here – of the role of elder. Good performance is to be appropriately rewarded, misconduct to be punished, and appointment to the role cautiously undertaken.

6.1-2

The third and final group addressed in this section of practical instruction is slaves (dou=loi).⁹⁰ The connection with the preceding sections is again a concern with timh/ (6.1; cf. 5.3, 17), though here the sense is with showing honour or respect, not with material or financial support. Slaves are urged to consider their own masters⁹¹ worthy of all honour (pa=sa timh/) – the pa=j here emphasizing and heightening the extent to which honour is due.⁹² The reason is so that God's reputation, and the reputation of the Christian teaching, may not be slandered. In other words, if slaves' conduct is such as to deviate from the expectations of due deference and conformity to established patterns of social relationships, the church will draw (even greater) public hostility and criticism.

One reason, then, for slaves to honour their masters is to lessen hostility from outside the church. A second reason, given in v. 2, concerns the identity of the masters

⁹⁰ As Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 283, notes, the description of them as u(po_ zugon 'may be used here in order to make clear that no metaphorical sense is intended'.

⁹¹ Tou_j i0di/ouj despo&taj. The instruction is thus focused on the relationship between a slave and their particular master; Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 283, therefore suggests that '[i]t does not inculcate a class consciousness toward all masters as a group'. However, the relationship with their own master is the *relevant* relationship in this instruction, which implies a duty of respect for whomever one might happen to serve; so, as is usual, this inculcates 'class consciousness' not via some abstract or generic means but in the particular relationships where it is pertinent.

⁹² Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 629-30, notes that 'pa/j functions as a superlative' here, citing Tit 2.10 as a similar instance.

themselves, if they are believers (pistoi/).⁹³ The focus here, then, is on the relationship between Christian slaves and Christian masters (contrast 1 Pet 2.18-3.6, where issues concerning relationships with non-Christian masters/husbands seem a more prominent concern). The instruction is that the slaves should not despise their masters (mh\ katafronei/twsan), but the reason given – o3ti a) delphi/ ei0sin – contains some ambiguity. Does it mean (a) that some slaves *are* ‘despising’ their masters on the grounds that they are a) delphi/? Or (b) that slaves *should not* despise their masters, for the reason that they, the masters, are a) delphi/? This makes a significant difference here, since our interpretation will determine the way in which a) delphi/ functions in this discussion. If (b) is the correct understanding,⁹⁴ then the author is making a positive appeal to a) delphi/-language in order to foster an appropriate pattern of relationship among members of the churches. Most translations and commentators favour (a), which seems to me the most plausible reading:⁹⁵ ‘the second o3ti clause explains the reason slaves are not to despise but rather serve their masters’ all the more – because they are ‘beloved believers’ (pistoi\ kai\ a)gaphtoi/)- ‘[t]he first *hoti* clause (*hoti adelphoi eisin*) discloses an essential element in the slaves’ reasoning’.⁹⁶

This then requires us to make some sense of why slaves should be ‘despising’ their masters, on the grounds that they regard them as a) delphi/. This is, of course, the author’s language and perspective, and we need to be alert to the fact that others, notably the slaves, may have interpreted their performances differently. What seems most

⁹³ Pistoi/ here, given parallel uses elsewhere in the epistle, should be taken to mean ‘believers’ not ‘faithful’ or ‘reliable’; so Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 283, citing 4.3, 10, 12; 5.16.

⁹⁴ So, e.g., Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* 328.

⁹⁵ Merz puts it concisely: ‘Der o3ti-Satz begründet das katafronei=n, nicht etwa das mh_ katafronei=n.’ A. Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* (NTOA 52; Göttingen/Fribourg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Academic Press, 2004) 252 n. 26, with arguments given there.

⁹⁶ Towner, *Goal* 178. Cf. Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 284; Merz, *Selbstausslegung* 252-53, 257-58, who suggests that the phrase a) delphi/ e0smen/ei0sin is a ‘Gegnerzitat’ (253); similarly, Towner, *Goal* 178 (‘the slaves’ own slogan’).

plausible is that, on the basis of their common identity as ἀδελφοί/, slaves were inclined to treat their masters in a way which did not ‘respect’ their superior social position, but rather reflected their standing as family equals.⁹⁷ This kind of ‘treating one’s master as an equal’ is, from the perspective of the established household order, effectively a form of insubordination and as such is firmly rejected by the author. Instead of such disrespect, slaves should serve all the more (μα=λλον δουλεue/twsan) not because masters are ἀδελφοί/ – a rather risky identification, with its possibly egalitarian implications – but because they are πιστοὶ ἁγαπῆτοι/, loved by God, and thus, by extension, worthy of love by fellow believers.

