THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

The Use of Ransom Language in 1 Timothy 2:1-7 and Titus 2:11-14

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the

School of Theology and Religious Studies

Of The Catholic University of America

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Peter Dunstan Brown

Washington, D. C.

2014

The Use of Ransom Language in 1 Timothy 2:1-7 and Titus 2:11-14

Peter Dunstan Brown, Ph.D.

Director: John Paul Heil, S.S.D.

Although there have been a number of studies on the theology of the Pastoral Epistles of 1 Timothy and Titus, none have looked closely at how Paul in those letters makes use of the term "ransom." This term λύτρον and its verbal cognate λυτρόω appear in several places in the New Testament but most notably in Mark 10:45—where Jesus interprets his own death in redemptive terms. This study employs audience-oriented exegesis to examine Paul's appeal to the ransom theme and its rhetorical and theological effect on the implied epistolary audiences of 1 Timothy and Titus.

Chapter One provides a brief review of the relevant literature on the Pastoral Epistles and explains my decision to follow a number of recent critical commentaries who have ascribed these letters, with some qualifications, to Paul. Chapter Two provides a thorough examination of the themes of redemption and ransom as they appear in the LXX and related literature. Chapter Three provides an audience-oriented exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:1-7 and an exploration of the ransom logion there. It argues how and why Paul bases the main theme of the passage—the potential salvation of "all human beings"—on the tradition that Jesus is "ransom." It also argues that Isaiah 43 provides the most likely background for the ransom language in 1 Timothy 2:1-7.

Chapter Four provides an audience-oriented exegesis of Titus 2:11-14 and a deeper examination of the verb "ransom" that appears in 2:14. It contends that ransom theology—despite being only mentioned explicitly once in 2:14—is nonetheless a hitherto unappreciated motif in the entire short letter. It also contends that "ransom" 1) serves to ground the moral demands Paul places on the Cretan community and 2) is also connected integrally to the grace which enables the satisfaction of those demands. Ransom, when heard in light of the LXX, also is the basis of the Cretan community's self-understanding. Chapter Five concludes the dissertation by comparing the two passages and examining their relationship to the use of ransom themes in the undisputed Pauline corpus.

The dissertation explores two important pericopes in the Pastoral Epistles from a unique angle, concluding that the ransom language sheds new light on their meaning as well as our understanding of the letters as a whole. The dissertation also fills a gap in providing a focused comparison between how Paul uses the theme of ransom in the Pastoral Epistles and how he uses it in his other letters. In both the undisputed letters and the PE, ransom and redemption for Paul are both strongly connected to themes of universal salvation and presented as a mark of Christian identity.

This dissertation by Peter D. Brown fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Biblical Studies approved by John Paul Heil, S.S.D. as Director, and by Hellen Mardaga, S.T.D., and Ian Boxall, D.Phil. as Readers.

_____

John Paul Heil, S.S.D., Director

_____

Hellen Mardaga, S.T.D., Reader

_____

Ian Boxall D.Phil., Reader

To my awesome wife Liz for her undying patience, her fervent prayers and her years of support and encouragement!

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
Bar	Baruch
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDAG	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich (3d ed.; rev. by F. W. Danker), *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the NT*
BK	*Bibel und Kirche*
Bib	*Biblica*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Monograph Series
CD	Damascus Document
COP	Colloquium Oecumenicum Paulinum
Conf.	*De confusione linguarum*
Congr.	*De congressu quarendae eruditionis gratia*
Did.	*Didache*
diss.	dissertation
DPL	Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin (eds.) *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
EDNT	H. Balz and G. Schneider (eds.) Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae Louvanienses*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie

ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	JSNT, Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
Jub.	*Jubilees*
Let. Barn.	*Letter of Barnabas*
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NA^{28}	Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28^{th} ed.
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBNT	New Clarendon Bible New Testament
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NIB	New Interpreter's Bible
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	NovT, Supplements
NTL	New Testament Library
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsche
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTT	New Testament Theology
OTL	Old Testament Library
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PNTC	Pelican New Testament Commentaries
PSB	*Princeton Seminary Bulletin*
Pss. Sol.	*Psalms of Solomon*
1QH	*Thanksgiving Hymns* from Cave 1
1QM	*War Scroll* from Cave 1
4QpPs	*Pesher on the Psalms* from Cave 4
RevistB	*Revista bíblica*
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*
SacPag	Sacra Pagina

Sacr.	*De Sacrificiis de Abelis et Caini*
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPCIC	Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus
TCGNT	B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TDOT	J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
TLNT	C. Spicq (ed.), *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*
TPINTC	Trinity Press International New Testament Commentaries
TVGMS	TVG-Monographien und Studienbucher
TZ	*Theologisch Zeitschrift*
T. Jos.	*Testament of Joseph*
T. Levi	*Testament of Levi*
T. Sim.	*Testament of Simeon*
T. Zab.	*Testament of Zebulon*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testaments
ZABR	*Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The letters of 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus are conventionally designated the Pastoral Epistles. In the Pastoral Epistles (hereafter PE), there are two appearances of ransom terminology. First Timothy 2:6 states that Jesus "gave himself as a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for all" while Titus 2:14 states that Jesus "gave himself for us, in order that he might ransom (λυτρώσηται) us from all lawlessness and cleanse for himself a special people zealous for noble deeds." In both passages ransom language is connected instrumentally to God's universal saving will and thus figures integrally in the soteriology expressed by Paul in 1 Timothy and Titus.[1] Ransom terminology (e.g., ἀντίλυτρον, ἀπολύτρωσις, λύτρωσις, λυτρόομαι, λύτρον) has received considerable scholarly attention when it occurs in the undisputed Pauline epistles (Rom 3:24; 8:23; 1 Cor 1:30).[2] Indeed a similar volume of literature has been devoted to explaining its

[1] I will discuss the issue of Pauline authorship of the PE below.

[2] E.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1989) 66-67; Harry Alan Hahne, *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19-22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006); David A. Brondos, *Paul on the Cross: Reconstructing the Apostle's Story of Redemption* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006); J. G. Gibbs, "The Cosmic Scope of Redemption according to Paul," *Bib* 56 (1975) 13-29; S. Lyonnet, "L' Emploi paulinien de *exagorazein* au sens de 'redimere'; est-il atteste dans la literature grecque?" *Bib* 42 (1961) 85-89; "Redemptio cosmica secundum Rom 8,19-23," *VD* 44 (1966) 225-42; "The Terminology of Liberation," in *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice* (AnBib 48; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970) 79-119; Kurt Kertelge, "ἀπολύτρωσις," *EDNT* 1:38-40; Douglas Campbell, *Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3:21-26* (JSNTSup 65; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 119-30; Elpidius Pax, "Der Loskauf. Zur Geschichte eines neutestamentlichen Begriffes," *Anton* 37 (1962) 239-78; Wilfrid Haubeck, *Loskauf durch Christus. Herkunft, Gestalt, und Bedeutung des paulinischen Loskaufmotivs* (TVGMS 317; Giessen: Brunnen, 1985) 164-65; Friedrich Büchsel, "λύτρον," *TDNT* 4:340-56; K. Wennemer, "*Apolytrosis* Römer 3:24-25a," *SPCIC,* 1:283-88.

several appearances in the gospel tradition (Mark 10:45 // Matt 20:28; Luke 1:68, 71; 2:38; 21:38; 24:21).[3] But Paul's appeal to the ransom tradition in the PE remains largely neglected.

Incoherence in the PE: The Old Paradigm

This neglect is partly because biblical scholarship has only recently come to the conclusion that the PE contain a coherent theology of salvation read either as a group or considered individually. Until the late twentieth century, scholarly belief in the PE's incoherence was pervasive. Prominent commentators such as Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann spoke of the "disparate nature in both form and content" of the traditional material employed in the PE, concluding that soteriological concepts are used "indiscriminately."[4] For Dibelius and Conzelmann the only unified concept of salvation "results from the constant emphasis on the meaning of salvation for the present."[5] This present salvation assumes the delay of the parousia.

---

[3] For appearances in Matthew and Mark, see Brant Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the End of the Atonement* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2005) 381-455; I. Howard Marshall, "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament," in *Jesus the Savior: Studies in New Testament Theology* (London: SPCK, 1990) 239-57; A. J. Hultgren, *Christ and His Benefits: Christology and Redemption in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); Gustav Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910); M. Wilcox, "On the Ransom Saying in Mark 10:45c, Matt 20:28c," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70.Geburtstag* (3 vols.; ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996) 3:173-86; Rikki E. Watts, "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (ed. William Bellinger Jr. and W. R. Farmer; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998) 125-51; Peter Stuhlmacher, "Vicariously Giving His Life for Many, Mark 10:45 (Matt 20:28)," in *Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 16-29; Joachim Jeremias, "Das Lösengeld für Viele (Mark 10:45)," in *Abba: Studien zur neutestamenlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966) 216-29; C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in *New Testament Essays* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959) 1-18; A. Feuillet, "Le Logion sur la rançon," *RSPT* 51 (1961) 365-402.

[4] Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles* (trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro Collins; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 9-10.

[5] Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 9.

Indeed, the presupposition is that salvation has become a reality in the epiphany of the past; salvation in the future appears to be nothing but a shadow of this past epiphany. This salvation-consciousness is the essential presupposition of the attitude toward the world expressed in the concept of "good citizenship."[6]

The judgment of the French scholar Ceslas Spicq was similar, despite his acceptance of Pauline authorship. While affirming the prominence of soteriology in the PE, he wrote:

> La nature, l'ordre et l'importance des divisions adoptées dans cette théologie des Pastorales sont en partie arbitraires puisque ces letters pratiques et circonstanciées ont été écrites sans plan systématique et n'exposent la doctrine où n'y font allusion que dans la mesure ou les exhortations concrètes le requièrent, et dans les contexts les plus divers.[7]

Concurrently in British scholarship, Burton Scott Easton was even more devastating in his assessment that the PE were, in effect, written by a confused hack:

> There is no sustained thought…The topic changes without preparation and apparently without motive. For emotional appeal the Pastor relies chiefly on citations; and these are often in glaring contrast to his own work, not only in vocabulary but in religious thought as well.[8]… We can hardly speak of the 'theology' of the Pastoral Epistles… Despite (the Pastor's) great admiration for Paul, he never really understood him.[9]

---

[6] Ibid., 10. "Good citizenship" in German is *christliche Bürgerlichheit* and is perhaps better translated as "bourgeois Christianity."

[7] Ceslas Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales* (Paris: Gabalda, 1947) 147.

[8] Burton Scott Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1947) 14.

[9] Ibid., 22. His conclusion presupposes pseudepigraphy and a second-century provenance.

A generation later the findings of Anthony Hanson were barely more favorable. Hanson's own studies concluded that the letters consisted of "a series of pedestrian remarks, varied by occasional flashes of quite different material, often introduced with no very great relevance to the topic at hand."[10] Moreover for Hanson there is "relative incoherence" in the soteriology of the PE because their author is not a theologian in his own right but is a "purveyor of other men's theology," supplying on his own only a "conventional piety" and "strong moral earnestness."[11] In Hanson's view the PE appropriate traditional designations of "savior" and related terms such as "ransom" rather haphazardly and without any overarching theological strategy.

One finds support for this view even in recent literature. For instance, James D. Miller has claimed in a lengthy monograph that the PE as a whole represented "composite documents" that are better understood as anthologies of traditional elements than as systematically ordered compositions.[12] Miller does not argue, however, as Hanson does, that the letters are the somewhat incoherent product of a single confused author. Rather they are literary patchwork quilts assembled in various stages by different redactional hands, after the manner of other biblical literature such as the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and extracanonical literature such as 1 Enoch.[13] Miller's thesis is provocative, though he remains something of an outlier in

---

[10] Anthony Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1966) 110.

[11] Hanson, *Studies,* 110-11.

[12] James D. Miller, *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents* (SNTSMS 93; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

[13] Ibid., 49-56.

scholarship on the PE. Most commentators have succeeded in reading the PE as the product of a single author—be it a pseudepigrapher or Paul himself.

The Question of Authorship of the PE Revisited

Naturally, how one construes the coherence of the PE depends in part on whether the letters are judged to have been actually written by Paul or not. The question of authorship is more acutely felt since the work of the German exegete Friedrich Schleiermacher who declared 1 Timothy pseudepigraphal.[14] After Schleiermacher's 1807 work, a steady stream of critics followed suit, holding one, two, or all three of the Pastorals to be pseudonymous.

The basic arguments for pseudepigraphy are fairly familiar and need not be rehearsed here.[15] Its proponents have posited two main alternatives to the traditional view of Paul's authorship. Some hold to a full-blown theory of pseudepigraphy, considering the PE to be a mid second-century polemic against Marcion and other opponents of orthodox Christianity, written in the guise of a letter by Paul. This view had its heyday in the height of the influence of the Tübingen School.[16] More common today is the critically sympathetic position that holds the PE to be actual letters dated toward the end of the first century by an author or authors writing in Paul's name, as members of a posthumous Pauline school. In the latter opinion, the PE are

---

[14] Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über den sogennanten Ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus: Ein kritisches Sensschreiben an J. C. Gass* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1807).

[15] For an excellent summary of the case against Pauline authorship see Raymond F. Collins, *Letters That Paul Did Not Write: The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Pseudepigrapha* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988) 88-131.

[16] See, for instance, F. C. Baur, *Die sogennanten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht* (Stuttgart: Catta'sche, 1835).

deemed "Deutero-Pauline," occupying a sort of middle ground between "fraudulent" and fully "Pauline." One need not posit conscious deception in letter writing in the Deutero-Pauline view; one only need adopt a looser construal of the notion of "authorship."[17]

But in whatever form it takes, the paradigm of pseudepigraphy is well established and not only in commentaries. In critical histories of early Christianity, introductions to the NT, and studies on the life and theology of Paul, the pseudonymous status of the PE is generally assumed, rather than demonstrated. This is odd, however, since Luke Timothy Johnson, who investigated the matter at great depth in his 2001 Anchor Bible commentary on 1 and 2 Timothy, managed to unearth dozens of critical commentaries and special studies since the late nineteenth-century that were written from the perspective of Pauline authorship. Opinion—even in the critical age—has never been nearly as unanimous as the dominance of the pseudipigraphy paradigm would suggest.[18]

Johnson went on to challenge the consensus in several provocative ways which I summarize here:[19]

(1) The methodology used to establish the pseudepigraphy of the PE could be used to establish the pseudipigraphy of all the letters attributed to Paul, were it to be applied systematically. Yet

---

[17] This common view is developed into a lengthy proposal by I. Howard Marshall who coins the term "allonymity" or "allepigraphy" to designate his theory of authorship. See *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999) 57-92, esp. 79.

[18] Luke Timothy Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AB 35A; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 48-49.

[19] Ibid., 42-99.

since the days of Bruno Bauer, who challenged the legitimacy of the entire Pauline corpus, critical scholarship has mostly shrunk from this task, preferring to construe the Paul of Romans and Galatians as normative, and to construct the "authentic" Paul upon the one found in those letters.[20]

(2) The scholarly habit of separating 1, 2 Timothy and Titus into a package called the "Pastoral Epistles" tends to predetermine the conclusion that these letters are of a provenance different from the rest of the letters written under the name of Paul. Moreover, treating the "Pastoral Epistles" as a distinct unit tends to obscure both differences between the Pastorals themselves as well as similarities that, say, 1 Timothy has to 1 Corinthians and Titus has to Galatians.

(3) Too little is known about the actual career of Paul to rule out the possibility that he could have both founded a church in Crete (as presupposed in Titus) and could also have written letters to Timothy both from prison and on the way to Macedonia. Thus, the *argumentum ab silencio* from the narrative of Acts and the data of the uncontested Paulines is inconclusive.

(4) There is enough variation in the style and vocabulary of the uncontested Paulines to throw significant doubt on the value of conclusions of pseudonymity based on comparisons with these letters.

---

[20] See Bruno Bauer, *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe* (1850 repr.; Aalen: Scientia, 1972). Harold Hoehner has helpfully reminded us of Bauer's original argument and the highly selective manner in which scholarship has since applied the criteria used to declare the disputed Pauline letters pseudonymous in "Did Paul Write Galatians?" in *History and Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Dr. E. Earl Ellis on his Eightieth Birthday* (ed. Sang-Won Son; London: T & T Clark, 2006) 150-69. Terry Wilder has argued that the letter to the Philippians would be similarly disqualified from full membership in the Pauline corpus were it subjected to the same standards of authenticity as have been rigorously applied to the PE. See Terry L. Wilder, "Pseudonymity, the New Testament and the Pastoral Epistles," in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles* (ed. Andreas Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder; Nashville: B & H Publishing Group, 2010) 28-51.

(5) The appearance of early offices within the church as depicted in the PE is unconvincing as a basis for pseudepigraphy. The same offices appear in Phil 1:1 in a letter generally considered to have been written by Paul. Besides, the offices are absent from 2 Timothy entirely and only appear in passing in Titus. A detailed theological justification for the creation of new offices might suggest a later provenance beyond the life and career of Paul. But the offices that appear in 1 Timothy are not connected to any cultic function nor are they legitimated by reference to cultic offices of Judaism, early Christianity or of Christian apostles. Their existence is purely functional and the necessary qualifications are attitudinal and moral. The leadership offices in 1 Timothy and Titus are *presupposed* rather than prescribed. Nothing supports the older critical view that the offices were being created as a response to crisis. Therefore, there is no good reason to suppose that these offices must be of a post-Pauline origin. Finally, it is historically and sociologically counterintuitive to suppose that Paul's churches, even while their founder was alive, could have continued for long without *any* structure or formal leadership in the apostle's absence.

(6) The original proponents of the pseudepigraphy hypothesis such as F. C. Baur rightly felt the burden to provide an alternative historical setting to account for the existence of the PE and their acceptance into the canon. But the solution of Baur—that the letters were of a late second-century anti-Marcion provenance—has proved utterly unworkable.[21] Yet no advocate of pseudepigraphy since has produced an alternative historical reconstruction which explains when and why a pseudepigrapher would have penned letters in the name of Paul and how he would

[21] Baur dated the PE to around 150 in *Die sogennanten Pastoralbrief*, 8-39.

have passed them off as Pauline to the early church. The hypothesis of Jerome Quinn in which Luke wrote the PE in composing a third volume of Luke-Acts causes more problems than it solves.[22]

(7) No one has produced evidence for the existence of a Pauline school that arose after the apostle's death, much less why such a school would have produced letters to delegates which were without precedent in the undisputed Pauline corpus. On the other hand, data from the uncontested Pauline letters as well as from Acts indicate that Paul had a ministry team that accompanied him to various locales. Some of these associates even appear as co-authors with Paul in the uncontested corpus. In addition, all acknowledge that Paul used diatribe and midrash in his letters, techniques which presuppose a social setting of a teacher with students. Is it not better then to posit the existence of a Pauline school during the life of the apostle—a school that was authorized to compose letters in the apostle's name? Could not the existence of this school at least partly account for the differences between the PE and the uncontested Paulines? Could Paul be said to have authored the letters in the sense that he *authorized* their production? If so, the recourse to pseudepigraphy is unnecessary.

None of these considerations either individually or taken *in toto* amounts to proof that Paul really did write the PE. But Johnson has, in my judgment, made the case for a fresh appraisal of the question.[23]

---

[22] Jerome Quinn, "The Last Volume of Luke: The Relation of Luke-Acts to the Pastoral Epistles," in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. C. H. Talbert; Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978) 62-75.

[23] Years ago Bruce Metzger also pointed out that statistical studies that purport to assess the breadth of Paul's literary capability are less sophisticated than they appear, since they are generally based on such a small

Moreover the issue of authorship does relate indirectly to the PE's use of ransom language because, until fairly recently, both the assumptions of pseudonymity of the PE and their theological incoherence often went hand in hand as mutually reinforcing premises. Indeed the dominance of the pseudepigrahy paradigm has tended to dampen critical interest in the theology of the PE, *even among interpreters who considered them genuine*. How does one justify, after all, the exertion of scholarly energy upon letters that most respectable opinion considers "Deutero-Pauline"? As Albert Schweitzer observed about Pauline scholars and the PE, "Anyone who was not converted to the rejection of the Pastorals at all events took the precaution to give a separate chapter to these writings…These epistles were as completely excluded from the presentation of the Pauline system as if they had been pronounced wholly spurious."[24] The designation "Deutero-Pauline" has meant in practice a consignment to second-class status both within the Pauline corpus and the NT canon more generally.

But commentaries defending Pauline authorship of the PE are still appearing.[25] And scholars who uphold the banner of Pauline authorship also have tended to reject the idea that the

---

sample of only the seven letters deemed actually written by Paul. See Bruce L. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," *ExpTim* 70 (1958-59) 91-94.

[24] Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History* (trans. W. Montgomery 1912; repr.; New York: Schocken Books, 1964) 27.

[25] Indeed, the three most recent critical commentaries have embraced Pauline authorship. In addition to Luke Timothy Johnson's commentary in the Anchor series there is also Ben Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2 Timothy, and 1-3 John* (2 vols.; Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic Press, 2006); Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (NICTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006). Older works embracing Pauline authorship are more numerous than is usually admitted. See, for instance, Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales;* Joachim Jeremias, *Die Pastoralbreife* (NTD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht*,* 1975)*;* George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), to name only a few better known ones.

PE suffer from incoherence.

Yet in one important respect, however, a shift has taken place. There are several important, recent works that reject Pauline authorship but still find the PE to be works of great rhetorical sophistication. First, there was the work of Benjamin Fiore that focused on the strategic use of autobiography in the PE, which was a familiar hortatory technique in Greco-Roman letters written at or around the time of 1, 2 Timothy and Titus.[26] Second, there was the study by David Verner of the use of Greco-Roman household norms and imagery in PE's hortatory strategy.[27] Third, there was the monograph of Lewis Donelson that studied the author's tendency to employ christology and soteriology for the purpose of enjoining moral and ethical commands upon his audience.[28]

This study by Donelson drew on a series of German commentaries and articles which, despite their concessions to the earlier view of the alleged incoherence of the PE, were able to find in the Pastorals a recognizable "epiphany Christology."[29] These works in turn provided the

---

[26] Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (AnBib 105; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986).

[27] David C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS 71; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

[28] Lewis Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (HUT 22; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986).

[29] See, for instance, Norbert Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT 7; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969) 51, 71-72; Victor Hasler, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (Pastoralbriefe*) (ZBNT 12; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1978); "Epiphanie und Christologie in den Pastoralbriefen," *TZ* 33 (1977) 193-209; Lorenz Oberlinner, "Die 'Epiphaneia' des Heilswillens Gottes in Christus Jesus: Zur Grundstruktur der Christologie der Pastoralbriefe," *ZNW* 71 (1980) 192-213.

foundation for a well-received monograph on the subject by Andrew Lau.[30] It is safe to say that the old paradigm of the "incoherent" PE has been replaced by one that holds the PE as both rhetorically sophisticated and theologically consistent, even if not written by Paul himself.

Recent Interest in the Soteriology of the PE

More relevant for this study is the renewed interest in the soteriology of the PE. Jerome Quinn appended an excursus to his Anchor Bible commentary on Titus entitled "The PE on Salvation."[31] Quinn noted the prominence of cognates involving the root σωζ/σωτ in the PE: they are frequent both in absolute terms and in relation to rate of occurrence found both in the other Pauline letters and in other NT works. I. Howard Marshall soon after published an article asking whether the theology of the PE had been neglected.[32] He then proceeded to answer his own question with another article devoted to the PE's treatment of soteriology, the first scholarly work of its kind in nearly a century.[33] This paved the way for a recently published monograph dealing with the soteriology of the PE by George Wieland.[34]

---

[30]Andrew Lau, *Manifest in Flesh: The Epiphany Christology of the Pastoral Epistles* (WUNT 2/86; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996).

[31] Jerome Quinn, *The Letter to Titus* (AB 35; New York: Doubleday, 1990) 304-15.

[32] I. Howard Marshall, "'Sometimes Only Orthodox'—Is There More to the Pastoral Epistles?" *Epworth Review* 20.3 (1993) 12-24.

[33] I. Howard Marshall, "Salvation in the Pastoral Epistles." in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (3 vols.; ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996) 3:449-69. His work was the first of its kind since that of A. Klöpper, "Zur Soteriologie der Pastoralbriefe (Tit 3:4-7; 2 Tim 1:9-11; Tit 2:11-14)," *ZWT* 47 (1904) 57-88.

[34] George M. Wieland, *The Significance of Salvation: A Study of Salvation Language in the Pastoral Epistles* (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006).

Ransom Logia in the PE: The State of the Question

Only the work by Wieland even touched on Paul's appeal to the ransom tradition in the PE.[35] Thus it remains the case today that the scholarly treatment of the issue of ransom in the PE is largely confined to the standard commentary exegesis of 1 Tim 2:1-7 and Titus 2:11-14 as well as the more general works on the NT theme of "redemption" mentioned above.[36] With regard to 1 Tim 2:6 and the appearance of ἀντίλυτρον, Dibelius and Conzelmann see it as a "Hellenistically colored variant" of the word in Mark 10:45. Indeed, since these authors considered that it was a confessional formula adopted from tradition at the disposal of the author, it hardly merited further investigation.[37] This was similar to the judgments of Roloff and Oberlinner who (following Kertelge) saw in the ἀντί-prefix a heightened notion of substitutionary atonement that ought not to be pressed for further clarification.[38]

The understanding of "ransom" based more on the notion of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus and less upon the economic emancipation of captives is not confined to German scholarship. Raymond Collins also finds the idea of a person dying as a substitute for others to be at work in this passage. This is akin to the self- sacrificial notions reflected in other texts such as 2 Macc 7:37-38 and 4 Macc 6:27-29, 17:21-22. Collins also notes what he considers to be a

---

[35] Ibid., 63-64, 208-12.

[36] See notes 2 and 3.

[37] Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 43.

[38] Jürgen Roloff, *Der Erste Briefe an Timotheus* (EKKNT 15; Zürich: Benzinger, 1988) 122-23; Lorenz Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (HTKNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1994) 75; Kurt Kertelge, "λύτρον," *EDNT* 2:366. I will have to defer till later the degree to which "substitution" (*Stellvertretung*) is to be understood in an inclusive representative sense or an exclusive replacement sense.

universalizing tendency as well: whereas Mark 10:45 has Jesus becoming a ransom "for many," 1 Tim 2:6 understands Jesus as a ransom "for all."[39]

Other authors adhere to a notion of paying the price in a way that is both economic *and* substitutionary. Thus George Knight writes, "ἀντίλυτρον represents a price paid to free captives and thus means 'ransom' or more appropriately 'substitute ransom' as Leon Morris renders it, noting the emphasis on the thought of substitution in the preposition."[40] Similarly Philip Towner states, "Paul replaces Mark's λύτρον with the rare compound ἀντίλυτρον. This shift may intensify the sense of substitution (already present in Mark 10:45), or render the idea into more suitable Greek; but it expresses the same sense of ransom payment that secures the release (of someone or something)."[41] Likewise William Mounce is convinced that "at minimum there is here an idea of substitution."[42]

But how does the concept of "substitution" fit with the concept of "ransom"? Benjamin Fiore attempts to draw out the Hebrew concepts that lie behind "ransom" to define the concept more precisely. He avoids the term "substitution" entirely when he writes:

> The three Hebrew words behind the Greek *antilytron* ("ransom") suggest vicarious payment for the life of another in covering a fault or debt (*koper* in

---

[39] Raymond F. Collins, *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002) 61.

[40] Knight, *Pastoral Epistles,*121-22.

[41]Towner*, Timothy and Titus*, 183-84. See also Gordon D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (NIBC 13; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988) 66. Both Towner and Fee refer to the work of Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (London: Tyndale, 1957) 48.

[42]William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: T. Nelson, 2000) 90.

> Hebrew). *Melkita* on Exodus 21:30 (93a) explains that the price of payment is the value of the guilty party if he were to be sold as a slave. The redemption is by the nearest relative, which came to mean God as "redeemer" (*goʾel*) of Israel, God's people; but the redemption can be accomplished by a nonfamily member (*podeh*) who makes payment. The payment is not inanimate, but rather life for life. While Hebrew thought first applied the idea of redemption to the release of a nation in bondage (Exod 6:6 and Isaiah 40–55), it came to be connected with sin as the life of faith became individualized (Ps 129:8; 144:10). This grew to include redemption from death and from the powers of the underworld (Ps 48:15; Job 19:25). There can be no self-redemption here; only God can redeem in the face of death.[43]

Thus for Fiore, "ransom" in 1 Tim 2:6 is to be understood as "an offering of life for life, by one like and kin to the captives."[44]

Other leading commentators on 1 Timothy prefer to think of ἀντίλυτρον in both economic and sacrificial terms. Thus Ben Witherington writes, "It means either 'ransom' and therefore a payment of some sort, or 'redemption' and thus some sort of deliverance from bondage. It should be noted however, that we do have hints of substitutionary atonement. Christ gave himself on behalf of all. The prefix 'anti' here probably suggests replacement."[45] Similarly J. L. Houldren states, "The basic idea is freeing slaves but the concept of a purificatory sacrifice is close at hand. The crucial episode of the Exodus from Egypt, when, after smearing of the doors with the blood of Passover lambs, the Israelites were freed from bondage, probably lies in the background."[46]

---

[43]Benjamin Fiore, *The Pastoral Epistles* (SacPag 12; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007) 61.

[44] Ibid., 61.

[45] Witherington, *Letters and Homilies,* 1:216.

[46] J. L. Houldren, *The Pastoral Epistles* (TPINTC; London: SCM, 1976) 68.

Houldren is one of a number of scholars who have held that OT allusions lie in the background to "ransom." But most seem to believe that ransom terminology in 1 Timothy is only loosely allusive to a variety of OT concepts. Only a few have suggested any specific Septuagintal texts that may lie in the background. Joachim Jeremias and I. Howard Marshall both see a reference to the Suffering Servant passage—specifically Isa 53:10-12—mostly because both authors also see Mark 10:45 in this light.[47] Most recently, J. Christopher Edwards published a brief "note" on the ransom logia in the PE, suggesting that Paul's use of "ransom" had the same Isaianic background as the Epistle of Barnabas. Edwards limited his treatment to two passages in Isaiah— 42:6-7 and 49:6-8.[48]

Similar interpretive issues present themselves concerning "ransom" as it occurs in Titus 2:14. But few interpreters operate within the template of "substitutionary atonement" here.[49] Both the verbal form λυτρώσηται in the middle voice as well as the context in the passage tend to militate against any understanding other than "set free through the payment of a price." Indeed an OT provenance for this passage is generally acknowledged. Commentators, however, are divided concerning which OT passages are being alluded to. The disagreement is understandable since the verb λυτρόομαι/λυτρόω appears nearly a hundred times in the LXX. Philip Towner and Raymond Collins both suggest more remote references to the deliverance of

---

[47] Jeremias, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 20; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 431.

[48] J. Christopher Edwards, "Reading the Ransom Logion in 1 Tim 2:6 and Titus 2:14 with Isaiah 42:6-7 and 49:6-8," *Bib* 90 (2009) 264-66.

[49] One curious exception is Hanna Stettler in *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe* (WUNT 2/105; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1998) 259. Towner also mentions the concept but mainly in reference to Jesus "giving himself." See Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 760.

Israel from Egypt (Exod 6:6; Deut 7:6-8; 9:26; 13:5; 15:15; 24:18; 2 Sam 7:23).[50] Towner (along with Gordon Fee) also notes the similarity of Titus 2:14 to Ps 129:8.[51] George Knight also discerns an allusion to the same psalm and to the Pentateuchal texts dealing with Israel's emancipation from Egypt.[52]

A few scholars detect an echo of Deutero-Isaiah with its emphasis on God's promise of "redemption," specifically Isa 44:22-24, which relates "redemption" to removal of sin.[53] Andrew Lau sees the whole unit Titus 2:11-14 as a trope on 2 Sam 7:3.[54]

The Focus of this Study

There remain many unanswered questions concerning the meaning and OT background of "ransom" as it appears in the PE. By contrast, a considerable body of scholarship has been devoted to understanding the ransom tradition as it appears in Mark 10:45 and Matt 20:28. W. D. Davies and Dale Allison commenting on the latter verse write:

> As it stands in Matthew, 20:28 (= Mark 10:45) states that Jesus was—note the one time aorist—an atonement offering, a substitution, a ransom for sins. But almost every question we ask remains unanswered. What is the condition of the 'many'? Why do they need to be ransomed? To whom is the ransom paid? To God,to the devil, or to no one at all? Is forgiveness of sins effected now or at the last

---

[50] Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 760-61; Collins, *1 & 2 Timothy & Titus*, 354.

[51] Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 197.

[52] Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 327-28.

[53] Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 284; Quinn, *Titus,* 258-61; Wieland, *Salvation*, 209-10.

[54] Lau, *Manifest in Flesh,* 150-54.

> judgment or both? How is it appropriated? We have in the gospel only an unexplained affirmation.[55]

Yet these questions have seldom even been asked of the appearance of ἀντίλυτρον in 1Tim 2:6 much less answered–a fact which is surprising given what everyone acknowledges are the profound similarities–or even literary interdependence–between that verse and Mark 10:45.

In the case of 1 Tim 2:6, one would like to know the identity of the "all" who are said to be the object of ransom. What is the condition from which they need to be "ransomed" and what is the relationship between the "all" and those who are instructed to pray for "all people" in 1 Tim 2:1? How did the "many" to be ransomed in Mark 10:45 become the "all" in 1 Tim 2:6? Is this simply a Hellenistic adaptation of an earlier theme or is something more at work in the development of Pauline soteriology? Or is there no real development at all but just a variation in terminology that one finds in the uncontested Pauline letters?[56] And what is the best interpretation of "ransom"? Is it best understood as "substitutionary atoning sacrifice" or is the economic conceptual framework more satisfactory? Or should we opt for some combination of the two? Or are there other paradigms for understanding "ransom" that might shed new light on its usage here? For instance, Rikki Watts has suggested understanding "ransom" in Mark 10:45 within the parameters of first-century Jewish eschatology.[57] Specifically God's repeated promises given in Deutero-Isaiah to "ransom" Israel from exile are one way of expressing Jewish

---

[55] W. D. Davies and Dale Allison, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996) 3:100.

[56] So Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 123.

[57] Rikki Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 2/88; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997) 125-51.

hope for restoration—what Watts and many others call the "New Exodus." Could such a paradigm shed new light on 1 Tim 2:1-7 also, even though no interpreter (to my knowledge) has yet considered it?

Along these lines, I would similarly ask whether ἀντίλυτρον in 1 Tim 2:6 can be read in light of the underlying OT narrative. A few scholars have attempted to read Mark 10:45 in this vein with great profit.[58] Yet this has scarcely even been attempted with 1 Tim 2:1-7.

In Titus 2:11-14–the other ransom passage in the PE— the OT background is more obvious and yet as we have seen, there is considerable disagreement about what that background is. Especially when one looks at other parts of the pericope, it is evidently replete with what Richard Hays terms "intertextual echoes."[59] But of the scholars who are able to "hear" certain echoes, none has attempted to derive much exegetical insight from them. They are noted as a point of interest and little else. They invite further exploration.

For instance, in Titus 2:14 we are told that Jesus "gave himself up that he might ransom us from all lawlessness." We are given more specificity here than in 1 Tim 2:6. The ransom seems to be a *fait accompli*. And the object of the ransom is "us" and it is "from all lawlessness." But are there ways in which Paul expects his hearers to understand this in light of their assumed knowledge of the OT? Are there "New Exodus" resonances here as well?

---

[58] E.g., Jeremias, "Das Lösengeld für Viele (Mark 10:45)," 216-29; Stuhlmacher, "Vicariously Giving His Life for Many, Mark 10:45 (Matt 20:28)," 16-29; Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation and the End of the Exile*, 381-455.

[59] Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989) esp. 1-33.

It is not that critical scholarship has pursued these questions already and concluded them to be a blind alley. It is rather that scholarship has only recently come to the realization that the PE do contain a coherent theology and an intelligible soteriology worth investigating. For mostly this reason the above lines of inquiry have not been pursued. I, therefore, will attempt to fill this lacuna, providing a thorough investigation of the use of ransom terminology in the PE, with the goal of learning how this language informs the author's rhetorical strategy in 1 Timothy and Titus. I will attempt to answer the questions posed above as well as to pursue new lines of inquiry as noted above. This, in turn, will contribute to our understanding of Pauline soteriology as it is expressed in those letters.

Methodological Considerations

The methodology of this study will employ the tools of audience-oriented criticism.[60] By "audience" I do not mean a hypothesized reconstruction of the actual historical audiences but rather idealized audiences implied by the texts themselves. This is to say, the implied audiences (1) acknowledge the authority of the epistolary author; (2) know the things that the author assumes they know either from Paul's own kerygmatic preaching or from the text of the OT;[61]

[60] A fuller explanation of "audience-oriented" criticism can be found in Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables* (CBQMS 30; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998) 1-22. Though he does not employ the term "audience-oriented" to describe his study of Paul's rhetorical strategy in Galatians, the "text-centered approach" of D. Francois Tolmie bears a strong resemblance to my own methodology. See *Persuading the Galatians: A Text-Centered Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter* (WUNT 2/190; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005) esp. 1-24. Tolmie's approach is unique in that it is not based on applying to the letter a specific rhetorical model (either ancient or modern) but rather seeks to explain Paul's rhetoric using the letter itself as a starting point.

[61] I do not assume knowledge on the part of the ideal audience of the text of Paul's other letters. However, the exact content of Paul's preaching cannot be known but only imperfectly reconstructed from the extant letters. The methodology I will employ for reconstructing Paul's preaching is that when one can identify (1) the high frequency of a word, phrase, theme or theological motif (2) consistency of usage of the above across several letters

(3) are capable both of remembering all that has been said previously in the letter and also of following its thought progression; and (4) respond to the admonitions, exhortations, and arguments in precisely the way Paul intends.

Yet at this point a qualification must be made as to the identity of the epistolary audience, even when that audience is considered ideally. The PE are unique among the Pauline corpus in that the letters are not addressed directly to whole communities. Neither can they be classified merely as personal appeals to individuals as in the case of the letter to Philemon. Their addressees rather are *individual delegates in charge of whole communities*—Timothy in the community in Ephesus and Titus in the church of Crete. The question then arises as to whether the ideal audiences ought to be reckoned as Timothy and Titus personally and not the churches for which they were responsible. Of the scholars who have entertained this particular question, Ben Witherington and Luke Johnson have convincingly argued that 1 Timothy and Titus both fall under the Greco-Roman epistolary genre *mandata principiis* or "commandments of a ruler." As Witherington explains, "Titus and 1 Timothy are in important ways like administrative letters from important officials who were in charge of administering certain domains (e.g., like a letter from the emperor to the proconsul of a Roman province, or the letter of a proconsul to one of the client kings in the region.)"[62]

---

(3) the unexplained introduction of topics wherein Paul seems to assume foreknowledge on the part of his audience, we have a stronger case for assuming such material is part of Paul's standard repertoire. The case is of course cumulative rather than dispositive.

[62] Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 1:92.

Johnson, for his part, expounds the *mandata principiis* genre further in light of examples drawn from contemporary Greco-Roman papyri: "Although addressed to an individual, the delegate in question, the letters had at least a quasi-public character, for the *entolai* were to be heard by others as well as by the delegate. In some instances, such mandates were accompanied by instructions and exhortations to the delegate having to do less with specific actions and more with general behavior."[63]

Johnson goes on to construct the social setting typical for the reception and hearing of *mandata principiis*:

> A delegate carrying such a letter from his superior and having read it aloud in the assembly of the city in which he was commissioned—even for such a short period as envisaged by 1 Timothy—would accomplish two things. First, the provisions of the community would be perceived as the will of the superior and not the whim of the delegate. As a result, the instructions would be legitimated. Second, those parts of the letter exhorting the delegate to good behavior provided the community with a norm by which to measure the delegate's behavior as the leader's representative. The populace would therefore have a basis for appeal to the leader if the delegate fell significantly below the standards established by the letter.[64]

Johnson and Witherington both make a strong case that 1 Timothy and Titus were always intended for public consumption. This finding is incidentally bolstered by the conclusions of both 1 Timothy and Titus in which the author-sender signs off with the phrase "grace be with you" (ὑμῶν, 1 Tim 6:21) and "grace be with all of you" (ὑμῶν, Titus 3:15). The use of the plural

---

[63] Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy,* 140.

[64] Ibid., 141.

pronouns is difficult to explain on the view that the letter was meant only for private reading.[65] The implied audience of each letter, therefore, is not limited to the stated addressees Timothy and Titus. The implied audience must include the early Christian communities they led.