The use of the term ἀδελφοὶ here, and the context in which it is set, calls to mind Paul’s letter to Philemon, in which ἀδελφοὶ-language is also emphatically used, though in a very different way. There Paul insists that Philemon, whom he addresses as ἀδελφε/ (Phlm 7, 20), receive back his slave Onesimos οὐκ=ε/τι w(j dou=lon a)ll 0 u(pe\r dou=lon, ἀδελφο\ n ἀγαπῆτο\ n... Here the term ἀδελφοὶ is used with positive force, indicating what should become the character of the relationship between Philemon and Onesimos. That this is intended to be no merely spiritual revaluation of their relationship is stressed in the striking conclusion to the sentence: καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἐν κυρίῳ (v. 16). While it is uncertain exactly what Paul intended Philemon practically to do in this regard – is a request for manumission implied, as some have argued?⁹⁸ – the contrast with 1 Tim 6.2 is clear. As I have previously remarked: ‘The author of the Pastoral Epistles does not (and could hardly) deny the firmly established belief that fellow Christians are ἀδελφοί/. But he does warn slaves *not* to draw social consequences from this. On the contrary, he adds Christian legitimation to the notion that slaves should serve Christian owners willingly and well (οὐκ=ε/τι πιστοὶ ἐἰσιν καὶ ἁγαπῆτοι/).’⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Cf. Towner, *Goal* 41: ‘Slaves... were apparently asserting that on the basis of their equal standing in Christ as “brothers” they could ignore the social constraints of slavery’. See also Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 284; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 627-30.

⁹⁸ E.g., S.C. Winter, ‘Paul’s Letter to Philemon’, *New Testament Studies*, 33 (1987) 1-15.

⁹⁹ Horrell, ‘From *adelphoi* to *oikos theou*’, 307. Cf. p. 302 on Phlm 16.

The clear echo of Philemon, and more generally the use of the ἀδελφοῦ- language so prominent in Paul, makes this text a particularly good example of what Annette Merz calls ‘fiktive Selbstausslegung’ – and, indeed, forms one of the key examples in Merz’s book. In direct opposition to those who found in Phlm 16 (and more generally in the baptismal declarations in Gal 3.28, 1 Cor 12.13 and Col 3.11) a basis for challenging and changing the master-slave relationship in a more egalitarian direction, the author, with clear and deliberate intertextual references to Phlm 16, seeks to take away the (Pauline) basis for this interpretation. He introduces an answer to the question not directly addressed in Philemon – ‘die... Frage nach dem angemessenen Verhalten des Sklaven’: ‘Dieses wird auf eine Weise definiert (μαῦλλον δουλεύει/τῶσαν), die die Pln Aussage auf den Kopf stellt und das kritische Potenzial von Phlm 16 ein für allemal entschärft’.¹⁰⁰ To pick up the terms used by Margaret Mitchell elsewhere in this volume, where she develops Merz’s approach to the Pastorals, the author is engaged here in a form of ‘corrective exegesis’ – by which Mitchell means to communicate that the author, rather like a scribe copying a text, ‘corrects’ a textual tradition, with which he stands in continuity, both by positively reinscribing or emphasising and by altering and reshaping.¹⁰¹ In her words, one of the key aims of the author of the Pastorals is to have Paul “‘correct his own legacy against views the pseudepigraphical author deems mistaken. The author engages in *self-correction* (though he is not that self) which has in mind *correction* of others (who also make claims on that Pauline self).’ This is precisely how Merz, persuasively in my view, regards the author’s strategy in 6.1-2.

The final phrase in this section of the text, describing the masters as οἱ ἡμεῖς ἐργεσι/αἱ ἀντιλαμβάνομενοι, is again somewhat ambiguous, due to the range of possible meanings for ἀντιλαμβάνομενοι.¹⁰² Are the masters the ones who receive ἐργεσι/αἱ, or the ones who dispense it? The alternatives are somewhat finely balanced. If the phrase refers to the kindness displayed by masters towards their

¹⁰⁰ Merz, *Selbstausslegung* 245-67, quotations from 266.

¹⁰¹ Thus Merz’s approach is explicitly intended to offer a way of integrating two contrasting emphases in scholarship on the Pastorals, one of which stresses discontinuity with Paul, the other continuity (see Merz, *Selbstausslegung* 202-22).

¹⁰² On which see Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 632. For the active meaning ‘help’, see Acts 20.35.

slaves,¹⁰³ then it indicates a further reason for slaves to respect them. If, as seems perhaps more likely, it refers to the *eu) ergesi/a* rendered by the slaves, then it is striking – though not as radical as some suggest – in depicting this service as a benefit.¹⁰⁴

These instructions for slaves are reminiscent of other NT household codes (Col 3.18-4.1; Eph 5.21-6.9), though here focused entirely on the behaviour required of slaves (cf. also 1 Pet 2.18-20; Tit 2.9-10). Again Christian discourse is used to discipline role-performance – the performance of the slave’s role in their everyday relationship to their masters – and, without denying that slave and master are *a) delfoi/*, to warn against any notion that this ecclesial designation might disrupt the normal performance of their roles. Instead, *ma~llon douleue/twsan*. And, as we have seen, the author is interpreting, ‘correcting’, the Pauline tradition as he does this, in direct opposition to alternative forms of its performance. Put differently: the author seeks to proscribe, or at least firmly to constrain, a performance of the role of Christian slave informed and shaped by the notion of all believers as *a) delfoi/*; and, bringing different terms to the

¹⁰³ So, e.g., R.M. Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS, 122; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990) 140-56; Roloff, *Timotheus* 324-25; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 82; Merz, *Selbstausagebung* 253-54. Roloff concludes his discussion of 6.2a: ‘Weil der christliche Sklave einem Herrn dient, dessen ganzes Handeln auf *eu) ergesi/a* ausgerichtet ist, kann er sein *douleu/ein* bejahen, denn es ist ja Teilhabe an diesem Handeln und dient dem gleichen Ziel’ (325).

¹⁰⁴ Knight III, *Pastoral Epistles* 247, and Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles* 633, favour this reading, partly because it offers the most clear and logical construal of the thought of this whole phrase, as does Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* 284-85, who sees it as startling and subversive, since slaves are giving a benefaction to their masters, a flow from social inferior to superior. However, Seneca, *De Ben.* 3.18-21, would suggest that the point is perhaps not so radical. Seneca discusses at some length whether a slave can give a benefit (*beneficium*) to a master, and argues that he can: ‘All that he does in excess of what is prescribed as the duty of a slave, what he supplies, not from obedience to authority, but from his own desire, will be a benefit, provided that its importance, if another person were supplying it, would entitle it to that name’ (3.21.2 [LCL]). On this understanding of beneficence, the slaves 1 Timothy addresses might be being urged to go beyond the call of duty and obedience in rendering good service to their masters, an interpretation which would fit, I think, with the thrust of the author’s instruction here. Moreover, Acts 4.9, the only NT use of the word, shows that *euergesia* is not to be seen exclusively as the prerogative of the higher social classes.

fore, gives an alternative model which emphasises instead the need for full and loyal service of their masters.

Disciplining performance and 'placing' the church

Our text is thus dominated by practical instruction for various groups within the church, and I think it is helpful to conceive of the author as shaping, or disciplining the performance of these various roles, not least because this enables a comparison with opposing patterns of discipline which challenges any simple and ideologically-loaded contrast between the author being oppressive versus opponents whose approach is emancipatory, or the author using power and the opponents being egalitarian, or even between the author as orthodox, the opponents as heretical. From the angle of performance, and specifically the notion of the *disciplining* of performance, both author and opponents have conceptions as to how certain roles should be performed, either of which necessarily involves various forms of the disciplining of bodily and social practice, and in both of which – this is partly what the word ‘discipline’ is intended to convey – power is thus intrinsically bound up.¹⁰⁵ We cannot simply label one position, say, as ‘liberating’, the other as ‘oppressive’. This is not to say, of course, that such an approach removes the scope – and, in the end, the need – for theological and ethical judgments to be made about the value and the impact, then and since, of the different patterns of disciplined practice represented by the author and his opponents. But it does see both sides as engaged, at a general level, and, indeed, competitively, in the same kind of activity: shaping and disciplining the performance of roles within the church, and calling on Paul’s teaching so to do.