As for the method itself, audience-oriented criticism studies how the implied audience is meant to respond to Paul's rhetorical strategy as it progresses throughout the letter. The method has a historical dimension in that it takes into account the cultural and historical context of the implied audience as well as its assumed knowledge of the Pauline kerygma and the OT background of the preaching of Paul. This study agrees with and seeks to build upon and refine the work of those scholars who find in 1 Timothy and Titus both a coherent soteriology as well as a deliberate rhetorical strategy. This study also agrees with and seeks to build upon the qualified embrace of Pauline authorship seen in recent work done on the PE.

The study will proceed as follows. In Chapter Two there will be a detailed background study of the term "ransom" in both its nominal and verbal forms, both in secular usage at the time of the letters as well as its use in the Greek OT. In Chapters Three and Four respectively, there will be an audience-oriented exegesis of the two relevant passages. For each passage a consideration of textual criticism will establish the Greek text from which a fresh translation will be made into idiomatic English. The exegesis will demonstrate ways in which Paul's use of ransom language sheds light on the implied audience's understanding both of his call to pray for all people and all rulers in 1 Tim 2:1-7 and his call for the implied audience to be a people

[65] One late manuscript reads the second person singular pronoun for the final line of Titus while Codex Bezae is alone among early witnesses to the second person singular reading for the sign-off in 1 Timothy. For both verses Metzger classifies the plural reading as "certain." See *TCGNT*, 577, 586.

zealous for noble works in Titus 2:11-14. Chapter Five will conclude the study with a summary of how its findings add to our understanding of 1 Timothy and Titus as a whole, especially with regard to the question of soteriology in the PE more generally.

CHAPTER TWO

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to study the cognates of λύτρον and λυτρόω as they appear both in profane Greek literature of the biblical period and in the Bible itself. I will review and build upon the significant amount of linguistic analysis already done on these terms, but my main focus will be to trace their development as well as the theological concepts that accompany them in the biblical usage. In addition, I will attempt to apply much greater emphasis to the LXX's use of these cognates and its implications for NT theology with the goal of complementing existing scholarship which has traditionally focused much more on redemption as it is treated in the Hebrew Bible. My working assumption is that Paul's OT was in Greek and thus a thorough account of his biblical theology of redemption must begin there.

Λύτρον/λυτρόω Cognates in Profane Literature

The English term "ransom" appears in the LXX in words containing the root λυτ. These in turn are etymologically related to the far larger λύω family of words which have the connotation of "loosing," "releasing," or "freeing from captivity."[66] In Greek literature in the centuries BCE, the λυτ cognates are not particularly controversial in meaning, invariably denoting payment of a price to free someone from captivity or servitude or "release on receipt of ransom."[67]

This broad meaning is amply attested in sources assembled by the authors of older

[66] Kurt Kertelge,."ἀπολύτρωσις," *EDNT* 1:138-40.

[67] LSJ, "λύτρον," 1067.

philological works, most notably Deissmann.[68] A man "ransoms" a captive by paying money (or having the money paid by someone else). Since the word λύτρον denotes money, it often appears in the plural λύτρα as it does in Herodotus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and the Oxyrhynchus papyri.[69] According to Deissmann, "when anybody heard the Greek word λύτρον, 'ransom,' it was natural to think of purchase-money for manumitting slaves."[70]

Frequently the context concerned sacral manumissions. In this situation there was a fictive "purchase" of a slave by some deity, wherein the slave himself paid the funds from his own savings for his own release in a ceremony administered by a local shrine. The slave then became property of the god with a record etched in stone. The related terms λύτρωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις—quite rare in Koine Greek—generally occur in the context of these manumissions along with the related term ἀπελευθέρωσις.[71] Based on the Cos inscription, the "freedom" occuring after the "ransom" is duly recorded by cultic officials.[72] The much rarer cognate ἀπολυτρόω which Liddell and Scott define as "to release by ransom" is attested nowhere in the Bible but only in five scattered references in profane literature.[73]

---

[68] Deissmann, *Light,* 325-35.

[69] Deissmann (ibid., 332) mentions three such papyri from Oxyrhynchus Papyri numbers 48, 49, and 722. In Plato a typical use of the word occurs in *Laws* 11, 919a: "As enemies taken captive and subjected, he liberated them by the most extraordinary, unjust and vile ransoms [λύτρα]."

[70] Ibid., 331-32.

[71] In Plutarch (*Arat.* 11) it appears in the sense of "redemption of captives," as cited by T. K. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1903) 11.

[72] Deissmann, *Light*, 331 n. 4.

[73] The other occurrences are in Plato, *Laws* 919a; Menander, Μισούμεναι, 21; Polybius, *Fragments*, 2.6.6; and Demosthenes, *Epistles.* 159.15.

As for the verb λυτρόω, Morris judges that the sense is either to "release on the receipt of ransom" or in the middle voice to "secure release through the payment of ransom."[74] Morris is dependent upon the examples proffered by Moulton and Milligan such as these:[75]

> Nephoris released [ἐλύτρωσεν] the things that were seized for the royal official when he received half what our household had in common.

The more common sense of "redeeming something pledged through the payment of money" is the meaning here: "Of which you will give [δώσεις] to Serapion my friend 100 drachmas when you redeem [λυτρώσασα] my clothes."[76]

One might expect a slight semantic difference between λύτρον and ἀπολύτρωσις. Words with a -τρον ending often carry the sense of a practical tool used instrumentally to accomplish some task, while –ωσις words are more abstract and conceptual.[77] Thus λύτρον would mean the money or price paid to effect the ransom while ἀπολύτρωσις would denote the "ransoming" or "redemption" considered more abstractly.[78] Nevertheless, the notion of a specific price is often close at hand when ἀπολύτρωσις is used as well and so this nuance is difficult to discern in practice. Morris is correct to conclude that the extrabiblical semantics of the entire λύτρον word group are settled and that "it is only in biblical Greek that there is any question of another

---

[74] Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, 24.

[75] Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 4:383.

[76] Ibid., 4:387.

[77] Thus Ceslas Lavergne, *Diagnoses des Suffixes Grecs du Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Gabalda, 1977) 372-73.

[78] Thus BDAG, ἀπολύτρωσις, 117.

significance attached to the λύτρον words."[79]

Λύτρον/λυτρόω Cognates in the LXX

In the LXX the nominal term λύτρον nearly always appears in the plural mostly in the Pentateuch and involving the real exchange of money for any number of contingencies.[80] "Ransom" is also required for every firstborn who opens the womb (Num 18:15) and can be offered as indemnity for serious offenses (35:31-32).[81] In no case in the LXX is Yhwh ever described as offering λύτρον in either the singular or the plural. But Yhwh is the subject in the LXX's first use of λυτρόω found in Moses' memorable first encounter with the deity in Exod 6:6: "And I will deliver you from slavery and I will redeem [λυτρώσομαι] you by a raised arm and great judgment."[82] The predominant use of λυτρόω is in the middle voice, whether a human being or God is the acting subject. There are only seven appearances of λυτρόω in the active voice, each one being a restatement of the Pentateuchal command, "You shall redeem [λυτρώσῃ] every firstborn" (Exod 13:13; 34:20, and Num 18:15, 17).

Approximately one-third of the uses of λυτρόω are found in the Pentateuch and of the 37 appearances, 30 have an acting subject other than God. Most appearances of λυτρόω come in texts outside of the Torah however, and in these texts God is always the one doing the

---

[79] Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, 10.

[80] The only singular uses are in Prov 6:35 and 13:8. The legal contingencies include (1) In the event of an ox goring (Exod 21:30); (2) to avoid the plague that accompanies census enrollment (30:12); (3) to liberate a slave (Lev 19:20) ; (4) or to redeem pledged assets such as land (25:24, 26), the fruits of the land offered in tithe (27:31), or even one's own freedom from servitude (25:51).

[81] The one other occurrence of λύτρον outside Torah is found in Isa 45:13 which promises God's stirring up of Cyrus to liberate the Jewish exiles "without ransom."

[82] All translations of LXX are taken from *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007). Hereafter referred to as "NETS."

ransoming.[83] The term λυτρόω becomes a common predicate in later poetic texts to describe God's salvation of Israel but canonically early uses appear in Exod 6:3 and 15:13,16. Since the manumission of slaves is not always at issue, "redeem" sometimes better captures the sense of λυτρόω, though there are many instances where "ransom" seems perfectly acceptable. Indeed in the latter text, Yhwh's ransom of Israel and his acquisition or purchase of Israel are depicted as two different sides of the same coin (Exod 15:13; 16 LXX):

> You led by your righteousness this people whom you have redeemed [גאל; ἐλυτρώσῃ];
> You summoned them by your power into your holy abode.
> …
> This people whom you acquired [קנה; ἐκτήσω // ἐλυτρώσω] should pass by.[84]

Ransom words nearly always serve to translate two Hebrew terms: גאל and פדה.[85] The LXX nearly always translates פדה with a λύτρον cognate though גאל frequently is the term in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. גאל concerns redemption within the clan to ensure that neither the assets nor person of one's kinsman ever pass out of the family by reason of indebtedness.[86] By contrast פדה in its Pentateuchal uses is employed in the context of ritual requirement to redeem or buy back the firstborn of children and animals from Yhwh's

---

[83] The one exception to this is in Ps 48/49:7. (All psalms are denoted by their LXX enumeration followed by their MT number.)

[84] Aquila even translates both גאל and קנה with the ransom term λυτρόω, a move which may be explained by the fact that λυτρόω embodies not only ransom from slavery to freedom but also purchase from one slave owner (Egypt) by the rightful owner (God). This is a theme that will reemerge in the Pauline epistles below. Redeemed Israel is free in one sense but also owned by Yhwh in another. This is one reason for rejecting the thesis of David Hill who, in *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (SNTSMS 5; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), would deny the propriety of ever speaking of an economic nuance when God is described as redeemer.

[85] There are a handful of exceptions: λύτρον/ λύτρα translates מחיר (Isa 45:13b), פרק (Lam 5:8 and Ps 135 /136: 24) and כפר (Exod 21:30; 30:12; Num 35:31-32; Prov 6:35; 13:8) and we have λυτρόω for שגב in Ps 58 /59:1.

[86] The handful of exceptions are 1 Sam 14:45 (in which God is not the rescuer), σώζω for פדה in Isa 1:29, ἀφωρίζω for פדה in Isa 29:22 and ῥύομαι for פדות in Isa 50:2. H. Ringgren, "גאל," *TDOT* 2:351.

symbolic possession.[87] Both legal sanctions carry strong associations with Yhwh's own redemption of Israel from Egypt (גאל and פדה) and perhaps for this reason the LXX outside the Pentateuch tends to level out the semantic differences entirely.

In Lev 25:23-28 Yhwh enjoins the Israelites to establish procedures by which land lost to financial distress can be redeemed by its original rightful owner. A parallel idea of redemption is at work in Lev 25:47-55 which deals with ransoming of indebted *slaves* rather than *land*.[88] In either case the basic concept involves financial rescue by kinsmen. The duty of redemption (גאלא/λύτρωσις) falls on the "next of kin" to provide the necessary funds to prevent the land or the relative's person from passing permanently to his creditors. If even the next of kin fails in either duty, then debt slaves will be released and free and clear ownership of the land will still revert to the debtor—both at the "year of release" (ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως) or the "Jubilee year." The Jubilee was instituted to serve as a backstop measure to guarantee the restoration of the land and freedom from debts in case the duty of redemption—for whatever reason—was left unfulfilled. [89]

The גאלא/λύτρωσις embodies the ideal of *restoration* of the proper state of affairs before the occurrence of tragedy, injustice, or misfortune.[90] The redeemer *substitutes for* a relative to discharge his duties in his stead with the broader goal of making whole the relative himself or the broader extended family who has been injured

---

[87] H. Cazelles, "פדה," *TDOT* 11:485.

[88] The main lexical difference is that גאלא is rendered more abstractly by λύτρωσις in Lev 25:48: "after he has been sold to him he shall have redemption [גאלא; λύτρωσις]."

[89] Thus Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27* (AB 3B; New York: Doubleday, 2000) 2189.

[90] Milgrom adduces all the biblical duties incumbent upon the kinsman-redeemer who is charged with the גאלא/λύτρωσις. Ibid., 2189. He is to (1) provide his deceased relative with a surviving heir by marrying his childless widow as in the case of Boaz marrying Ruth (Ruth 3–4); (2) receive the restitution when his relative has been wronged and (presumably because of death) is not able to receive the restitution funds himself (Num 5:8); (3) execute vengeance against one who slays his kinsman (Num 35:9-34); and (4) repurchase the land of his indebted relative (Lev 25:25-28).

or impaired by his absence. But the theology of λύτρωσις transcends the clan. Yhwh acts through the law of the Jubilee to restore the land to its rightful owner when the requisite human redemption fails, since human redemption was ordered to preserving God's original redemption. In this way God serves as the supreme גֹּאֵל through the Levitical law itself and it is within this broader framework that redemption within the clan is to be understood.[91] The foundational theological assumption is that the children of Israel belong to God just as the land does. Yhwh's property interest is a corollary to his act of redemption at the Exodus (Exod 6:6; Lev 25:42).[92] By guaranteeing divine redemption when human redemption fails, the Jubilee ordinance preserves the Exodus. The גאלא/λυτρώσις is rooted in Israel's identity as an Exodus people. As Hubbard puts it, "The redemption amounts to an institutional Exodus in Israel. . . .Each instance of redemption amounts to a fresh moment of divine liberation—as it were a miniature Exodus."[93]

In summary, in the usage of Exodus and Leviticus, λυτ cognates never lose their ability to denote the idea of release or acquisition through the payment of money, whether an individual or God is the subject. And the obligation of redemption found in Leviticus is grounded in God's redeeming activity, even though the former has a more explicitly economic manifestation. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to see that beyond the paradigmatic meaning of λυτ cognates, the important theological ideas of *restoration* and *recovery* lie close at hand.[94]

---

[91] Ibid., 2190.

[92] In the MT this connection is made explicit in Lev 25:55. When all possibilities of human redemption are exhausted, the indentured servant shall still "go forth in the year of release. For the children of Israel are my servants. . . . whom I brought out from the land of Egypt."

[93] Robert L. Hubbard, "The *Go'el* in Ancient Israel: Theological Reflections on an Israelite Institution," *BBR* 1 (1991) 11.

[94] "Reclaim" and "buy back" are two other related possibilities suggested by Hill, *Greek Words*, 53.

The λύτρον family of words provides an important metaphor for describing Yhwh's freeing of Israelite slaves at the Exodus. But as I hope to show below, this family of words also provides a rich and variegated manner of describing Yhwh's future saving intervention in history. This is not simply because salvation in post-exilic texts of the LXX is understood as a kind of "New Exodus" and thus is described in redemption terms reminiscent of the first Exodus. It is also because slavery and indebtedness become metaphors to depict exilic Israel's condition and thus invite Yhwh's continued intervention in history in ways analogous to duties placed upon the kinsman-redeemer under the law.

Redemption as Salvation in the LXX

Redemption in the Psalter

I now turn to λύτρον as a salvation term in the LXX. By far the greatest cluster of such uses of λυτρόω occurs in the Psalter. When utilized in parallel constructions, the verb λυτρόω appears frequently in parallel with σώζω (Ps 7:2; 58/59:1; 71/72:14; 105/106:10; 143/144:9-10), ῥύομαι (Ps 58/59:1; 68/69:19) and ἐξαιρέω (Ps 58/59:1-2; 143/144:9-10). But in the poetry of the Psalter λυτρόω parallels other terms such as "have mercy" (ἐλεέω, Ps 25/26:11),"help" (βοηθεώ, Ps 43/44:27-28), "take" (λαμβάνω, Ps 48/49:15) and "spare" (φείδομαι, Ps 71/72:14), which are perhaps less often considered salvation terms. Often the thing being ransomed is the individual life of the psalmist (Ps 31/32:7; 33/34:23; 48/49:16; 54/55:18; 68/69:19; 70/71:23; 71/72:14; 118/119:54). The ransom is from a generic enemy "those who pursue me. . . . like lions" (Ps 7:2), "transgressors" (Ps 25/26:11), "those that encircle me" (Ps 31/32:7), "Hades' hand" (Ps 48/49:16), "those that approach me" (Ps 54/55:18), "those who rise up against me" (Ps

58/59:1), or "the extortion of human beings" (Ps 118/119:134). There are clearly many instances in which λυτρόω (גאל or פדה in the MT) lacks the specific monetary ideas intrinsic to the semantic sense of "ransom." Still Psalm 48/49 shows that the Psalter as a whole does not leave behind the core economic notion that "ransom" signifies.[95] And there are yet other passages that seem to play on the basic notion of λυτρόω designating not only freeing of slaves but the *acquisition* of slaves by Yhwh for divine service (Ps 33/34:23; Ps 143/144:9-10).

But most commonly λυτρόω evokes the Exodus tradition. In Ps 77/78:35 the psalmist notes that after the first wilderness chastisement Israel only briefly remembered that "God is their helper" and that "God most high was their redeemer." In 77/78: 42 he then criticizes Israel for failing to remember the hand of God "that redeemed them from an oppressor's hand." God's Exodus redemption is one of his many acts of mercy catalogued in Ps 135/136:24. Psalm 76/77:15-20 seems to be a trope on Exod 6:6-9. In general there is a great amount of fluidity between individual hopes of redemption, the corporate memory of it, and collective aspirations for future ransom.

Redemption in the Prophets

Critical scholarship has long discerned the presence of Exodus traditions in the exilic and post-exilic poetry of Jeremiah, Zechariah, Hosea and most of all, Deutero and Trito-Isaiah. The rationale for the prophetic rereading of the Exodus tradition was the prophets' desire to ground exiled Israel's hope of future salvation and restoration in the belief in Yhwh's past archetypal act

[95] "And the price of the ransom [פדיון; λύτρωσις] is his soul" (Ps 48/49:9). And "God will ransom [פדה; λυτρώσεται] my soul" (Ps 48/49:16).

of salvation from Egypt. The prophetic revelation of the "New Exodus," in other words, was born out of the theological exigency of a people who doubted the reality of God's continued patronage after he allowed the destruction of the nation, the burning and looting of the Temple, and the collapse of the Davidic throne. Moreover the theme of redemption fit neatly with exilic Israel's need for God's reacquisition, repurchase, restoration and recovery of a lost people.

1. Redemption in Prophets outside Isaiah

A good many uses of ransom language by the prophets come amidst stock images of the Exodus that do not differ significantly from the poetry of the Psalms.[96] Still Minor Prophets such as Zechariah break new theological ground with the idea of a return from exile cast as a future redemption (Zech 10:8-12), and so redemption becomes functionally equivalent to terms such as "bring," "bring back," and even "gather." Micah also adds another distinctive element. Not only will God's "people" alone be the beneficiaries of the promised ingathering, but in some mysterious way the nations too will be a part of the restoration (Mic 4:1-2, 10). Jeremiah also uses ransom terminology in connection with a promised ingathering, in ways similar to uses found in Micah. In Jer 38:31-34 (31:31-34 MT) we have the famous promise of a new superior covenant taking place in the context of a promised future redemption and ingathering.

2. Redemption in Isaiah

In Isaiah 40–66 the theme of redemption receives the most development.[97] Sometimes

[96] See, for instance, Mic 6:4 or Hos 13:14, "And shall I redeem [פדה; λυτρώσομαι] them from death?"

[97] For instance, God is called by the epithet "redeemer" thirteen times in Isaiah 40–66 against only seven times in the rest of the Bible.

the laws of redemption are intimated but mostly λύτρον cognates simply appeal to the Exodus event directly, appearing as one class of a broader constellation of salvation terms which populate the text of Deutero-Isaiah. One reason for Deutero-Isaiah's attachment to the theme of ransom is that it interprets Israel's exilic status as one of slavery—specifically debt slavery—for which the appearance of a divine redeemer would be most appropriate.[98] Further, Dijkstra has revived an ancient understanding of "double payment" (διπλᾶ in the LXX) as an economic gift from God to pay the price for her sins instead of divinely inflicted punishment.[99] Though not always recognized in the secondary literature, the LXX of Isaiah seems to introduce a sense of ἁμαρτία that includes moral indebtedness that can be remitted monetarily (e.g. Isa 50:1).[100] And there are several other reasons to view Yhwh's "comfort" in 40:1-3 as specifically redemptive.[101]

What this shows is that any treatment of redemption in Deutero-Isaiah cannot proceed solely from lexicographical considerations. Though the LXX is more guarded in using λύτρον

---

[98] Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 49. Baltzer argues that 40:2 should be translated, "Truly fulfilled is her time of service. Truly paid off is her indebtedness. Truly she has received from Yhwh's hand double for all her sins."

[99] Meindert Dijkstra, "YHWH as Israel's *Go'el*: Second Isaiah's Perspective on Reconciliation and Restitution," *ZABR* 5 (1999) 236-57. His argument depends in part on construing "double payment" based on the redemption statute in Exod 21:30 in which "ransom" serves as a fine. The double fine is due to economic loss itself plus punitive damages (cf. Exod 22:1-8).

[100] For instance, nowhere in the extensive treatment of ἁμαρτία in the *TDNT* is "moral indebtedness" put forth as a possible meaning. See M. H. Bertram, "Theological Nuances of ἁμαρτία in the LXX," *TDNT* 1:286-89. See also Isa 44:22 in which redemption is closely connected to "sins" and "lawlessness."

[101] (1) E.g. λύω is a cognate of λύτρον, as in λέλυται αὐτῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία (lit. "her sin has been loosened"), which for Procksch conveys the notion of a captive Israel whose fetters have been removed (O. Procksch, "λύω," *TDNT* 4:328). (2) Ταπεινώσις "humiliation", when predicated of Israel, generally reflects involuntary servitude in the LXX (e.g., Exod 1:12; Deut 26:6) and sometimes debt slavery (Lev 25:39; 27:8) (3) The Lord's "hand" which dispenses the "double payment," in Deutero-Isaiah generally stands as a metaphor not for God's punitive power but his creative (Isa 40:12; 41:20; 45:11, 12; 48:13) or redemptive power (43:13; 49:2; 49:16, 22; 50:2; 51:16). (4) The "double payment" (διπλᾶ) can surely bear an economic sense (Exod 22:3, 6, 8; Zech 9:11-12).

cognates than its *Vorlage* is in using the Hebrew equivalents, there are important texts in which "redemption" is not stated explicitly, but where the idea lies only barely submerged. One must be attentive to Yhwh's figurative buying and selling of his people and also to the corollary of the ransom metaphor: the presentation of Israel's condition before God as one of servitude and the depiction of her sins as a form of debt slavery.

It is mistaken to historicize excessively the captivity and ransom language of Deutero-Isaiah since the book's language does not reflect the actual historical experience of Jewish exiles living either in Babylon or Egypt.[102] Rather, one should treat the idea of redemption as a core element within a broader "sociomorpheme" which includes God as "master" who sells or permits his wayward "servant" to be sold to foreigners due to his excessive (moral) indebtedness.[103] Naturally the background of indebtedness and redemption does not account for all the sin and salvation metaphors in Isaiah that triangulate between God, Israel, and the exile, such as Yhwh as spouse or Yhwh as judge. But the debt slavery metaphor illuminates ways that Deutero-Isaiah has reinterpreted the traditions of slavery and redemption as they are found in both the Mosaic Law and Israel's historical experience.[104]

The first appearance of λύτρον cognates in the LXX text of Isaiah 40–66 occurs in God's inaugural speech (41:1-20) which sets the stage for a salvific action on a much grander scale.

---

[102] This observation goes back to Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (HKAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892) 294.

[103] Thus Klaus Baltzer, "Liberation from Debt Slavery," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson and S. Dean McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 477-84.

[104] The idea of Israel or a part thereof being sold by Yhwh to enemies is well attested in the Bible (Judg 4:1; Ps 43/44:13; 1 Sam 12:8; Jer 34:8-32; Isa 52:3).

God's ongoing redeeming activity forms part of an important bridge between past and future salvation. And this redemptive activity also ensures a clearly *international* dimension to the future salvation even more so than in the past.

In 43:1-3, many of the same ideas are present.

> But now, thus says the Lord God who made you, O Jacob, and he who formed you, O Israel, 'Do not fear, for I have redeemed [גאל; ἐλυτρωσάμην] you. . . . I am the Lord your God, the Holy One of Israel, who saves you; I have given Egypt and Ethiopia and Soene as your exchange [כפר; ἄλλαγμα], on your behalf.

God's creation not of the world but of Israel figures prominently in this oracle. The form ἐλυτρωσάμην stands in synonymous parallelism with God's self-designations as "the one who made [ὁ ποιήσας] you" and "the one who formed [ὁ πλάσας] you"—with the same creation terms being repeated chiastically in 43:7.[105] And at the center of the chiasm is the expression of God's love for his people, which finds its deepest expression in redemption: "I have given Egypt as your exchange, Cush and Sheba in your place." Here the "exchange" (ἄλλαγμα) echoes the redemption statutes in Leviticus 25 and Numbers 35, respectively. The reference not only interprets God's redemption of Israel at the first Exodus (Exod 6:6) but also forms a bridge to future action. Just as God *gave* Egypt in exchange for you, so now he *will give* many men and even rulers for your head.[106] The term λυτρόω loses neither its connection to the Mosaic law nor to the more general notion of exchanging assets to free captives, just as the concept of redemption again forms the bridge between past and future salvation.

---

[105] Thus John D. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66* (rev. ed; WBC 25; Nashville: Thomas Nelson,1987) 670.

[106] The reference to "rulers" is absent from the MT.

The divine λυτρούμενος appears again in Isa 43:14 promising a future redemption in terms reminiscent of the first one at the Exodus: Yhwh is the one who is redeeming (ὁ λυτρούμενος) Israel, "who provides [ὁ δίδους] a way through the sea. And a path in the mighty waters; who brought out chariots and horse and a mighty throng together; but they have lain down and will not rise again; they have been quenched and extinguished like a wick" (43:16-17). However, the new redemption will be also utterly new and different than the first one, for Yhwh "is doing new things" which Israel "will come to know." Yhwh "will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the dry land that his chosen race, his people, can drink from"—the people whom he acquired "to declare my saving deeds."

In the next appearance of the divine λυτρούμενος in Isa 44:24a, we learn that in the past God blotted out the cloud of lawlessness and the darkness of sin of his "servant" as a parallel to the "double payment" they obtained for their sins in 40:2. Redemption however is explicitly presented as a future hope received when Israel turns back to God: "Return to me and I will redeem [λυτρώσομαι] you" (44:22). Yet in the next verse (44:23c) we learn that "God has redeemed [ἐλυτρώσατο] Israel while Jacob will be glorified." The reader of Isaiah has by now grown accustomed to the prophet juxtaposing past and future salvation, yet this is the first time that the prophet employs redemption terminology itself in such a flexible manner.

This cluster of "redemption" references also marks the emergence of the robust internationalism for which Isaiah is justly famous. The prophet promises the interconnectedness of the destinies of Israel and the other nations. Yhwh surprisingly chooses the "anointed" Persian Cyrus to effect Israel's future redemption. And Isaiah 45 in fact seems to develop ideas presented when "redemption" was last mentioned in 43:1-

14. In choosing Cyrus, God reveals himself creator of all peoples (45:12-13) and not just Israel (43:1). As an unwitting agent of Yhwh, Cyrus will himself not be the recipient of the "ransom" God himself has remitted to free the exiles. Rather, the nations of Egypt and Ethiopia—formerly the ransom price God "paid" to ransom Israel (43:3)—will now come to know Yhwh through Israel as she benefits from Cyrus' conquest (45:13-14)! This distinctively international theology of redemption will provide the template for subsequent interpretation in a universalist vein. Isaiah 50:10-11 interprets redemption within the logic of covenant, designating Israel as both "saved" (ῥυομένοις) and "ransomed" (λελυτρωμένοις) and thus identifying her closely with the God who saves (ὁ ῥυσάμενος) and redeems (ὁ λυτρούμενος) her.

Yet it is in 52:1-12 that the prophet reveals new aspects of Israel's future redemption. God promises a future purification of Zion (52:1-2), yet paradoxically the returning exiles must themselves be pure (52:11-12). Seitz contends that this exile should not be understood simply as Jews in Babylon but as more a cosmos in exile until God returns to Zion.[107] But the broader message here is that future purification is needed. This is one difference between the past and ongoing redemption in which the Lord paid double for the sins of Israel (40:2) and Egypt and Seba were remitted to secure her release (43:3). She was sold "for nothing" (δωρεάν; 52:3, 5). This double entendre signifying both "at no cost" and "for no reason" plays on the idea of ransom to underscore the senseless gratuity of what Israel has suffered. Significantly, we learn that

[107] Christopher Seitz, *The Book of Isaiah 40–66* (NIB 6; Nashville: Abingdon, 2001) 454.

her future redemption will not involve monetary disbursement: "οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε" (52:3b). This should not be interpreted to mean that the notion of redemption "price" is lost completely.[108] Rather, the idea is that the very real cost should be reckoned in nonmonetary terms. Specifically, the future redemption will include purification from uncleanness and this in turn will come as a result of the work of Israel's servant which the prophet will soon describe in 52:13–53:12.

Another important use of λυτρόω comes at the culmination of Isaiah 60–62, which scholarship perceives as a distinct unit devoted to "salvation and nothing but salvation."[109] The center of the unit is the anonymous anointed figure who appears on the scene in 61:1-3. The mysterious person who says "the spirit of the Lord is upon me" is probably best identified with the "servant" of whom 42:1 says, "This is my servant. . . . I have put my spirit upon him."[110] The servant/prophet figure of Isaiah 61 is not depicted as "ransoming" anyone or described as a "redeemer" but by "binding the brokenhearted" and "proclaiming a year of the Lord's favor," he personally enacts the Jubilee.[111]

The mission of the servant/prophet in 61:1-3 not only continues the mission of the servant in Isaiah 40–55 but puts into effect the promises of the divine redeemer (ὁ λυτρούμενος). This idea seems to be in view in the dramatic conclusion to the salvation

---

[108] Contra Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, 216.

[109] Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66* (trans. David M. G. Stalker; Philadelphia: Westminster) 296.

[110] Other options include the prophet himself or the offspring of the servant figure in the Servant Songs.

[111] Thus John S. Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran* (VTSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 190-203.

oracle in 62:10-12. In the great crescendo of triumphal images dealing with the restoration of Zion, the image shifts to the New Exodus which, unlike the first, will be performed in the sight and hearing of all the nations (62:10-11). Indeed, this is the triumph of the divine "savior" whose "holy people" are called "redeemed [λελυτρωμένον] by the Lord" (62:12). The redemption image is the manifestation of the work of the servant/prophet in 61:1-3.

Finally, we turn to Isa 63:1-6 and 63:7-13. The first unit is best classified as a colloquy between a sentinel and God himself.[112] The defeat of Edom at the hands of Babylon serves as a reminder of the event referred to in Isaiah 34.[113] But the phrase in its present context also functions as a representative of, and perhaps the beginning of, God's coming eschatological triumph. The easy juxtaposition of "day of vengeance" and "year of redemption" (ἐνιαυτὸς λυτρώσεως) in 63:4 refers back to the work of the servant figure in 61:1-3, whose mission was depicted as inaugurating both a "day" and a "year." This suggests also that the "year of redemption" is another echo of the Jubilee tradition, as it was being reinterpreted in postexilic theology. The "year of redemption" becomes one more way of expressing Israel's eschatological hope for a coming time in which Yhwh will wipe away debts (i.e., forgive sins) and redeem the people and the land (i.e., restore his people as free to make unencumbered use of their inheritance).

---

[112] Thus Seitz, *Isaiah 40–66*, 518.

[113] Indeed, the phrase "day of vengeance" clearly hearkens back to Isa 34:8-9 which specifies Edom as one such object of divine vengeance.

Isaiah 63:7-13 is a beginning of the long two-chapter lament featuring the evident eschatological disappointment of the prophet. This particular lament juxtaposes themes of God's past salvation of Israel. But rather than assurance of future salvation, there is a strong note of despair as to why God has allowed Israel's sin to delay his saving intent. The Greek of the LXX for 63:7-8 to describe God's salvation is fitting, since it is both the final appearance of redemption language in Isaiah as well as a symphony of salvation terms popular both in Isaiah and poetic texts generally. God is known not only for having "redeemed" his people but he has "saved" them or given them "salvation" from affliction, "loved" them, "spared" them, "took" them and "raised them up."

Redemption in Late Canonical and Deuterocanonical Works

In Daniel λυτρόω terms function as generic salvation terms more or less synonymous with σώζω and ῥύομαι (Dan 3:88; 6:28).[114] Similarly 1 Macc 4:11 bases the hope of divine redemption in battle explicitly on God's covenant with the Jews but otherwise falls back on standard phrasing referring back to the Exodus.

By contrast, Sirach, in the final hagiographical section found in Sir 44:1–50:24, interprets redemption in novel ways. God's redemption is being effected with the assistance of the human hands of Isaiah (48:20) making it both more human and historically less remote. And in Sir 49:10, the twelve prophets are agents of redemption in a verse that seems to contain the inchoate notion that the death of the righteous can

[114] In one instance, Daniel exhorts King Nebuchadnezzar to "ransom" (himself) for his sins by means of alms, which evidently means "pay the price for."

mysteriously effect the redemption of the people as a whole. The hope that the bones of the twelve might "sprout anew" may further connect this redemption to an incipient hope of resurrection.[115] In 51:2 we see the idea of the redemption of a body which may lie behind Rom 8:23 a text to be examined below.

Summary of λύτρον/λυτρόω as a Salvation Term in the LXX

(1) There are many uses of λυτρόω in which the term seems completely synonymous and interchangeable with "save" "rescue" and "deliver." Similarly the condition from which Israel (or the psalmist) is redeemed does not always relate directly to slavery or indebtedness and the redemptive action is often non-economic. Indeed, there are several important texts (e. g., Zech 10:8-12; Mic 4:6-10; Ps 106:2-3LXX) in which to redeem means specifically "to bring back from exile." Nonetheless, it is surely wrong to assert that λυτρόω in its salvific sense has lost any economic nuance of "ransom" or that "redeem" is purely a technical term to denote salvation by God after the pattern of the Exodus. There are too many allusions to money, exchanges, debts, or freeing slaves to permit this interpretation.

(2) It seems likely that Deutero-Isaiah's frequent appeal to the divine-redeemer theme as well as Israel as the "redeemed people" goes hand in hand with a belief that Israel's exilic condition can be thought of in terms of debt slavery. This is seen in the allusions to

[115] Indeed the case for the existence of a belief in resurrection at least in the Greek of Sir 44:1–50:24 is a little stronger than is usually admitted. See, for instance, Francesco Saracino, "Risurrezione in Ben Sira?" *Henoch* 4 (1982) 185-203. But for the majority report, see Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987) 86.

the Jubilee in Isa 61:1-3; 63:4, "freeing the captives" in 61:1-3, and in the programmatic 40:1-2 which is probably best interpreted as God himself furnishing "double" the required payment for Israel's sins.

(3) Redemption in the prophets is closely associated with many important themes of NT soteriology. In addition to the "return from exile" uses, in Jeremiah the promised redemption takes place in the context of a New Covenant (Jer 38:7-12, 31-34 LXX). In Isaiah 40–66 it is frequently international in scope. Foreign nations like Egypt and Seba are being given by Yhwh as the redemptive "exchange" for Israel (43:3) but in the process come to know Yhwh themselves (45:13-14). God's redemptive activity is mentioned frequently in the context of his self-disclosure to the nations (42:1-6; 43:7-13; 44:21-28) and in some psalms the appearance of God's righteousness takes place alongside redemption of people (e.g., Ps 70:23-24 LXX).

(4) Redemption often forms a bridge between past and future salvation. This is especially evident in Isaiah 40–66 where past and future (41:1-20; 43:1-7; 44:22-23) or present and future images (44:23-24; 50:9-11) of redemption and salvation are closely juxtaposed.

(5) Sirach especially seems to contain several uses which parallel the developmental trajectory of the NT. Redemption is by God but through the hand of others (Sir 48:20). At least once in Sirach, redemption applies to the body specifically and not simply "human life" (51:2). Redemption might be triggered by the death of the righteous. And redemption might be associated with resurrection (49:10).

Redemption in Philo and Josephus

In Josephus and Philo the nominal form ἀπολύτρωσις is weakly attested, with but one occurrence in Josephus and two in Philo.[116] Only one usage in Philo is of theological import because in commenting on Abraham's bargaining with God over the fate of Sodom, the Alexandrian suggests redemption as an exchange of persons in which ten righteous are "offered" for the rescue of many from threatened destruction.[117] Elsewhere we encounter Philo's "doctrine" that "a wise man is a ransom [λύτρον] for a worthless one."[118] This principle in turn derives from the law itself in which the Levites serve as "ransom" (λύτρα) in lieu of the obligation of the firstborn offering which ordinarily would fall on Israel. But, in the broader sense, the law requiring ransom for the firstborn is really an allegory (μεταφορά) for the spiritual freedom of the soul to which the law is ultimately directed. In fact, there are several instances of Philo using ransom terms when the liberation is purely spiritual and figurative.[119] Both kinds of Philonic references are unique in that they are extra-biblical examples of a broadened semantic sense of ransom words, and without involving the actual payment of money. It is within this broader interpretive tradition that the NT use of ransom must be understood.

---

[116] In the remainder of Intertestamental literature the appearances of ἀπολύτρωσις and λύτρον are generic Greek for the period and relatively uninteresting theologically. But the popular Jewish literature featured the term λυτρόω to continue the idea God as redeemer both past (*Pss. Sol. 8:11,30*; cf. *9:1*) and future (*T. Sim. 2:10; 7:1*;*T. Zab. 9:8* ; *T. Jos. 18:2*). In the DSS פדה occurs several times (1QH 2:32, 35; 3:19; 17:20; 4QpPs 37:14-15) in the context of a plea of the petitioner for God to "redeem" his soul, while the War Scroll has several uses which reflect the heightened eschatological sense of the Qumran community and the coming "eternal redemption" (1QM 1:12; 11:9; 14:5; 15:1; 17:6; 18:11).

[117] Philo, *Congr.,* 107-8.

[118] Philo, *Sacr*., 37. Virtually the same phrase is found in *Sacr.,* 38: "Every good man is ransom for a worthless one."

[119] Philo, *Conf*., 20; *Sacr.*, 34, 35.

Redemption in the NT

Redemption in Mark 10:45

I consider first the cryptic saying which the Gospel of Mark attributes to Jesus in 10:45 (cf. Matt 20:28): "For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many." There was a time when many scholars would commonly deny the authenticity of the logion.[120] But the case for the dominical origin of the saying is stronger.[121] The saying is, in short, too vague, mysterious, and open to manifold interpretation to suppose it was generated by the early Church.[122] If its authenticity is accepted, it provides an important hermeneutical window into the NT appeal to the ransom tradition. Jesus himself would be responsible not only for the introduction of "ransom" as a *theologoumenon* of the early Church but also for the likely theological trajectory of the idea as other NT authors employed it. This in turn is quite significant, since historical reconstructions of Jesus over recent decades going back to Schweitzer have quite often

---

[120] Chiefly that (1) while Jesus may well have believed his own death to constitute a kind of "service," there are no parallel sayings to indicate he thought of it in terms of ransom; (2) connecting Jesus' service to a death which would bear soteriological significance presupposes a sophisticated atonement theology otherwise absent from the synoptic gospels; (3) the use of ἦλθεν in "the Son of Man came" implies an origin at a time when the early Church could look retrospectively on Jesus' life and work; and (4) the idea of "redemption" is common enough in other NT writings, especially the letters of Paul, to account for its presence in Mark 10:45 without ascribing it to Jesus. D. E. Nineham in *The Gospel of St. Mark* (PNTC; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963) 278-79 sketches out these and other basic reasons for the judgment of inauthenticity.

[121] The case for discontinuity is provided in some detail by Stuhlmacher in "Vicariously Giving His Life for Many," 20-21 who follows Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (trans. John Bowden; New York: Scribner, 1971) 264-65. The principal reasons for this judgment are (1) the Church was very reticent concerning the use of the title "Son of Man;" the Church's ransom logia by contrast used "Jesus Christ" (Eph 1:5-8) ,"Christ Jesus" (Rom 3:24-25; 1 Cor 1:30) ," the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim 2:5-6), or the "Beloved Son" (Col 1:13); (2) the Church never elsewhere adopted "the many" as the object of redemption but instead considered that "all" would be its beneficiaries (Rom 3:25-26; 1 Tim 2:6); (3) the saying itself is utterly silent as to whom the "many" are who will be ransomed, what it is that they will be ransomed from, what, if anything, is the necessary price and what their new status will be after the ransom has been completed; by contrast, the Church, as I will show below, tended to answer these questions in a variety of distinct ways and with much greater specificity; and (4) the use of ἦλθεν actually coheres well with other sayings of Jesus usually deemed authentic. See, for instance, Allison's defense of the authenticity of Jesus' "I came" sayings in *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 1:483.