In terms of understanding what shapes and informs this particular pattern of the disciplining of performance, the author’s ‘placing’ the church – his construction of the church as *oikos*-type space – is significant. In short, and in contrast to the distinctions between *oikos*-space and *ekklesia*-space Paul is seen by Barton and Økland to draw in 1 Corinthians, the author constructs the church as a household, though at the same time distinguishing it from actual households. Certain roles and duties are to be performed within households, yet the church also functions as a household, not least for those

¹⁰⁵ Cf. further Valantasis, ‘Constructions of Power in Asceticism’,

widows who cannot be placed within a household of their own relatives or male spouse. Many scholars have indeed seen the household as a central concept in 1 Timothy, and in the Pastorals generally, with 1 Tim 3.15 the key ecclesiological statement describing the church as the οἰκὸς θεοῦ.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, as I have argued elsewhere, this represents something of a shift in focus from an ecclesiology dominated by the language of siblingship to one in which the household forms a structuring ideal.¹⁰⁷ Jens Herzer has recently challenged this designation of the Pastorals' ecclesiological focus, partly on the grounds that each of the Pastoral letters should be treated individually,¹⁰⁸ and partly on the grounds that this description of the church appears in 1 Timothy only once, and here 'primarily evokes the idea of the congregation as God's temple'.¹⁰⁹

There is, though, considerable evidence in the letter to support the view that the model of the household profoundly informs the author's sense of the kind of 'place' the church is and should be. The church may only once be explicitly described as the household of God, but there are a good many other indications that the author sees proper ordering of the household as an appropriate model both for 'real' households and for the church-as-household. A primary qualification for leadership in God's household is that leaders manage their own households well, with children, wives and slaves duly

¹⁰⁶ See esp. D.C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS, 71, 1983); also N. Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT 7; Regensburg: Pustet, 1969) 157 (who describes 1 Tim 3.15 as [d]ie zentrale ekklesiologische Stelle der drei Briefe'); H.-J. Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (SBS 103; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981) 66-68; Wagener, *Die Ordnung des "Haus Gottes"*, etc.

¹⁰⁷ Horrell, 'From *adelphoi* to *oikos theou*',

¹⁰⁸ A concern he shares with Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*; cf. above n. 35.

¹⁰⁹ J. Herzer, 'The "House of God," Its Social Setting, and a New Perspective on the Interpretation of the Pastoral Epistles', paper given at SBL Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, November 2005.. I am very grateful to Professor Herzer for sending me a copy of his (as yet) unpublished paper. Alternatively, focusing on the imagery of the 'pillar and bulwark' in 3.15, Karl Löning suggests: 'Die Metapher "Säule und Fundament" akzentuiert dabei den Aspekt der Stabilität. Im Hintergrund steht also nicht die Vorstellung von der Kirche als Hauswesen oder als Bau oder Tempel, vielmehr die Vorstellung von der *Wahrheit* als verlässlicher Größe' (K. Löning, "'Säule und Fundament der Wahrheit'" (1Tim 3,15). Zur Ekklesiologie der Pastoralbriefe', in R. Kampling and T. Söding (eds.), *Ekklesiologie des Neuen Testaments. FS Karl Kertelge* (Freiburg, Basel, Vien: Herder, 1996) 409-30, here 424, emphasis original).

respectful and submissive (cf. 3.4, 5, 12). In our section of the text, too, much of the author's instruction can be seen to reflect this household-shaped sense of ecclesial space. So far as widows are concerned, their first source of support is their own familial household; only those who lack this social network can be cared for in the household of the church. And the widows who are especially dangerous are those who are sufficiently itinerant to gad from house to house, spreading what the author regards as satanic teaching. What the author therefore recommends is reintegration into a household structure, fulfilling the roles of wife and mother (cf. 2.15) under the governance ($\text{proi}^{\text{5st}}\text{hmi}$) of a *paterfamilias*. In this sense, the $\text{oi}] \text{koj}$ – whether of the church or the human family – is indeed to serve as a protection against the dangers of false teaching, 'the pillar and bulwark of the truth', as 3.15 describes the $\text{oi}] \text{koj} \text{ qeou}^{\text{=}}$. Elders are, as Campbell has shown, most likely to be the senior heads of households, whose social position and management responsibilities also make them appropriate persons to undertake leadership in the church. Indeed, the focus of leadership and authority is moving away from itinerant apostles and prophets and towards the resident leaders, though the same legitimations used by Paul to justify support for the former are now drawn on in relation to the latter. Finally, slaves are to have their relationship with their masters defined not primarily by their identity as $\text{a) del} \text{foi} /$ but rather by their respective social positions, as within the $\text{oi}] \text{koj}$ structure.

All this and more shows how deeply the author's sense of ecclesial space is formed by a household ideology, and how this household model is seen as the appropriate basis for the disciplining of role-performance in the church and the world. 'Placing' the church as household shapes the instruction the author gives, and helps to explain its particular character.

References

- AASGAARD, R., 'Brothers and Sisters in the Faith: Christian Siblingship as an Ecclesiological Mirror in the First Two Centuries', in J. ÅDNA (ed.), *The Formation of the Early Church* (WUNT, 183; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 285-316

- BARTON, S.C., 'Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth', *New Testament Studies*, 32 (1986) 225-46
- BASSLER, J.M., 'The Widows' Tale: A Fresh Look at 1 Tim 5:3-16', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 103 (1984) 23-41
- BOND, H.K., 'Review of Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*', *Conversations in Religion and Theology*, 4 (2006) 17-20
- BROX, N., *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT 7; Regensburg: Pustet, 1969)
- CAMPBELL, R.A., *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994)
- CLARKE, A.D., 'Equality or Mutuality: Paul's Use of "Brother" Language', in A.D. CLARKE, et al. (eds.), *The New Testament in its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 151-64
- DAVIES, S.L., *The Revolt of the Widows: The Social World of the Apocryphal Acts* (Carbondale and Edwardsville/ London and Amsterdam: Southern Illinois University Press/ Feffer and Simons, 1980)
- DESILVA, D.A., *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2000)
- DIBELIUS, M. and CONZELMANN, H., *The Pastoral Epistles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972)
- FATUM, L., 'Christ Domesticated: The Household Theology of the Pastorals as Political Strategy', in J. ÅDNA (ed.), *The Formation of the Early Church* (WUNT, 183; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 175-207
- FIORINZA, E.S., *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1983)
- HANSON, A.T., *The Pastoral Epistles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982)
- HARVEY, A.E., "'The Workman is Worthy of His Hire": Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church', *Novum Testamentum*, 24 (1982) 209-21
- HARVEY, D., *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990)
- HAWLEY, R., 'Practicing What You Preach', in S.B. POMEROY (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* (New York, Oxford: OUP, 1999), 116-27
- HERZER, J., 'Abschied vom Konsens? Die Pseudepigraphie der Pastoralbriefe als Herausforderung an die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 129 (2004) 1267-82
- , 'The "House of God," Its Social Setting, and a New Perspective on the Interpretation of the Pastoral Epistles', paper given at SBL Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, November 2005.
- HORRELL, D.G., *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996)
- , "'The Lord commanded. But I have not used.'" Exegetical and hermeneutical reflections on 1 Cor 9.14-15', *New Testament Studies*, 43 (1997) 587-603

- , 'Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity', in D.G. HORRELL (ed.), *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 309-37
- , 'From *adelphoi* to *oikos theou*: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 120 (2001) 293-311
- , 'Pauline Churches or Early Christian Churches? Unity, Disagreement, and the Eucharist', in A. ALEXEEV, et al. (eds.), *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Ecclesiology* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming)
- JOHNSON, L.T., *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 35A; New York: Doubleday, 2001)
- KARRIS, R.J., 'The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92 (1973) 549-64
- KELLY, J.N.D., *The Pastoral Epistles: I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus* (BNTC; London: A&C Black, 1963)
- KIDD, R.M., *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS, 122; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990)
- KIM, H.B., 'The Interpretation of *malista* in 1 Timothy 5:14', *Novum Testamentum*, 46 (2004) 360-68
- KLAUCK, H.-J., *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (SBS 103; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981)
- KNIGHT, G.W. III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992)
- KÖSTENBERGER, A., SCHREINER, T., and BALDWIN, H.S. (eds.), *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1995)
- KOWALSKI, W., 'The Reward, Discipline, and Installation of Church Leaders: An Examination of 1 Timothy 5:17-22', (PhD thesis; University of Gloucestershire, 2005).
- KRAUSE, D., *1 Timothy* (Readings; London: T&T Clark International, 2004)
- KRAUSE, J.-U., *Witwen und Waisen im römischen Reich*, 4 vols. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994-1995)
- LEFEBVRE, H., *The Production of Space*, trans. D. NICHOLSON-SMITH (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991)
- LOCK, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles (I & II Timothy and Titus)* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924)
- LÖNING, K., "'Säule und Fundament der Wahrheit" (1Tim 3,15). Zur Ekklesiologie der Pastoralbriefe', in R. KAMPLING and T. SÖDING (eds.), *Ekklesiologie des Neuen Testaments. FS Karl Kertelge* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1996), 409-30
- MACDONALD, D.R., *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983)
- MAIER, H.O., 'Family Quarrels: The Politics of Discord and the Representation of Household Division in Greco-Roman Literature and the Pastoral Epistles', paper given at SBL Annual Meeting, San Antonio, November 2004.
- MALINA, B.J. and ROHRBAUGH, R.L., *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992)