[122] Citing the utter unfittingness of Mark 10:45 to function as a later dogmatic formulation of the community, Vincent Taylor long ago contended, "It is better to conclude that Jesus has furnished a theme for later Pauline developments rather than that Mark has introduced a Pauline sentiment into the words of Jesus," in *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London; McMillan, 1937) 105.

concluded that Jesus interpreted his own death in distinctly eschatological terms, associating it with the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God and its messianic woes.[123]

The eschatological thrust of Mark 10:45 offers insight into the meaning of the ransom logion as well as why Mark chose to place it in its current context as the conclusion to a conversation that began with the request of the Zebedees to sit with Jesus in his glory (10:35). Many interpreters today recognize the influence of Isaiah 53 and the Suffering Servant discourse over Mark 10:45, usually on the basis of the similarity of "to give his life" (δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ) and "for many" (πολλῶν) to both the LXX and the MT for Isa 53:10-12.[124] Still how (if at all) Isaiah 53 figures into the background of Mark 10:45 is a question for which many scholarly theories have been advanced.[125] The relative strengths and weaknesses of the main proposals are less important for our purposes than the overall conclusion to which they all strongly tend: that ransom in Mark as well as in other NT texts must be interpreted in light of the eschatological framework provided by the OT. In other words, whenever the NT employs redemption terminology in connection with Jesus, there are two core assumptions that could not be lost on any (ideal) hearer of the text: (1) that God promised a future redemption to restore Israel

---

[123] Pitre summarizes only the best known of a wide variety of scholarly proposals to this effect in *Jesus, Tribulation and the End of the Exile,* 383. He cites Albert Schweitzer, C. H. Dodd, Oscar Cullman, Joachim Jeremias, Ben Meyer, Dale Allison, N. T. Wright, Scot McKnight, and J. D. G. Dunn.

[124] For instance see Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 3: 94-100; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 589-90; Jeremias, "Das Lösengeld für Viele," 216-29. It is also sometimes contended that אשׁם (sin offering)—though here in a verse rendered very differently by the LXX—is elsewhere translated by λύτρωσις in places such as Lev 5:18 and 5:25.

[125] Wright (N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God,* 604) takes a *pars pro toto* approach to the Suffering Servant background, arguing that for Jesus, the kingdom program of Isaiah 40–55 as a whole is put into effect through the Servant's work. Morna Hooker (*The Son of Man in Mark* [London: SPCK, 1967] 103-47) and C. K. Barrett ("The Background of Mark 10:45," *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson* [ed. A. J. B. Higgins; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959] 1-18) both reject the background of Isaiah 53 and instead turn the focus to Daniel 7 and the background of the Son of Man figure who is identified with the "saints of the kingdom" in 7:22 and their suffering. Pitre (*Jesus, Tribulation and the End of the Exile,* 390-417) suggests that Jesus indentified both with the Son of Man figure in Daniel 7 and the anointed one who will be cut off in Daniel 9, while interpreting his mission against the backdrop of the future redemption promised in the prophets.

and the rest of the world to its proper state; and (2) that God's promised redemption has been performed, proleptically enacted, or at least set in motion through the person and work of Jesus.

Redemption in Luke-Acts

In the canticle of Zechariah ("He has effected redemption for his people," Luke 1:68), in the speech of Anna ("she spoke concerning God to all those waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem"; (2:38), in the words of the disaffected disciples on the road to Emmaus ("We had hoped that he was the one about to redeem Israel," 24:21), we have appeals to the concept of redemption that are all very much in line with what we find in the LXX. All three verses assume the promised intervention by God in history—an intervention first exemplified in the Exodus and pledged again on a grander scale to restore things to their proper order after the exile.[126] Even Acts, in its depiction of the speech of Stephen the martyr, dubs Moses with the epithet "redeemer" (7:35)—reflecting the LXX tradition that the Exodus is a story of God's redemption through the agency of Moses (cf. Exod 6:6). Tension between realized and future eschatology in Luke-Acts has been much discussed among scholars. Luke seems to believe both in a kingdom that has already arrived (Luke 17:21) as well as a future time of refreshing which corresponds to Jesus' return (Acts 3:19-21). The presence of the kingdom corresponds to an already realized redemption which in turn is founded not upon the crucifixion but upon the presence of Jesus' person (Luke 1:68; 2:38). No accent whatsoever is placed upon the price paid in order to effect the ransom. As Büchsel puts it concerning Luke's use of λύτρωσις, "The reference is not to a ransom but to a redeemer."[127] At the same time, the "times of refreshment" relates to a future redemption at the second coming whose existence Luke also maintains (21:27-28).

---

[126] Thus Marshall, "The Concept of Redemption in the New Testament," 240.

[127] Büchsel, "λύω, etc.," 4:351.

Redemption in 1 Peter and Hebrews

By contrast the ransom price is explicitly spelled out in 1 Pet 1:18, though Peter stops well short of suggesting the mechanism by which the blood of Christ could amount to ransom money. Peter seems to have fused the traditional image of Jesus Christ as the Paschal lamb (cf. John 1:29; Rev 5:9; 1 Cor 5: 7) together with the Septuagintal Exodus account of God's redemption of Israel. In doing this, he has creatively interpreted the blood of the lamb—a *sine qua non* for the divine redemption to occur in the logic of the story—as the metaphorical ransom price, which vested the death of Christ with a ransoming significance. It is not clear that full-blown sacrificial logic is at work here.[128]

In Heb 11:35 the term simply means the "release" from slavery wherein God himself was not even necessarily the redeeming agent.[129] But the substance of the Hebrews writer's theology of redemption is found in 9:12 and 9:15. Though the background is tabernacle sacrifice (rather than the Passover), the burden of the author however, is not to explain the basis for the atoning significance of Christ's death, but the reason that this death is superior to and can cause the obsolescence of the Temple cult. For this reason Hebrews juxtaposes the efficacious death of Christ on one hand with the "mercy seat" and attendant sacrifices associated with the Old Covenant (9:5) on the other. The Temple sacrifices were many, repetitive, external and purify only the flesh while being conducted by men whose own sins had to be covered; the sacrifice of Christ is once for all, cleanses

---

[128] It is of course true that the term for "unblemished lamb" (ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος) is not used in Exod 12:5 as Paul Achtemeier points out in *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 128. However in the Aquila LXX it is from the ἀμνῶν from which the "perfect sheep" is to be taken. Moreover both ἀμνός and ἄρνιον are predicated of Jesus Christ in NT texts generally agreed to refer back to the Passover. And the reference to "redemption" and "perishable" as well as to the new inheritance in 1 Pet 1:4 would make the association with the Exodus story all that much stronger.

[129] It is possible however, as Marshall suggests, to infer both that the "release" the heroines refused was a lesser "release" than the ultimate resurrection and in this way their martyrdoms constituted a ransom "price." Marshall, "The Concept of Redemption in the New Testament," 247.

the conscience, and effects an eternal redemption. This is why Christ's death mediates a new covenant. One effect of the New Covenant is to convey the promised inheritance and to do this it is necessary that the heir first be redeemed from the transgressions committed under the Old Covenant.

Redemption in the Undisputed Pauline Corpus

1. Redemption in Rom 3:24

I now turn to examine the use of λύτρον cognates in the NT in the undisputed Pauline corpus. Such cognates appear but three times and in only two letters: Rom 3:24; 8:23 and 1 Cor 1:30.[130] Each time the term employed by Paul is ἀπολύτρωσις. Rom 3:24 comes nested in a very difficult and controversial text. 3:22b-24 reads:

> For there is no difference, all sinned and are falling short of the glory of God while being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus [διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] whom God put forth as an expiation [ἱλαστήριον] by his blood, to be received by faith.[131]

Questions abound about this passage as indeed every single word of it is controversial. Käsemann calls it "the most obscure and difficult in the whole epistle."[132] I will have to limit my brief treatment here to issues immediately germane to "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." The first matter is to determine how the three legs of the tripod of "redemption," "justification"

[130] It is likely, however, that ransom ideas lie behind the "bought with a price" trope that Paul twice employs (1 Cor 6:20; 7:23), but Joseph Fitzmyer points out that, although τιμή is common in Greco-Roman ransom transactions, Paul's term for "bought" ἐξαγοράζω is not. See, *Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989) 66. This might be because the Church had already by Paul's day developed a constellation of unique terms that signaled "redemption" in the special Christian theological sense. Seeing this, many modern translations such as the RSV and the NAB go so far as to describe Christ as "redeeming" from "the curse of the law" (Gal 3:13) and "redeeming" those "under the law" (Gal 4:5) despite the fact that cognates of ἀγοράζω and not λυτρόω are used in both instances.

[131] All translations of Pauline texts are the author's own from NA[28].

[132] Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Geoffrey E. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans) 92.

and "expiation/propitiation" fit together. Indeed the tradition of connecting redemption with the death of Jesus may go back to Jesus himself as I argued above. But how did "redemption in Christ Jesus" become so closely connected specifically with the term ἱλαστήριον which, far from pertaining to a human death, is a term traditionally translated "mercy seat" and found in connection with the Day of Atonement sacrifice commanded in Leviticus 16? There is another question. Both "redemption" and "expiation" appear extensively in different parts of Leviticus, but there would seem to be little conceptual connection between them. One never attains redemption through expiatory sacrifice and redemption is never said to result in expiation. How did these two concepts, which seem to run at right angles to each another, come to be used by Paul almost in tandem?

The answer is that Paul is building upon the theological tradition in late Second Temple Judaism by which the suffering and death of the righteous can not only turn away divine wrath and effect the forgiveness of sins but may have redeeming effects as well. Apparently he can assume such a belief on the part of his audience. The idea is seminally present in Philo but clearly expressed in the works of Daniel and the Books of Maccabees.[133] In 4 Macc 6:27-28, the idea is even more explicit.[134] And in 4 Maccabees 17 not only are the martyrs the true children of Abraham but they become "a substitute [ἀντίψυχον] for the sin of the nation, through whose

[133] Philo, *Congr.,* 107-8; Dan 9:3-19; 2 Macc 7:37-38.

[134] "You know O God, that I am dying in fiery torture, though I might have saved myself. Be merciful [ἵλεως] on your nation and be pleased with our punishment for their sake. Make my blood to be their purification and take my life as a substitute for theirs."

propitiatory death [ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θάνατου] Israel was saved" (4 Macc 17:22).[135] Jewish martyrology is the background for how the death of a righteous man could be regarded as a ἱλαστήριον. But how to account for the other two strands of "justification" and "redemption" when neither term carries strong association with stories about martyrs?

The proposal of Wright in this regard is attractive.[136] Israel's martyr stories provided the lens through which Paul read the crucial chapters of Isaiah 40–55. The program announced by Deutero-Isaiah for Israel's restoration—more specifically her "redemption" and "justification—required the death of the Servant figure to be put into effect. The Servant figure therefore serves for Paul as not simply a martyr but a martyr *par excellence*, whose death will be a catalyst for the restoration of Israel. The influence of Isaiah 53 on Paul's christology in Romans is often admitted either in 4:25, 5:20 or both.[137] It is at least possible that Paul considers that the death of the Servant has set in motion the Isaianic program of redemption as well.

Any proposal involving the Suffering Servant is bound to be controversial and uncertain.[138] By contrast, it is virtually certain that Paul's reference to "redemption" evoked in

---

[135] Many think that the term for "substitute" used in 4 Macc 6:28 and 17:22 (ἀντίψυχον) should be translated "ransom," a proposal which I will entertain in Chapter Three below.

[136] N.T. Wright, *The Letter to the Romans* (NIB 10; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002) 473-75.

[137] See, for instance, Wright, *Romans,* 475; Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) 387; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SacPag 6; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press,1996) 185; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 87; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38a; Dallas: Word Books, 1988) 225; Ben Witherington, *Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 129; Käsemann, *Romans*, 128; Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1988) 214; Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 288, 345. J. Jeremias ("πολλοί," *TDNT* 6:536-45) argues that ὀι πολλοί in its most important "universalist" NT appearances (including Rom 4:17, 5:16, 19 and 20) is rooted in Isaiah 53.

[138] For instance, it is not clear how "raised for our justification" fits with the idea of a true Servant figure who obeys in order to justify many.

the minds of his audience the memory of Israel's centrally defining narrative: the story of the Exodus and in particular how the telling of that story had been shaped by the words of the prophets. But what, for Paul, is the relationship of the Christ event to the Exodus? Part of the answer lies in the phrase "in Christ."

In terms of its sheer pervasiveness in Paul's letters, "in Christ" easily surpasses more studied terms such as "justification." More recent treatments of Paul's theology pay greater attention to "in Christ." For Dunn, "Paul's perception of the whole of Christian life, its source, its identity, and its responsibilities, could be summed up" in the phrase.[139] "In Christ" for Schnelle is "much more than a mere formula; it must be regarded as the continuum of his theology."[140] It is highly significant that Paul's most theologically important letter first invokes his central "in Christ" trope in Rom 3:24 in connection with "redemption." The believer receives not merely redemption, but the redemption which is *in Christ Jesus*. What does ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ add to ἀπολύτρωσις?

Surely Paul means to imply agency here as it is *through Christ* that the redemption has been accomplished.[141] But "in Christ" is a very versatile expression meaning "existential participation in a new reality brought about by Christ."[142] Therefore it must often denote the sense of "with," "into," and "belonging to," as well as "through." This is surely the case in Rom

---

[139] James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 399.

[140] Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul* (trans. Eugene M. Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005) 481.

[141] Romans 5, for instance, is laden with references to the effects that have been brought about "through" Christ (5:1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21).

[142] Dunn, *Theology*, 400.

3:24, coming as it does in the hinge passage wherein Paul takes a dramatic turn away from the depiction of an entire world under sin in 1:18–3:20 and toward that of a people reconstituted in Christ. Thus "redemption in Christ Jesus" sets the stage for his argument in participationist terms, with believers participating in the faith of Abraham, the identity forged by the new Adam, his death and resurrection and the spirit of his sonship and inheritance.

But far more than participation in Christ is involved in "redemption," which for Paul and his hearers is first and foremost a matter of narrative. Abraham is even more important for Paul than Moses not only because the patriarch was unencumbered by the wrath pronounced by the law (Rom 4:15) but also because he was the one in whom the promise of redemption was first vouchsafed (4:13-25). The justice first declared on Abraham in Gen 15:6 soon gives way to a reiteration of the promise in 15:7 followed by the first canonical revelation that the fulfillment of the promise will require the children of Abraham first to be reduced to foreign slavery as a precursor to their freedom and inheritance (15:12-15; cf. Gal 3:10-18). This is how Paul moves so seamlessly from the discussion about the timing of Abraham's justification in Rom 4:1-12 to the implications of faith in the promise itself in 4:13-25.

"Redemption in Christ Jesus" in Rom 3:24 also prepares the hearer for the next time in the letter that "in Christ" language appears, Romans 6, wherein Paul ponders the implications of being removed from being "in sin" (6:1) and being put "in Christ" or, more precisely, "baptized into his death." The person so baptized is to be considered "with" Christ in his death (6:4-5, 6) and in life both present (6:11) and future (6:4, 8). But the controlling metaphor here is not simply "in Christ Jesus" but "redemption in Christ Jesus." This is because being "in Christ"

effects not only a transformation from death to life but from slavery to freedom (6:14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23), as any "redemption" would. And the redemption Paul has in mind is of course the one specified in Exod 6:6 but promised before to Abraham. The story of Israel's promise of redemption is rarely submerged too far below the surface in Romans 4–8, even though the actual term ἀπολύτρωσις has only become explicitly audible to the hearer once. "Redemption" makes the believer as one belonging to Christ and thus connects him to the story that Christ has brought to completion.

2. Redemption in Rom 8:23

"Redemption" occurs a second time in 8:22-23.

> For we know that the whole creation groans and suffers labor pains together until now. Not only this but because of having the first fruit that is the Spirit, we ourselves groan in ourselves waiting for the adoption that is the redemption of our body [τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν].

The immediate context is different than in Rom 3:24. Future rather than past redemption is in view here just as the focal point of the text is not believers who have *already* experienced the redemption but rather believers who, together with all creation, await some future eschatological fulfillment. But the tension between the realized redemption wrought by Jesus Christ in 3:24 and the future redemption (a contradiction for some interpreters) has already been anticipated by Paul. Present redemption corresponds to the Christian's status as heir of the Abrahamic promise (4:13-25), though as an heir who has as yet received only the Spirit (5:1-5). This anticipates future redemption in which the time of suffering in the Spirit gives way to glory (8:12-16, 22-23). Present redemption also corresponds to the status as reconciled to God (5:1, 10-11), while awaiting a fuller salvation in the future (5:10). Present redemption corresponds to the liberation from slavery to sin (6:15-19), but

this corresponds to a period of sanctification whose ultimate goal is eternal life (6:22). Even the theme of cosmic renewal seems to have been anticipated by the earlier mention of the sin of Adam and its worldwide ramifications for all humanity. The cosmic renewal begun in Christ now is working itself out in the suffering of believers who in turn act out the eschatological suffering of the entire created order. Groaning is itself stock apocalyptic language.[143] Yet scholars such as Keesmaat have also suggested that the groaning—both that of the Spirit filled believers and the cosmos as a whole—looks back to the curse of "groaning" in childbirth pronounced upon the first woman in creation.[144] Such a reading would explain why Paul considers that the work of God through Christ will cause the renewal of the created order as well, since the sin of Adam prompted a curse on the earth too—which as a result shared in Adam's fallenness.

The "redemption of our body" is an alternative expression for what Paul elsewhere describes as the resurrection of the body (cf. 1 Cor 15: 35-50). Why does he use "redemption" here instead and what does "redemption" have to do with resurrection? Perhaps "redemption" is simply the salvation metaphor that fits most aptly with the "slavery to corruption" that all creation suffers along with the bodies of Spirit filled believers (3:21). But Paul has on several occasions cast the effects of God's work in Christ in economic terms. Besides "redemption" expressly mentioned in 3:23, Abraham set the template when he received the promise not as condign payment but as "free gift" (4:1-8). Thus the gift of justification is also "free" (5:15-21), since it is the full flowering of the Abrahamic promise. And the liberation of those who were enslaved to sin is a redemption, whose end is the "free gift" of eternal life and whose antithesis is death which is the *wages* of sin (6:23). This redemption can also be expressed as the gift of the Spirit which has set the believers free from death (8:2). The

[143] Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 472.

[144] Sylvia C. Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition* (JSNTSup 181; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 107.

paradox is that this gift makes its recipients "debtors" (8:12) not to the flesh but (as Paul implies) to the Spirit. This positions the hearer for 8:23, wherein the presence of the Spirit must be eschatologically consummated with a future "redemption" which completes the present "redemption" (3:24) and thus satisfies the metaphorical "debt" to the Spirit.

Few commentators have made much of the fact that Paul (contrary to nearly all modern translations) does not say "redemption of our bodies" but "redemption of our body" (cf. 8:11).[145] The change may be because Paul attaches to the theme of redemption a vibrant sense of solidarity better captured by one "body" than by a multitude. Redemption, when first mentioned, soon gave way to the "oneness" Jewish and Gentile believers have in justification (3:27-31), in Abrahamic sonship/adoption (Romans 4) and in both Adam formerly and Christ presently (Romans 5). Moreover the "we" passage in 6:1-11 not only completes the transition from the more abstract 3rd person discussion in 5:12-21, but is also marked by the abundance of verbs with a συν prefix: "co-buried with him (6:4); of a "co-nature" with likeness of his death (6:5); "co-crucified" with him (6:6); died "with" Christ (6:8); "co-live" with him (6:8). This gives way to the believers being "set free from sin" in 6:18.

Something similar is at work in Romans 8. Beginning in 8:12, we see another array of unusual συν words designed to underscore the paradoxical twofold solidarity possessed by the "we" whom Paul is addressing: solidarity with Christ in the Spirit on the one hand and solidarity with creation on the other. The Spirit "co-witnesses" (8:16); we are "co-heirs" with Christ with whom we must "co-suffer" to be "co-glorified" (8:17), just as we "co-groan" and "co-suffer labor pain" (8:22). All of this leads to the "redemption of the body" at which time the children experience adoption as one.

---

[145] Wright (*Romans*, 598) mentions it but summarily dismisses the possible significance.

Yet why is "redemption of the body" being tied closely to other themes? It is appositional to "sonship/adoption" not to mention its position following the "possession of the Spirit," "groaning," and the future hope of the "glory of the children of God." And why does Paul equate future redemption of the body to sonship/adoption and why should these things be preceded by possession of the Spirit? Part of the answer lies in what we have already seen, that for Paul "redemption in Christ Jesus" (3:24) is the metaphor that leads logically to all the various ways of expressing participation in Christ in Romans 4–8. But Paul is not simply tying together loose ends of ideas put forth earlier. In Romans 8 there is a profound narrative logic at work which serves to make more explicit what has only been implicit. For instance back in 8:14, we find the verse that asserts the connection between being led by the Spirit and being children of God. But the connection is not gratuitous. De la Potterie showed that—although the term "adoption" is never used—LXX references to the story of Israel's being led in the wilderness by the Spirit of God quite often are found in close contact with mention of Israel's being a son of God or of God being a father to Israel.[146] Keesmaat further expounds Paul's interpretation of the Exodus tradition as also entailing the recovery of lost glory by Israel.[147] The "future glory of the children of God" is precisely the glory to which Adam was originally called but forfeited, as did humanity as a whole (1:23) when it exchanged this glory for the images of corruptible creation.[148] And Paul can extend

---

[146] See, for instance, Deut 8:2, 5; 32:6, 12; Isa 63:14-16; Jer 3:14,19; 31:8-9; Wis 14:3 in Ignace de la Potterie, "Le Chrétien conduit par L'Espirit dans son cheminement eschatologique (Rom 8:14)," in *The Law of the Spirit in Rom 7 and Rom 8* (ed. L. de Lorenzi; Rome: St. Paul's Abbey, 1976) 225.

[147] Many passages in the Bible suggest a hope for future glory connected with man in his created glory. See, for instance, Isa 46:13; 60:29; 61:3 and Dan 7:7-21. Psalm 8:4-9 describes such glory in specifically Adamic and Edenic terms. See also Bar 5:1-9; 2 Bar 15:8; 50:48, 49; 51:1-6; 4 Ezra 7:60, 95. For further discussion see Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 84-96.

[148] Thus Adam is not simply a type of Christ and one who like Christ determined the destiny of many (Rom 5:12-21). Adam is an image for human glory lost while Christ is an image of human glory restored. The idea of a future hope of restored Adamic glory was quite common in various strains of Judaism of Paul's day if the surviving texts are in any way representative. The phrase "all the glory of Adam" is a virtual cliché in Qumranic texts. See

the eschatological "co-groaning" (συστενάζω) and "co-travailing" (συνωδίνω)—which had their origin at the protological curse upon human beings—to all creation, since both biblical and intertestamental texts had done much the same thing.[149]

But the groans are shared between a creation in bondage and a people in exile. Fittingly, "groaning" does not appear only in the creation story in Genesis 3 as a result of the Fall. It also appears in the Exodus account itself when Israel "groans" under the weight of Egyptian bondage (Exod 2:23, 24) and with the "groaning" of Daughter Zion in exile in Jer 4:31. As with Deutero-Isaiah before, the suffering of a people in exile goes hand in hand with the suffering of the created order as both await full restoration. Twice do the "labor pains" or "groaning" of Israel result in the promise of divine redemption. In Mic 4:10, a text we have already examined for its reference to the theme of ingathering of exiles we read:

> Suffer pain [ὤδινε] and be courageous and draw near, O Daughter Sion, like one in labor, for now you shall go forth from the city and tent in the plain, and you shall come as far as Babylon. From there he will rescue you, and from there the Lord your God will redeem [λυτρώσεται] you from the hand of your enemies.[NETS]

Micah, before Paul, connected the "exilic labor pains" to the future redemption. And in an even more significant text (Exod 6:5-6), the first and most paradigmatic reference to "redemption" in the Greek OT, we have:

> And I listened to the *groaning* [στεναγμόν] of the sons of Israel, those whom the Egyptians are making into slaves and I remembered your covenant. Go! Tell the sons of Israel saying, 'I am the Lord and I will bring you out from the domination of the Egyptians. And I will deliver you from slavery and I will *redeem* [λυτρώσομαι] you by a raised arm and

---

1QS 4:22-33; CD 3:19-20; 1QH 17:14-15; 4QpPs 37: 3:1-2. See also the "Animal Apocalypse" in *1 Enoch* 85–90 in which humankind is transformed to reflect the glory of Adam (90:37-38).

[149] See Lev 17:24-30; Deut 29: 22-29; Isa 24: 4-6; Hos 4:1-3.; *T. Levi 4:1*; *Jub. 23:18*.

great judgment. NETS

Redemption is also the erstwhile solution for the "slavery groans" suffered by Israel at the beginning of her national existence. But there is more. In Exod 6:5-6 the Israelites are truly "sons" (cf. 4:22) but who nonetheless are being treated as "slaves." But sons though they are, they must undergo a period of groaning in apparent slavery until the hour of their redemption, in which their "sonship" will be made manifest to all creation, which somehow will itself share in the redemption.[150] The redemption of the body therefore is not simply an alternative expression for resurrection of the body chosen here because it fit better with the slavery metaphor seen earlier. Redemption ties together the original Exodus with the promised new one, but more than this, allows Paul to extend his conception of slavery back to the time of Adam, the entire human race, and the cosmos as a whole. Put differently, the future redemption underscores the utter continuity of the Christian believers, comprised of all sorts of Adam's children, with God's people Israel. They are guided by the same Spirit and experience the same "groaning" as they wait for the same adoption which amounts to their inheritance of the same restored creation which God promised.

3. Redemption in 1 Cor 1:30

The final mention by Paul of ἀπολύτρωσις comes in 1 Cor 1:29-31.

So no flesh must boast before God, since from him you are in Christ Jesus who

[150] Paul's claims here seem partly based on the unstated assumption that the human body is itself part of the created order (cf. 1 Cor 15: 35-50; 2 Cor 4:7– 5:5). Moreover, the narrative background of Exodus further explains the paradox that Matera, *Romans*, 202, notes, that "sonship/adoption" in Rom 8:23 is presented as a future reality while in 8:15 it is stated as a *fait accompli*. Israel was God's "son" while Israel was a slave. The fullness of sonship implies the reception of inheritance which in turn necessitates the completion of redemption from all forms of slavery. One can possess a Spirit of sonship/adoption now while still awaiting the fullness of sonship/adoption later.

> was made wisdom of God for you and also righteousness, sanctification and redemption [ἀπολύτρωσις], just as it is written, "Let him who boasts boast in the Lord."

The sudden appearance of "redemption," "justification," and "sanctification" in the above passage presents serious challenges for the exegete. Little in the discussion has prepared the hearer for the mention of these terms and neither do they (obviously) anticipate much of what Paul mentions later. Christ as "our wisdom" fits perfectly while it seems the other three terms "justification," "sanctification," and "redemption" are thrown in as an afterthought. Collins suggests both that the three terms are an allusive link to three similar terms in Jer 9:23-24 and that the terms appear in a rhetorical *gradatio*—though it remains unclear precisely for what rhetorical effect he thinks Paul might have been aiming. [151] Conzelmann confesses puzzlement when he contends that "the three concepts are not systematically arranged."[152] Fee is surely correct that the sudden appearance of the terms here signal that the intended audience has already been made familiar with them through Paul's preaching. The terms must have been typical of the standard Pauline message already as stock metaphors of salvation, which in this instance are meant to relate Paul's emphasis on God's wisdom to what is already familiar.[153] This is why exegetes almost invariably find themselves appealing to Paul's more explicit treatment of these themes elsewhere. Determining the precise relationship between "wisdom" on the one hand and "justification, sanctification and redemption" on

---

[151] Raymond Collins, *First Corinthians* (SacPag 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999) 112-13.

[152] Hans Conzelmann*, 1 Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 52.

[153] Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 86.

the other hand remains elusive.[154]

But Paul's sudden mention of "justification," "sanctification," and "redemption" are not *wholly* gratuitous even in the context of 1 Corinthians. A few verses earlier, Paul enjoined the Corinthians to "look at their calling," which amounts to being "called into fellowship" with Christ (1 Cor 1:9). But for Paul to be "called" is to be at once "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1:2) and "called to be holy." Since one of Paul's primary burdens in 1 Corinthians is overcoming the great factionalism that has beset the Church in Corinth, it seems that Paul is appealing to "sanctification" as a source and principle for unity based on fellowship and a common divine calling.[155] Similarly "justification" and "redemption"—though both salvation terms— also serve as "unity terms." Paul's idea of justification by faith emphasizes the oneness of all believers against intra-church Jewish-Christian infighting over the role of Torah observances. Likewise, "redemption" not only harkens back to the common pedigree of the people of God "redeemed" at the Exodus (Exod 6:6) but also fashions a basis in Paul's preaching for a shared relationship in Christ or "redemption in Christ Jesus" as he puts it in Rom 3:24. Not only do "justification, sanctification, and redemption" constitute a shared body of doctrinal content, but they also amount to a common possession of all believers of a shared reality; reminding the Corinthians of this is thus a fitting antidote to factionalism.

---

[154] Anthony Thiselton (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000] 190-203) helpfully critiques several of the leading modern proposals as well as the interpretive tradition.

[155] Richard Hays, *First Corinthians* (Louisville: John Knox, 1989) *,* 6; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 16-17; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 14-15; Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians,* 17-28.

Moreover, a number of commentators have suggested that the threefold "justification," "sanctification," and "redemption" actually anticipates the "moral" section of the epistle found in 1 Cor 5:1–6:20.[156] In 6:11 we read, "You were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." In this view, "justification, sanctification, redemption" has been replaced with "washed, sanctified, justified." The *idea* of redemption (though not the word) occurs soon after in 6:20 (cf.7:22-23) with Paul's "bought with a price" trope. The Corinthians twice assert "all things are lawful for me" to which Paul in diatribe form responds "not all things are helpful" and "but I will not be enslaved by anything." (6:12)[157] The Corinthian audience misunderstands the nature of its freedom, which means, in a certain sense, *it has misjudged the moral dimensions of its redemption in Christ*. With his respective statements in 6:20 and 7:22-23,

> You do not belong to yourselves for you were bought for a price [ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς], so glorify God in your body.
>
> For the slave [δοῦλος] who is called in the Lord is free of a master, likewise the free person once called belongs to the Lord. Since you were bought with a price [τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε], do not become slaves [δοῦλοι] of human beings.

Paul makes explicit a dimension of redemption which has been only implicit: to be redeemed in Christ means not only to be freed from slavery but means, in an altogether different and paradoxical sense, to experience a change in the entity to whom one belongs. One passes from slavery to one master (sin, death, the flesh) to slavery to another master (God, Christ,

---

[156] E.g., Hays, *First Corinthians*, 100.

[157] Ibid., 101-3.

righteousness).[158]

One might wonder if it is correct to interpret "bought with a price" as tantamount to "redemption" at all, since continued slavery to the purchaser—rather than freedom—is the result of the transaction. The difficulty passes when one recalls that the LXX often depicted Yhwh at once as both a redeemer and liberator on the one hand and a beneficent slave master on the other. The Psalter that both celebrates Yhwh's past redemption while requesting future ones also celebrates Yhwh as the one who "will ransom the lives of his slaves" (λυτρώσεται κύριος ψυχὰς δούλων ἀυτοῦ, Ps 33:22 LXX). Moreover the psalmist can petition Yhwh for salvation precisely *because* he is his slave (122:2; 142:12 LXX). The same paradox is embedded in Isaiah which emphasizes both Yhwh as "redeemer" and the people as "redeemed" but also as "slave of God" (δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ, 42:19; 48:20; 49:3).[159]

Paul at times appeals to the negative dimensions of slavery–*when slavery is held in comparison with adoption* (Galatians 4–5; Rom 8:12-17).[160] But many more of Paul's references

[158] Dale Martin surely seems correct that at work here is not the sociological background of a slave becoming free but rather, the attainment of social advancement though the acquisition of a better owner of greater standing. His research indicates that slavery in the Roman Empire was a complex institution in which slaves sometimes climbed the social ladder *within slavery* eschewing full manumission. See *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) 1-49, 60-68.

[159] The term παῖς which also translates the Hebrew עבד seems to be functionally synonymous with δοῦλος and is also quite often used of Israel in relation to God in Isaiah 40–66. Curiously this condition of servitude for Isaianic theology is not probationary but eschatological. Isaiah 63:17 and 65:9 make clear that individuals, though also chosen heirs, will nonetheless be slaves dwelling in the eschatological renewal—an honor that will eventually be extended even to the Gentiles (56:6).

[160] Cf. Phlm 16.

to slavery (δοῦλος/δουλεύω) are positive.[161] Paul himself is a "slave" to Christ (Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1; Gal 1:10) and to God (Titus 1:1), as are both Timothy (2 Tim 2:24) and Epaphras (Col 4:12) as well as epistolary audiences more generally (Rom 6:22, 12:11; 14:18; 16:18; 1 Cor 7:22; 1 Thess 1:7; Eph 6:6,7; Col 3:24). What matters is not so much whether one is *sociologically* slave or free–both in Christ have equal dignity. What is decisive is the question of *to whom one is a slave*. A Christian must not remain a slave to elemental spirits (Gal 4:8-9), to the law (4:24: 5:1; Rom 7:25), to sin (6:17, 20), to fear (8:15), or to pleasures and passions (Titus 3:3). Slavery to these things is incompatible with slavery to God and Christ (1 Cor 7:23) and the service which is done in righteousness (Rom 6:16, 18) and the Spirit (7:6). Paul's doctrine of redemption at root is a change of ownership accomplished by the payment of a costly purchase price. The use of the aorist ἠγοράσθητε indicates the completed action of the transaction—a fact which carries serious repercussions for those who ignore the moral demands of the new owner.[162]

We now see better why Paul has a two-stage understanding of redemption: present redemption already accomplished "in his blood" (Rom 3:24) and a future redemption tantamount to adoption as God's children (8:23). And we see more clearly why "present redemption" is consistent with continued slavery. For Paul slavery to Christ and God is what constitutes Christian life in the present. This slavery is of course wholly consistent with the inner sort of freedom one finds in loving service and eschewing the desires of the flesh. But this period of the slavery of free, loving service is itself an interim condition associated with the initial redemption.

[161] I am excluding from consideration neutral uses wherein Paul simply alludes to the sociological fact of slavery (1 Cor 12:3; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11, 22; 4:1; 1 Tim 6:1-2).

[162] Thus Collins, *First Corinthians*, 249.

In the final redemption, even slavery to God and Christ gives way to sonship/adoption and the inheritance that accompanies it. Put differently, the initial redemption effects a change from servile slavery to lower principles to slavery to the greatest master, who graciously bestows on his slaves an inner freedom to serve him fully, with the Spirit both as guide and guarantee of eschatological blessings. The final redemption effects the ultimate transformation of slaves of God and Christ to children of God in Christ.[163]

Redemption in the Disputed Paulines

1. Redemption in Col 1:14

The singular reference of Paul to "redemption" in Colossians occurs in that epistle's extended greeting (1:12-14):

> With joy giving thanks to the Father who has made us sufficient for the measure of the inheritance of the saints which is in the light, who rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved son, in whom we have redemption [ἀπολύτρωσιν], the forgiveness of sins [τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν].

Most commentary on this passage concerns the standing of Colossians *vis à vis* the undisputed Pauline corpus. All acknowledge similarities as well as differences. "The inheritance of the saints" is surely similar to material in Romans 8, though with distinctive terminology in Colossians. Likewise the contrast between light and darkness is without *exact* parallel elsewhere in Paul as is the idea of "transferral" to the "kingdom of his beloved son" (Col 1:13). Still, such ideas seem akin to the transformation from "the reign of sin" (Rom 5:17, 21) on the one hand to

[163] In this respect Paul's eschatology is different than the latter part of Isaiah and texts such as Rev 19:10; 22:9 which envision eschatological divine servitude.

both the "reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ" (5:17) and the "reign of righteousness (5:21)" on the other. And of course ἀπολύτρωσις is certainly a concept indigenous to Paul as is "forgiveness of sins" which, while rare in the undisputed letters, does appear as a hapax in Rom 4:7 when Paul is quoting the LXX.

Nonetheless it is worth asking why ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is presented appositionally to "redemption" as though the two expressions were different ways of saying the same thing. By comparison with Romans, Dunn describes the equation as "astonishing."[164] But one wonders how astonishing this understanding of redemption really is. The word ἀπολύτρωσις is an economic term and is a result that presupposes the payment of some "ransom" price, even if that price is purely metaphorical. Moreover the primary meaning of ἄφεσις is "the act of freeing or liberating."[165] Indeed, the term bears this sense in the overwhelming majority of times it appears in the LXX—usually in connection with the great Jubilee "year of release" (Leviticus 25; cf. Deuteronomy 15) but which prophets such as Isaiah tend to interpret eschatologically (Isa 61:1-3; 63:4).[166] Paul is following the eschatological tradition of the prophets. Both "redemption" and "release" are two closely related notions wherein the latter effect follows automatically from the former. If this analysis is correct, Paul's equation between "redemption" and "release," far from being "astonishing," is actually *less* in need of exegetical explanation than his uses of the

---

[164] James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 81.

[165] Thus BDAG, ἄφεσις, 155.

[166] Thus Rudolf Bultmann, "ἀφίημι, etc.," *TDNT* 1:508-12. Of the some 49 times the term appears in the LXX at least 40 times does the term mean some sort of debt forgiveness, nearly always in reference to the Jubilee, stereotypically called either the ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως or the ἐνιαυτὸς τῆς ἀφέσεως.

term in Romans and 1 Corinthians. It is precisely the way an ideal audience conditioned both to period Greek and the LXX hears "redemption" and "release of sins" when they are said together.

It is of course by no means clear that Paul considers "sins" in the sense of moral indebtedness that can be remitted with money. But this might press the metaphor too far. The idea of "paying off" or "ransoming away" one's "sins" with money or something else of value was not unheard of in the LXX, in the NT, or in early Christian literature.[167] Moreover, it is evident that Paul does consider sin as a form of slavery (Rom 6:16, 18) for which "release" by means of "redemption" would be the most fitting remedy.

2. Redemption in Eph 1:7

A similar passage appears in Eph 1:7-8 where Paul writes:

> In whom we have the redemption [ἀπολύτρωσιν] through his blood, the forgiveness [ἄφεσιν] of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace, which he has superabundantly showered on us, in all wisdom and knowledge.

The first clause features the prepositional phrase "through his blood" reminiscent of the phrase "in his blood" in Rom 3:25. With regard to "redemption" and its connection to "forgiveness," we are presented with much the same interpretive possibility as in 1:14 even though the term παράπτωμα "trespasses" no more connotes "indebtedness" than ἁμαρτίαι above. Indeed, there is more to suggest that the apposition between "redemption" and "forgiveness" is rooted in fundamentally economic logic: namely, the "riches" of "his grace" which he has "superabundantly showered" on the Ephesians. Not only do these terms pleonastically emphasize the utterly superabundant gratuity of the redemption, but

[167] See Dan 4:24 LXX; *Did.* 4:6; *Let. Barn*. 19:10; 1 Pet 1:18. The tradition of ransom payments is presupposed in Exod 21:30, 30:12 and Num 35:31-32. .

they call attention also to the corollary of that gratuity—the immense cost to the giver of the gift given. In both Eph 1:7-8 and Col 1:14, Paul is preparing his hearers to absorb fully the cosmic scope of redemption (Eph 1:10; Col 1:15-20).

3. Redemption in Eph 1:14

The next appearance of ἀπολύτρωσις comes a few verses later in Eph 1:11-14:

> In him we were apportioned, ordained according to the purpose of him who works all things according to the decision of his will, that having hoped in Christ we should be for the praise of his glory, in whom you have heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom you also believed and were sealed in the Holy Spirit of promise which is the down payment of our inheritance for the redemption of possession [εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως] for the praise of his glory.[168]

A great division among commentators and translators concerns the treatment of εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως. Much of the debate surrounds the sense of περιποίησις. Does it carry the meaning of "acquisition" or "possession"? Or is it to be understood in the sense of "rescue"? And if we opt for the former meaning, to whose "possession" is the text referring? Is it the Christian's possession of the inheritance or is it God's possession of Christians as adopted children?[169] The present context can be marshaled in support of either interpretation. God's possession of the Ephesians might be intimated in Eph 1:11 which speaks of their collective

[168] The theme of the Holy Spirit being a down payment on future inheritance is very similar to the "first fruits of the Spirit" in Rom 8:23. "Sealed" in the Spirit, possibly a baptismal reference, is an idea found only in Paul in Col 1:5 and Eph 4:21, 30.

[169] For the former view see E. Best, *Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998) 152-53; R. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians: A Commentary* (trans. Helen Heron; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991) 45, 61. For the latter view, see Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 121-22; Andrew Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas: Word Books, 1991) 44-45; Pheme Perkins, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (NIB 11; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997) 376; Marshall, "The Concept of Redemption in the New Testament," 245.

"appropriation" according to God's purpose of will.[170] Moreover the sense of "for the praise of his glory" which follows "possession" in 1:14 is revealed in 1:11 to be the people themselves which shall exist εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. And, though περιποίησις is not especially common in the LXX, the important salvation oracle in Isaiah 43 features the divine λυτρούμενος (43:14) speaking of the people whom he has "acquired to tell of his goodness" (ὅν περιποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγεῖσθαι, 43:21). On the other hand, the "down payment of the inheritance" seems to point the other way to the eschatological "possession" of the reality that present possession of the Holy Spirit prefigures. Indeed the reference to "redemption" in Eph 1:7 makes clear that it is the Ephesians (not God) who "have" it as possessors. Barth seems correct that it is unnecessary to make a hard and fast decision between the two options. As he puts it, "in blunt terms, God is not only spending but he is earning."[171] God not only purchases an inheritance for his children but these children become his people to praise him in the process. Besides the underlying OT narrative never fails to tie the future inheritance of Israel to the covenant formula: "You will be my people and I will be your God." And parallel expressions in Paul such as Romans 8 seem to sew together seamlessly God's adoption of his children to the children's cosmic inheritance while affirming that both eventualities are preceded by faith and possession of the Holy Spirit.

In any event, it is inarguable that Eph 1:14 reflects a future eschatological sense of ἀπολύτρωσις whether the focus is upon God or upon the Ephesians themselves. For this reason,

[170] The reading depends in part on understanding ἐκληρώθημεν in the sense of "we were appropriated" (by God) rather than in the sense of "we were apportioned." The matter is further complicated by the fact that both A and D read ἐκλήθημεν ''we were called" instead of ἐκληρώθημεν. But the latter reading is better attested.

[171] Markus Barth, *Ephesians 1–3* (AB 34B; New York: Doubleday, 1974) 94.

1:14 bears close comparison to Rom 8:23 which also reflects future redemption amidst a similar constellation of supporting ideas.

4. Redemption in Eph 4:30

Eph 1:14 is also similar to the final appearance of "redemption" in Eph 4:30 where Paul remarks in a paranetic section: "Do not continue to grieve the Holy Spirit of God in which you were sealed for the day of redemption [εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως]."

The reference to being "sealed in the Holy Spirit" is one indigenous to Colossians and Ephesians. But the allusion to the future "day of redemption" not only mirrors the future redemption in Eph 1:12-14 but is akin to the same theme in Rom 8:23. Given that this phrase appears in passing in a long paranetic section in which eschatology is meant mainly to buttress moral behavior, it is hazardous to probe much further into its background beyond pointing out its membership in the larger class of eschatological "day" references elsewhere in the Pauline corpus (Rom 2:16; 1 Cor 1:8; 3:13; 5:5; 1 Thess 5:2; 2 Thess 2:2; Phil 1:10; 2:16; 2 Tim 1:12, 18; 4:8). Perhaps Paul here conflates both the "day of vengeance" and the "year of redemption" of Isa 63:4 in which release from sins will be accompanied with vengeance on those who betray their calling (Eph 5:1-21). But this can only be suggested as a possibility.

Summary of Redemption in the NT

(1) A strong case can be made that the "ransom" logion in Mark 10:48 is dominical in origin and thus that the connection of "redemption" to Jesus' death is an idea that entered into the tradition through Jesus himself. Moreover, λύτρον is a term best understood within the overall eschatological hope of Israel in the late Second Temple period and was surely evocative of many of the particular prophetic texts I have examined above.

(2) Despite (1), Luke-Acts does make use of archaizing references to God's promise of redemption (Luke 1:68; 2:31; 24:21) that not only do not name a redemption price but are not specifically connected to Jesus' death. Luke is unique in the NT in this regard however. Both the authors of 1 Peter and Hebrews and the apostle Paul all closely connect redemption to Jesus' blood—explicitly naming the blood as a ransom price (1 Pet 1:19-20) and implicitly connecting it to a ransom price in the case of Paul (1 Cor 6:20; 7:23 cf. 1 Cor 1:30; Rom 3:24). In the case of Hebrews 9, the redemptive blood is evocative of a cultic sacrifice but mainly with the aim of showing Christ's sacrifice as better than the Tabernacle ones.

(3) Redemption for Paul is best understood not in abstract terms of "atonement theology" but in the narrative world of the LXX. "Redemption in Christ Jesus" means not only "redemption through Christ Jesus" but "redemption into Christ Jesus." And being "in Christ Jesus" for Paul means incorporation into the OT story that Christ has brought to perfection.

(4) "Redemption of our body" is an alternative way of saying "resurrection of our body." But its use in Rom 8:23 is also intended in several ways to evoke the OT story. "Groaning" is not only a term freighted with eschatological connotations but it is a catalyst for divine redemption in both the Law (Exod 6:5-6) and the Prophets (Mic 4:10). And the Exodus story itself recalls Israel's "sonship/adoption" (Exod 4:22) which was said to prompt the need for God to redeem Israel in the first place. The "groaning" also hearkens back to the creation story in Genesis 1–3 and is one basis for Paul extending redemption to the entire created order. The singular "body" in Rom 8:23 is used here rather than the plural "bodies" because redemption is constitutive of a unified people.

(5) Paul's notion of redemption is not wholly captured by the image of slaves being set free. A more dominant image in the letters is that of redemption from slavery to things other than God to slavery to God himself. But slavery to God is an interim condition resulting from present redemption. Final redemption brings

about the end of slavery and the full eschatological blessings of sonship/adoption. Paul's understanding of slavery to God seems to explain why for him the idea of redemption is both a present and future reality.

(6) Paul presents redemption as "forgiveness of sins" in Col 1:14 and Eph 1:7 probably because he understands ἄφεσις more in the broader sense of "release" and further "release" where metaphorical "payment" is at issue. The well-known theme of "riches" in Ephesians serves in 1:7-8 to call attention to the cost of the redemption, and the immense expense of the gift to the divine giver. Paul in 4:30 may even have in mind the eschatological time of "release" in Isa 61:1-3 and 63:4.

Conclusion

The biblical concept of redemption is varied. Where God is the one doing the redeeming, the point of departure is Exod 6:6 which summarizes God's intent to fulfill his covenant promises to Israel–both in the sense of "ransoming" Israel from captivity and in the sense of "purchasing" her for exclusive service to himself. The laws of redemption governing the issue of land ownership and human indebtedness are also at issue, since it is those laws which were intended to safeguard the effects of the redemption from Egypt and by insuring the perpetual possession of the land inheritance. When the land was lost, God pledged another intervention in history, feeling compelled to act as redeemer once again, since the initial redemption had been undone, as the land and people of his possession passed into the hands of others. The Priestly theology of redemption both in Exodus and Leviticus is the major reason why redemption terms and related ideas figure so prominently in the prophetic oracles of restoration after the exile. To redeem is not simply to save a people and a land but to restore and recover the proper order of things.

The idea of redemption also carries with it important cognate concepts. The term "redeem" can mean variously (1) "deliverance of a group from imprisonment or enslavement"; (2) "paying the price of exchange for captives to effect a ransom"; (3) "freeing a slave by purchase or by writ of manumission"; or (4) "buying back the freedom or free use of indebted persons or pledged assets." Therefore, when a people is "redeemed," it implies something about their status both prior to and after the redemption. They needed to be redeemed because they were "in captivity," "slaves," "sold," or "indebted." Their status after the redemption is "freedom," "in possession again of family inheritance," or, in some instances, "owned once more by the divine purchaser." Paul embraces all of these notions at various places in his writings. Indeed, the idea of "slavery to sin" or else sin as a kind of moral indebtedness probably derives from the notion that it was Israel's and all humanity's sins that had occasioned the need for a divine redeemer to bring about a redemptive result analogous to the first Exodus. At no point in the Bible is any suggestion made concerning the entity to whom payment must be made for redemption to be brought about. But this is no justification for attempts to deny altogether the economic logic which underlies the concept.

Later in the tradition, the theology of redemption takes on other important nuances. It is the suffering of righteous people that can help bring about God's redemption or even in some way can itself be redemptive. This idea seems unrelated to "kinsman-redeemer" theology of the older period but rather seems an outgrowth of the late Second Temple Jewish martyrology of the Maccabean era, which itself probably traces back to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53. This provides an essential understanding of how Jesus himself can connect his own death to a

"ransom" but also how the NT authors, especially Paul, can see in the Christ-event the promised divine redemption being brought about, proleptically prefigured or at least set in motion.

CHAPTER THREE

Introduction

My analysis of ransom themes in the PE is based on two findings presented earlier. The first is that "salvation" figures prominently in the PE both in absolute terms and relative to other NT works. The second is that "ransom" and "redemption" have just as much claim to being salvation terms as any σωζ- cognate, in spite of their relative neglect in important recent soteriological studies of the PE. Therefore, before turning to 1 Tim 2:1-7, the first of two ransom passages in the PE, it is necessary to take a moment to summarize what is known about salvation and eschatology in 1 Timothy as a whole and particularly in the rhetorical strategy of Paul leading up to 1 Tim 2:1-7. I hope to show that eschatology is the main theme that holds together the material in 1 Timothy 1 and thus offers unique possibilities for understanding the meaning of Paul's pastoral instructions in 1 Tim 2:1-7. Later, I also intend to demonstrate that not only is the ransom logion in 1 Tim 2:6 the basis for Paul's doctrine of universal salvation but exploring the LXX background which Paul interprets and shapes in this unit offers new possibilities for understanding his theology of redemption.

Overview

1 Timothy is unusually fond of predicating σωτήρ of God, doing so three times while also featuring an abundance of different forms of the cognate verb σώζω. God is σωτήρ and because of this, Jesus Christ came into the world to "save" sinners, of whom Paul is the leading example (1:15). But individuals can participate in salvation too. Not only may a woman be

"saved" by childbirth (2:15), but by holding fast to the teaching Timothy the delegate also "saves" both himself and others (4:16). In relation to the length of the book, the frequency of σωζ- cognates easily surpasses any work in the NT except Titus—and this does not include other allusions to salvation or the use of the salvation term "ransom" in 2:6, the focus of this study.

But for all its use of salvation terminology, 1 Timothy cannot on that account be said to have been written to address soteriology per se. Rather, it is the Church, its conduct, and its organizational behavior with which Paul is most concerned.[172] And ecclesial conduct for Paul, as I hope to show below, is grounded in the fact that the Church finds itself in the age of salvation. But advancing this claim requires a demonstration that 1 Timothy can be interpreted with a standard Pauline eschatology. This is all the more relevant for this study, since "redemption" as it appears in the uncontested Pauline letters, presupposes an "already but not yet" eschatology and an age that is "between the times of the beginning and consummation of the End."[173] But whether "ransom" as we have it in 1 Tim 2:5-6 can be interpreted in an analogous manner depends on the eschatology that 1 Timothy advances. It is precisely this point that continues to be contested.

In the matter of eschatology, the influence of older interpretive paradigms continues to be felt. The thesis of *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* advanced by Dibelius and Conzelmann contended that the PE's

---

[172] Though schemata differ it is generally agreed in the literature that the bulk of 1 Timothy is comprised of something akin to a "Church order" or "organization of God's household," as Philip Towner (*The Letters to Timothy and Titus* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006] 70-74) puts it.

[173] Gordon Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (San Francisco: Harper Row, 1984) xxx-xxxi.

> concept of 'good citizenship' [*christliche Bürgerlichkeit*] in the actual situation of conflict. . . . proves . . . to be a mode of acting in the Church's consolidation. The Church must make adjustments for a prolonged stay in the world in the face of the evolution of both orthodoxy and heresy within the Christian communities.[174]

For Dibelius and Conzelmann the call to good citizenship is not eschatologically conditioned but is rather grounded in creation (1 Tim 2:13-14; 4:4) or simply in "sound teaching" understood as an end within itself.[175] Bultmann, for his part, posits a "faded Paulinism," in which Christian life mainly "molds bourgeois living."[176] At work here is the assumption not only of the pseudepigraphal nature of the letters themselves but of their provenance well after the career of Paul, which accounts for their need to make eschatological adjustments in the face of the "delay of the parousia." The tendencies to hold the letter as post-Pauline and to hold that the letter advances an eschatology distinct from Paul are thus mutually reinforcing ones. Though the old German view does not command quite the broad acceptance that it once did, faint echoes of it are detectable in much more recent literature on 1 Timothy by scholars who see the epistle not only as deutero-Pauline but who base that judgment in part on the belief that the letter reflects an eschatology noticeably different from the authentic Paul.[177]

---

[174] Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 8.

[175] "There is no longer a living expectation of the End as the careful preparation of the next generation shows." Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Howard Clark Kee; Nashville: Abingdon, 1975) 383.

[176] Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols; trans. Kendrick Grobel; New York: Scribner, 1955) 2:186.

[177] Characteristic of this are Jouette M. Bassler, *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 32-33; Raymond Collins, *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: John Knox, 2002) 9; and Jürgen Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKKNT 15; Zürich: Benzinger, 1988) 377-79.

But a great deal in 1 Timothy suggests a standard Pauline eschatology. For instance, one observes 1 Timothy's citations of eschatological time markers—"these very times" (καιροῖς ἰδίοις; 2:6; 6:15). And one also notes the strategic placement of the eschatological "now," both in 4:8 and in the ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι phrase in 6:17, in contexts plainly reflective of stark contrast between the current age and the coming one.[178] Moreover, 1 Timothy elsewhere demonstrates a characteristically Pauline interest in the things to come: "the life now and to come" (ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης, 4:8); a good foundation for what is to come" (θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον, 6:19; cf. Rom 4:24; 5:14; 8:13, 18, 38; 1 Cor 3:22; Gal 3:23; 1 Thess 3:4; Eph 1:21; Col 1:27). Finally Paul in 1 Tim 1:11-17 also draws a sharp contrast between his earlier and later ethical conduct wherein the Christ-event forms the transition point. This feature too is characteristic of undisputed Pauline letters and the likely preaching of Paul.[179]

The thesis of *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* also entails a profound diminution of the Church's hope for the rapid return of the Lord Jesus. But even this seems unlikely given the specific *timing* associated with Paul's final charge to Timothy (6:13-15) to "keep the command. . . . *until* [μέχρι] the epiphany of our Lord, which God will reveal at *the proper time* [καιροῖς ἰδίοις]." Also striking is the passing remark of Paul in 4:1 in which he equates the "last times"

[178] To all appearances, these usages are indistinguishable from the eschatological "now" of the undisputed Paulines by which Paul marks out the characteristics of the current age as opposed to ages past or future.

[179] Rom 5:8-9; 6:5-23; 7:5-6; 11:29-30; 1 Cor 6:9-11; Gal 1:23; 4:1-11; Col 1:21-23; 2:13-15; 3:5-10; Phlm 11; cf. Eph 2:1-22; 5:3-13; Titus 3:1-7. For an exposition of the entire theme, see Peter Tachau, *Einst und Jetzt im Neuen Testament* (FRLANT 105; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1972) 79-143.

(ὑστέροις καιροῖς) with the emergence of false teachers in the Church.[180]

There is little warrant for imputing to 1 Timothy a reworked eschatology to meet the needs of a second-generation Church.[181] On the contrary, we have a solid basis for approaching this letter assuming not Bultmann's "faded Paulinism" but the normal eschatological coloring of the undisputed Pauline corpus. Indeed, I hope to demonstrate that the theme of eschatology offers a unique possibility for understanding the material leading up to the ransom logion in 1 Tim 2:6.

Salvation and Eschatology in 1 Timothy

By the standards of the undisputed epistles, the opening greeting in 1 Timothy is strikingly unique. Not only does Paul address God as σωτήρ, an epithet surprisingly rare in the NT, but he names Jesus Christ "our hope [ἐλπίς]" as paired with God.[182] The σωτήρ/ἐλπίς pairing actually signals an emphatic embrace of the standard eschatological framework found in Paul elsewhere. Paul not only assumes but *reminds* his hearers that they are in the stage between past and future salvation marked by present hope in Christ.

Indeed, there is an echo of the LXX in 1:1. Spicq observes what he terms "le

[180] The belief that the emergence of apostasy within the Church itself constituted a sign of the parousia's imminence is well attested in the NT (1 John 2:18; Revelation13). It was part of the eschatological message of Jesus (Mark 13:22) and was an aspect of the Lukan depiction of Paul (Acts 20:29-31). It is reflected elsewhere in the PE (2 Tim 3:1-17) and intimated in 2 Thess 2:3. It is scarcely likely that Paul was unaware of it.

[181] Equally inadequate is the view of Peter Trummer (*Die Paulustradition der Pastoralbriefe* [BBET 8; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978] 228) that the author of the PE is a compiler of traditional eschatological bits of Paul, who scarcely notices that this material is inconsistent with his own overall post-eschatological thrust.

[182] This of course is a deliberate preparation for the pairing later in 1 Tim 4:10, "It is for this we labor and strive because we hope [ἠλπίκαμεν] in the living God who is the Savior [σωτήρ] of all people."

parallelisme σωτήρ-ἐλπίς fréquent dans l'Ancien Testament."[183] Though the term ἐλπίς is capable of signifying trust in God's deliverance from temporal difficulties, it takes on a distinctive eschatological thrust in later Second Temple texts.[184] Paul's invocation of "hope" reworks Jewish eschatology to predicate a hope of good outcome at the judgment on the person of Christ. Hope also is a mark of a person living after the resurrection and before the Parousia.[185] It seems to make little difference that Paul lacks specificity as to whether Christ himself is constitutive of the hope (1 Thess 1:3; 4:13; 5:8; Col 1:5, 23, 27) or whether Christ is the basis for hope in God (Rom 4:18 *bis*; 5:2, 4, 5; 8:20; 12:12; 15:4, 13 *bis*; 1 Cor 9:10; 13:13; 2 Cor 3:12; 10:15; Gal 5:5; 2 Thess 2:16). "Hoping" is also closely connected with waiting for the "redemption of our body" (Rom 8:16-25). As Wieland puts it, "The content of ἐλπίς therefore is the hope of being reckoned worthy at the time of judgment and receiving eternal life."[186]

The greeting to Timothy is unique also in that the normal epistolary words "grace" (χάρις) and "peace" (εἰρήνη) are coupled this time with "mercy" (ἔλεος). The abundance of these words in the Pauline corpus makes clear that all three reflect standard Pauline soteriology. Grace is "the soteriological activity of God . . . . made . . . .effective in his salvation and Christ's

---

[183] Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 316. Verses cited include Jer 14:8; 17:13; Ps 43:3; 65:6; Sir 34:14; cf. *Pss. Sol*. 5:11; 15:1.

[184] In 2 Macc 7:14 "hope" is associated specifically with resurrection or the lack thereof for the unbeliever: "One cannot but choose to die at the hands of mortals and to cherish the hope [ἐλπίς] that God gives to being raised again by him. But for you there will be no resurrection to life." See also 2 Macc 3:19; 7:11, 14, 20, 34; 9: 20, 22; 4 Macc 11:7; 17:4. Similarly Wis 3:4 starkly contrasts the "hope of full immortality" of the just man with the "empty hope" of the ungodly man in Wis 3:18, assuming the reality of a final judgment.

[185] J. M. Everts, "Hope," *DPL,* 415-16.

[186] Wieland, *Significance of Salvation*, 29.

act of redemption and which continues to perfect the work of redemption in us."[187] χάρις in general connotes the beginning of salvation (i.e., the removal of the guilt associated with sin) but Paul's letters suggest more the exhortation to the continuation and perfection of "grace" in his hearers. Similarly εἰρήνη presupposes a state of friendship with God as well as the hope for an increase in "peace" both between God and the believer and within the Church as a whole.[188] Finally "mercy," which more generally refers to "compassion on the unfortunate," in Pauline preaching is always a salvation term (Rom 9:23; 11:31; Gal 6:16; Eph 2:4). "Grace," "peace" and "mercy" are not eschatological terms per se, yet they clearly presuppose the standard Pauline emphasis on present eschatology. Paul's audience in 1 Timothy has moved to a status and an age in which they are marked by having received from God "grace" and "mercy" and live at "peace" with him and with each other.[189] These facts are decisive for the (here unstated) future judgment and the charge to Timothy.

That Paul is thinking along these lines is confirmed by his autobiographical statement in 1:11-17. "Grace" and "mercy" are not merely banal greeting terms but are the sending upon Timothy and the audience the very marks of Paul's own transformation in Christ—itself marked by "grace" (1:14) and "mercy" (1:13, 16). The "then" and "now" transition which contextualizes Paul's autobiography is a common trope in the Pauline letters. It marks both the transition of the

---

[187] Gerhard Trenkler, "Grace," *Sacramentum Verbi: An Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology* (3 vols.; ed. Johannes Bauer; trans. from *Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch*; New York: Herder and Herder, 1970) 1:344.

[188] Stanley E. Porter, "Peace, Reconciliation," *DPL*, 695-99.

[189] Here I am assuming the *mandata principiis* framework offered by Johnson (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 97) in which theological claims and instructions directed to Timothy are meant also for the community at large.

ages in a more theological sense as well as the time of revelation of things previously hidden (Rom 16:26; 1 Cor 2:10; Gal 3:23; Col 1:26). Yet it also marks an analogous transition in which those who embrace the gospel leave behind their old patterns of life and adopt a new mode of living. This transition is a standby of Paul's preached message (cf. Rom 6:20-22; 11:30-32; Gal 1:23; Eph 2:1-22; 5:8; Col 1:21-22; 3:7-8; Phlm 11). For Christian believers, this eschatological and ethical transition from "then" to "now" has already been actualized. What is striking is that Paul individualizes the promises of the gospel, offering himself as an exemplar of its transforming power.[190] Paul himself was a "blasphemer," a "persecutor" and an "insolent man," who "acted unknowingly in unbelief." But all this was *"formerly"* (τὸ πρότερον, 1 Tim 1:13). The series of aorist tense verbs underscores the decisiveness of the fact of Paul's transformation. The apostle was "given mercy" (ἠλεήθην, 1:13,16) as "grace abounded [ὑπερεπλεόνασεν, 1:14] with faith and love in Christ Jesus," the very Christ Jesus who "empowered" (ἐνδυναμώσαντι, 1:12) him, and "considered [ἡγήσατο, 1:12] him faithful," and suitable "to be placed [θέμενος] in ministry."

Modern scholarship has puzzled over the connection between Paul's own example in 1:12-17 and the previous material containing his diatribe against the false teachers and what they represent in 1:3-11.[191] Scholars unconvinced by the supposition of a fragmentary and incoherent PE have the burden of explaining the transition. Most convincing is Johnson's observation that

---

[190] Dibelius and Conzelmann rightly see in it the familiar "once but now" preaching pattern in the form "I was once X, but now I am Y." However, in this case they insist on abstracting it from the eschatological framework it presupposes elsewhere in Paul. See Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 28.

[191] For Quinn (*First and Second Letters*, 122) it is an oddly placed thanksgiving prayer.

Paul rhetorically contrasts himself with the false teachers or alternatively likens his pre-conversion identity to them.[192] Both pre-conversion Paul and the false teachers were "blasphemers" (1:13, 20) and ignorant (1:7, 13). Besides, Paul acted in faithlessness (1:13) just as the teachers have shipwrecked their faith (1:19). And Paul's prior status as an "insolent man" may summarize the vice list in 1:9-10.

One function of the contrast is to highlight the degree to which Paul himself typifies the efficaciousness of the "sound teaching" of which he is both exponent and authoritative source. The essence of "sound teaching" is found in the confession of the gospel itself in 1:15, that "Christ came into the world to save sinners of whom I [Paul] am the first." "First of all sinners" is not an exaggerated confession of humility that even *after* receiving grace and apostleship, Paul remains mired in serious sin.[193] "First" indicates the progress of the gospel message: Paul has been saved by it but so also others *have been saved* and *will be saved* by the "sound teaching" that he echoes and embodies.[194] "First" implies there are others already saved and still more soon to be saved. The "have been saved" category surely includes Timothy as well as the

---

[192] Luke Timothy Johnson, "First Timothy 1,1-20: The Shape of the Struggle," in *1 Timothy Reconsidered* (ed. Karl Paul Donfried; Colloquium Oecumenicum Paulinum 18; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 18-39. Unconvincing is Towner's view (*Timothy and Titus*, 133) that Paul intends to establish his authority and apostolic pedigree against the false teachers in Ephesus—a reading which seems based much more on the function of Paul's autobiography in Galatians than material in this letter, where neither the apostle's status nor that of Timothy is ever in question.

[193] Contra Quinn, *First and Second Letters,*135. If "first of sinners" were intended to underscore rhetorically the depths from which Paul was rescued as "greatest" of all sinners, it would be far from clear why Paul would be speaking of himself in this manner with the present predication ἐιμί instead of the imperfect ἐμήν or the aorist ἐγένετο.

[194] Thus Michael Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (FRLANT 146; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988) 49-64, esp. 49-51, though Wolter's interpretation presupposes that a pseudepigrapher writing in Paul's name invokes the apostle as temporally "first" relative to the actual epistolary audience comprised of Christians of a later generation.

broader Ephesian epistolary audience—insofar as both hold fast to the doctrine. But the climax of Paul's self-description comes in 1:16. Paul was given mercy so that Christ Jesus might show "all patience" in him "first," so that the apostle might be an example not only to current believers but to those who were about to believe (τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν) for eternal life.

The orientation of Paul's rhetoric is—at least in part—missiological, directed to the progress of the gospel beyond the existing Church boundaries.[195] The false teachers and their doctrine oppose sound doctrine (1:3-4, 10-11) and thus hinder the spread of the gospel, which by its very nature diffuses centrifugally outward. The term "about to" (μέλλω) is common enough in the Pauline epistles to suppose it to have been a standard *theologoumemon* of the apostle and one always freighted with eschatological connotations.[196] Christ's coming into the world as Towner puts it, "is an event which broke in upon history from above, causing a disruption in the present age."[197] That there are some "about to believe" indicates the eschatological advance of the age of salvation and the increased importance of the present time and the pattern of conduct that issues from it. Paul's doxology in 1:17 sums it up with a three-fold rhetorical emphasis on the eschatological "ages": God is not simply "king" but the "king *of the ages*," whose reign is most felt in the age marked by faith, hope and love, and will be even more acutely felt in the age to come.

---

[195] Curiously even commentators who perceive the missionary thrust of 2:1-7 only a few verses later (see n. 206 below) make little of the implied missiology in this verse. And those who do think along these lines such as Wolter, ibid., 49-64, see only the present Church which was once "about to believe" being addressed by a pseudepigrapher.

[196] Rom 4:24; 5:14; 8:13, 18, 38; 1 Cor 3:22; Gal 3:23; 1 Thess 3:4; Eph 1:21; Col 1:27.

[197] Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction*, 64.

The above analysis sheds further light on the contrast between Paul and the false teachers. In a sense, the contrast is one of eschatological time. The false teachers belong to the former age as Paul once did, and thus have a different destiny than those transformed by the gospel. But the eschatology is not clear initially. At first blush, Paul seems to suggest that adhering to faith is its own reward since he claims in 1:5 that the purpose of his commands is a "love from a pure heart," "a good conscience" and "sincere faith." For Dibelius and Conzelmann this is a sign that a later pseudepigrapher has introduced *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* where the true Paul would have referenced the imminent judgment. But eschatology cannot be far from the author's mind since only a few verses later, Paul clearly associates "faith" and "love" with salvation and eternal life (1:15-16), just as the "faith" and "good conscience" seen in Timothy contrast with Hymenaeus and Alexander who are "handed over to Satan" (1:19-20). Moreover, the vice list in 1:9-11 is preceded by the reminder that the law is not established for the "just" but (by implication) the "unjust." But the term δίκαιος itself presupposes some notion of judgment in which the "unjust" will be convicted. It is the assumed future judgment against those who oppose sound teaching that makes the vice list intelligible. For these reasons, the view of Dibelius and Conzelmann must be judged unlikely. On the contrary, all indications are that "love from a pure heart" and "sincere faith" in 1:5 function as "faith" and "love" do in Paul's preaching more generally—as gifts of the Holy Spirit which "make a form of eschatological existence actually possible in the present."[198]

The first chapter of 1 Timothy furnishes two other possible indications that Paul raises

[198] R. Mohrlang, "Love," *DPL*, 576.

the issue of Timothy's response to the false teachers by way of continuing the salvation/hope matrix. Paul exhorts his delegate to "fight the good fight" (1:19), using a martial metaphor in a manner which anticipates his later use of a metaphor drawn from the gymnasium (4:6-8). The image of fighting is at odds with the supposedly bourgeois and de-eschatologized condition of the Church addressed by the letter. Quinn is right to see the martial metaphor as eschatological but mistaken to connect it to the tradition of Holy War.[199] Instead, it is of a piece with the broader tendency of Paul throughout his letters and preaching to interpret both apostolic struggles and those of the Church within the broader eschatological framework of a people both redeemed and awaiting future redemption.[200]

Finally the existence of named false teachers may be significant for another reason. Hymenaeus and Alexander are false teachers *within the Church* as evidenced by their disciplinary excommunication. Scholarship has generally concerned itself with reconstructing the precise doctrine of Hymenaeus and Alexander (assuming that the pair is not simply a literary creation of a pseudepigraher). But apart from whatever doctrine the two men might have held, the point may be that the *existence* of false teachers within the Church may itself be understood by Paul as a reminder of the eschatological time in which his audience finds itself. The mention of the names of Hymenaeus and Alexander reminds the audience of this. In light of the fact that

---

[199] Quinn, *First and Second Letters*, 151-52.

[200] To this effect, he uses not only martial terms such as "fellow-soldiers" (συστρατιώτης, Phil 2:25; Phlm 2) and "fighting," (στρατεύομαι, 2 Cor 10:1-6) but also "struggling,"(ἀγών/ἀγωνίζομαι, Phil 1:27-30; 1 Cor 9:19-27; Col 1:21–2:3; 4:10-14; 1 Thess 2:1-12; 1 Tim 6:11-16; 2 Tim 4:6-8) and suffering "affliction" (θλῖψις, Rom 5:1-5; 8:31-38; 12:12; 1 Cor 7:28; 2 Cor 1:3-12; 2:1-4; 4:16-17; 6:1-10; 7:1-4). Almost always these terms underscore the apostolic struggle in bringing about salvation or as part of a broader demand for behavior on the part of the Church in anticipation of future judgment and salvation.

the apostle cites the word concerning the emergence of false teaching as a sign of the "last times" later in 4:1, it is surprising that (to my knowledge) no commentator has suggested that Paul or his audience might be thinking of the eschatological significance of false teaching itself in 1:19-20, apart from the content of the teaching.

Summary of Eschatology in 1 Timothy 1

I have argued that it is eschatology rather than response to false teaching per se which binds the material in 1 Timothy 1. My reasons for this judgment are as follows: (1) Paul opens the letter with the unusual savior/hope designations for God and Christ respectively, in order to emphasize the current age between salvation and hope. (2) Grace, mercy and peace understood (1:2) within the preaching of Paul also serve to accent the apostle's present eschatology. (3) Paul's own conversion story is marked by the "formerly" and "now" pattern (1:12-13) by which Paul customarily contextualizes a person's coming to faith within the backdrop of the changing of eschatological ages. (4) Paul's conversion is also directed at those who are *about to* come to faith for eternal life (1:16), indicating that his ministry is also to be understood as a phenomenon within the current eschatological age. (5) The false teachers serve as rhetorical inversions of Paul's example (1:3-7, 18-19) and thus exemplify future failure in the imminent judgment for all who are guilty of the vices listed in 1:8-10. (6) The false teachers also serve to contrast the destinies of Timothy marked by "faith" and "good conscience" that leads to "eternal life" and Hymenaeus and Alexander who are handed over to Satan (1:18-19). (7) The heavy three-fold emphasis on the "ages" in the doxology in 1:17 also accents God in relation to eschatological time. (8) The fight (1:18) to which Paul exhorts Timothy seems connected to the realities of the

current eschatological age marked by struggle and strife. (9) The existence of false teachers in the Church (1:18-19) may itself be a reminder of eschatological oracles in the early Church (cf. 1 Tim 4:1) which predicted the emergence of this very phenomenon in advance of judgment.

My forthcoming contention is that "ransom" in 2:6 also must be understood within this savior/hope eschatological matrix.

Audience-Oriented Exegesis of 1 Tim 2:1-7

Translation

> [1]I therefore first of all urge that intercessions, prayers, petitions and thanksgivings be made for all people, [2]for kings and all those in authority, so that we might lead a quiet and peaceful life in all piety and seriousness. [3]This is good and acceptable before God our savior [4]who wishes all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.
>
> [5]For God is one
> And the mediator between God and people is one
> The person Christ Jesus
> [6]Who gave himself as a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for everyone.
> This is the testimony for these very times.
>
> [7]For which I was appointed herald and apostle (I speak the truth, I do not lie), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth. [201]

1 Tim 2:1-2: Prayers for All

Paul begins 2:1 with a command for all manner of prayers to be said: "petitions, prayers,

[201] Author's translation from NA[28]. A great deal of scribal activity is seen in attempting to clarify the sense of the ambiguous and asyndetic τὸ μαρτύριον in 2:6b. What is "the witness for these very times"? ℵ* reads καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον ἐν Χρίστῳ, while D*, F, G and Ambrosiaster have added οὗ ἐδόθη. Both are efforts to connect explicitly τὸ μαρτύριον to the self-surrender of Jesus in 2:6a. These divergent attempts to make sense of a difficult text strongly suggest the originality of the ambiguous τὸ μαρτύριον preserved in A.

intercessions and thanksgivings." Without further evidence, one cannot assume that these different types of prayer refer specifically to a liturgical or Eucharistic praxis.[202] The main point here is that the rhetorical repetition of synonymous terms underscores both the importance of the charge and the idea of *all kinds of prayers* for all peoples.

Grammatically this unit must be connected to the preceding material in 1 Timothy 1. The οὖν in 2:1 guarantees that the hearer knows that it is *because* of all that Paul has said up to now that he is now commanding prayers to be said. But it is not entirely clear why prayers "for all people, for kings and those in authority" should be the logical response to 1 Timothy 1. If one assumes that the placement of 2:1-7 is not another datum in favor of the hypothesis of the PE's incoherence, the exegetical challenge is to connect it to what comes before. Interpreters who have taken up the issue have mostly settled on the view that the prayers are a response to the false teaching.[203] The validity of this interpretation depends on the ability of scholarship to reconstruct the doctrine against which 1 Timothy is aimed. On the basis of what seems to be a faint echo of the dispute with the Judaizers, Witherington calls the opponents "Ephesian elitists."[204] Towner posits an "over-realized eschatology" based on a single verse (2 Tim 2:18)—a claim with which he combines the questionable assumption that this was the defining

---

[202] As does J. N. D. Kelly (*The Pastoral Epistles* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1960] 60). Benjamin Fiore (*The Pastoral Epistles* [SacPag 12; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007] 57) reminds us that prayer for Paul can be occasioned by an eschatological context. See e.g., Phil 4:5-7; Col 4:2, 12; cf. Eph 6:18.

[203] Fee (*1 and 2 Timothy, Titus,* 5) goes so far as to claim that the entire epistle is an effort to combat heresy.

[204] Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 1:170.

characteristic of the opposition to Paul in all three of the PE.[205]

Skepticism is warranted regarding these reconstructions as well as the exegetical value of the inference that the false teaching is a kind of mirror image of the universal prayer in 2:1-2a. In truth, much of the rhetoric directed at false teachers here and elsewhere in the epistle seems quite stereotypical and generic.[206] Moreover, the sins recorded in the vice list in 1:9-10 are indicative neither of "elitism" nor Judaizing, nor of an over-realized eschatology. And the view that the instruction in 2:1-2a to pray for "all people" is a kind of pastoral prophylaxis against a recrudescence of Jewish-Christian sectarianism utterly fails to explain why "kings" and "all who are in authority" should merit special intercessory consideration. If the point is simply to reinforce universalism that "all" should be saved rather than "some," why should the people of Ephesus direct special petitions for rulers?

If my argument above that the material in 1 Timothy 1 could be explained under the savior/hope matrix is correct, then that same framework ought to be operative here as well. Prayers for "all people" especially for "kings and all who are in authority" is precisely the appropriate behavior of a Church that finds itself in the current eschatological age, looking back upon salvation in the past while looking forward in hope to its consummation. Paul has not yet reminded his hearers of the explicit foundation for the universal prayer, but his threefold rhetorical emphasis on the word πάντων (first of "all" . . . pray "for all" . . . "for all in authority")

---

[205] Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction*, 28-45.

[206] See R. J. Karris, "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles," *JBL* 92 (1973) 549-64. For Quinn also (*First and Second Letters*, 16) the opponents have a "typological character." James D. G. Dunn (*The First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus* [NIB 11; Nashville: Abingdon, 2000] 791) suggests that the vagueness is intentional and of the "if-the-shoe-fits" variety.

is based first on the exigency of leading a life in "all godliness."

Furthermore it is Paul who connects his charge to Timothy in 2:1 not to the hypothetical doctrines of false teachers but *to the apostle's own example in 1:12-17*. The prayers to be said "first of all" (πρῶτον, 2:1) recall Paul's earlier (τὸ πρότερον, 1:13) career as a "blasphemer," "persecutor" and "insolent man," which lead to his current status as "first" (πρῶτος, 1:15) of saved sinners, in whom Christ had shown all his patience "first" (πρώτῳ, 1:16), as an example to *those who were about to believe*. "First" specifically recalls the progress of the gospel itself in the age of salvation. Paul's salvation and appointment to ministry were not merely events of the past but were fundamentally ones with a dynamism toward a future that includes even those who do not yet believe. The prayers of the Church are "for everyone" and especially "kings" and "those in authority" because they make up the ranks of potential future believers for whom Paul is an "example" (1:16) and for whom his ministry was established. Such prayers by the Church are an extension of that ministry. They are more missiological than prophylactic in orientation.[207]

At first glance, 1 Tim 2:2b would seem an obstacle to this reading, since the ἵνα clause there says nothing about the salvation of "all peoples" much less the salvation of rulers. Rather the charge is grounded in the desire that the Church might "live a peaceful and quiet life in all godliness and respectability." Far from missiological, the focus seems strangely pragmatic, even utilitarian. Taken in isolation, 2:2b even has a whiff of the sort of sectarianism one finds in an

[207] Thus Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 421-22 and Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 170. On the whole matter, see Chiao Ek Ho, "Mission in the Pastoral Epistles," 241-67, esp. 250-51. In a nod to the common reading however, Chiao notes that missionary work and prophylaxis are not necessarily mutually exclusive goals.

intentional community that seeks above all a life of holiness in isolation. It is little wonder that 2:2b was a major pillar of the *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* thesis of Dibelius.

There is no denying that the quiet tranquility of the Church is in view here.[208] But in Hellenistic Jewish parlance, "quiet" (ἡσύχιον) also can contain religious connotations.[209] For Philo, not only is ἡσυχία the proper disposition for receiving synagogue instruction (*Spec. 2:60-64*), he even describes the LXX translators as being quiet and still (ἐνεσυχάσαι καὶ ἐνερημῆσαι, *Mos. 2.36*). The Alexandrian even attributes these conditions to the leadership of a king (βασιλεύς, *Mos. 2.29-31*). This background is the first hint that "a peaceful and quiet life" is not an end within itself but rather a set of conditions conducive to the success of the gospel.

Confirmation of this comes in Paul's other word choices in 2:2b. "Leading" (διάγω) a peaceful and quiet life carries connotations of the visible life.[210] And leading a life "in all godliness and respectability" seems also to bear this outward, visible sense. Εὐσέβεια in Hellenistic ethical thought is centered upon the idea of a passive attitude of reverence for rulers. Yet if the LXX is any guide, Greek-speaking Jews also understood the term in the context of "fear of the Lord" (Prov 1:7; Isa 11:2; 33:6) or in the rejection of sin (Sir 13:17; 33:14), the commitment to the law (37:12), the knowledge of God (43:33), and the response to the covenant (49:3). Moreover in intertestamental works such as 4 Maccabees, the term encompasses all

---

[208] Spicq, "ἡσυχάζω, etc.," *TLNT* 2:178-83.