- MALONEY, L.M., 'The Pastoral Epistles', in E.S. FIORENZA (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures, Volume 2: A Feminist Commentary* (New York/ London: Crossroad/ SCM, 1994), 361-80
- MARSHALL, I.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999)
- MATTHEWS, S., 'Review of Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 67 (2005) 162-63
- MCGOWAN, A.B., *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
- MCNAMARA, J.A., 'Gendering Virtue', in S.B. POMEROY (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* (New York, Oxford: OUP, 1999), 151-61
- MEIER, J.P., 'Presbyteros in the Pastoral Epistles', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 35 (1973) 323-45
- MERZ, A., *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* (NTOA 52; Göttingen/Fribourg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/Academic Press, 2004)
- MITCHELL, M.M., 'Why Family Matters for Early Christian Literature', in D.L. BALCH and C. OSIEK (eds.), *Early Christian Families in Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 345-58
- MOUNCE, W.D., *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC, 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000)
- MURPHY-O'CONNOR, J., '2 Timothy Contrasted with 1 Timothy and Titus', *Revue Biblique*, 98 (1991) 403-18
- NEYREY, J.H., 'What's Wrong With This Picture? John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space', *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 24 (1994) 77-91
- NICKLE, K., *The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy* (London: SCM, 1966)
- ØKLAND, J., *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space* (JSNTSup, 269; London: T&T Clark International, 2004)
- PADGETT, A., 'The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1-10', *Evangelical Quarterly*, 59 (1987) 39-52
- , 'Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Tim 2:8-15 in Social Context', *Interpretation*, 41 (1987) 19-31
- PAGE, S., 'Marital Expectations of Church Leaders in the Pastoral Epistles', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 50 (1993) 105-20
- PALMER, G.B. and JANKOWIAK, W.R., 'Performance and Imagination: Toward an Anthropology of the Spectacular and the Mundane', *Cultural Anthropology*, 11 (1996) 225-58
- PIETERSEN, L.K., 'Despicable Deviants: Labelling Theory and the Polemic of the Pastorals', *Sociology of Religion*, 58.4 (1997) 343-52
- , *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity* (JSNTSup, 264; London: T&T Clark International, 2004)
- POMEROY, S.B. (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography* (New York, Oxford: OUP, 1999)

- PRIOR, M., *Paul the Letter Writer and the Second Letter to Timothy* (JSNTSup, 23; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989)
- QUINN, J.D. and WACKER, W.C., *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000)
- ROLOFF, J., *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKKNT 15; Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1988)
- THURSTON, B.B., *The Widows: A Woman's Ministry in the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998)
- TOWNER, P.H., *The Goal of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles* (JSNTSup, 34; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989)
- TREBILCO, P.R., *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (WUNT, 166; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004)
- VALANTASIS, R., 'Constructions of Power in Asceticism', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 63 (1995) 775-821
- VERNER, D.C., *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS, 71, 1983)
- WAGENER, U., *Die Ordnung des "Haus Gottes". Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe* (WUNT 2, 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994)
- WILLIAMS, M.A., *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996)
- WINTER, B.W., *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (First-Century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994)
- , *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003)
- WINTER, S.C., 'Paul's Letter to Philemon', *New Testament Studies*, 33 (1987) 1-15
- YOUNG, F., *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: CUP, 1994)