[209] Thus Wieland (*Significance of Salvation*, 53-54) who notes several parallels to Philo here.

[210] See Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 116.

manner of fervent, Torah-based piety up to and including martyrdom.[211] For Paul the term represents the analogous "godliness" of living out the Christian life.

"Respectability" (σεμνότης) is also an outward virtue deriving from observable conduct.[212] It has a well-known secular sense in Hellenistic parlance but Greek-speaking Jews also attached religious "respectability" to the example of Maccabean martyrs (2 Macc 6:28; 4 Macc 5:36). For Paul the term denotes the way in which Christians present themselves in public. The premise is that the σεμνότης that flows from a life of faith and love will earn the respect also of those who are outside. Like "godliness," "respectability" is a secular term which Paul, following the Hellenistic Jewish tradition, drafts into theological service.

1 Tim 2:3-4: Rationale for Prayers for All

When Paul writes "this is noble and acceptable before God our savior," "this" may refer either to the universal prayers for rulers in 2:1 or to the quiet and peaceful life in godliness and respectability, since both actions are in keeping with God's universal saving will (2:4). Both the prayers of the Church and the "quiet and peaceful life" are ordered to the spread of the gospel.

The "good and acceptable before God" phrase contains a powerful LXX resonance by which Paul constructs an analogy between behavior within the OT cult and the life and prayer of the Church. Just as the former sacrifices of Israel were "acceptable" (δέκτος) before Yhwh so

---

[211] 4 Maccabees uses the term 47 times in its celebration of martyrs, not counting 17 uses of cognates such as εὐσεβεῖν and εὐσεβής. Philo also considers it the source of virtues (*Spec. 4.135, 147*), yet always connected to Torah. See W. Forster, "εὐσέβεια," *TDNT* 7:180-81.

[212] Spicq, "σεμνός, etc.," *TLNT* 3:248.

also are the prayers and respectable living today.[213] The phrase "good and acceptable before God" also echoes the stereotyped phrase in the LXX Deuteronomy "good and pleasing before God" to depict a much broader range of acceptable conduct including what is outside the cult.[214]

This is not the first time the apostle has invoked the LXX in 1 Timothy. The astute auditor has from the very first verse heard God described as "savior," an epithet repeated here in 2:4. Some have suggested a background for σωτήρ either as a counter-claim to Hellenistic mystery religions or even as a hidden polemic against the imperial cult.[215] But Wieland is correct that the most plausible background for σωτήρ is the OT's use of the term as a predicate for Yhwh especially in later books.[216] When the divine σωτήρ is possessed by anyone or the object of his saving activities is spelled out, he can be "our" savior (Ps 78/79:9; 94/95:1) but most commonly is "my" savior (Ps 24/25:5; 26/27:1, 9; 61/62:2; 64/65:5; Sir 51:1; Mic 7:7; Isa 12:2; 17:10).[217] Paul however balances the particularism of "our savior" in 2:3 with God's universal saving desire in 2:4. The fourth use of "all" in the span of four verses indicates heavy

---

[213] Exod 28:38 LXX; Lev 1:3 cf. 1:4; 17:4; 19:5; 22:19, 20; 23:11.

[214] See e.g., Deut 12:28, "τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἀρεστὸν ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ σου" (cf. Deut 12:25; 13:19; 21:9).

[215] For the background of mystery religions, see e.g., Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 101-2. For the background of the imperial cult, see e.g., Malcolm Gill, *Jesus as Mediator: A Study of the Cultural Understanding of the Role of Mediator in First Century Asia Minor and Its Implications for the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:1-7* (Ph.D. diss.; Dallas Theological Seminary, 2007). Against these, Quinn notes rightly that, "Only a minimal foothold for the usage of the PE has appeared in the data from the imperial cult and the oriental mysteries." See "Jesus as Savior and Only Mediator (1 Tim 2:3-6): Linguistic Paradigms of Enculturation," in *Fede E Cultura Alla Luce della Bibbia: Atti della Sessione Plenaria 1979 della Pontificia Commissione Biblica* (ed. J. D. Barthélemy; Turin: Editrice Elle di Ci, 1981) 251.

[216] Wieland, *Significance of Salvation*, 23-24. Of the 37 appearances of σωτήρ, all but two are predicated of God himself.

[217] "Your" savior (Bar 4:22) and "his" savior (Deut 32:15) are also attested.

rhetorical emphasis by Paul on the latter universal idea in 2:4.

But the Septuagintal support specifically for the idea of a savior of all people is scant. Only in Wis 16:7 do we read of God as a σωτὴρ πάντων which precedes the description in Wis 16:12 of a God whose word heals "all people" (πάντας). But given that the section is a creative gloss on the story of serpent-bitten Israel in the wilderness, it is not clear that truly universal salvation is envisaged. It is more likely that Ps 64:5 LXX is the background. Here we find a God "our savior" in parallel with "hope of all the ends of the earth" which not only recalls the σωτήρ/ἐλπίς framework which began the epistle (1:1) and has helped to frame the material up to now, but also is one LXX passage that intimates a broader scope for the divine savior's salvific activities.[218]

1 Tim 2:5-6a: Paul's Traditional Formula

The formula is connected to the previous verse by γάρ. How one interprets the particle γάρ in 2:5 depends in part on how 2:4 is construed. To be saved is tantamount to come to the knowledge of the truth as the καί that separates σωθῆναι from εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν functions epexegetically. Coming to the knowledge of the truth is, for Paul, constitutive of salvation. This is evident in Paul's own case who, prior to being saved, acted "not knowing" and in "unbelief" (1:13). And Paul's own knowledge finds an object in the confessional πιστὸς ὁ λόγος formula in 1:15. That Paul wishes to draw the audience back to himself as a prototype for "being saved" is confirmed by the use of the aorist infinitive ἐλθεῖν, which immediately precedes

[218] There are other passages which hint at universal salvation (e.g., Ps 22/21 LXX: 27-31; 33/32:13-22; 65/64:5; 67/66:4; 72/71:8-19; 86/85:9; 117/116:1-2) and at universal judgment (e.g., Ps 96/95:13; 98/97:9; 105/104:7).

the introduction of the one God one mediator formula. Christ *came* (ἦλθεν) into the world (1:15) to save sinners and this is so that all might *come* (ἐλθεῖν) to the knowledge of the truth (2:4). The "came into the world" formulation seems Johannine and is without exact parallel elsewhere in Paul, but still can be explained as an essentially Pauline adaptation of the logion in Mark 10:45.[219] Just as Paul concretized the word of the gospel into a formula (Christ came into the world to save sinners. . . .) so now he concretizes for the audience the very truth that God wishes all people to know—namely that God is one and the mediator between God and man is one. Paul's personalized confessional formula in 1:15 stands in parallel to the more public formula of 2:5-6. The audience was just reminded that Paul's conversion produced not just a saved sinner but a minister (1:12) and an example of Christ's patience for those who are soon to believe (1:16). It is for this reason that γάρ in 2:5 may be understood epexegetically meaning "indeed" or "namely."[220] The formula in 2:5-6 is the substance of the "truth" of which God wishes all people to know.

Nevertheless, it seems difficult to exclude interpreting γάρ in the more familiar sense of "because."[221] Paul undeniably uses causal γάρ elsewhere.[222] Besides, the confessional formula

---

[219] In fact, it is more likely that the "came into the world" formulation parallels the "ransom" formula in 2:5-6 in that both are related to Mark 10:45 in which Jesus says, "The Son of Man came [ἦλθεν]…to give his life as a ransom for many," as I will discuss in greater detail below.

[220] So Quinn, *First and Second Letters,* 165. See also BDAG, s.v. γάρ, esp. s. 2, 189. A. T. Robertson cautions against always reading γάρ as causative and suggests trying the epexegetical sense first. See *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914) 1189-90. Dibelius and Conzelmann (*The Pastoral Epistles*, 41-42) hint at this reading as well.

[221] Thus Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 179; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 428; Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 120; Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 28.

[222] E.g., Rom 1:9; 1 Cor 11:5 and otherwise "often" according to BDAG (ibid., 189).

concludes with the peroration "ransom for all people" which is natural to connect back to the will of God to save "all people" in 2:4. In this reading, 2:5-6 functions as the theological grounding for the command to pray and we have an example of indicative-imperative rhetoric at work. The times themselves dictate adherence to the gospel but the gospel takes the particular universal shape that it does *because* of the nature of God and the nature of Christ and his redemption. To paraphrase, it is "because God is one and the mediator between God and man is one who gave himself as a ransom for all, that I, Paul, want you to pray for all." The formula serves as the very basis of why everyone should be the object of prayer. Γάρ then does double duty in Paul's rhetorical maneuver. It grounds the cause of the prayers for everyone in the causal sense of "for." And it also acts epexegetically as "namely" since Paul wishes also to concretize the truth in a formulaic way, the truth of 2:5-6 that those whom God wishes to save should come to know.

Now we address the content of our formula beginning with the first line: God is one. The "one God" formula draws ultimately upon the *Šᵉma* in Deut 6:5, the most famous declaration of Biblical monotheism. Here εἷς θεός may be taken in the broader theological sense of God's indivisibility, his numerical oneness or his transcendent incomparability. It is by no means clear however that Paul really intends to ground God's universal saving will upon his oneness.[223] In fact, few commentators have remarked after all that the εἷς θεός formula figured so prominently

---

[223] One gets the impression in the secondary literature that many commentators have been influenced by the "oneness" argument in the discussion about justification in Rom 3:21-31, where Paul argues that one means of justification should be the same for Jews as well as Gentiles because the one God is God to both. Minto points out however that the argument there is more nuanced and that christology there too plays a key role in tying together that dense passage. See Andrew L. Minto, *1 Timothy 2:1-7 and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Ph.D. diss.; Catholic University of America, 1999) 48.

in the Deuteronomist theology—not, of course, to make Israel's God more cosmopolitan and internationally palatable—but to reinforce Israel's exclusivism! A God who is incomparable, fittingly raises up worshippers who are analogously incomparable through God's election and who through "knowledge of the truth" have a privileged access to him. It is hard to see then how εἷς θεός by itself serves as an argument against a putative Jewish exclusivism.[224]

But Paul's theology in 1 Timothy is really intended to buttress his christology. *God's* gospel with which Paul is entrusted in 1:11 finds expression in what Christ has done: he found Paul faithful (1:12); appointed him minister (1:12); came into the world to save sinners (1:15); bestowed mercy and grace on Paul (1:14; 1:16). The work of Christ is complete enough to end it with a doxology to the "only God" (1:17). And this pattern was suggested in 1:1 when God as "our savior" was complemented and confirmed by "Christ Jesus our hope." "God is one" is not itself the reason that God is a universal savior. Much as God as σωτὴρ ἡμῶν is a more common expression that leads to and accentuates the unexpected designation of Jesus as ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν, so also εἷς θεός is a stock formula that highlights the astonishing title for Jesus "one mediator between God and people, the man Christ Jesus (2:5)." Paul never describes Jesus as μεσίτης elsewhere in his corpus and has done little to prepare the hearer for it at this stage in 1 Timothy. Indeed were he following the logic of the *Šᵉma,* as in his "one God . . . one Lord" statement in 1 Cor 8:6, he ought to have referred to Jesus Christ as εἷς κύριος here instead of εἷς μεσίτης. For this reason, it is by no means clear that Son of God christology is really implied in this

[224] William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000) 77.

formula.[225]

There are of course more explicitly theological aspects to mediation available to Paul. Oepke catalogues a number of them though none really seems to lie behind 1 Tim 2:6.[226] This is problematic since the concept of mediation is important. Though the term scarcely occurs in the LXX, Oepke nevertheless contends that "mediatorship is at the heart of OT religion."[227] Paul's unexplained εἷς μεσίτης is even more perplexing, since the general concept of mediation is, if anything, even more central to NT religion. In what sense is Jesus "mediator?"

Paul's notion of Jesus as μεσίτης is based on two elements. He is the mediator between God and people *because* (1) he is a person and (2) he has given himself as a ransom for all people. In other words, Jesus' mediatorship is based on who he is and what he has done, two facts already known to the audience and set forth again here by Paul by way of reinforcement. As for the ἄνθρωπος aspect of "mediator," Jesus as ἄνθρωπος in 2:6 looks back only two verses to 2:4 when God himself had desired salvation for πάντας ἀνθρώπους. Christ has achieved in his person the foundation of a new relationship between God and human beings. Paul's doctrine of

---

[225] Contra Andrew Lau, *Manifest in Flesh* (WUNT 2/86; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996) 81.

[226] Anthony Oepke, "μεσίτης," *TDNT* 4:604; 617-18. The LXX in Job 9:33 had used the term to bemoan the absence of someone to officiate between man and God. Anthony Hanson unconvincingly posits Job 9:33 as the main background here ("The Mediator: 1 Timothy 2:5-6," in *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* [London: S.P.C.K., 1968] 56-64). Philo had made considerable use of μεσίτης and cognates in his voluminous speculations about the existence of various cosmic and angelic intermediaries between God and human beings. The Mithra cult and other Greco-Roman religions also made liberal use of the term in their various mediatorial theologies. See also *T. Dan* 6:2 concerning angelic mediators which might have influenced Paul himself in Gal 3:19-20. The term is predicated elsewhere of Christ (Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24) but with reference specifically to priestly sacrifice and thus not at issue in 1 Tim 2:5-6.

[227] Ibid., 614. See also David De Lacey, "Jesus as Mediator," *JSNT* 29 (1987) 101-21.

universal salvation is revealed to have a more christological than a theological basis. To be sure, it is the humanity of Jesus and not his masculinity that empowers his mediation.[228] And this would suggest a model of mediation analogous to what Paul argued in Rom 5:15 (without using the term μεσίτης) when he described "the one man Jesus Christ" as the new Adam.[229] The idea is one man through his act of obedience who affects the destiny of "many" or "all" other people.

But more can be made of Jesus as ἄνθρωπος as it concerns human mediation. We know that μεσίτης in ordinary speech had the general sense of a "go-between" who serves as a judge or even "umpire" or else brokers a relationship between two or more estranged parties where one did not previously exist.[230] But there is another aspect to mediator in Greco-Roman parlance which is not religious per se but *economic* as one "who intervenes in business transactions as a negotiator or broker."[231] This mediatorial activity might consist of brokering treaties or of "standing surety" by serving as the guardian of oaths, contracts or deposits. A mediator might either formally "recognize the existence of a debt" or be "present for the paying of a sum of money."[232]

If this understanding applies here, one is not "mediator" primarily through membership in

---

[228] So Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy,* 192.

[229] Thus Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 29; Stettler, *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*, 68.

[230] Oepke, "μεσίτης," 598-624.

[231] Spicq, "μεσίτης," *TLNT* 2:466. Lorenz Oberlinner goes so far as to see subordinationist christology in the designation of Jesus as ἄνθρωπος. See *Die Pastoralbrief. Erste Folge. Kommentar zum Ersten Timotheusbrief* (HTKNT 11; Freiberg: Herder, 1994) 70. There is solidarity between Jesus and God as well but mainly through the term Χρίστος or God's anointed.

[232] Spicq, "μεσίτης," *TLNT* 2:466.

each of the separated parties whose affairs one mediates. One is mediator primarily through the transactional nature of the intermediary action. Mediation *can be*, in other words, what "ransom" *is*: an economic concept. It is the notion of "payment" that binds "mediator" and "ransom" together. Fittingly both the action of "giving" and doing so as "ransom" underscore the sense of μεσίτης as an economic actor whose remittance not only settles the metaphorical "debt" between the two parties but who also acts as "surety" to confirm that the debt in fact has been paid. This is why the primary sense of mediation that Paul envisions here is found in Christ's act of self-donation—recorded in the formula ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν. The self-surrender of Jesus is the conceptual bridge that connects the divergent senses of "mediator" and "ransom." The mediation Jesus effects is to serve as the ransom price, a price which has potentially universal redemptive effects. The idea is not so much that as "sole valid representative of both parties. . . . the God-Man was, so to speak, born to be the Peacemaker."[233] Rather, the idea is that, as in the analogy of human mediation, Christ's self-donation remitted humanity's debt while simultaneously acting as proof that the debt had been paid.

The Ransom Logion

The phrase ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν is likely indigenous to Paul's standard preaching as reflected by the corpus of his letters.[234] The aorist participle δούς referring to Jesus' self-surrender also recalls antithetically Paul's giving over (παραδοῦναι) to Satan the false teachers Hymenaeus and

---

[233] Ibid., 2:468.

[234] The phrase appears in Gal 1:4, 2:20 and Eph 5:2 with only small variations in the form of the verb δίδωμι used and the object of the self-giving. Curiously in Gal 2:20 Paul himself is the object of Christ's donation while in Gal 1:4, and Eph 5:2 Christ's self-surrender is for sinners.

Alexander. This suggests that the "all" whom God wishes to be saved just as the "all" for whom Christ is ransom reflects a universality of desire and intent but not (necessarily) of actuality.

In the second and final phrase of the formula ἀντίλυτρον ὑπερ πάντων, Paul moves his hearers to the final step in his "one for all theology."[235] Jesus Christ's identity as "one mediator" is explained in that "he gave himself as a ransom for all." The self-surrender is revealed finally to constitute an ἀντίλυτρον or ransom with the focus not so much on redemption in the abstract but upon the concrete "price" necessary to effect the redemption. The striking similarity of 2:6 to Mark 10:45 which reads, "The Son of Man did not come [ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν] to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many [δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν]," has prompted a great deal of speculation as to the precise relationship between Paul's formula and the ransom logion in Mark.[236]

Whatever the means by which the saying was appropriated, it can be demonstrated that Paul's formula is more Greek and less Semitic, with differences that seem to correspond to shifts in emphasis.[237] Following the tendency of NT authors to reserve the "Son of Man" title for Jesus' self-designation, Paul calls him simply ἄνθρωπος. The purposive aorist infinitive δοῦναι becomes the aorist participle δούς to emphasize the fact of Jesus Christ's self-surrender. The verb ἦλθεν is not used here, but this may be due to the fact that Paul *already* made use of ἦλθεν

[235] Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 193.

[236] For example, for Guthrie (*The Pastoral Epistles* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957] 67) it is an "echo," for Kelly (*Pastoral Epistles*, 63) it is a "free version," while for Lock (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* [New York: Scribner, 1924] 28) it is a "reminiscence."

[237] Here I follow Roloff (*Der Erste Brief an Timotheus,* 111) who conducts a thorough tradition-critical analysis of the verse.

in the previous christological formula in 1:15. The Semitically accented "his life" (τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ) becomes the more Hellenistic ἑαυτόν. And perhaps most significantly, the phrase ἀντὶ πολλῶν becomes ὑπὲρ πάντων while λύτρον is written as ἀντίλυτρον. The distinctions between λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν in Mark 10:45 and ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων merit consideration *seriatim*.

The differences between ὑπέρ and ἀντί are subtle while there is considerable semantic overlap between them. Both can mean "on behalf of" or "for" "in the process of intervention" or in the context of an activity "for the sake of something or someone else."[238] Yet ἀντί also carries the sense of equivalence in the context of an exchange or substitution that ὑπέρ lacks. For this reason, the term ἀντίλυτρον—a compound of ἀντί and λύτρον—seems to mean "ransom-substitute" or, better still, "ransom-exchange." The latter meaning is preferable since the term λύτρον, as we have seen above in Chapter Two, often suggests the actual payment of money or something valuable which results in freedom. The compound itself is a biblical hapax and is rare even in secular literature. Its use here follows upon the transactional aspect of Christ's human mediation. The self-offering is an exchange "for all," though I will explore below the question of how the "ransom-exchange" relates to the intercessory prayers of the Church (2:1) which also are "for all." The "ransom-exchange" is entirely metaphorical as it usually was in the LXX.

The most salient difference between 2:6a and Mark 10:45 is the broadening scope of the ransom from "many" to "all" who are identified as its potential beneficiaries. It should not

[238] BDAG, s.v. ἀντὶ, s. 3, 87-88; ὑπέρ, 1030-31.

immediately be assumed however that this change is theologically significant.[239] Rom 5:12-21 at several junctures seems to waver indiscriminately between "many" and "all" who are affected both by Adam's sin and Christ's obedience (cf. 1 Cor 15:22; 2 Cor 5:14-15). But the context here is one in which the scope of both the Church's prayer and God's saving will are at issue. The universalism seems really founded on Paul's notion of "ransom," since "ransom for all" is the final term in the universality of the passage.[240] Moreover, the repetition of "all" in the passage suggests a deliberate point of emphasis and not simply a Hellenization of what sometimes appears as an Aramaism elsewhere in Paul. And if it is true that the "many" in Mark who are the beneficiaries of ransom derives from the Suffering Servant in Isa 53:12 as many commentators think, then it seems probable that in 2:6a some other source or background for the idea is in play.[241] I will investigate this question below.

1 Tim 2:6b-7: Paul, the Church and the Testimony for These Times

The final phrase in 2:6 τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις is both asyndetic and grammatically ambiguous. The lack of a coordinating conjunction makes it difficult to evaluate the precise function of the phrase in the flow of the argument. Μαρτύριον is a legal term denoting the "confirmation of facts" or of the "demonstration of . . . the correctness of an assertion."[242] Who

[239] See e.g., Jeremias ("Das Lösengeld für viele," 260) who contends that πολλῶν is a Semiticism of πάντων and thus functionally equivalent to "all."

[240] This is despite the fact that Paul *could* have grounded universal salvation in the LXX without referencing the "ransom" concept. See n. 49 above.

[241] E.g., Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 111.

[242] H. Strathmann, "μάρτυς, etc.," *TDNT* 4:485.

is doing the "witness" and what is the relationship of τὸ μαρτύριον to what comes before? Some hold that the self-donation of Christ as ransom for all is constitutive of and appositional to the "witness"—in this case construing τὸ μαρτύριον as the "testimony" to or "proof" of God's saving power which occurred in "due time."[243] In this reading, Jesus' ransom for all bears witness to God's desire to save all. But though Jesus Christ with the verb μαρτύρειν is mentioned once later in the letter (6:13), the reading here wrongly supposes that the universality of salvation is something which Paul is marshaling arguments to *demonstrate*. A related objection can be leveled against Hanson's view that it is God himself using Christ's self-surrender as his own "testimony" to his desire to save all.[244] It seems mistakenly based on the analogy of Rom 3:25-26 where Paul actually was arguing that God was demonstrating his own righteousness. But the context here is not a *demonstratio* of the universality of salvation but the conduct of the Church in its life of prayer. The Church is to pray for all precisely because the scope of the ransom is "for all."

More probable is the view that the "testimony" refers back to the "truth" in 2:4 forming a kind of *inclusio* which frames the confessional material in 2:5-6a—material which is the constitutive part of Paul's apostolic ministry to which he alludes in 2:7. Τὸ μαρτύριον in this reading is the apostolic witness of Paul which is the gospel message itself summed up in 2:5-

---

[243] E.g., Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 1:215; Fiore, *Pastoral Epistles*, 61; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 43; Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 61. See also Knight (*Pastoral Epistles*, 125), and Oberlinner (*Kommentar zum Ersten Timotheusbrief,* 76) who each contend that the "witness" is both the action of Jesus and the apostolic proclamation concerning it.

[244] Anthony Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 69; see also Kelly (*The Pastoral Epistles*, 65) who contends that τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις should be translated "bearing testimony in God's good time."

6a.[245] Though it does not contain an explicit account of the resurrection, it does recapitulate the story of Jesus as the one mediator giving himself as a ransom for all. And the phrase καιροῖς ἰδίοις underscores the focus on the eschatological age, a focus which I argued above began with the mention of God as savior and Jesus as hope in 1:1. The strength of this reading is that Paul's "witness" coincides with his role as teacher of the Gentiles in "faith" and "truth," two terms which recall respectively the "faithful" saying in 1:15 and the "truth" given in 2:4-6a. Paul's self-description as teacher of Gentiles, in other words, deliberately recalls the content of his public teaching given in two prior formulas. It is plausible then to understand "witness" as referring to Paul's teaching itself.

The difficulty with this reading, however, is that it tends to forget that the passage began not to relay another formulation of the gospel but as a charge to the Church to pray. Indeed it is little noted that τὸ μαρτύριον is preceded by ὑπὲρ πάντων which recalls not Paul's witness but *that of the Church in her prayers* (2:1). The above reading makes the passage much more about the content of the gospel and Paul's appointment to preach it thus rendering the prayers of the Church as something of a digression rather than the main idea being communicated. It might be better for this reason to take τὸ μαρτύριον as a reference to *the Church's* prayerful testimony to the universality of God's salvation, a testimony which Paul himself, as apostle and herald and teacher to the Gentiles, is helping to bring about with the command announced in 2:1. The testimony consists of prayer for all and a quiet life in godliness and respectability. The attractiveness of this reading is that it incorporates the Church much more tightly into the logic

[245] Thus Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 433; Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus,* 123; Quinn, *First and Second Letters*, 187; Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 186.

of the pericope.[246] This interpretation need not even entail a total rejection of the previous one which assigned the "witness" to Paul. The prayers of the Church as μαρτύριον could even be understood to be the living manifestation of Paul's own "testimony" summarized in 1:15 and 2:5-6a.

Whether the "witness" belongs to the Church or to Paul himself, the apostle has clearly been placed (by God) to bring it about. Indeed, Paul in 2:7 recalls the title "apostle," with which he opened the letter in 1:1 but not before coupling it with the term "herald" (κῆρυξ), a hapax for Paul, though the apostle does frequently speak of himself as "preaching" (κηρύσσειν).[247] "Teacher of the Gentiles" echoes such material in the other letters (e.g., Rom 15:16; Gal 1:16; 1 Thess 2:16) but here it is striking language which underscores again the role of Paul and his audience as missionaries. "Gentiles" here parallels "all people" as the object of the Church's prayer (2:1-2) and of God's salvific will (2:4).

Exegetical Results for 1 Tim 2:1-7

If the above exegesis is correct, the material in 2:1-7 might be paraphrased accordingly: "I Paul, am urging you in the Church to pray for everyone, especially rulers and leaders, so that the Church may lead a life that is quiet and also pious and respectable. This is so that those on the outside might be saved and learn the truth that, just as God is one, so also is Jesus Christ the one mediator between God and human beings who is so named because he gave himself as a ransom for everyone. This is the Church's witness for this age which I, Paul, have been

[246] Indeed Towner (*The Goal of Our Instruction*, 83), while contending the "witness" is that of Christ, is more careful than many commentators to relate the witness back to the activities of the Church.

[247] Rom 10:8, 14, 15; 1 Cor 1:23; 9:27; 15:11; 2 Cor 4:5; 11:4; Gal 2:2; 5:11; 1 Thess 2:9; cf. 1 Tim 3:16.

appointed apostle, herald and teacher of the Gentiles to bring about."

Excursus on the Ransom Logion

Romans as a Source

But questions remain about the passage's universality and why this universality is grounded in "ransom." Commentators who have attempted to probe more deeply into the universal soteriology of 1 Tim 2:1-7 have often concluded that the apostle (or more likely a pseudepigrapher writing in Paul's name) has simply borrowed from ideas presented in Romans, in which case the curious scholar can simply pursue his line of inquiry there. This source critical model applied specifically to "redemption" has a certain surface plausibility.[248] After all, "redemption" as it is presented in that letter is closely associated with the theme of universality. In Rom 3:22-26, grace is a free gift through "redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσις) which gives justification "to all who believe" (εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας). Likewise in Rom 8:18-25 the "redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσις) for which "our body" eagerly awaits in some mysterious way parallels the anxious expectation of the entire creation. Did Paul (or a pseudepigrapher under the alternative authorial hypothesis) simply borrow this motif from Romans? If so, pursuing the background here might prove superfluous.

But as a matter of fact, "redemption" in Rom 3:21-26 is unsatisfactory either as an explanatory background or as a source of "ransom" in 1 Tim 2:6a. The similarities between the

[248] A number of scholars have referred to Rom 3:21-31 as the source for ideas and terms in 1 Tim 2:1-7 including "ransom." See Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 122; Fiore, *Pastoral Epistles*, 61; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 43 n. 50; Stettler, *Die Christologie der Paulusbriefe*, 71. Minto (*1 Timothy 2:1-7 and Paul's Letter to the Romans,* 54-93) presents a detailed argument for literary dependence of the author of 1 Tim 2:1-7 on Rom 3:21-31.

two usages are much less salient than the divergences. It is significant that ἀπολύτρωσις and ἀντίλυτρον are cognate terms but this only draws attention to how differently they are used in the respective letters. Paul uses ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom 3:23—a more abstract term—because his argument is more abstract. Just as sin has spread to both Jews and Gentiles (1:18–3:21), so both groups are justified by faith. Or just as "all men both Jews and Gentiles" are "under sin" (3:9, cf. 3:23), so "redemption" comes to all who believe. The goal in Romans is (in part) comity in the Church between Jewish and Gentile members to be achieved with a theology that insists that the appropriation of the benefits of justification and redemption be the same for both groups. Redemption in Rom 3:24 is thus abstract because it is as much ecclesiological as soteriological and christological since Paul emphasizes that it affects potentially the "all" who sinned (3:23), whom we have already learned are "all, both Jews and Greeks" who in fact are "under sin" (3:9).

And this leads to another significant difference. The universality in Rom 3:21-26 is of a different species altogether than the universality in 1 Tim 2:1-7. The "all" Romans envisages really amounts to "both types of people that comprise humanity, Jews as well as Greeks." And the thrust of the argument concerns truths about *existing* believers of both types not *potential* ones. The "universality" of Rom 3:21-26 (where "redemption" is mentioned) is of a particular sort, directed to "all believers" represented by the audience of the Roman Church—not so much to "all human beings."[249] Likewise the universality of redemption in Rom 8:18-25 surely in

[249] Of course "all human beings" is used in Rom 5:18 for instance, in a passage that I argued above has some echoes with the "one for all" logic of 1 Tim 2:5-6. Nevertheless the broader context remains very particularistic in that it emphasizes the common Adamic pedigree to reinforce the theme of the common justification by the one man Jesus Christ of *current Christians* in Rome and elsewhere. It is no accident that the material in Rom 5:12-21 is sandwiched between "we" sections in Rom 4:1– 5:11 and Romans 6, where "we" is made up of Jewish and Christian believers.

some way includes "all creation" (8:22) which will be "set free from bondage to decay" (8:19, 21, 22). But it too is particularistic, centering around "our body" which serves as the future redemption's focal point (8:23).

This contrasts sharply with the "all people" especially "all rulers" who are the objects of prayer, the "all" whom God wishes to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. The "all people" surely includes Timothy and the Ephesian Church and especially Paul who is the example of salvation by being saved in the past. But the accent necessarily falls on potential future believers of the sort mentioned in 1 Tim 1:16. *Future* potential believers are also in view in the "all" who benefit from the "ransom" in 2:6a. But the future believers are only potentially affected by the concrete self-surrender of the man Jesus Christ. This is why the "ransom" spoken of in 2:6a is not exactly like present redemption in Rom 3:24 nor like future redemption in 8:23. To be sure, it is like present redemption in that it is grounded in the past fact of the self-surrender of Jesus which parallels the "expiation through his blood" put forth by God (3:25). But it is different in that the "ransom's" objects are spoken of as a potential "all" rather than an actual "all believers." The ransom's effects are not mentioned in 1 Tim 2:5-6a but they too are wholly theoretical for future believers. Unlike both present redemption and future redemption, "ransom" occupies a middle ground, neither containing a realized eschatology nor a future one, but with an eschatology characterized as incipient and unfolding according to the success of the Church's and Paul's mission.

This might further explain why Paul opted in 2:6a for "ransom-exchange" with the more concrete term ἀντίλυτρον instead of the more abstract word ἀπολύτρωσις. As we have seen, 1

Tim 2:1-7 is not so much a theological *argument* given to abstractions as a pastoral *exhortation* given to concrete realities. The Church is being enjoined to pray in a manner that furthers the mission with which Paul was entrusted. The final term in the exhortation is "ransom-exchange for all" which both is concrete and suggestive of actual money, as if to encourage the Church that the self-gift of Jesus Christ has placed sufficient funds at the Church's disposal to "purchase" the freedom of everyone.

"Redemption" in Romans as a source or background for the use of "ransom" in 2:6a therefore is unsatisfactory. For this reason, it is worth probing further into the matter of the passage's universality and the connection of that theme with ἀντίλυτρον. The potentially universal scope of salvation depends ultimately not upon the oneness of God but upon the "one mediator" who is ransom "for all." But how are the concepts of ransom and universality connected and what background is being assumed? Similarly it is time to revisit a question posed above but only partially answered: How do the prayers "for all people" and especially "for kings and all those in authority" relate to "ransom," or is it just a happy coincidence for Paul that all these things happen to have a universal scope?

Messianic Ideas as Background

One possibility is that Paul has combined the notions of Messiah and redeemer to posit Jesus as Christ and therefore as mediator of redemption.[250] It has been suggested in secondary literature that Paul's notion of the Messiah is as the representative of everyone, since Messiah is

[250] Such a possibility is entertained by De Lacey, "Jesus as Mediator," 108.

the one in whom all the people of God are summed up.[251] To the extent this is true, the Messiah can be said to be a mediator of sorts for all people, or at least all people who belong to God. Perhaps then it is Paul's idea of *Messiah* rather than *ransom* that is the true basis for universalism. But if the surviving texts of Second Temple Judaism are any indication, there is little or nothing to suggest that the Messiah was ever conceived specifically as one who mediates *redemption*, much less whose mediatorial action could be conceived as a "ransom-exchange."

Martyrology as Background: The "Parallel" of 4 Maccabees

Perhaps Paul's background is human mediation through martyrdom and this inspired him to describe Jesus as "ransom for all." Indeed commentators going back at least to Hill have often noted the similarities between ἀντίλυτρον of 2:6a and ἀντίψυχον of 4 Macc 6:29 by way of suggesting the latter text or complex of ideas therein as a possible background.[252] In 4 Macc 6:29 we have a prayer to God to "be merciful to your nation . . . make my blood a purification and take my life as a substitute (ἀντίψυχον) for theirs." Later in the same work, we have in 17:21 homage paid to the martyrological death of the seven brothers: "they, having become . . . a substitute (ἀντίψυχον) for the sin of the nation."

The idea has a surface plausibility. Both ἀντίψυχον and ἀντίλυτρον are compound terms formed with the prepositional prefix ἀντί and thus connote the idea of substitution or exchange—"life-exchange" in the case of ἀντίψυχον. They both contain the idea of a human being willingly

[251] This, for example, is central to Paul's idea of the Messiah in the reconstruction of N. T. Wright (*The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991] chaps. 2 and 3).

[252] Hill, *Greek Words*, 76-80. See also Wieland (*Significance of Salvation*, 64) for a defense and explication of the martyrological background of 4 Maccabees as an account for "ransom" in 1 Tim 2:6.

dying in exchange for others or, at minimum, the idea of an "effective death" upon which God bestows a deeper theological significance.[253] And in both cases the exchange's beneficiaries are specified—the "nation" in the case of 4 Macc 6:29 and 17:21 and "all" in the case of 1 Tim 2:6a. So much does the notion of redemption seem to be in the background, that commentators on 4 Maccabees (perhaps under the influence of 1 Tim 2:6a) often go so far as to translate ἀντίψυχον with "ransom."[254]

Yet as a matter of fact, the parallels here are rather scant. Not only does no cognate of λύτρον ever occur in 4 Maccabees, but the underlying source of ἀντίψυχον seems to be Lev 17:11 which provides a rationale for the atoning significance of the sacrificial death of an animal—but does so in a passage which is utterly devoid of ransom terminology or redemption theology. Moreover, 4 Maccabees scarcely even contains constellation terms related to "ransom" described above in Chapter Two, such as "freedom," "slavery" or "release/forgiveness."[255] The deaths of Eleazar (4 Macc 6:29) and those of the seven brothers (17:21) in some way *spare* the greater people or *save* them in a generic way (though salvation language does not appear either) but the result is not the people's "freedom," either from slavery or as God's newly acquired slaves, or even "forgiveness." Finally in both texts in 4 Maccabees,

---

[253] "Effective death" is Williams' term for the substitutionary or expiatory death of the martyrs in 4 Maccabees. See Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event,* 179.

[254] David A. deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (ed. Stanley Porter, Richard Hess, John Jarick; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 23. See also Williams, *Jesus' Death as Saving Event*, 176-80.

[255] "Slave" and "to be enslaved" do appear in 4 Macc 3:2 and 13:2 just as "freedom" appears in 4 Macc 14:2 but in the context of discussion of virtue and not as the result of a redemptive death.

the scope of the ἀντίψυχον is limited to the "nation" which contrasts notably with Paul's notion of ἀντίλυτρον for "all." Upon closer inspection therefore, the parallels between ἀντίψυχον and ἀντίλυτρον seem little more than a curious lexical coincidence. Ideas of martyrs may well have subtly influenced 1 Tim 2:6a, but they scarcely account for "ransom," much less explain how "ransom" became "for all."[256]

The question of background is worth pursuing further, however. Virtually alone among commentators on 1 Timothy, Mounce reminds us that the term "ransom" necessarily has two dimensions: a price paid *and* a new status acquired for "all" as a result of the ransom.[257] The first dimension is clear enough: the self-surrender of Jesus. The second dimension however remains opaque. Who are the "all" and what will be their status acquired as a result of the ransom?

The LXX as Background

I begin my audience-oriented approach to this question with the observation concerning "ransom" by Pitre (commenting on Mark 10:45):

> The first thing that would come to the mind of an ancient Jewish auditor is not (at least initially) simple atonement for the sin or transgression of individuals (or even all humanity), but rather the redemption of Israel from exile. . . . Rather than thinking immediately of an atonement offering, a substitution, a ransom for sins—although, as we will see these are important and ultimately in view—we should think principally of release, the one release that had been awaited by Israel for

[256] Contra Wieland, *Significance of Salvation*, 64.

[257] Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 89.

centuries was the release of the scattered flock from exile. [258]

The understanding of λύτρον that would be heard in NT times is mostly as echo of the OT promise of redemption. In Chapter Two, we saw that the redemption contained both the notion of *restoration* of God's people's rightful status as well as *recovery* of her lost inheritance. This is true both of past saving action by God on behalf of Israel in the Exodus (Exod 6:6-8; 2 Sam 7:23; Ps 77:42 LXX, 139:8) and of future cognates of λυτρόω frequently used to denote the promised salvation of Yhwh from the exile, which consists of a redemption and restoration for all Israel. Often it is all Israel (even the reunification of the twelve tribes) that will be ransomed (Isa 44: 21-23; 51:10-11; 52:3; 62:12; Jer 38:11 LXX; Lam 5:8; Hos 13:14; Zeph 3:15 LXX; Zech 10:8). Paul and his hearers assume that in all LXX texts that promise a future "redemption," Jesus Christ is the one who has brought this about—even by way of personally serving as the "ransom" or "ransom-exchange."

But these texts and the notion of ransom suggested by them are both general and also quite "Israel-specific." They furnish a broad textual matrix from which *any* NT author including Paul might have derived his more foundational ideas about redemption. But there is little here to suggest LXX support for a potential redemption that extends, even eschatologically, beyond the boundaries of visible Israel. There is in short little to connect the idea of "ransom" to the idea of "all."

The prophetic text Mic 4:1-2 sounds positive notes concerning "many nations" and

[258] Brant Pitre, "The Historical Jesus, The Great Tribulation and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of Atonement," (Ph.D. diss.; University of Notre Dame, 2004) 526.

"peoples" shortly before describing a forthcoming redemption by Yhwh. I contended above in Chapter Two that this text was alluded to in Paul's treatment of redemption in Romans 8.

> And the peoples shall hasten to [the mountain of the Lord], and many nations [ἔθνη πολλά] shall come and say, 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will show us his way, and we will walk in his paths.'

But the redemption promised a few verses later in Mic 4:10 seems limited to Israel herself: "From there he will rescue you [Daughter Sion], and from there the Lord your God will redeem [λυτρώσεται] you from the hand of your enemies."

It is of course quite possible that Paul is simply assuming a renewed Israel of Jews and Gentiles and thus could read these sorts of passages much more universally. But Isaiah 40–55 is more promising terrain for our background study for several reasons. First, it is unsurpassed in terms of the sheer density of λύτρον cognates and indeed, as I argued above in Chapter Two, it is possible to read the "double payment" in Isa 40:1-2 as divine ransom, thus putting redemption in the background for all of Deutero-Isaiah. Second, it abounds in πᾶς cognates with some 60 uses in the span of sixteen chapters. Third, a fair number of these πᾶς cognates are used to describe people in general, giving Deutero-Isaiah an expressly international dimension unequalled elsewhere in the LXX. Not always are "all people" or "all the nations" mentioned favorably or as potential candidates for Yhwh's salvation but there are several key passages such as Isa 42:6-7 and 49:8 which do lend themselves to that interpretation.[259] Fourth, the material in 1 Timothy, up to and including the "ransom" *theologoumenon*, resonates with Isaiah in another way. Paul's

[259] J. Christopher Edwards ("Reading the Ransom Logion in 1 Tim 2,6 and Titus 2,14 with Isa 42,6-7; 49,6-8," 265) suggests that the "light to the Gentiles" passages in Isaiah are in the background.

use of "gospel" (εὐαγγήλιον) in 1 Tim 1:11 not only establishes the basis of the apostle's mission in relation to which we should interpret the urging that the Church pray for "all" in 2:1-7, but it also echoes εὐαγγελίζομαι in Isa 40:9; 52:7 and 61:1—references that seem thematic for the "good news" preached in the latter half of the prophetic book. Fifth, my exegesis above indicates that 1 Tim 2:1-7 is deeply concerned with the relationship of Paul, Timothy and the Church to the rest of the world constituted by "all." This emphasis roughly coincides with the major burden of Isaiah 40–55 and better still, Isaiah 40–66 which in no small part concerns the complex inter-relationship between the "servant," the remnant of Israel, the whole of Israel and the "nations."

Along these lines, one can hear in 1 Tim 2:1-7 some echoes of Isa 43:1-4 which reads:

> But now, thus says the Lord God who made you, O Jacob, and he who formed you, O Israel, 'Do not fear, for I have redeemed [ἐλυτρωσάμην] you. . . . I am the Lord your God, the Holy One of Israel, who saves [σώζων] you; I have given Egypt and Ethiopia and Soene as your exchange, on your behalf [ὑπὲρ σοῦ]. Because you have become precious in my sight, you have been glorified, and I have loved you, and I will give many people on your behalf [ὑπὲρ σοῦ] and rulers on behalf of [ὑπέρ] your head.

The similarities between this and our passage are interesting. There is the salvation term σώζων which also frequently appears in our passage. And both ἐλυτρωσάμην in Isaiah and ἀντίλυτρον in Paul occur in the vicinity of ὑπέρ—in the case of Isaiah we see that "I have redeemed you" is parallel to "I have given an exchange on your behalf (ὑπὲρ σοῦ)." One difference is that the word ἐλυτρωσάμην is a cognate which as an aorist verb naturally connotes the *action* of redeeming rather than the ransom-exchange "price" (ἀντίλυτρον) by which the

redemption was accomplished. But Paul's formula is a more concise way of putting things. Christ's giving himself as ἀντίλυτρον or "ransom-exchange" is conceptually the same as God redeeming (ἐλυτρωσάμην) through the giving of an "exchange" (ἄλλαγμα).

Still the passage does not of itself provide a satisfactory background for Paul's idea of Christ's universal ransom-exchange. In Isa 43:1-4 the nations are the exchange's *price* not its *beneficiaries* or *counter-parties*. But a few verses later the role of the nations is developed further. Isaiah 43:9-11 reads:

> All the nations [πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] have been[260] gathered and rulers [ἄρχοντες] will be gathered from among them. . . . Let them bring their witnesses [μάρτυρας] and let them be justified and speak truths [ἀληθῆ]. Be my witnesses [μάρτυρες]; I too am a witness [μάρτυς], says the Lord God [θεός], and the servant whom I have chosen so that [ἵνα] you will know [γνῶτε] and believe [πιστεύσητε] and understand that I am. Before me there was no other god [θεός], nor shall there be any after me. I am God [θεός] and besides me there is none who saves [σώζων]. I declared and saved [ἔσωσα]. . . You are my witnesses [μάρτυρες]; I too am a witness [μάρτυς], says the Lord God [θεός].

With this we have even more textual and thematic similarities with 1 Tim 2:1-7.[261] There is an emphasis on the uniqueness of God, salvation, and upon "witnesses" whose act of bearing witness results in knowledge and faith in God's uniqueness. Most importantly, the act of witness specifically occurs in the sight of "all the nations" who have been summoned to judgment—a judgment which takes place after God has redeemed his own people making use of the nations of the world (Egypt, Ethiopia and Soene) as exchange.

---

[260] Here I maintain συνήχθησαν as an aorist passive, while NETS renders it as an intransitive.

[261] To my knowledge, only Wieland (*Significance of Salvation*, 67) has suggested Isaiah 43 as a background to 1 Tim 2:1-7.

Using the criteria of intertextual echoes developed by Hays, this proposed echo would be of only moderate "volume."[262] This is because Paul is not making a straightforward *allusion* to Isa 43:1-4, 9-11 as much as he is developing the trajectory of its ideas to produce an exhortation which is both similar and dissimilar to its original content. Nevertheless, the background is quite illuminating for a number of reasons. (1) The Isaianic text's setting of final judgment agrees with the eschatological thrust which I have identified in 1 Tim 1:1–2:7 and has been reinforced most recently with Paul's mention of "the testimony for these very times"—when one understands the "witness" or "testimony" as belonging collectively to Paul, Timothy and the Church, and "these very times" as both looking back to the Christ-event and looking forward to the final judgment. (2) The Isaianic text offers a plausible explanation as to why Paul specifically requests prayers for "kings" and "all who are in authority"; the judgment described by that LXX text envisions a special role for "leaders" as representatives of all nations—given this, it is essential that special intercessions be directed to them. (3) Isaiah's original theme of "witness" has been altered, for Paul does not speak of "witnesses" but of the actual testimony (μαρτύριον) that witnesses bring. Paul is a "witness" to Christ's salvation but the accent is that his life is a living testimony to it. Similarly the life and prayers of the Church are not constitutive of "witnesses" so much as the testimonial content to the saving truth of the gospel. (4) In both Isa 43:9-11 and 1 Tim 2:2, the behavior of witnesses brings about knowledge of saving truth. The difference is that in Isa 43:9-11 the witnesses follow God's own witness so that *they themselves* may come to the truth about God's uniqueness. But for Paul, Christ's coming into the world has changed things. The Church is already in the age of knowledge of

[262] Hays, *Echoes*, 29-33.

God and does not need to be reminded of his uniqueness as did her counterparts in exilic Israel. The mission *now* is to help usher others into this age as well. The audience of 1 Timothy is one stage beyond the audience of Isaiah. (5) The background of Isaiah suggests a reason for (4), namely that the saving knowledge of God has undergone some crucial updates in light of the Christ-event. No longer is knowledge of the uniqueness of Israel's God sufficient as it was in Isaiah's day, either for God's children or for the Gentile bystanders. The focus of the truth which God wishes everyone to know now includes not only his own oneness but also the one mediator Jesus Christ. (6) Most importantly for this study, the scope of God's redemptive act has changed. Isaiah 43:1-4 speaks of Yhwh's past redemption of Israel using Gentiles as the ransom "price," though this is but a prelude to the summoning of all the nations to judgment. Based solely on Isa 43:9-13, there is little to suggest that the nations will be vindicated. But against the backdrop of Isaiah 40–55 as a whole, such hope is possible. Only a chapter before, the servant Israel was to be a "light to the nations." And only a chapter later we see a cluster of redemption references in which not only is a future ransom promised by Yhwh, but one in which the destinies of Israel and the nations will be interconnected. For instance, the nations of Egypt and Ethiopia—formerly the ransom price God "paid" to ransom Israel (43:3)—will now come to know Yhwh through Israel as she benefits from Cyrus' conquest (45:13-14).[263] From here, it is a small step to conceive of a future redemption that is not only for Israel but for "all people." Much as Israel's redemption suggests a future redemption for the Gentiles, so also Paul's notion of "ransom for all" suggests both an already accomplished ransom for the Church that extends through the Church to all people.

[263] I develop this theme in greater detail in Chapter Two above.

All of this permits one final inference of the implications of Jesus Christ as the ultimate "ransom- exchange" for all (including the nations). Paul's logic, unlike Mark 10:45, is not based on the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 and his "one for many" action, wherein the nations later in NT theology come to be inserted into "the many." Paul's logic in 2:6a is based rather on Isaiah 43–45 wherein the nations played an essential role as Yhwh's "ransom price" to free Israel from exile. Thus it follows that, for Paul, Jesus has not only stepped into and fulfilled the role of the divine redeemer by bringing about the redemption, or alternatively by serving as proof that God had brought it about (cf. Rom 3:21-26). Jesus Christ has, in some mysterious way as "man" who has come into the world to save sinners, stepped into the role of the nations themselves who were Yhwh's original "ransom price" but whom now, by virtue of his self-gift, have been liberated from their old function as ransom price for Israel to a new position now where they too can receive the benefits of redemption.

Conclusion

In this study of "ransom" in 1 Tim 2:1-7, I have approached 1 Timothy heuristically as a Pauline letter using an audience-oriented exegesis in which familiarity on the part of the audience both with the LXX as well as the preaching of Paul (insofar as this can be reconstructed from his other letters) is assumed. I have sought to build on recent scholarly work (e.g., Towner) which has broadened the eschatological treatment of the PE beyond the epiphany schema and has in so doing detected far more similarities in the eschatology of the PE to the rest of the Pauline corpus than previous scholarship had noticed. Given the finding of my audience-oriented exegesis of 2:1-7 that Paul's idea of universal salvation is really grounded in the idea of Christ as

"ransom for all," (and not God's oneness), I have attempted to discover where Paul derived the notion and what it tells us about his theology. The most common scholarly attempts to answer this question which focus in turn on the parallels of Mark 10:45, or Rom 3:21-26, or of the martyrology of 4 Maccabees all are inadequate either because they are, on closer inspection, not very similar to 1 Tim 2:6a or because, in the case of the ransom logion in Mark, the universality is of the "one for many" variety and is thus different from what Paul is arguing in 2:1-7.

The background most plausible for Paul's "ransom for all" comes from the LXX prophets, specifically Isaiah, who emphasizes both universality and redemption—though without ever quite saying explicitly that God would one day ransom "all people" in the future as he had Israel in the past. The passage in Isaiah 40–55 most similar to 1 Tim 2:1-7 is Isa 43:1-4, 9-13 in which the prophet assumes the existence of a grand assize where all the nations and their rulers are summoned to hear Yhwh's judgment. Paul's eschatology too presupposes such a final judgment but one interpreted in light of the Christ-event. In the case of 1 Tim 2:1-7, the background of Isaiah 43 offers an explanation of why Paul is commanding the Church to pray for "all people" and "all in authority" that is different from most commentators who assume, on very thin and ambiguous evidence, that Paul is combating some sort of exclusivist or Judaizing heresy. These prayers under my reading are missiologically oriented and reflect the Church's participation in the apostolic work of Paul and Timothy which in turn is directed to spreading the gospel which presupposed the same final judgment as Isaiah, though one from which potentially all people might be saved and ransomed. "Ransom for all" serves as both a key portion of the substance of the "truth" that God wishes "all" to come to know but also the ultimate proof of the

universal scope of salvation in the first place.

One has not understood "ransom" fully until one reckons both with the price paid on the one hand *and* the new status acquired by the ransomed party on the other. It is the "all" as ransomed party that I have attempted to account for above. If I am correct, there is a hint of ecclesiology in Paul's use of "ransom"—a term which has already been recognized to carry soteriological and christological implications. In that case, this study could serve as a basis for other studies into Paul's possible uses of Isaianic ecclesiology. Specifically for scholarship on the PE, my treatment of 1 Tim 2:1-7 may also be a modest contribution to theological treatments of 1 Timothy, which have attempted in various ways to combine the letter's ecclesiology, christology and soteriology into a coherent whole.

CHAPTER FOUR

Introduction

At first glance, it does not appear that Christ's "ransom" is an especially important idea in Titus. The term λυτρόω after all occurs but once in the epistle and as a result the scholarly assessment of its import for the theology of Titus is bound to be greatly eclipsed by other more salient cognate clusters and themes.[264] But in this chapter I intend to show that not only does "ransom" serve to undergird the theology of Paul's exhortation in 2:11-14, but that the term sheds new light on the theological message of the letter as a whole. I will demonstrate that Paul's use of the verb "ransom" is intended to move his epistolary audience to (1) connect it to the rich tradition of redemption in the LXX and so to furnish a correct self-understanding for the Church in Crete that is an implicit rejection of false notions present among those in Crete but outside the Church; (2) to tie together the letter's several references to "slaves" and "slavery" in a manner by which the hearer might understand both Paul's own mission and the gospel's moral demands on them in terms of being a people "ransomed from lawlessness"; (3) to connect the moral demands of Christian life with the appropriation of the grace necessary to attain to those demands; this is accomplished by describing a baptism in 3:4-7 that is both cleansing and redemptive—two ideas anticipated by the ransom/cleanse tandem in 2:14.

[264] I mean themes and cognate clusters such as "faith" (πίστις, 1:1, 3, 4, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:15); "piety" (εὐσέβεια, 1:1; 2:12); "hope" (ἐλπίς, 1:2; 2:13; 3:7); "eternal life" (ζωὴ αἰώνιος, 1:2; 3:7); good/noble works (ἔργα ἀγαθά/καλά, 1:16; 2: 6, 14; 3:8, 14); "teaching" and "healthy teaching" (διδασκαλία ὑγιανούσα, 1:9 *bis*, 11; 2:1, 6, 7, 10) and especially "save" and "savior" (σῳζω/σωτήρ, 1:3, 4; 2:10, 11, 13; 3:4, 5, 6).

Overview of Salvation in Titus

The appreciation of "ransom" in Titus begins with the recognition that it is a salvation term and thus is of a piece with the soteriology of the letter as a whole. The prominence of salvation in this brief epistle has been noted by Quinn, Collins, Marshall, and Wieland among others and is born out statistically.[265] Indeed this brief letter not only uses σωτήρ more often than any other NT book in absolute terms, but the letter's short length also means that it possesses a salvation word "density" that surpasses all other books in the NT by far.[266]

Furthermore this "density" is employed with heightened rhetorical force for the listener since the σωζ-cognates are not evenly distributed throughout the letter but are clustered within three discrete passages which occur roughly at the letter's beginning (Titus 1:1-4), middle (2:11-14) and end (3:4-5). The title "savior"—first given to God (1:3)—is also bestowed upon Jesus Christ (1:4), a fact which places the two saving agents in parallel with one another. Both share the epithet σωτήρ, and participate in the coming "epiphany" in which common divine glory will

[265] Quinn, *Titus*, 304-15; Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus*, 308-18; Marshall, "Salvation in the Pastoral Epistles," 449-69; Wieland, *Significance of Salvation,* 187-238.

[266] I base this conclusion on the work of Quinn (*Titus*, 304) who counts nine σωζ-cognates in the epistle (6x σωτήρ; 1x σωτηρίος, σώζω, and ἀσωτία) and the work of Felix Just [online; <http://catholic-resources.org/Bible/NT-Statistics-Greek.htm.> last modified on June 27, 2013; accessed, May 11, 2013.], who counts 659 words in Titus. Over 1% of the words in Titus is a σωζ-cognate. The nearest runner-up in terms of "salvation density" in the NT is 1 Timothy in which σωζ-cognates only appear at about 1/3 the frequency of Titus. Lest 1% seem paltry as a "density," other NT works bear comparison for a sense of proportion. As important as δικ-cognates are in Romans, they amount to well under 1% of Paul's total verbiage. Only when one adds in πισ-cognates does the "density" in Romans exceed 1%. In the fourth Gospel, the oft-used terms "Father" and "Son" *combined* just exceed 1% of all words. Indeed for all the other terms and cognates thematic in John's Gospel ("believe," "witness," "truth," "life," "light," "send," "world"), the "density" figures at just over 2%. It is thus quite remarkable for any single cognate group to achieve a 1% density in a single work. Σωζ-cognates are probably unprecedented in the NT for doing so in Titus.

be made manifest (2:13).[267] And both figure instrumentally in the salvation which has been wrought; God "our savior" (σωτὴρ ἡμῶν), "saved us [ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς] through the washing of rebirth," but this has been accomplished "through Jesus Christ our savior [διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν]" (3:4-6). If God is the gerent of salvation, Jesus Christ is a co-gerent or at minimum a vice-gerent of it.

In addition, we find rarer σωζ-cognates. Rather than salvation itself, we have the elliptical expression "the grace of God that brings salvation [σωτήριος]" (2:11) that was made manifest to all people. "Saving God" was evidently unusual enough that Codex Sinaiticus assimilated this expression to "the grace of God our savior." Further, Quinn counts the term ἀσωτία (1:6) as a σωζ-cognate.[268] If this judgment is correct, Paul probably intends ἀσωτία (dissolution) to be heard in a soteriological sense, as if to say bishops should not be accusable of having behaved as "unsaved" people.

More importantly, the concentration of the term "savior"—predicated both of God and Jesus—serves to draw rhetorical attention to the non-σωζ-cognates of which σωτήρ is a subject. The emphasis on savior implies a corresponding emphasis on the savior's salvific actions. In the first pericope (1:1-4), God the savior "promises" (1:2) and "manifests" (1:3) his word. In the third pericope (3:4-7), God the savior "saves" (3:5) but he also "pours out richly" (3:6). In the middle pericope (2:11-14)—central to the entire letter—our God and savior Jesus Christ "gave

[267] Or the epiphany concerns Jesus himself as God and savior. The text seems written intentionally to ambiguate God and Jesus Christ.

[268] Quinn, *Titus*, 304.

himself" (2:14) that he might "ransom us" (λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς) and "cleanse for himself a special people." This verse is the focus of our study.[269]

Salvation and Eschatology in Titus

The letter to Titus was included under the *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* hypothesis of Dibelius and Conzelmann, since the theory was developed to explain the PE corpus as a whole.[270] As noted in Chapter Three above, the theory entailed, among other things, a diminution of Pauline eschatology. Yet in even a cursory reading of Titus, the close literary connection between common PE terminology such as "piety" (εὐσέβεια) and "the hope of eternal life" (1:2) is difficult to ignore. Later in 2:11, the behavior associated with *christliche Bürgerlichkeit*—"rejecting impiety and worldly desires and living justly and piously in the present age"—immediately precedes "waiting for the blessed hope and the appearance of the glory of the great God and savior Jesus Christ." It is hard to see how the author imagines that Christian behavior is an end in itself, detached from any eschatological expectation. Indeed it seems improbable that the theory of Dibelius would have gained any scholarly traction at all were it limited to the data of Titus alone.

---

[269] Here I agree with Van Neste (*Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*; JSNTSup 280; London: T & T Clark International, 2004, 269-70) et. al. who demonstrates extensive lexical correspondence between 1:1-4; 2:11-14 and 3:4-7, not only with σωζ terms but also "hope (ἐλπίς)," "eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιος)," "Jesus Christ" and "manifest (φανερόω/ἐπιφαίνω), concluding that the three units are full of "doctrinal pieces. . . .deliberately formed to cohere with one another."

[270] Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 8-10; 39-41.

There remain defenders of the framework in more updated forms such as Collins who contends that "the author's theology presents a perspective that extends beyond time."[271] Moreover Collins argues that the author "does not share Paul's apocalyptic worldview in which 'this age' (*ho aiōn houtos*) is an evil age destined to pass away with the world to come."[272] He bases this judgment almost wholly on the terminological shift from the Pauline term παρουσία to the (purportedly) deutero-Pauline ἐπιφάνεια. Collins maintains that the apocalyptic-related notions of coming wrath and judgment associated with Paul's notion of the παρουσία are absent from the PE's concept of epiphany.[273] A thorough evaluation of this position will have to await my audience-oriented exegesis below. But it suffices here to point out that the close connection (albeit not synonymous!) between παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια elsewhere in Paul (2 Thess 2:8) in a robust apocalyptic context, as well as the clear implication of judgment associated with epiphany in 1 Tim 6:14, render this opinion unlikely. For Titus (as with all of the PE), the audience is in the age between the epiphanies. Thus to posit an eschatology in Titus significantly different than the one found in the undisputed Paulines seems to go beyond the evidence.[274] On the contrary,

[271] Raymond Collins, "The Theology of the Epistle to Titus," *ETL* 76 (2000) 64.

[272] Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus*, 351.

[273] Ibid., 352.

[274] Oberlinner's contention ("Die 'Epiphaneia' des Heilswillens Gottes in Christus Jesus: Zur Grundstruktur der Christologie der Pastoralbriefe," *ZNW* 71 [1980] 200-201) that "epiphany" in Titus refers less to the παρουσία as a discrete historical event and more to the general "Einbruch des Göttlichen in diese Welt" similarly seems unconvincing. As Towner (*The Goal of Our Instruction*, 66-71) argues at some length, the term ἐπιφάνεια was "consistently related to an historical and datable, not a mythical event."

all indications are that the period between the epiphanies is a different way of expressing the Pauline notion of a time between the ages.[275]

Audience-Oriented Exegesis of Titus 2:11-14

Translation

> [11]For the grace of God has appeared which brings salvation to all people,
> [12] having disciplined us to reject ungodliness, worldly desires, and to live wisely, justly and piously in the current age,[13] as we wait for the blessed hope which is manifestation of the glory of the great God, our savior Jesus Christ,[14] who gave himself for us in order to ransom us from every lawlessness and to cleanse for himself a special people zealous for good works.

Context

In deference to custom, I will also refer to the preceding material in 2:1-10 as a *Haustafel*, even though good questions have been raised as to the aptness of this term.[276] The *Haustafel* is seasoned with language suggestive of more outward and visible forms of piety. It is an extended paraenesis, unusual here for its placement in the body of the epistle rather than as a peroration.[277] Many of its terms and cognates are repeated for emphasis: "respectable" (σεμνός, 2:2, 7); "to be submissive" (ὑποτάσσω, 2:5, 9); "sensible, self-controlled" (σώφρων/σωφρονέω, 2:2, 5, 6) or "train" (σωφρωνίζω, 2:4); "loving" (φίλανδρος/ φιλότεκνος, 2:4); "sound" (ὑγιής/ ὑγιαίνω, 2:1, 2, 8); "noble" (καλός/καλοδιδάσκαλος, 2:3, 7). All of this visible piety is geared

[275] Thus Dunn, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 784.

[276] Marshall (*Pastoral Epistles*, 231-36) has a helpful excursus on the matter.

[277] Thus Abraham Malherbe, "Paraenesis in the Epistle to Titus," in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (BZNW 125; ed. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004) 297-317.

toward putting into effect and finally "adorning" the "teaching" (διδασκαλία, 2:1, 7, 10).[278] This final end of "adornment" is anticipated by other lesser goals set forth for right conduct. At the urging of Titus, older men must be "sober" (2:2) and older women must exhibit "reverent behavior" (2:3) in order to make the right impression on young women (2:4), but ultimately so that the "word of God not be blasphemed" (2:5). Likewise, Titus must be a model of "good works" (2:6) for the young men with the final goal of not giving the opponents of the Church anything evil to say against it (2:8). Lastly, Titus should instruct slaves to subject themselves to their masters (2:9) with an eye toward showing good faith in all things (2:10a). All this seems to anticipate and constitute the adornment of the teaching (2:10b).[279] The *Haustafel* provides detailed behavioral norms and leads to the redemption passage in 2:11-14 which will furnish household code's theological rationale.

Titus 2:11-12: The Appearance of Grace and the Life of the Church

Unlike for 1 Tim 2:5, we face no difficult exegetical decision concerning the handling of γάρ. The post-positive γάρ in 2:11 is surely causal and serves to establish the entire pericope as the theological basis for the *Haustafel* in 2:1-10, in a classic example of indicative-imperative reasoning. But more than this, the fact that the grace of God has become manifest is the very rationale that the good conduct of the people must assume a highly visible character.

---

[278] Spicq (*TLNT* 2:330) reminds that the notion of "adorn" in the term κοσμέω carries with it the connotations of bestowing honor and most fundamentally "to put in order."

[279] Spicq (Ibid., 2:331) adds, "In the first century, moreover, κοσμέω means 'honor, do homage, and make famous.'" The idea is that right conduct pays to the "teaching" a highly visible tribute.

What is the "grace" and how was it manifested? The term χάρις may mean "favor," "love," a more general "benevolence" or even "gratitude" or "pardon"—always with the sense of something given freely.[280] A large number of commentators have interpreted χάρις in 2:11 as an expression of some aspect of the Christ-event, while remaining careful to disavow any sense of Jesus Christ being a hypostatization of grace. This reading derives from an insistence on drawing 2:11 into the larger discussion of "epiphany christology"—an idea based, in any event, not on data in Titus but on the whole collection of the PE. Indeed χάρις is often interpreted christologically in various ways.[281] Interpreters who understand χάρις christologically lean heavily on the background of 2 Tim 1:10—the one passage in the PE that unambiguously couples the passive of φανερόω with an already realized ἐπιφάνεια.

But the difficulty with this line of interpretation is twofold. We will soon confront a future ἐπιφάνεια in 2:13, which, as I will demonstrate below, is a word that carries a specialized meaning. But ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις in 2:11 simply cannot bear the exegetical weight of being read as "the epiphany of grace" with the full-blown technical sense attached to the term "epiphany."[282] "Grace appeared" is not the same as saying there was an "epiphany of grace." Moreover, for the

---

[280] Spicq, "χάρις," *TLNT* 3:500-6.

[281] For instance, as Christ's incarnation (Pierre Dornier, *Les Épîtres Pastorales* [Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1968] 142), his death and resurrection (George M. Montague, *First and Second Timothy, Titus* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008] 238), the Christ-event as a whole (Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 746; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles,* 422), the face of Christ (Delio Ruiz, "Se Manifestó La Gracia Salvadora de Dios," *RevistB* 65 [2003] 199-214), or as a catchall designation for the saving intervention of God in history (Dunn, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 871; Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus*, 349). For Lau (*Manifest in Flesh,* 243-59) the appearance of χάρις is God himself intervening as Christ in history, in an interpretation that smacks of Modalism.

[282] Contra Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 142. Abraham Malherbe ("Soteriology in the Pastoral Epistles," in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives in Soteriology* [NovTSup 121; ed. Jan van der Watt; Leiden: Brill, 2005] 336) too interprets the passage as though the term ἐπιφάνεια itself appeared in 2:11.

Cretan epistolary audience, there has been no mention hitherto of ἐπιφάνεια much less an "epiphany christology." Ἐπεφάνη is a divine passive that recalls the active verb φανερόω in 1:3 where Paul opened the letter telling Titus and the Cretan Church that God has manifested his word, once promised before the ages. This manifestation has taken place first of all in the *kerygma* with which Paul, as an apostle of Jesus Christ (1:1), has been entrusted. There is therefore a parallel between Paul, whose apostolic mission assists in making manifest the word of God, and the Church of Crete whose actions are ordered to and based on the manifestation of God's grace as they "adorn" the teaching in all things. This parallel is underscored by the "grace" (χάρις) which God manifests in 2:11 and which recalls the "grace" that Paul sends upon Titus and the rest of the Cretans in 1:4. In the first pericope (1:1-4), God chooses Paul who sends grace upon Titus and the Church—grace which manifests itself in the teaching being adorned (2:1-10). In the second pericope (2:11-14), it is grace revealed as the reason for the teaching being adorned. The appearance of χάρις therefore relates mainly to the "word" God revealed in preaching (1:3) as it has been received and lived in the Cretan Church itself, both remade and moved by the grace of God in Jesus Christ.[283] One must be careful not to exclude the christological aspect entirely since it is God and Jesus Christ who are the source and the cause of grace being revealed—just as the verse looks forward to the epiphany of Jesus Christ

[283] Thus Wieland, *Significance of Salvation*, 200; Norbert Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT 6; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1989) 298.

himself.[284] The aorist ἐπεφάνη seems to point to a punctiliar or global action and not to a process of ethical conversion.

Another exegetical difficulty concerns the treatment of σωτήριος together with the dative phrase πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις in 2:11. Does one take "to all people" with the adjective σωτήριος to yield "the grace of God appeared bringing salvation for all people" or with the verb ἐπιφαίνω to get, "the saving grace of God appeared to all people"? Since σωτήριος is anarthrous while modifying ἡ χάρις, it is a predicative adjective and Liddell and Scott adduce several examples in profane Greek of σωτήριος meaning "bringing safety or deliverance to" when it appears with the dative.[285] Both considerations tell in favor of the former reading.[286] This gives 2:11-14 a minor universal flavor. The purpose of this is not "polemical" but hortatory, emphasizing the Church's role in living out in a visible manner the grace that she has received and the word she has heard preached.[287] The term "all" (πᾶς) in "all people" recalls for the audience the command given in 2:9-10 to slaves that they should be submissive to masters "in all things," (ἐν πάσιν) behaving "in all good faith," (πᾶσαν πίστιν ἀγαθήν) so that the teaching of God might be adorned "in all

---

[284] This is the danger of the interpretation of Stephen Mott ("Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10-14 and III 3-7," *NovT* 20 [1978] 22-48), who understands χάρις to refer exclusively to ethical conversion personified in the Church.

[285] Provided of course, one rejects the variant ἡ σωτήριος which appears in C^3, D^2, the Majority Text, et. al. LSJ, "σωτήριος," 1751.

[286] Thus Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 142; Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 146-47; Dunn, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 871; Knight, *Pastoral Epistles,* 319; Luke Timothy Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996) 236-38; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 268; Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 746-47; Quinn, *Titus*, 150-51; Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 1:142-43. A few scholars such as Collins (*I & II Timothy and Titus,* 349), Fiore (*Pastoral Epistles*, 208) and Spicq ("ἐπιφαίνω, etc.," *TLNT* 2:66) take the dative with ἐπεφάνη, in keeping with the older tradition maintained by the KJV, the Douay Rheims and the Vulgate of Jerome.

[287] Contra Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus,* 349.

things." The whole burden of 2:11 is to connect what God has done through Christ back to the behavior of the Church.

Verse 2:12 continues this basic thrust. "Grace" not only appeared once, but it is "instructing" us; the present participle παιδεύουσα indicates *iterative* activity which complements the aorist participle ἀρνησάμενοι and aorist verb ζήσωμεν, which suggest a one-time denial of worldly desire and the total experience of living virtuously. That grace could have such an ongoing disciplinary and instructive role is further reason to assume that χάρις is indeed based on the kerygma of which Paul is an appointed messenger. It is not clear that παιδεύουσα is really "the most important word in the statement" but certainly it is through the idea of the grace of God "instructing" that the first connection is made with the "teaching of God our Savior" in 2:10.[288] The word παιδεύουσα, in other words, reveals partly how the ethical demands in 2:1-10 are grounded in theology. The term's rich religious resonance expands the static notion of "doctrine" (διδασκαλίαν) however, by introducing the idea of a life oriented to virtue.[289] The echoes often found in the LXX of παιδεύω as "chastisement," "chastening" and "correction" (often by corporal means) are less in view than connotations of cultivation of virtue and character that informed the Greco-Roman background of the παιδεύω word group.[290] Discipline by God with an aim toward formation and education of his children best captures the sense of the

---

[288] Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates,* 240.

[289] Quinn, *Titus*, 153.

[290] G. Bertram, "παιδεύω, etc.," *TDNT* 5:596-612; 621-25. Of course the LXX in its later strata does indeed contain uses of παιδεύω in the more Hellenistic sense. There are numerous references in the books of Wisdom and Sirach.

term as Paul uses it. Part of Paul's immediate pastoral aim is to remediate the notoriously boorish morals of the Cretans (1:12) with the grace of the gospel—the subject of the participle—serving as the pedagogue. The audience in view is "us," that is, the entire Church of Crete. The instructive aspect of the manifested grace of God begins to reveal the inner logic of the grounding of the *Haustafel* (2:1-10) on the theology and (later) soteriology of 2:11-14.

What is the goal of the instruction? First of all two things are to be rejected: "ungodliness" (ἀσεβείαν) and "worldly appetites" (κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας). The former concept suggests a perversion of the spiritual or psychic realm while the latter concept points to the corruption of the fleshly and material.[291] Taken in tandem these notions constitute a "vicious" merism, signifying the whole gamut of that which is opposed to a life of spiritual and moral rectitude. There are also several points of sharp rhetorical contrast. While Paul emphasizes "denial" of what is opposed to God on the one hand, his rhetoric recalls that the heretics in Crete exhibit precisely the wrong kind of denial and rejection: "They profess to know God; but they *deny* [ἀρνοῦνται] him by their deeds" (1:16). Besides, "ungodliness" is the very antithesis of a "godly" (εὐσεβῶς) life in accord with the truth (1:1). And there is a deliberate play on the κοσμ- root for we learn in 2:12 that renouncing "worldly desires" (κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας) is a significant part of what is entailed by "adorning" (κοσμῶσιν) the teaching.

But secondly there is a positive dimension to the instruction of grace as well. Renunciation of spiritual and fleshly evils is only part of the battle. The Cretans must also *affirm*

[291] Ἐπιθυμία is "desire as impulse. . . .in fact, lust, since the thought of satisfaction gives pleasure and non-satisfaction pain. . . .[It] is anxious self-seeking. . . .a danger against which man must be warned and must fight." F. Büchsel, "θυμός, etc.," *TDNT* 3:171.

what is good and noble. Paul accordingly orients the education of grace specifically to this end of full virtuous living (σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν). The σωφρονέω cognate group points to living with moderation, temperance and "overcoming passions" in a manner "especially identified with prudence."[292] Δικαίως and similar terms indicate a way of life in which one fulfills his proper and just obligations both to men and God, while the LXX often uses the terms to depict persons as upright before God when one's conduct is measured according to Torah.[293] And the εὐσεβ-group, as we saw in Chapter Three, denotes "piety" both as Jews and Greeks understood the term.[294] Paul draws on both the Jewish and Hellenistic nuances of all three terms. Indeed, if Mott is correct that the three virtues enumerated here—temperance, justice, and godliness—represent one variant of the "canonical" list of cardinal virtues that circulated in the ancient world, then we have a second *virtuous* merism to balance out the vicious combination of "impiety" and "worldly desires."[295]

The enumeration of virtues applies directly to the moral dangers confronting the Cretans. Indeed the threefold mention of "temperance, justice and piety" in adverbial form depicting the way Christians must live rhetorically inverts the threefold parade of horribles associated with

---

[292] Spicq, *TLNT* 3:360.

[293] Ibid., 1:322.

[294] See Chapter Three n. 40; cf. W. Forster, "εὐσέβεια," *TDNT* 7:180-81. For Quinn (*Titus*, 167) virtues point to one's various spheres of existence with temperance concerning relation to oneself, justice the relation to fellow humans and piety the relation to God.

[295] Mott, "Greek Ethics," 22-48. Cf. also, Quinn, *Titus*, 166-68.

Cretans at their worst: "liars, wild beasts and idle bellies" (1:16).[296] Temperance was lacking in the "idle bellies" (1:12) who lusted after "shameful profit" (1:11). It was thus a virtue urgently needed for the elders and older men (1:7; 2:2), as well as for the women, who were to avoid excessive drinking (2:3) and to "teach moderation" (σωφρονίζωσιν, 2:4) to the younger women. Justice, which governed relations between people and parts to the whole, condemned the example of the "insubordinate" outsiders whose false teaching was overturning households (1:10-11). By contrast, it would teach servants to give their masters their due, i.e., respectful obedience (2:9), and mothers to pay the debt of love to their husbands and children (2:4). "Piety" (εὐσέβεια), finally, which comprehended human relations with the divine and "often carried considerable notions of knowledge and wisdom," would have been offended by the falsehood and impurity of the heretics (1:15-16).[297] Its practice would safeguard the Cretans in hope of eternal life through the knowledge of the truth by faith in the gospel (1:1-2).

The phrase ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι corresponds to the καιροῖς ἰδίοις phrase employed earlier to mark the eschatological age of the manifestation of God's "word in preaching" (1:2). Living virtuously "in the current age" is to be done precisely because this is the time in which God's enabling grace has been revealed. The phrase ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι also reminds the audience that the virtuous life is never an end in itself much less a means for the Church to seek assimilation to broader cultural and ethical norms. Rather, such moral living is intelligible only from the standpoint of living "in the current age"—the age marked both by the manifest entry of God's

---

[296] Reggie M. Kidd, "Titus as *Apologia*," *HBT* 21 (1999) 186. According to Kidd, "soberly, justly, and piously" are a rhetorical inversion of "liars, beasts and bellies."

[297] Mott, "Greek Ethics," 25.

grace into history as well as the anticipation of the coming ἐπιφάνεια to be mentioned explicitly in the succeeding verse.

Titus 2:13: Awaiting the Epiphany of Jesus Christ, our Great God

In 2:13 the audience is reminded that the "blessed hope" and the "epiphany" of Jesus Christ are things that they are "waiting for." I will examine the term ἐπιφάνεια below in greater detail but suffice it to say here that the term's presence after the present participle προσδεχόμενοι suggests strongly that "epiphany" is denominative of a specific event for which one must "wait."[298] The ongoing instruction that leads to a virtuous life ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι is specifically linked with a time of "waiting" for a decisive future moment.

"Blessed hope" reminds the hearer that, despite Paul's appropriation of Hellenistic concepts of virtue, the goal of virtuous living is not participation in Greco-Roman autonomy but Jewish-Christian eschatology. The μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα formulation in 2:13 is without exact parallel in the Pauline corpus. Nevertheless, the standard use of "hope" in the undisputed epistles where Paul uses the term as a mark of the "eschatological community. . . . living in the power of the Holy Spirit and moving toward the realization of the full purposes of God" fits very well with the utilization of ἐλπίς in 2:12-13 with its context of the shape of living "in the current age."[299] In 2:13 however, ἐλπίς does not describe a *virtue* which defines Christian life between eschatological inauguration and fulfillment; rather the term denotes a specific *object* to be awaited. Indeed the fact that ἐπιφάνεια is anarthrous strongly suggests that the preceding καί is

[298] Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction*, 67.

[299] J. Everts, "Hope," *DPL*, 415.

epexegetical as I have translated it—so that the "blessed hope" is to be identified with the event of Jesus Christ's appearance.[300] "Hope" (ἐλπίς) does not always denote a virtue for Paul. The apostle in his other letters commonly uses hope to encompass some sort of *object*.[301] It is telling however that besides 2:13, the instance when Paul most clearly identifies a *specific event* as constitutive of the "hope" is the "redemption of our body" (Rom 8:16-25; esp. 8:23)—another eschatological moment for which "we" are "waiting" (ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν). Close at hand is the inference that "waiting," "hope" and "redemption" are all related terms for Paul. I will examine this idea in Chapter Five below.

In the immediate context of the letter to Titus, the content of ἐλπίς also recalls the "eternal life" mentioned in 1:2, just as it anticipates the repeat of ζωή αἰώνιος in 3:7. But what sort of "epiphany" does the hope consist of? The term ἐπιφάνεια in its most general sense means "appearance" but the evidence is that, by the late first century, it had become a religious *terminus technicus* to designate a sort of "helping intervention"—often in a time of battle—with connotations of "magnificence," "splendor" and "renown."[302] The fact that the term did not always entail a literal appearance of a deity and instead could be used when a person wanted to attribute a favorable outcome to general divine "assistance," permitted Bultmann to blunt the full

---

[300] Thus Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 274.

[301] Christ himself (Rom 15:12; 1 Cor 15:19; 2 Cor 1:10; Phil 2:19; 1 Thess 1:3), "glory" (Rom 5:2; 2 Cor 3:12; Col 1:27), "righteousness" (Gal 5:5), what is "stored up for you in heaven" (Col 1:5), or the content of "the gospel" (Col 1:23).

[302] R. Bultmann and D. Lührmann, "φαίνω, etc.," *TDNT* 9:8-10.

eschatological force of the term when applied to Jesus Christ in 2:13.[303] But others have adduced instances of epiphanies being associated with royalty, particularly when they include the element of "glory" as is the case in 2:13.[304] This suggests that the term refers for Paul roughly to what παρουσία refers to elsewhere.[305] Still, the terms παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια are not precisely synonymous; ἐπιφάνεια adds to παρουσία the nuance of a helping intervention attendant upon the Lord's coming.[306] But the epiphany is expanded further by the lengthy epexegetical genitive chain τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is laden with terms evocative of the Imperial cult.[307]

But what is the rhetorical goal of the epiphany language in 2:13? The question is tied up intricately with how one interprets the christology of the phrase. Is Jesus Christ being differentiated from "the great God" or being identified with him? After exhaustively reviewing the main interpretive options concerning the christological puzzle of 2:13, Harris defends the identification of Jesus with "the Great God" principally on the following grounds: (1) the appearance of two persons at the "epiphany" (read as referring to the παρουσία) would be

---

[303] Ibid., 10. Bultmann writes, "To the degree that Jesus' appearing on earth can be understood as an eschatological event it may be called an ἐπιφαίνεσθαι of the χάρις or χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία of God." Cf. 2 Tim 1:9. In other words, Christ's future epiphany seems for Bultmann to amount to a colorful way of expressing a bestowal of God's grace, kindness and generosity.

[304] E.g., Spicq, "ἐπιφαίνω, etc.," *TLNT* 2:67 esp. n. 7.

[305] Thus Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction*, 67.

[306] In his exhaustive study on the term, Dieter Lührmann ("Epiphaneia: Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte eines griechischen Wortes," in *Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971] 198) writes, "Επιφάνεια ist also nicht bloß Synonym zu παρουσία, sondern bringt in die Texte das Moment des helfenden Eingreifens ein."

[307] Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 143-46. The authors draw attention to the use of μέγας, σωτήρ, μακαρία ἐλπίς, ἐπιφανές and similar terms associated with ruler-divinities.

without parallel elsewhere in the NT; (2) God the Father is never elsewhere in the NT referred to as "great" but Jesus Christ is so referred to (Luke 1:15, 32); (3) the parallel between an abstract noun such as "glory" with a concrete noun such as "savior" would be unusual; "glory" therefore seems to be something shared both by "the great God" and Jesus Christ—even if one takes ἐπιφάνεια δοξής as a Hebrew genitive (i.e., meaning the "glorious appearance")—and sharing in God's glory suggests a "high" christology if not an absolute identification with divinity; (4) the term σωτήρ is anarthrous which indicates that the expression ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτήρ is most naturally understood as "the God and savior" (coordinate nouns in apposition) and not "the God and the savior" (two subjects); (5) the terms θεός and σωτήρ often were employed as a hendiadys in the Greco-Roman world (Ptolemy I as σωτὴρ καὶ θεός; Julius Caesar as θεὸς καὶ σωτήρ; cf. Antiochus Epiphanes as θεὸς καὶ ἐπιφανής) and in the LXX (Yhwh as θεός μου καὶ σωτὴρ μου, e.g., Ps 61:3, 7), and thus the presumption should be that they are to be equated here too; (6) in 2:13, Jesus is "savior" while in 2:14 he is "redeeming" and "purifying"; both were functions assigned to Yhwh in the OT which—as in sharing glory in (2)—suggests a way of sharing in divinity by sharing in divine roles and titles.[308]

Not all of these arguments are incontrovertible of course. However, cumulatively they are quite weighty. There are commentators who reject the identification of Jesus with the "Great God," mostly because of (1) the clear distinction between the two persons elsewhere in the PE and the undisputed letters of Paul and (2) on the basis of developmental models of early

[308] For a summary of the different scholarly approaches as well as a defense of the equation of Jesus and God, see Murray Harris, "Titus 2:13 and the Deity of Christ," in *Pauline Studies* (ed. Donald Hagner and Murray Harris; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 262-77. See also Stettler, *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*, 257-58.

Christian thought which preclude at the stage of Titus the simple equation between Ἰησοῦς Χριστός and θεός.[309] But scholars who argue on this basis have in recent decades become few and far between.[310] In any scenario, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that, if Paul did not intend his hearers to conflate Jesus and God, he has chosen his words very carelessly. In the minds of the first hearers, the person of Jesus Christ would have been recognized, through the magnificent richness of this description, as the one in whom trust for divine life was unshakably placed. It probably is the case that the divinity of Jesus is to be understood in a less metaphysical manner and a more functional one. Whether Paul thinks Jesus is to receive or to be revealed as already possessing divine honor at the epiphany cannot be determined from the text before us.

Titus 2:14: The Self-Surrender of Jesus and its Redemptive and Cleansing Effect

Indeed in 2:14 the text shifts away from eschatology with the introduction of soteriological verbs: ἔδωκεν. . . ἵνα λυτρώσηται. . . .. καὶ καθαρίσῃ. The glorious future epiphany of our God and savior Jesus Christ is the ultimate "helping intervention" because it is based on Jesus' gift of self. The cross in its redemptive meaning now comes briefly and indirectly into focus for the first and only time in the letter. The relative clause at the head of v. 14 introduces a variation on the self-surrender formula and, as a staple of Paul's preaching (1 Cor 15:3; Gal 1:4; 2:20; cf. 1 Tim 2:5-6), one certainly familiar to Titus and the Cretans: ὃς

[309] E.g., Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 143; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, 246-47.

[310] In the last 25 years, to my knowledge, Helmut Merkel (*Die Pastoralbriefe* [NTD 9.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991] 99-100) and Johnson (*Letters to Paul's Delegates,* 238) are the only commentators who still contend that God and Jesus are distinct subjects in Titus 2:13. Towner (*Timothy and Titus*, 752) combines the abstract "glory" with the concrete "savior" to equate Jesus with the glory of God. Frances Young (*The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* [NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994] 53) maintains that the expression is ambiguous.

ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. All versions are probably derived ultimately from the dominical saying in Mark 10:45. As Marshall points out, the phrase has several elements in common with the self-donation formula expressed elsewhere by Paul: (1) a form of δίδωμι for "give" or "hand over"; (2) "himself" or "his life"; (3) the preposition ὑπέρ or ἀντί; and, (4) an object of the preposition (me, us, all).[311]

But this version of the self-surrender formula is notably different from all the others in that it follows the mention of the final eschatological epiphany. Paul moves from Jesus' final "appearance" to Jesus' self-donation which is not only precisely the opposite of the expected progression but it is the only instance in which the two concepts are ever mentioned in such close succession.[312] The inversion of the preached gospel of the Christ-event serves to underscore Paul's real rhetorical focus which is neither eschatological nor soteriological but rather the "us" who comprises the ecclesiological community being addressed. It is the doctrine of *"our"* savior which is to be adorned (2:10) with the guidance of the grace that instructs *"us"* to renounce passions and lead godly lives (2:12) as *"we"* wait the epiphany of *"our"* God and savior (2:13), who gave himself for *"us"* to redeem *"us"* from all lawlessness (2:14). The pleonastic attention to the Church itself is inescapable. This emphasis reminds the audience of the original point of

[311] Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 282-83.

[312] The closest parallel on this score is 1 Cor 15:3-28 which refers to the death (15:3), the resurrection (15:4-22), and the παρουσία (15:23-28).

the passage; 2:11-14 is a long sentence written precisely to serve as the theological grounding of the *Haustafel* in 2:1-10. It is entirely fitting therefore that it should be centered upon "us."[313]

The rhetorical aggregation of first person plural pronouns climaxes with the final appearance of ἡμᾶς as the object of the verb "ransom." This is significant because it means that the ἵνα clause serves as the backbone of the whole sentence in 2:11-14; it is in the end, *because of* Jesus' self-surrender in order to "ransom" and "cleanse" "us," that "we" must behave in all the various ways that constitute adornment of the teaching (2:10). The verbal pair λυτρόω and καθαρίζω rhetorically underscore the *adversio* and *conversio* highlighted in 2:12.[314] There the Church was not only to reject "worldly desires" (*adversio*) but to embrace fully a life marked by "temperance," "justice" and "piety" (*conversio*). One must turn away from evil as well as turn toward the good. Likewise the self-surrender of Christ was to ransom the Church "*from* all lawlessness" (ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας; *adversio*) while at the same time cleansing it "*for* himself" (ἑαυτῷ; *conversio*).[315] The movement of the people of God, at once both *from* a lawless state of alienation from God to a status of *for himself* as a special people is precisely what the fullness of redemption effects in Pauline theology.

Since λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς appears in the purpose clause governed by ἵνα, the term "ransom" seems a bit more precise than "redeem" with the self-surrender standing as the implied

---

[313] For these reasons Marshall's suggestion (*Pastoral Epistles*, 282) that 2:14 is only "loosely attached" to the previous material is unconvincing. The purposes clauses in 2:14b and 2:14c are the ultimate theological basis for what has come before.

[314] Marshall (*Pastoral Epistles*, 263) also notes the parallel.

[315] Quinn (*Titus*, 173) describes it as "positive" and "negative" dimensions of Jesus' passion.

ransom "price." Nonetheless, the verse surely taps into the broader soteriological sense of λυτρόω that one finds in the LXX Psalms and prophets, which I have examined above in Chapter Two. The terms "redemption" and "special people" are obvious allusions to the Exodus story, particularly as they appear in tandem. God's promise to "ransom" Israel from Egypt as well as his post hoc declaration of the liberated nation as a "special people" are both the divine speech-act associated with Israel's defining story. The former occurs in Exod 6:6 in Yhwh's initial appearance to Moses in a passage I examined above in Chapter Two. The latter occurs immediately at Israel's arrival at Sinai and is a preface to Moses' reception of the law on Mt. Sinai (Exod 19:5; cf. 23:22; 14:2; 26:18).[316] In Deut 7:6-8 the concepts are even more tightly juxtaposed:

> . . . .God has taken you to be to him a special people [λαὸν περιούσιον] apart from all the nations. . . .and he led you in mighty hand and outstretched arm and he redeemed [ἐλυτρώσατο] from the house of slavery from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.

The emergence of a "special people" is a corollary of divine redemption. The people is "special" precisely because God has ransomed them. But how does the language of cleansing figure here? The notion of purification (καθαρίσῃ) in 2:14c recalls 1:15 ("To the pure all things are pure; but to the defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure"). It may have appeared again in 2:14 partly to remind the listener of the standard Pauline corrective to the older distinction between clean and unclean urged by Judaizers. The false path of "Jewish myths and the commands of men" (1:14) is thus contrasted with the true path of covenant fidelity and road to

[316] Interestingly in the Exodus narrative, God does not tell Israel that she is to be a "special people"; this message is given by Yhwh to Moses who in turn is to relay it to Israel. This parallels the rhetorical structure in Titus wherein Paul commands his delegate to "speak these things" (2:15) to the epistolary audience as a whole.

purity and holiness, which comes through Jesus' self-gift. Rather than a law which separates "clean" from "unclean," God cleanses a special people himself—an act which renders the old distinctions moot.[317] Moreover the distinction between clean and unclean corresponds to "law" (νόμος) and thus, ransoming from "lawlessness" accomplishes the same effect as "cleansing." For this reason the καί between λυτρώσηται and καθαρίσῃ should be understood epexegetically.[318] The cleansing is not regarded by Paul as a separate action from the redeeming but instead reminds the hearer *how* the redemption took place and *what its effects* were. Collins combines the two concepts as a "ritual redemption."[319] Below I will explore further how the distinct concepts of "redeeming" and "cleaning" fit together.

Besides epexegetically linking λυτρώσηται and καθαρίσῃ, the καί also establishes the final parallel of the two parts of the ἵνα clause: the "us" (ἡμᾶς) who are redeemed by means of cleansing are the "special people" (λαὸν περιούσιον). The final attribute of the people "zealous for noble deeds" reminds the hearers again that the point of remembering stories of salvation of old is to bolster moral living in the present. Visible works moreover commend to others the gospel. "Noble deeds" (καλὰ ἐργά, 2:7) are essential for the delegate Titus to exemplify, just as the absence of "any good deed" (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, 1:16) constitutes a grave moral deficit in those whose minds and consciences are impure.

---

[317] Thus Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates*, 240.

[318] Thus Stettler, *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*, 259.

[319] Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus*, 354.

Exegetical Results for Titus 2:11-14

We are in a position to paraphrase 2:11-14 thus:

God manifested his grace in the form of the preaching of the gospel (which offers salvation to everyone). This was to discipline us to reject worldly desires opposed to God and instead to embrace virtuous living as we wait in the current age for our God and savior Jesus Christ to make his final decisive intervention in history. He gave himself for us to ransom us from our former state by cleansing us as his own special people, eager for good works.

The final sentence in my paraphrase (which is a relative clause in the Greek, 2:14a-b) connects back to the "grace manifested" in 2:11. Whether one classifies this relative clause as a "hymn," a "confession," or a "*formelhafte Wendung*" is less important than the recognition that the final relative clause is a condensed form of the preached kerygma (1:3-4) and thus is a restatement of the "grace of God manifested" in 2:11.[320] It is content which must be known by the audience. Recall that Paul had at the beginning of the letter insisted that his own ministry, the "knowledge of the truth," what God promised before the ages and the manifestation of God's word in preaching were all part of a unified whole (1:1-4). But in 2:11-14 we find that this knowledge of the kerygmatic content is power too—the ultimate source of the power to live virtuously as God's special people. Put differently, the preached *kerygma* derives its power from the cleansing and redeeming self-gift of Jesus Christ, which establishes *who* the special people of God is, *what* the people is to do, and *how* it is to do it. The final purpose clause in 2:14 which

[320] "Hymn" is Collins' term (*I & II Timothy and Titus*, 353); "confession" is that of Quinn (*Titus*, 172) while "*formelhafte Wendung*" is that of Oberlinner (*Die Pastoralbriefe*, 3:138).

describes the effect of Jesus Christ's self-surrender thus binds together and supports the entire sentence in 2:11-14 and, through this, rounds out and completes the material in 1:1-4 while serving as the ultimate basis for both the Church order in 1:5-9 and the *Haustafel* in 2:1-10. For this reason it is worthwhile to linger a bit longer in 2:14b to explore more deeply Paul's redemptive theology there.

Excursus on Ransom in Titus

Ransom as the Mark of Christian Identity

Ransom cognates never appear in Titus but Paul surely supposes knowledge of the LXX on the part of his audience. Quinn finds the language of 2:14 "conspicuously Septuagintal" and many LXX passages have at times been proposed to lie in the background.[321] One important parallel has been suggested by Lau who hears an echo of 2 Sam 7:23:[322]

> And what other nation on earth is like your people [λαὸς σου] Israel, whom God led in order to redeem [λυτρώσασθαι] him as a people [λαόν], to establish you as a name to perform greatness and a helping intervention [ἐπιφάνειαν] that you should drive out nations and dwelling places from before your people whom you redeemed [ἐλυτρώσω] for yourself [σεατῷ] from Egypt.

The Greek text of 2 Sam 7:23 (2 Kgdms 7:23 LXX) is hard to translate precisely, as it appears to have preserved many of the underlying textual difficulties of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. But the textual and thematic similarities between the two passages are curious. Both feature many of the same terms (λυτρόω, λαός, ἐπιφάνεια) as well as the dative of advantage pronouns σεατῷ and ἑαυτῷ respectively. Also of note is the parallel use of ἐπιφάνεια. In 2 Sam 7:23 it is a wondrous

---

[321] Quinn, *Titus,* 171.

[322] Lau, *Manifest in Flesh,* 150-54.

and awesome display of divine power or, to use the term in its most technical sense, it is the manifestation of Yhwh's helping intervention in the context of the military defeat inflicted upon Egypt. God's original act of redemption can be conceived of as his consummate ἐπιφάνεια. It thus is the prototype of his final awaited intervention in which his redemptive cleansing will be perfected.

Both texts also are laden with identity markers. 2 Sam 7:23 emphasizes a "people" whose existence and identity are forged by redemption and who belong to their divine agent of redemption, who not only ransomed them but did so to himself and for his own purpose (σεατῷ). The LXX text is moreover concerned with shaping a national identity around God's dynastic promise to David. In an analogous way, Titus 2:11-14 is also concerned with the identity of the Church as a whole. I have already remarked above on Paul's rhetorical emphasis on "us." The ethical conduct of the Church is founded on her identity as a people who have seen the appearance of God's grace, who live temperately, justly and piously waiting for the final epiphany of Jesus Christ and who do so ultimately on the basis of the purifying redemption effected by the self-surrender of Christ. It is this very purifying redemption to which the audience owes its transformation from its former status to the status of membership in a special people free from lawlessness and belonging to Christ (ἑαυτῷ).

Seen in this light, the final phrase "zealous for noble deeds" reveals new facets in the hearing of the audience. The emphasis of the short letter on "good works" (1:16; 3:1) and "noble works" (2:7, 14) is obvious to even the casual listener. By 2:14 in fact, three mentions of good/noble works have already been made either by the presentation of those "unapproved" to

perform them (1:16), by Titus' charge to exemplify their performance (2:7) or by a Church to do them. But strikingly 2:14 is not concerned only with the *performance* of works but with the *zeal* for them. Zeal, to be sure, can have a secular Hellenistic ring connoting enthusiasm for a moral ideal.[323] But in light of the robust emphasis on the Church's religious identity as well as the earlier echoes of false Jewish construals of that identity that plagued Pauline churches elsewhere ("those of the circumcision," 1:10; "Jewish myths and commandments of men," 1:14), it is best to conclude that "zeal" is meant mostly to be evocative of Jewish particularism.[324] To wit, Paul is trying to reclaim the concept of "zeal" from those who identified in one way or another with the fervent Torah based piety of the Maccabees (1 Macc 2:54; cf. Num 25:11; 2 Kgs 19:31) and for the Cretan audience to devote themselves fervently to visible forms of piety in the Church. Verse 2:14b-c thus marks a thorough Christianization of concepts indigenous to the very core of the self-understanding of first century Judaism (redemption, purify, special people, zeal). It is in this respect parallel to 2:12 which analogously had appropriated popular Hellenistic doctrines of virtue to ground their truest expression in "God's grace" and to place them at the core of authentic Christian life in the present age. Sound teaching embodies both *true* virtue and *true* zeal.

In this vein, 2:11-14 holds the key to unlocking the mystery early on in the epistle as to why Paul in 1:10-16 mixes some generalized descriptions of problems in Crete with pointed and highly specific criticisms directed at both vague and unidentified Jewish and Gentile opponents

---

[323] A. Stumpff, "ζῆλος, etc.," *TDNT* 2:877.

[324] Quinn, *Titus,* 174; Wieland, *Significance of Salvation*, 210-11; Benjamin Lappenga, "Zealots for Good Works": The Polemical Repercussions of the Word ζηλωτής in Titus 2:14." *CBQ* 75 (2013) 715-17.

of the gospel. Unlike the opponents in Ephesus addressed in 1 Timothy, these troublemakers do not appear to be wayward members of the Church of Crete but rather are presented mostly as threats from outside—"especially from the circumcision group" (1:10) or from the larger Gentile community of Crete who might identify Epimenides as one of "their own" prophets "from them" (1:12). There is far too little in the way of sustained argumentation in the rest of the letter to suppose that either group (or any group) presented a distinctive theological or doctrinal challenge to Paul or the Cretan Church. Both the qualities of overseer (1:5-9) as well as moral attributes associated with the hearers' living out the "sound teaching" (2:1-10) are generic and are not shaped in light of a distinct exigency.

In fact, both opponents serve to fill the role of rhetorical foil to Paul's correct grounding of the Cretan Christian identity in 2:11-14. They are largely hypothetical, each in turn representing false menu options of *unhealthy* teaching on offer. Drawing on the works of Diodorus and others, Kidd has unearthed several interesting facts about stereotypical Cretan religious beliefs.[325] Among his findings are: (1) the Cretan theological heritage held that gods were once merely mortal men and women; (2) as a rejoinder to Olympus, Cretans held that their island was the birthplace of the majority of the Greek pantheon just as it was the seed of the Greek race; (3) this general belief was paired with the Cretan tradition that the island was the place of Zeus' final repose; (4) there was a local legend taught by Cretans involving a lie told by Zeus to cavort with a human woman on Crete; (5) it was largely to Cretan religious ideas that their reputation as "liars" was due— "*kretizein*" or "to Cretize" actually means "to lie"; (6) the

[325] Kidd, "Titus as *Apologia*," 193-203.

main line of ancient critique against popular Cretan theology was that their gods were all too human.

As a means of laying the groundwork for correct doctrine and practice, Paul is rejecting alternative religious heritages and their misappropriation which tend to reduce divinity to humanity. Cretans like Jews have their myths and purely human teachings. This is why Paul, the slave of God, begins by reminding his audience that his purpose in writing is "knowledge of the truth," to wit, that God properly understood is an "unlying" deity (unlike Zeus and his Cretan partisans) who made a promise of eternal life (which the circumcision group misunderstands). This promise God has fulfilled in the purifying redemption of Jesus Christ's self-surrender (2:14b). This redemption from lawlessness (the Jewish formulation of the human condition) is the ultimate cause of the appearance of grace (2:11) which empowers the truest expression of a life of virtue (as Greek wisdom understood it). "Ransom" is thus constitutive of a people distinct from both Gentile Cretans and non-Christian Jews whose identity was based on circumcision.

Redemption and Slavery in Titus

Redemption is denominative of a people belonging to God in another way as well. We have seen above in Chapter Two that divine redemption sometimes involved "freedom" for the party being redeemed but other times could be described as God settling the accounts of an indebted party, graciously removing their encumbrance, all as a means of taking possession of that party himself. In addition, I showed that ransom theology consists not only of λυτ-cognates but also of constellation terms, chief of which is the word δούλος. Not only is it a slave of one sort or another who is the object to be ransomed from his slavery, but also, paradoxically, slavery

can be the result when the ransoming agent is God himself. This is the meaning of Paul's epistolary introduction to the Cretans as δούλος θεοῦ (1:1). By depicting himself as "slave of God," the apostle holds himself up as an exponent of divine redemption. That Paul himself thinks along these lines is clear from the rest of his corpus. The large majority of his usages of the term δούλος are positive.[326] Paul himself is a "slave" to Christ (Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1; Gal 1:10) as are both Timothy (2 Tim 2:24) and Epaphras (Col 4:12) and epistolary audiences more generally (Rom 6:22, 12:11; 14:18; 16:18; 1 Cor 7:22; 1 Thess 1:7; Eph 6:6, 7; Col 3:24). Given that Christ is soon to be described in terms suggestive of divinity or divine honors (1:3-4; 2:13), it does not seem especially significant that Paul in 1:1—in a manner without exact parallel elsewhere in his corpus—calls himself "slave of God" rather than "slave of Christ."[327] What is significant is that Paul's use of redemption language in 2:14 is anticipated from the very first words of the letter.

Unlike in 1 Timothy, Paul does not remind the Cretan audience of what he was before he became a "slave of God," how God called him, and what changes in Paul that the call effected. Beyond ἀπόστολος and ὁ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ, Paul has nothing else to say about himself in 1:1-4. But this is fitting for a letter preoccupied less with fostering conversion of those beyond the Church's boundaries and more with establishing and confirming the identity of those already inside. Seen in this light, the phrase δούλος θεοῦ is evocative of redemption theology in another significant way as a title that defines all Israel. The Psalter that both celebrates Yhwh's past

[326] The negative references occur when slavery is contrasted with divine sonship (Galatians 4–5; Rom 8:12-17).

[327] Contra Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus*, 302.

redemption while requesting future ones also celebrates Yhwh as the one who "will ransom the lives of his slaves" (λυτρώσεται κύριος ψυχὰς δούλων αὐτοῦ, Ps 33:22 LXX). Moreover the psalmist can petition Yhwh for salvation precisely *because* he is his slave (Ps 122:2; 142:12 LXX). The same paradox is embedded in Isaiah which emphasizes both Yhwh as "redeemer" and the people as "redeemed" but also as "slave of God" (δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ, 42:19; 48:20; 49:3). The phrase δούλος θεοῦ thus can serve as highly particularistic language that is intended to prepare Paul's hearers for a letter focusing upon "us," i.e., the Cretan Church itself—which has been ransomed "for himself" as a special people.

At first blush, the mention of "slaves" in 2:9 at the conclusion of the *Haustafel* would seem to lack redemption theology. For it is here that Paul refers to slavery in a purely socio-economic vein, while declining to develop further the slavery motif of 1:1 in light of redemption theology. Persons in the Church who happen to be slaves are enjoined to subordinate to their masters—a seemingly banal request that requires little further explanation. But upon deeper inspection, there are grounds to suspect that Paul is up to more than this. The primary command is to be "subordinate in every way" to masters with ὑποτάσσεσθαι in the middle voice having the nuance of a free submission of self. The command is given here to "slaves" but the concern is easily seen to be of a much more general nature. The absence of accusations of "insubordination" (ἀνυπότακα, 1:6) is a leading qualification of an overseer, just as "being insubordinate" (ἀνυπότακοι, 1:10) heads the list of Paul's complaints about the attributes of the Church's opponents. And subordination (ὑποτασσομένας, 2:5) to husbands is an important way

in which young women are to be tempered. Slaves—by being subordinate "in every way"—represent the fullest expression of the central Christian virtue.

Moreover this subordination to their own masters is ultimately a subordination to God himself—which is the essence of what it means to have experienced the effects of redemption as a δούλος θεοῦ. Paul does not make this argument explicitly because he will provide the ultimate theological grounding only a few verses later. Yet even at this stage, the attentive hearer knows that in Pauline preaching "to be pleasing" (εὐάρεστος εἶναι) always takes God himself as the one who is to be pleased and never human beings (Rom 12:1, 2; 14:8; 2 Cor 5:9; Eph 5:10; Phil 4:18; Col 3:20).[328] Besides, the ultimate object of subordination is apparent from the fact that the epistle itself constitutes a continuation of the basic *kerygma* revealed in these times, entrusted to Paul, and preached under the final authority (κατ' ἐπιταγήν) of God himself (1:4).

That slaves stand in a more subtle and unique way for the redemptive meaning of the gospel is also the reason Paul's instruction to slaves constitutes the crescendo of the *Haustafel*. The ἱνα clause provides far more noble and exalted justifications for slaves' instructions than for addressees of the two prior units. Whereas the previous two purpose clauses are purely negative and defensive ("so that the word of God might not be blasphemed" [2:5]; "that opponents might be ashamed, having nothing evil to say about us" [2:8]), it is the slaves whose subordination "adorns the teaching of our God in all things" (2:9). For Spicq, it is no accident that slaves, "at the bottom of the human hierarchy, are able through the splendor of their conduct, to honor God

[328] Thus Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 415; Quinn, *Titus,* 147.

and increase the attractiveness of the gospel in the hearts of pagans."[329] Paul is subtly stretching and subverting social institutions to make broader statements about the topsy-turvy effects of redemption. It is normally the wealthy and not slaves who "adorn" cities and leaders in return for public recognition.[330] Buried within seemingly mundane instructions to slaves, there are thus—as Towner puts it—"textual cues that Paul regarded the Church's calling in the world as a robust, redemptive role."[331] Surely the whole Church of Crete—and not simply slaves—are to strive to adorn the teaching of God as the fullest expression of good works. But it is no coincidence that a unit devoted to "slaves" gives way to a dense theological unit that climaxes with the self-surrender of Jesus in order to effect a cleansing redemption. Redemption and slavery are related concepts.

We have seen above in Chapter Two that redemption theology also serves to bolster Paul's presentation of the moral demands of the gospel. Paul at times appeals to the negative dimensions of slavery when slavery is considered as a mark of someone unredeemed (Galatians 4–5; Rom 8:12-17).[332] A Christian must not remain a slave to elemental spirits (Gal 4:8-9), to the law (4:24: 5:1; Rom 7:25), to sin (6:17, 20), to fear (8:15). These negative dimensions of slavery are invoked to explain fleshly man's hopeless and inescapable attachment to worldly objects other than God. Ransom becomes the obvious salvific metaphor to explain the manner by which God sunders these bonds. The Cretan audience has already heard the slavery metaphor

[329] Spicq, "κοσμέω," *TLNT* 2:335.

[330] Towner, *Timothy and Titus,* 739.

[331] Ibid., 735.

[332] Cf. Phlm 16.

invoked in just this manner. Faithful older women are—as an expression of "healthiness in faith"—to evince such healthiness by, among other things, "not being enslaved" to too much wine. The perfect passive participle μὴ δεδουλωμένας (2:4) indicates that redemptive status is presupposed in the person, which in turn liberates the person to teach and temper others effectively. Ransom/slave language is a standard way in which Paul couches moral demands in truths of soteriology. It is therefore unsurprising that 2:11-14—whose burden is to provide the theological grounding of moral behavior in the Church—should invoke "ransom" as the main saving action of Jesus Christ, rather than simply "save."

This background prepares the hearer for the final occasion of slave rhetoric in 3:3. The unit 3:1-7 is like the preceding chapter in that there is a series of moral instructions (3:1-2) followed by the doctrinal motivation for such instructions (3:3-7). And as in 2:11-14, the doctrinal *motivation* of moral living also contains a reminder of *the source of the power* for the hearer to be equal to the moral requirements being affirmed. The decisive rejection of worldly desires and the embrace of a life of virtue in the present age in 2:11-12 are, in light of the work of purifying redemption in 2:14, presented positively in 3:3 by way of sharp contrast. For prior to the present age of redemption, the Cretans were "foolish," "disobedient," "led astray" and above all "enslaved to desires and various pleasures [δουλέυοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις] while living a life in wickedness and envy." And what is the power to dissolve this servile condition? Just as the appearance of grace empowered the rejection of "worldly desires" and living "soberly, justly and piously" so here it is the appearance of divine "goodness" and "kindness" (3:4) that decisively broke the old bonds of slavery. Both are different expressions of

the effects of the self-gift of Jesus Christ who redeemed the Cretans for himself.

The Purifying Redemption: the Puzzling Hendiadys of 2:14

Relatively little discussion has taken place concerning how it is that "ransom" and "cleanse" came to be used in tandem or, as I have argued above, functionally as a hendiadys. Even given that the language of 2:14 is "conspicuously Septuagintal," these are in fact two well known Septuagintal concepts that bear no obvious relationship to one another. There are passages such as Isa 44:22-23 which associate a future redemption with a previous condition of lawlessness as well as future glory:

> I erased your lawlessness [ἀνομία] like a cloud and your sin like darkness. Turn back to me and I will redeem [λυτρώσομαι] you. . . .God has redeemed [ἐλυτρώσατο] Jacob and Israel will be glorified [δοξασθήσεται].

But references in Isaiah to Yhwh "cleansing" are rather scarce.[333] More useful is the suggestion of Marshall that the author drew upon a combination of two or more verses, perhaps, as Stettler contends, using the term ἀνομία as a "hook-word," following the rabbinical exegetical technique known as *Gezera Shewa*.[334] Indeed, the OT precedent for God specifically ransoming Israel from lawlessness (ἀνομία) occurs in Ps 129:7-8 LXX which reads:

> From the Lord is mercy and from him is much redemption [λύτρωσις].
>
> He will ransom [λυτρώσεται] Israel from all his lawless deeds [ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ].

[333] The nearest example is in God's desire to "clean" the Suffering Servant from his blows (Isa 53:10 LXX).

[334] Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 284-85; Stettler, *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*, 259.

But as καθαρίζω is a term overwhelmingly associated with Israel's ceremonial law, it is rare for the LXX to describe God himself as "cleansing." But this fact makes Ezek 37:23 all the more memorable, since it is known for employing cultic terminology to present Yhwh himself promising to clean a people from lawlessness:

> And I will rescue them from all their lawless deeds [ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν] in which they sinned, and I will cleanse [καθαριῶ] them, and they will be a people [λαόν] to me and I will be their God.

In the opinion of Marshall, Stettler and others, Paul, by combining these verses, derives the notion of a redemptive cleansing or better still, a ransom by means of purification.

If this background is correct, it explains the textual derivation of the two distinct ideas and how they overlap to a degree in Ezekiel and Psalms. But beyond sources cited and exegetical mechanics employed, it begs the question as to *why* the terms are coupled here. The term ἀνομία itself, by which "I will ransom" and "I will cleanse" were brought together, seems of no special significance in Titus or even the rest of the PE. On the assumption that in 2:14b we are not in fact seeing the effects of Paul haphazardly ransacking his mental LXX concordance, the challenge remains to explain the pairing.

Collins is correct to claim that 2:14b advances "a kind of ritual redemption" in anticipation of the forthcoming (apparent) allusion to baptism in 3:4-5.[335] Indeed a number of

[335] Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus*, 354. Many commentators recognize the "washing of rebirth" in 3:5 as a reference to baptism. See e.g., Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 148; Dornier, *Les Épîtres Pastorales,* 153; Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 3:174; Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, 277; Quinn, *Titus*, 217-19. Even scholars whose exegesis (or theology!) precludes an identification between baptism and spiritual rebirth will tend to see in

commentators see the rite of baptism already alluded to in 2:12.[336] This latter interpretation of 2:12 may depend too heavily on material later in the epistle; the global aorist participle ἀρνησάμενοι directs the audience more to the ethical effects of its overall conversion event (and not specifically baptism). Nonetheless, it is clear that in many ways the audience's reception of the dense material in 3:1-7 is heavily conditioned by the equally dense 2:11-14. Therefore it is appropriate to consider ways in which the ransom/cleansing pairing prepares the hearer for material to follow.

Actually, I have already remarked above upon one such effect of Paul's redemption theology: the account of the Cretan audience's former state as one of "slavery to various desires." Marshall rightly regards this as the "dominant thought" behind the coming pneumatological salvation to be explicated in 3:3-7 and an idea that clearly builds upon redemption in 2:14b.[337] Moreover, the rejection of "worldly desires" in the "now" time (2:12) anticipates the reminder of the "slavery to various desires" *then* (3:3). Between Paul's familiar eschatological "then" and "now" lies the self-surrender of Jesus and its redemptive effects.

But there remains the question of how these redemptive effects are communicated. An important message of Titus is that the gospel does not merely set forth moral ideals but also empowers their attainment. I have contended above both that (1) the grace of God that appeared in 2:11 is to be identified with the gospel preaching and the life lived by those who receive it by

---

the language of 3:5 baptismal symbolism at work. See, e.g., Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 268; Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 782.

[336] Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 298; Dornier, *Les Épîtres Pastorales,* 143.

[337] Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles,* 305.

faith and (2) that the appearance of this grace is in some way the result of Jesus Christ's work of redemption in 2:14b. Verses 2:11-14 are meant to ground the appearance of grace in the work of redemption while leaving the precise connection unstated.

More of the connection becomes clear however in 3:1-7. "The grace of God appeared" in 2:11 looks forward to the "kindness" and "generosity" of God that also "appeared" in 3:4. The latter appearance makes the breaking of the bondage to desire much more explicit. The ὅτε δέ that marked the manifestation of the divine χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία also ended the period of "slavery to various desires." Put differently, the "kindness" and "generosity" of God communicated the redemptive effects of Jesus Christ's self-gift.

It should be remembered at this point that the full breadth of Pauline "ransom" theology entails both the identity of the ransomed people and the state of that people after the ransom has taken place. This I have dealt with above. Yet also the notion of price is usually included, at the very least through the presence of terms which are capable of bearing an economic signification. The most obvious here is "he gave himself for us" in 2:14b in which διδώμι and ὑπέρ together denote—if not an actual exchange—then a transaction in which the ransomed Church is the beneficiary. Paul however declines to press further the christological aspects of this. Rather he is concerned with how redemptive benefits are tangibly manifested. This is why he tells the hearer that "kindness" and "generosity" appeared. Neither χρηστότης nor φιλανθρωπία per se denote money anymore than χάρις does in 2:11. Yet both terms often amount to this very thing in the manner in which they were used in the Hellenistic world. Χρήστος is a frequent characteristic of God in the LXX but in Greco-Roman society the term was frequently associated

with the cheerful beneficence (financial and otherwise) of nobles and others of high social status.[338] In fact, χρηστότης was often paired almost formulaically with φιλανθρωπία in Philo, Josephus, Plutarch, Menander, Dio Cassius and many others.[339] And this latter term for "generosity"—though rare in the LXX and never as an attribute of God—is known also to have a specific application in Greco-Roman antiquity to the ransom of captives.[340] Χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία in tandem serve as a bridge concept for Paul to explain how redemptive work is communicated to the Cretan Church.

But in what sense did χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία "appear" in 3:4? The answer to this question in 3:5 will enable a fuller explanation for the ransom/cleansing hendiadys in 2:14b. Their appearance is complementary to the appearance of grace in 2:11. Grace appeared in the kerygmatic preaching of the Church; kindness and generosity appeared in the pneumatological cleansing associated with the rite of baptism. Though both appearances make possible the Christian life, neither is based on human works per se (3:5a-b); rather, both are rooted in and indeed are manifestations of the redemptive and purifying work of Jesus Christ.

This work is signified by the phrase in 3:5d: ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας. The first two words "he saved" (ἔσωσεν) and "us" (ἡμᾶς) aptly sum up the dense material in 2:11-14. Not only does ἔσωσεν recall the epistle's strong emphasis on God and Jesus Christ

---

[338] Spicq, "χρηστεύομαι, etc.," *TLNT* 3:511-16.

[339] BDAG, χρηστότης, 1090; K. Weiss, "χρηστότης, etc.," *TDNT* 9:489-90.

[340] Surprisingly this aspect of the term was missed both by Spicq ("φιλανθρωπία," *TLNT* 3:440-45) and by Luck ("φιλανθρωπία," *TDNT* 9:107-12). But Walter Lock (*The Pastoral Epistles* [ICC; New York: Scribner, 1924] 153) shows a few examples of this sense of the term which he regards as "consciously present" in 3:4.

alternatively as "our savior" but also serves to encapsulate the threefold salvific actions in 2:14: "gave himself," "to ransom us," and "to cleanse for himself." These actions are not recalled to teach the Cretans finer points of soteriology but rather to remind again how this salvation became constitutive of "us."

The placement of the noun λουτρόν together with παλιγγενεσία is a curious choice. Neither cognate has thus far been anticipated in the letter, and for this reason, scholars are probably correct to suggest that Paul is appealing to traditional material. This is especially true of the term παλιγγενεσία which has no close cognates in the Pauline corpus.[341] On the other hand, λουτρόν does serve to recall the cleansing aspect of the purifying redemption as the λούω and καθαρίζω word groups are broadly synonymous.[342] Indeed to the extent that there is a difference, it is that καθαρίζω cognates are far more common for Hellenistic Jewish rites of purification (if the relative dearth of λούω terms in the LXX is any indication), while λούω words are strongly associated with Greco-Roman baths used for cleansing (both physical and spiritual) among other things.[343]

But it is left to an audience-oriented exegesis to expose not only lexical cognates but the auricular aspects of the language as well, mindful of the fact that Titus—like all the Pauline epistles—was intended first and foremost for public recitation. In such a scenario, the *sounds* of

---

[341] Λουτρόν however does appear once in Eph 5:26 in another passage often considered to refer to baptism.

[342] In fact, they appear together in Eph 5:26. BDAG ("καθαρίζω," 489; "λούω," 603) describes both terms as denoting cleansing from impurity with connotations of ritual purification.

[343] Spicq ("λούω, etc.," *TLNT* 2:410-14) describes the Hellenistic lustral baths as being for rest, relaxation, healing from sickness or after an athletic event, to prepare for the solemn approach of a deity, or as a pre-nuptial rite.

words can exert an effect just as significant as their lexical meaning.[344] It therefore may be no coincidence that Paul chose in λουτρόν a term that sounded nearly homophonic to the other part of the ransom/cleansing hendiadys—the verb λυτρόω.[345] Paul's unusual term for "washing" is highly evocative of 2:14 and its notion of ritual redemption, since λουτρόν has a *meaning* similar to καθαρίζω but a *sound* similar to λυτρόω.

Here is not the place to concern ourselves with the various interpretive permutations of "the rebirth of the Holy Spirit" in 3:5b nearly all of which press overly subtle distinctions.[346]

---

[344] The scholarly appreciation of the hermeneutical relevance of the orality of the NT is still in its infancy. But a few fairly recent works have attempted to evince the exegetical relevance of Greek sounds. See, e.g., Holly Hearon, "The Implications of the Orality for the Study of Biblical Text," in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark* (ed. Richard Horsley, Jonathan Draper, and John Foley; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006); Jeffrey Brickle, *Aural Design and Coherence in the Prologue of First John* (LNTS; formerly JSNTSup 465; New York: T & T Clark, 2012) and Margaret Lee and Bernard Scott, *Sound Mapping the New Testament* (Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2009). John D. Harvey has produced a monograph devoted to orality in Paul called *Listening to the Text: Oral Patterning in Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998). Since his study was focused on broader oral/aural patterns, he offers no examples of homophones precisely analogous to λυτρόω/λουτρόν in Titus. Nevertheless, he remarks that at the time Paul wrote, "Thought and expression were shaped to a greater or lesser extent by sound." For this reason, oral patterns must be based on "acoustic resonances rather than on conceptual parallels found by silently rereading the text" (Ibid., 56). Given this, it would seem an even stronger case for intentional oral patterning would exist when the "acoustic resonances" themselves coincide with "conceptual parallels," as I have argued that they do here. Elsewhere in the PE, many have noted the alliterative π sounds in 1 Tim 2:1. Likewise the proliferation of words that begin with επ sounds in Titus 1:1-4 is unlikely to be accidental. But if alliterative sounds could produce important rhetorical effects, how much more could homophonic ones!

[345] I say "nearly homophonic" because one cannot assume the validity of Erasmian conventions of Greek pronunciation which have tended to conflate the sounds of the vowel Y and the diphthong OY. These conventions are generally acknowledged today to be inaccurate with respect to certain vowel sounds. How vowels sounded during the career of Paul is another question and phonological questions of this sort are only beginning to arouse scholarly interest. The most thorough and up to date research on this question was conducted by Chrys Caragounis (*The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* [WUNT 167; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004] 340-96, esp., 350.) Using papyrological evidence of confusions and variations in popular word spellings with modern Greek pronunciation as a reference point for phonological development, Caragounis concluded that the vowel sound of Y and the diphthong OY—though they once were conflatable in the Iron Age—were moving apart by NT times. The sound of the diphthong OY resembled the English oo as in the word "look." Meanwhile Y sounded somewhere between u in "luck" and i in "did." Λουτροῦ under this pronunciation still can produce a wordplay with λυτρώσεται.

[346] Marshall (*Pastoral Epistles*, 316-17) lists the major options remarking that "it is very doubtful if there is any major difference in understanding whichever set of possibilities we adopt."

Beyond the first explicit appearance in the epistle of the Holy Spirit (unsurprising in a section devoted to spiritual transformation and baptism), what is interesting is the phrase "poured out richly through Jesus Christ our savior." The identity of the savior in 3:3-7 had been ambiguous to this point and indeed the contextual flow of the letter would suggest that the audience would understand "he saved us" in 3:4 to refer to Jesus himself. The effect here is to introduce God the Father, with Jesus Christ and the Spirit. Nevertheless the name of Jesus Christ, our savior, recalls once again 2:11-14 and especially 2:14, where the divine "pouring" is related back to Christ's "cleansing." But the other part of the ransom/cleansing hendiadys is alluded to as well since the adverb "richly" (πλουσίως) belongs more to the logic of a gratuitous *economic* outpouring associated with a ransom of slaves than a *lustral* one associated with baptism of converts. "Richly" creates a mixed metaphor which attaches to "pouring" the notion of redeeming and thus serves to recall the "purifying" and "redemption" pair in 2:14 while grounding it more explicitly in the ritual life of the Cretan Church.[347] It only appears to interpreters like Wieland that the role of Christ is "strangely muted" in 3:5-6 because the instrumental basis of the rich pouring in the redeeming and purifying work of Christ is not fully appreciated.[348]

Conclusion

Titus is an epistle highly concerned with soteriology as most readily seen by the proliferation of σωζ-cognates. Yet if my argument is correct, despite the dispersion of σωζ-terms

---

[347] As I noted in Chapter Two above, Eph 1:7-8 also drew a close connection between "riches," "outpouring," and "redemption."

[348] Wieland, *Significance of Salvation*, 228.

in three passages 1:1-4, 2:11-14 and 3:4-7, the soteriology of Titus is centered in a highly focused manner in the "ransom" and "cleansing" mentioned in 2:14. The central saving act is Jesus Christ's self-surrender and the principal salvific effect is "ransom from lawlessness" together with "cleansing for himself a special people." It is around these effects that the soteriology of Titus is concerned. Paul develops this soteriology to provide the theological basis for the moral standards he places upon the Cretan Church, but also to explain how these standards are to be realized. Redemption theology factors into these moral standards in at least two ways: (1) through the verb "to ransom" in 2:14 which—as the first effect of Christ's self-surrender—makes operative and efficacious the kerygmatic proclamation of the Church and the faith that it produces and (2) through the pairing of the verb "ransom" with "cleanse"—a connection which is later exploited by Paul to link the redemptive effects of Christ's death in the past with the transforming effects of baptismal renewal in the present life of the Church. The "ransom"/"cleansing" pairing functions in another important way as well by connecting "redeem" and "special people." Since "redeem" and "special people" are two different sides of the same coin in the LXX on which Paul depends, his idea of redemption figures prominently in the Church's understanding of itself *vis a vis* the surrounding world, which is evidently a major purpose of the apostle's writing to the Cretans in the first place. Redemption theology also grounds the power of the gospel for moral transformation—through the epistle's proliferation of "slave" references which have been strangely neglected in scholarship, even as other frequently repeated terms in Titus ("faith," "sound teaching," "good works," "ἐπιφάνεια/appear," etc.) command considerable attention.

CHAPTER FIVE

Introduction

In this concluding chapter, it remains carefully to take stock of my findings in the above chapters by tying up several loose ends. First, I will compare the two PE ransom passages whose similarities are occasionally noted but seldom explored. This will enable us to see what more generally can be deduced of Paul's redemption theology as it appears in those letters. After this, I will attempt to situate these units within the Pauline corpus as a whole in order to ascertain what they would add to Pauline theology of redemption were they to be treated as fully Pauline.

Comparison of 1 Tim 2:1-7 and Titus 2:11-14

The passages are actually quite similar in both text and theology.[349]

1 Timothy 2:1-7	**Titus 2:11-14**
[1]I therefore first of all urge that intercessions, prayers, petitions and thanksgivings be made for all people (πάντων ἀνθρώπων), [2]for kings and all (πάντων) in authority, so that we might lead a quiet and peaceful life in all piety (εὐσεβείᾳ) and seriousness. [3]This is good and acceptable before God (θεοῦ) our savior (σωτῆρος ἡμῶν) [4]who wishes all people (πάντας ἀνθρώπους) to be saved (σωθῆναι) and to come to the knowledge of the truth. [5]For God (θεός) is one And the mediator between God (θεοῦ) and people (ἀνθρώπων) is one	[11]For the grace of God (θεοῦ) has appeared which brings salvation (σωτήριος) to all people (πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις),[12] having disciplined us (ἡμᾶς) to reject ungodliness (ἀσέβειαν), worldly desires, and to live wisely, justly and piously (εὐσεβῶς) in the current age,[13] as we wait for the blessed hope which is manifestation of the glory of the great God (θεοῦ) and our savior (σωτῆρος ἡμῶν) Jesus Christ (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ),[14] who gave himself (ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτόν) for us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) in order to ransom (λυτρώσηται) us (ἡμᾶς) from every

[349] These are my translations taken from the text of NA[28].

1 Timothy 2:1-7	**Titus 2:11-14**
[6]The person (ἄνθρωπος) Christ Jesus (Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς) Who gave himself (ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν) as a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for all (ὑπὲρ πάντων). This is the testimony for these very times. [7]For which I was appointed herald and apostle (I speak the truth, I do not lie), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth.	lawlessness and to cleanse for himself (ἑαυτῷ) a special people zealous for good works.

Besides the obvious presence of ransom logia for which they have been examined in this study (ἀντίλυτρον, 1 Tim 2:6 // λυτρόω, Titus 2:14), the passages share a strikingly high number of key terms and themes. Both involve exhortations that are rooted in the identity of God (θεός, 1 Tim 2:3, 5 *bis*; Titus 2:11, 13) and the offer of salvation through Jesus Christ (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, 1 Tim 2:5; Titus 2:13), invoking the designation σωτήρ to describe alternatively "God" (1 Tim 2:3) and "Jesus" (Titus 2:13). Both passages describe the salvation as derived from Christ's self-surrender, while employing two very similar formulas to do so (ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν, 1 Tim 2:6 // ὅς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτόν, Titus 2:14) and specifying the beneficiaries of the self-surrender with the preposition ὑπέρ. The self-gift is "for all" in 1 Tim 2:6 and "for us" in Titus 2:14. Moreover, both passages share a certain symmetry of emphasis: "all people"—while mentioned once in Titus 2:11—comprises the major theme of 1 Tim 2:1-7 (2:1, 2, 4, 6); on the other hand, both "we" verbs and the self-referential pronoun "us" for the Church appear but twice in 1 Tim 2:1-7 (2:2, 3), while "we" is the major theme of Titus 2:11-14 (2:12 *bis*, 13, 14 *bis*). 1 Timothy 2:1-7 emphasizes God's universal offer of salvation

with the support of the Church while Titus 2:11-14 emphasizes the Church as the recipient of the ἐπιφάνεια that brings salvation, potentially, to all people. Both passages therefore combine a salvific universalism ("all") with an ecclesial particularism ("us") though in different proportions.

As for the Church itself, both passages mention "piety" (εὐσέβεια, 1 Tim 2:2 // εὐσεβῶς, Titus 2:12) and—though they use different terms to describe it—both express concern with the proximate goal that their respective audiences "live" (διάγω βίον, 1 Tim 2:2 // ζάω, Titus 2:12) a life marked by "piety." In Titus this intermediate goal is specifically connected to the "wait" for coming eschatological "appearance," though I demonstrated above in Chapter Three that there are good reasons to understand the exhortation of 1 Timothy within a similar eschatological framework. Titus echoes the standard Pauline eschatology of the Church existing "in the now age" (ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, 2:12)—the age after the resurrection of Jesus and before the παρουσία—while 1 Tim 2:7 expresses much the same idea with the phrase "for these very times" (καιροῖς ἰδίοις).

There are other thematic parallels as well. In Titus the urging is for mostly unspecified "noble works," while the works are specified in 1 Timothy to consist of prayer and intercession on behalf of outsiders and especially their rulers. Both types of works have a function internal to the Church but are also to be performed at least in part with the goal of visibility for the benefit of outsiders. Both involve exhortations given to a delegate who is in turn to exhort and instruct the faithful as a whole. It is surprising then that in the several tradition-critical studies of the PE—including that of Miller who judges the letters to be composite documents—so little has

been made of the textual and thematic resemblances between the passages.[350] Monograph commentaries on the PE occasionally note the pericopes' similarities, but are generally far more interested in the interdependence between 1 Tim 2:5-6 and Mark 10:45 and the (possible) interdependence between Titus 2:11-14 and 1 Pet 1:13-21.

The differences are also illuminating. For one thing, my analysis above in Chapters Three and Four reveals that the theology of redemption itself is employed by Paul in the respective pericopes with a considerable amount of flexibility and creativity. 1 Timothy 2:1-7 is very much concerned with the universalism associated with God's offer of salvation through Jesus Christ. It is this universalism which is the basis of Paul's exhortation through his delegate Timothy that the Ephesian Church might direct its prayers for the salvation of all people. Contrary to a number of other scholarly interpretations, I have rejected the idea that 1 Tim 2:1-7 constitutes a *demonstratio* for universalism or even a pastoral reinforcement of it in a Church beset by some form of exclusivism or elitism, while proposing an alternative based on the idea of mission. Indeed there is a distinct logic to 1 Tim 2:1-7 and, in the passage's structure, the theme of universalism is based ultimately on the idea of Jesus Christ being the "ransom for all" (ἀντίλυτρον ὕπερ πάντων). This traditional formula is constitutive of the saving truth that God wishes all people to come to believe just as it is the reason the Church should pray

[350] Characteristic of this are, Mark Harding, *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles* (Studies in Biblical Literature 3; New York: Peter Lang, 1998); Patrick Miller, *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents* (SNTSMS 93; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); E. Earle Ellis, "Traditions in the Pastoral Epistles," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Brownlee* (ed. Craig Evans and William Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars' Press, 1987) 237-53;Trummer, *Die Paulustradition der Pastoralbriefe*; Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition*.

for all people—especially rulers—so that the people for whom the intercession is made might come to knowledge of the truth in the first place.

"Ransom for all" is not simply a lexical variation of Mark 10:45's "ransom for many" passage. Rather the theme of redemption is clearly connected to universalism in Paul's thought. My findings in Chapter Three led me to consider and to reject several leading explanations for the connection between "ransom" and "all" in 1 Timothy. What joins the idea of "ransom" on the one hand to "all people" on the other is not the belief that the Messiah is a representative of the whole people. Neither is the background the Isaianic Suffering Servant's bearing the sins "of many," nor the Maccabean martyrs, each of whom dies as a "substitute" (ἀντίψυχον) for the whole nation (4 Macc 6:29; 17:21). In fact the background for Paul is Isaiah 43–45, specifically Isa 43:1-4, 9-11. This section of Isaiah envisions a grand assize in which Israel together with the nations will be summoned to Yhwh's judgment. For Paul the basic idea of judgment has undergone several revisions in light of the Christ-event. The nations who were formerly the ransom "price" to free exiled Israel (Isa 43:3), now have the hope of a better eschatological future which is consonant both with Paul's interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah as a whole as well as his self-described role as "teacher of the Gentiles" (1 Tim 2:7) and his earlier insistence on his apostolic ministry for those "about to be saved" (1 Tim 1:16). Instead of Israel's role of "witnesses" in the final judgment depicted in Isaiah 43, the nations' hope of salvation now rests on "coming to the knowledge of the truth." It is here that Paul and the Ephesian Church have the role of bearing "witness for these times"; the witness of the

Church consists mainly in prayers for all people especially rulers and those in authority—prayers that are mainly missiological in intent.

The possibility of universal salvation is not a corollary of the existence of "one God"—which marks one of several departures from the logic of Rom 3:21-30. In Paul's thinking rather, universalism derives wholly from his christology, specifically Jesus Christ's unique role as the "one mediator" between God and human beings. Jesus' designation as ἄνθρωπος establishes him as the foundation of God's relationship with human beings. Nevertheless, Paul's doctrine of Jesus as "one mediator" does not employ Chalcedonian logic, as is sometimes asserted. Jesus is not mediator through his simultaneous membership in both the human and divine categories. Mediator rather is explained in 1 Tim 2:6a, which combines the idea of self-surrender with the term ἀντίλυτρον or "ransom-exchange." It is, in other words, upon the *economic* sense of the term "mediator" which Paul depends. Jesus is mediator precisely because he is "ransom-exchange"; his self-gift acts as the remission of the debt of human beings as well as the surety by which the debt is confirmed to have been paid. This economic logic need not entail speculation about to whom the "ransom funds" were directed. It is rather against the backdrop of the redemption theology in Deutero-Isaiah that Jesus stands as the proof of God's promised "ransom" of a people in bondage. It was necessary for Paul to tease out the universality associated with "ransom" from the internationalism present in Isaiah 40–55 and its basis for hope for a favorable eschatological verdict for the nations in light of the Christ-event. The nations, under the work of Jesus Christ, have lost their previous

role as "ransom" for Israel (Isa 43:3) and gained an eschatological possibility in which they might not only know Yhwh through his redemption of Israel (Isa 45:13-14), but that they might experience the redemption themselves.

Universal salvation is present in Titus 2:11-14 too, although it is peripheral to the passage's overall thrust of presenting the christological basis for the Cretan Church's moral norms as well as the soteriological basis for their attainment—a theme which I expounded upon in Chapter Four. Concerns for outsiders are by no means removed from Titus, yet Paul's main purpose in the letter is in building up the Church itself. Just as in 1 Tim 2:1-7 Paul was preoccupied with "all," in Titus 2:11-14 he is preoccupied with "us" who comprise the Church. Paul highlights "we" language because he wishes to instruct the Cretans in who they are (special people, ransomed from lawlessness), what they should do (good works) and how they should do them (as a cleansed people with zeal).

Redemption theology in Titus centers upon the soteriological action "to ransom" (λυτρόω) instead of the christological "ransom-exchange" (ἀντίλυτρον) in 1 Tim 2:6. In the latter unit, the rationale for the Ephesian Church to be concerned with the salvation of outsiders in 1 Tim 2:1-7 depended on Jesus Christ as a ransom for all. By contrast, it is Jesus' soteriological action in Titus 2:14 as the one who "ransomed us" which forms the basis of a Cretan Church poised to live as the special people of God.

Ransom plays a central role in the logic of Titus 2:11-14 too. The verb "ransom" together with the verb "cleanse" are the actions in the final ἵνα clause that supports the

long sentence that is 2:11-14. In fact, "ransom" is much more significant for the whole of Titus than for1 Timothy. For instance, λυτρόω and καθαρίζω together stand at the heart of the epistle's soteriology. This was seen in several ways. First, in a letter heavily laden with σωζ-cognates and in which salvation is a prominent theme, λυτρόω is the first finite verb predicated of Jesus Christ the savior. "Ransom" is thus central to how the savior actually saves in Titus. Second, given the LXX background closely connecting "ransom" and "special people" (e.g., Deut 7:6-8; Exod 6:6; 19:5), Paul's use of "ransom" in 2:14 should be seen as a major support of the edifying purpose of the letter as a whole, providing both a firm grounding for the distinctive moral demands on the Cretan Church as well as an implicit rejection of false models for the Church on offer both from Jews and Cretan Gentiles. Third, Jesus Christ having "ransomed" a people from lawlessness also ties together the diverse references in the letter to "slaves," "being enslaved," and "slavery." As I showed in Chapter Two, "ransom" as a salvation term not only presupposes a previous condition of slavery (either literal or metaphorical), but also—both in the LXX and in Paul—often signals recovery and restoration by the ransoming agent. Slave references in this letter run the gamut from Paul's own apostolic calling as "slave of God" (1:1), to the "not-enslaved-to-wine" women who are suited to instruct in the ways of Church behavior (2:4), and even to the slaves themselves (2:9-10), who best epitomize the redeemed people as a whole in its collective goal to "be pleasing" and to "adorn the teaching of God." Slavery to "worldly desires and various pleasures" characterizes the unredeemed life (3:3), while it is the divine "goodness" and "kindness" (understood economically) which frees *from* this kind of slavery and *for* service to the

new owner (3:4). Finally, ransom is closely tied to cleansing and this prepares the audience for the material in 3:3-7. By featuring the rare term λουτρόν which serves both as an allusion to Christian baptism and as a homophonic reminder of the verb λυτρόω, this passage confirms Paul's idea of a baptismal redemption first hinted at in 2:14.

The Ransom Passages of the PE and the Broader Pauline Corpus

In this thesis I have assumed Pauline authorship of the PE heuristically in concert with a number of relatively recent critical commentaries.[351] Therefore it is worth considering briefly the extent to which my exegetical findings regarding 1 Tim 2:1-7 and Titus 2:11-14 (and the treatment of "ransom" contained therein) fit within the Pauline corpus as a whole. Do they constitute a variant theology hard to harmonize with the other letters or can they be fairly described as a theological development?[352] What do the above passages tell us about Paul and what (if anything) would they add to the Pauline theology of redemption as reconstructed from the other letters?

Such integrative work between the larger Pauline corpus and the PE has seldom been undertaken. Commentators on the PE, regardless of where they stand on the question of authorship, generally limit themselves to pointing out textual parallels with

---

[351] E.g., Johnson (*First and Second Letters to Timothy,* 20-99); Knight (*Pastoral Epistles*, 46-47); Mounce (*Pastoral Epistles*, xlvi-xlviii); Towner (*Timothy and Titus*, 27-67); Witherington (*Letters and Homilies,*1:65-68).

[352] Any notion of "development" presupposes a historical setting for the letters in the career of Paul. Here I prefer the reconstructions of Witherington (*Letters and Homilies*, 1:65) and Mounce (*Pastoral Epistles*, lvii-lxii) to that of Johnson (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 68). The latter author posits a setting for 1 Timothy and Titus earlier in Paul's ministry in the "gap" found in the narrative of Acts 19 between vv.20-21, while the former two make a better case that the PE, if Pauline, were composed late in the apostle's career after the Roman imprisonment described at the end of Acts.

the undisputed letters. Magisterial treatments of Pauline theology generally bracket the PE, while more recent works on the theology of the PE tend to defer to the convention of not treating the corpus as fully Pauline.[353] Of the few authors who have attempted tradition-historical work on the PE, the findings of Beker are fairly representative. On the one hand, the true Paul of the authentic letters demonstrates

> an intricate and flexible manner by which [he] integrates the coherence of his gospel with the various contingent situations of the missionary churches.[354]

On the other hand, brittle, doctrinaire rigidity is the mark of Paul as he is depicted in the PE:

> Dehistoricization takes the form of presenting Paul as a static and dogmatic person….who imposes doctrine and engages in monologue….The author's abundant use of Pauline terminology should not deceive us….Paul's concepts have now become sacrosanct and "holy" words to which the tradition has given fixed and frozen meaning.[355]

This static, dogmatic and dehistoricized portrait of Paul presented in the PE coexists, to be sure, in an uneasy tension with the content of the letters themselves in which Beker finds that their pseudonymous author

> does not consider faithfulness to Paul to consist in a literal transposition of Paul's thought, but rather as a search for innovative strategies that permit Paul to speak in a fresh manner.[356]

---

[353] One recent exception to this is Frank Matera, *God's Saving Grace: A Pauline Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012).

[354] J. Christiaan Beker, *Heirs of Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 39.

[355] Ibid., 40-41.

[356] Ibid., 43. Beker echoes the judgment of Brox's own tradition-critical commentary (*Die Pastoralbriefe*, 53) who explains the PE as "der Botschaft des Paulus Kraft für eine neues, späteres Geschlecht."

Perhaps with his creative fidelity to the Pauline gospel, the author of the PE really is more like the authentic Paul after all! Indeed, even from the perspective of Pauline authorship which this study entertains, there is validity in Beker's paradoxical claims. As I would restate the problem, my reading of 1 Tim 2:1-7 finds it to contain content and themes both similar and dissimilar to what we find in the rest of Paul's letters. For instance, both 1 Tim 2:1-7 and Rom 3:21-30 embrace a form of universal salvation, though in very different ways. The universalism in Romans deals mainly with the categories of Jew and Gentile that Paul lays out from the beginning. "All" in Romans means "both." On the other hand, Paul in 1 Tim 2:1-7 provides warrant for the hermeneutical step that the Christian tradition was to take with Augustine: that the Jew/Gentile issue surrounding justification and salvation is generalizable to all human beings including those as yet unconverted and "about to believe" (1 Tim 1:16).

Another dissimilarity between the passages examined here and the rest of the Pauline corpus concerns prayer. The prayers mentioned in 1 Tim 2:1 are obviously common in Paul, being offered either by the apostle himself or by his epistolary audiences.[357] There are also a few occasions in which Paul expresses concern for those yet to be saved which parallel "those about to believe" (1:16).[358] But 2:1-7 is unusual in

---

[357] Of the various kinds of prayer mentioned in 1 Tim 2:1, only the term "intercessions" (ἔντευξις) is absent from the undisputed Pauline letters. One however finds the cognate verb ἐντυγχάνω in Rom 8:24, 37 and 11:2.

[358] The clearest example of this is found in 1 Thess 2:16. The other references to preaching the gospel to Gentiles in Romans (15:9 *bis*, 10, 11, 12 *bis*, 16 *bis*, 18; 16:26), Galatians (1:16; 2:2, 8, 9; 3:8, 14), Eph 3:8 and Col 1:27 seem in context less concerned with future conversions than with either providing the theological rationale for past preaching directed toward Gentiles or in citing their current faith as evidence of the worldwide reach of the

that Paul marries the theme of the Church's prayer for all specifically with God's desire for salvation of those outside who are as yet not believers. There are, to be sure, a few instances in the undisputed corpus in which the appearance of the Church to outsiders is cited by Paul as a reason for good behavior on the part of his audience.[359] Yet it is perhaps surprising that, for all the attention the activity of prayer and the idea of the mission to the Gentiles receive in Paul's preaching, the undisputed letters lack any clear instances of the Church being asked to pray specifically for the conversion of Gentiles in the context of Paul's ongoing mission. Carson remarks on this curious lacuna in the undisputed letters:

> On first reflection it is a little surprising that there is little intercession for the lost, little evidence of systematic praying for the conversion of men and women, few examples of what we might call mission praying—that is, praying specifically for the outreach of the gospel, not the least in cross-cultural contexts.[360]

Carson concludes that the absence of examples of concrete prayers or requests for prayers on Paul's part is due to the fact that mission in general or specific witness to unconverted outsiders does not constitute a discrete aspect of Paul's thought. Rather, it is of a piece with Paul's theology of creation and redemption and a comprehensive vision of the world reshaped by the Christ-event. For Carson, Paul "sees mission in holistic and

---

gospel. For the most part Paul's treatment of Gentile faith in his letters is less concrete and more abstract and theological.

[359] See, for instance, 1 Thess 4:12 and 5:22. Colossians 4:2-6 is curious in that it may constitute a connection in the apostle's mind between the Church's prayers, her dealings with Gentiles and the success of his mission, but the only real basis for this inference is that these themes are treated in succession.

[360] D. A. Carson, "Paul's Mission and Prayer," in *The Gospel to the Nations* (ed. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson; Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2000) 176.

even cosmic terms" and possesses an outlook "tied to his place in redemptive history."[361] There is much to be said for Carson's view as indeed even a cursory perusal of the references above in n. 4 concerning the Gentiles, redemption and the progress of the gospel reveals a more global perspective on the part of Paul.

This perspective is certainly present in the disputed Paulines. For instance in the opening chapter of Colossians, Paul interweaves the themes of the worldwide penetration of the gospel, the Church's thanksgiving prayers, and a redemption which effects the cosmic change in the Church and must be understood as the unfolding of a universal plan of reconciliation. Similarly in Eph 1:1-14, Paul paints the picture of both a present and a future redemption as the culmination of a divine plan even more ancient than the creation of the world, followed by mention of the apostle's own thanksgiving prayers, all to prepare for the theme of reconciliation of the Gentiles into the "one body" of the Church in the next chapters.

A similar nexus of themes occurs in the undisputed letters. In Romans—where the idea of redemption receives the most development—not only is the epistle itself bracketed with allusions to the worldwide ambitions for the gospel (1:5; 16:26), but both references to ἀπολύτρωσις come in the context of discussions of global issues: the worldwide accountability to God (3:19-20); the gracious gift of present redemption through which Jews and Gentiles may escape this accountability (3:21-26); and the future redemption of the whole cosmos (8:23) which moves to a discussion of the Spirit leading

[361] Ibid., 182.

intercessory prayers on behalf of the saints (8:26-27) who do not know how to pray as they ought.

In light of all this, it is not surprising that 1 Tim 2:1-7 should interweave the themes of prayer and redemption, and present both notions with a universal scope. But there is a much greater concretization of themes. The Spirit may intercede for all the saints in preparation for the future redemption, but in 1 Timothy it is for the Church herself to intercede in a tangible way for "all," including those as yet unredeemed. This marks the only instance in which the Church is asked to align her intercessory activities with the scope of Paul's mission to the Gentiles, almost as if to take part in the mission herself, as I argued above in Chapter Three. In this respect, it is an exception to the pattern discernible elsewhere in Paul, where the themes of redemption and prayer in the context of the progress of the gospel to Gentiles tend to be treated much more abstractly.

Interpreting 1 Tim 2:1-7 as a concretization of Paul's theology of mission and redemption seen in the other epistles goes a great distance toward explaining the most salient difference between this pericope and the rest of the Pauline corpus: the use of the concrete and instrumental term ἀντίλυτρον (ransom-exchange) instead of the more abstract ἀπολύτρωσις (redemption) used elsewhere by Paul outside the PE. The practical term is called for because Paul is enlisting the audience of 1 Timothy for practical, if spiritual, help.

Titus 2:11-14 likewise can be aptly judged within the creative adaptivity model of Beker as both similar to and different from the rest of the Pauline corpus. Paul does in Titus 2:11-14 what Beker finds him to do in the undisputed corpus: at once maintaining theological constancy while shaping his ideas for the ad hoc needs of distinct communities. There is little reason to think the Cretan audience of Titus is aware of an "epiphany schema" and moreover, the reference to a future ἐπιφάνεια seems functionally little different from Paul's idea of a παρουσία elsewhere.[362] And the identification of Jesus Christ both as "savior" and "God," while uncommon, possesses likely parallels in the undisputed letters.[363]

On the other hand, the idea that "grace appeared" (grace which in Titus seems to refer to the preached gospel), seems to stand at some remove from what we find in the undisputed epistles. Χάρις is an overwhelmingly Pauline term in the NT and the lion's share of the apostle's uses of the term deal with epistolary greetings and thanksgiving. There is however a theological use of the term wherein χάρις "is a central concept that most clearly expresses his understanding of the salvation event."[364] The term is usually

[362] 2 Thessalonians 2:8 uses ἐπιφάνεια and παρουσία in succession. In Chapters Three and Four above, I have built upon the work of Towner (*Goal of Our Instruction*, 62-74) who argues at length that the PE do not demonstrate an eschatology significantly different from the other letters of Paul.

[363] For Jesus as θεός, see Rom 9:5 (though with plenty of argument as to whether θεός really does refer to Jesus); for Jesus as functionally equivalent to God, see 1 Cor 12:1-13; for Jesus as σωτήρ, see Phil 3:20. For an exposition on the theme, see Suzanne Nicholson, *Dynamic Oneness: The Significance and Flexibility of Paul's One-God Language* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010).

[364] Hans Conzelmann, "χαίρω, etc.," *TDNT* 9:393.

abstract and underscores the gratuity of the gift of salvation and with it, the gift to live as a saved person.

There are instances in Paul however, in which χάρις "actualizes itself" in a more specific and concrete manner.[365] 2 Corinthians 9:8 is similar to Titus 2:11-14 in that in both cases χάρις is what leads ultimately to good works.[366] Moreover in Col 1:6, χάρις denotes a body of preaching which the Church can "hear" and "know" and whose emergence marks a definitive change from an earlier state of life. This is a usage quite similar to "grace appeared" in Titus 2:11, which recalls the beginning of the preached gospel in 1:3. "Grace appeared" is, to be sure, an unusual formulation for Paul but one certainly in keeping with his preached message reflected in his other letters. Χάρις is concretized in Titus 2:11 just as it is on occasion elsewhere in Paul.

"To ransom" and "to cleanse" together constitute the saving action in the final ἵνα clause which supports the long sentence that comprises Titus 2:11-14. Like χάρις, λυτρόω and καθαρίζω are also concretized. Χάρις refers to a specific body of teaching concerning moral and ethical norms inspired by the Christ-event, while λυτρόω and καθαρίζω are the specific salvific actions of Jesus Christ to fashion a people capable both of hearing the norms and putting them into practice. Their concrete realization is seen in the allusion to baptism a few verses later.

---

[365] Ibid., 395. E.g., in the Church itself, Phil 1:7; in the Jerusalem collection, 2 Cor 8:1, 4, 6, 7, 9; in Paul's own apostleship, Rom 1:5.

[366] In the former passage God makes grace "abound" for the Corinthians who have what they need in order to abound in every good work. In the latter passage "grace appeared" to instruct the Church in living piously, as a people redeemed and cleansed for "good works."

One can perceive lines of development to Titus 2:11-14 from Rom 3:24. In the latter verse, with his dense formulation "justified freely in his grace [τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι] through the redemption [ἀπολυτρώσεως] that is in Christ Jesus," Paul employs both "grace" and "redemption" very abstractly. This is because Rom 3:21-26 deals with the solution to the problem of sin that plagues human beings in general and is far from being reducible at this stage to occasional pastoral instructions directed to a specific community.

Similarly, I contended above in Chapter Two that one can perceive redemptive soteriology at work in Romans 6 and its repeated emphasis on both the termination of slavery to sin and the inauguration of the freedom that comes from slavery to God in righteousness (6:15-23)—and one could even infer that this transition (6:6) is related to baptism (6:3). In Titus, Paul's account of his own mission is similar to that in Romans ("slave of God," Titus 1:1 // "slave of Christ Jesus," Rom 1:1). But in every other instance by contrast, we see similar ideas about redemption at work though spelled out in much more specific terms in Titus. What is slavery to "sin" in Romans (6:16 *bis*, 17, 20) or later "decay" (8:21) becomes in Titus the more colorful slavery to "too much wine" (2:3), to "desires and various pleasures" (3:3) or even the paradox of actual slaves, who, as recipients of redemption, serve as exemplars of adorning the teaching (2:9-10).

Likewise the connection between redemption and baptism in Romans is a very loose one that requires several inferential steps on the part of the audience. In Titus by contrast, the connection is closer and more concrete and immediate both because

"ransom" is paired with "cleanse" in 2:14 and because of the number of textual cues in 3:3-7 which identify salvation as both the end of slavery (3:3) and as being saved through the "washing of regeneration" (3:5), and which recall in several other ways the material in 2:11-14.[367] Paul's use of the concrete verb λυτρόω (ransom) instead of the abstract noun ἀπολύτρωσις (redemption) is similarly explainable; not only does the former choice better fit the entire indicative-imperative thrust of 2:11-14 but it is more consistent with a letter that seems to couch its theology in mundane realities more easily accessible to its Cretan audience.

Titus 2:11-14 is similar to Romans in another important respect. As I discussed above in Chapter Two, Rom 8:18-25 not only features the mention of a future redemption, but it combines it with the themes of "waiting," and "hope." Creation itself eagerly "waits for" (ἀπεκδέχεται) the revelation of the children of God (8:19) just as "we ourselves wait for" adoption, the "redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσιν) of our body (8:23). The object of the waiting is "hope" (ἐλπίς, 8:24)—here not a character trait (as in 5:4) but constitutive of the totality of eschatological expectation for both the Church and the whole creation. Moreover this passage follows Paul's train of thought dealing with life in the Spirit (8:5-11) and the connection between this and the future shared inheritance with Jesus Christ (8:12-17).

---

[367] My treatment above in Chapter Four centered upon how 3:3 follows the mention of "ransom" in 2:14 to return to the "slavery" theme, while later using the term λουτρόν (washing) in 3:5 to produce a word play with λυτρόω (ransom). But beyond this, the textual connections between 3:3-7 and 2:11-14 are well known and, besides being noted in commentaries (e.g., Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 23), have been explored by works devoted solely to the structure of Titus. See, for instance, Ray Van Neste, "Structure and Cohesion in Titus," *BT* 53 (2002) 178.

Similar themes appear in and around Titus 2:11-14 even amidst some differences. When it is observed that all of Paul's exhortations in Titus assume the "renewal of the Holy Spirit" in 3:5, the "sound doctrine" that should inform the patterns of behavior described in 2:1-10 can be seen as some of the practical applications of what the apostle more abstractly calls "walking in the Spirit" (Rom 8:1-11)—though without the eschatological warnings about "death." These are evidently unnecessary in a letter to a delegate.[368] Moral teachings by Paul usually do refer to eschatology however, and this is the case in Titus 2:12-13 which, like Romans 8, explicitly situates living justly and piously in the present age in the context of "waiting" (προσδέχομαι) for the blessed "hope" (ἐλπίς). Ἐλπίς here too is constitutive of the eschatological consummation and certainly the "epiphany of our glorious great God and Savior Jesus Christ" is a more compressed formulation for the "glory" to be revealed in Rom 8:18-25.

The most salient differences, however, concern how the respective passages handle redemption and the world as a whole. The use of the verb λυτρόω in Titus as opposed to the abstract noun ἀπολύτρωσις in Romans is understandable. In a letter such as Titus geared more to specific moral outcomes on the part of the audience, "he gave himself in order to ransom us" is a much stronger indicative upon which to base an imperative than references to "redemption" in the abstract. But Titus 2:14 does invert the expected *ordo salutis*; Jesus' future epiphany actually precedes the reference to his redemptive death. Following the waiting for the hope of the future glorious epiphany in

[368] They may however be implied by the "self-condemned" man in 3:11.

2:13, one wonders why 2:14 does not follow with a mention of the *future* redemption and the *final* eschatological cleansing. Such would have made the parallels with Romans 8 even stronger. Instead Titus 2:14 reverts back to a discussion of the cross and its effects. Moreover, the past ransom is geared exclusively to the Church and apparently lacks the cosmic dimensions of Romans 8.

These shifts seem to be wholly explainable by the change in the occasion of the letter. Romans is not without occasional elements but, on the whole, approaches something akin to a Pauline exposition of larger themes. Titus by contrast is wholly occasional. To the extent larger themes are touched upon, it is here set to the very practical service of building up the Cretan Church.

Conclusion

The major thrust of this study has been to situate the treatment of redemption in the PE, first within the LXX's conceptual background and then within the Pauline corpus more generally. In Chapter Two, I provided the LXX background to the idea of redemption, while in Chapters Three and Four I interpreted the PE passages dealing with redemption in light of that background using audience-oriented exegesis. My results offer a few modest contributions to the growing tendency in recent scholarship to read the PE as full-fledged Pauline letters. Where redemption is concerned, it is possible to explain why Paul shifts from the abstract ἀπολυτρώσις in his other letters to the finite verb λυτρόω and the instrumental noun ἀντίλυτρον in Titus and 1 Timothy respectively. The shift seems less explainable as a theological development and more due to the

occasional nature of 1 Timothy and Titus. In both cases the indicative-imperative logic of the ransom passages seems to lend itself to a more concrete expression of Paul's redemption theology. If this is correct, however, it does invite speculation as to the timing of the composition of 1 Timothy and Titus that occasioned this particular shift. Does the occasion of 1 Timothy perhaps mark a transition in the twilight of Paul's own career such that it is time for the more established Church of Ephesus, under the leadership of Timothy, to shoulder a greater spiritual responsibility (at least through intercessory prayer) for the success of future missions of the sort intimated in 1 Tim 2:1-7? And does the occasion of Titus also indicate a time in which the Cretan Church will, in Paul's absence, have to orient itself increasingly to visible "noble works," with the correct self-understanding to show itself to the greater Cretan community as the redeemed and cleansed people belonging to the savior Jesus Christ?[369] In either case, there are important implications for Paul's practical ecclesiology in Churches whom he chose to address through a delegate.

As for ecclesiology, there are other possible ramifications of this study. In my audience-oriented exegesis of 1 Tim 2:1-7 and Titus 2:11-14, I began with the understanding of ransom and redemption as soteriological concepts, which for Paul have their genesis in the story of Israel's emancipation from Egypt even as they possess

[369] See n. 351 above. This reconstruction is easier to square with the assumption that Paul is writing near the end of his career after the narrative of Acts. But even under the hypothesis of Johnson (*First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 68) and Towner (*Timothy and Titus*, 12-13) that the time of composition of these epistles belongs to the narrative "gap" in Acts 19:20-21, this reconstruction still fits. In the latter case, Paul is returning to Jerusalem (Acts 19:21) to face what he knows will be an uncertain future and thus might well have needed to make provisions for the possibility of his absence.

conceptual points of contact with the contemporary Greco-Roman slave market. In each case however, my exegesis led me to the conclusion that both ἀντίλυτρον and λυτρόω, as they are employed in the PE, have important ecclesiological aspects as well. The former term ἀντίλυτρον is for Paul (1 Tim 2:6a) what establishes God's offer of salvation as truly universal and, given that the prayers of the Church are also universal in scope, we must consider that the Church is not merely the locus of universal salvation of both Jew and Gentile as in Romans, but also an instrument through which universal salvation flows to those outside. Likewise the term λυτρόω is for Paul in Titus 2:14 not merely an important metaphor for how Jesus Christ has merited the title "savior." It is the very foundation of the Cretan Church's understanding of itself, the norms for how it is to behave and the means by which those norms may be realized. Rather than speaking of redemption only as a metaphor for salvation, perhaps it is time to consider the extent to which it is correct to speak of a ransom ecclesiology as well. Such a move would add something to contemporary treatments of the ecclesiology of the PE, which hitherto have tended to treat this topic almost exclusively through the disputed prism of "Church orders." Such a move would also coincide with a great deal of work over the last thirty years which increasingly appreciates the neglected ecclesiological dimensions of the soteriological term "justification" in Paul's other letters.[370]

[370] In a 1983 essay proclaiming a "New Perspective" on Paul, James D. G. Dunn—following the work of Krister Stendahl and E. P. Sanders—argued that justification by faith should be understood not primarily "as an exposition of the individual's relation to God," but rather as dealing with "the question of how Jews and Gentiles stand in relation to each other within the covenant purpose of God now reached its climax in Jesus Christ." Dunn's original essay was reprinted in *The New Perspective on Paul: Collected Essays* (WUNT 185; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005) 110. This began a series of works in subsequent decades by a variety of scholars (e.g., N. T.

Finally, this study is written as the Church still waits for the blessed hope of the epiphany of our God and savior Jesus Christ. The waiting is, however, taking place in a world beset by increasing economic anxiety, financial instability and widening income and wealth inequality. Consequently, this study might aptly serve as a small impetus for the contemporary and practical theological contemplation of "redemption"—an essentially *economic* term—as a central Pauline metaphor for the salvation through Jesus Christ of the people of God and the whole world.

Wright, Luke Johnson, Richard Hays, Douglas Campbell, etc.) who embraced this "New Perspective" on Paul arguing (among other things) that "covenant membership" was central to the apostle's idea of justification.

Bibliography

Abbott, T. K. *Ephesians and Colossians.* ICC. New York: Scribner: 1903.

Achtemeier, Paul. *1 Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

Anderson, Bernhard W. "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah." In *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*. Eds. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York: Harper and Bros.,1963. Pp. 177-95.

Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*. Trans. Margaret Kohl. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

_____. "Liberation from Debt Slavery." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Eds. Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987. Pp. 477-84.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. *The Pastoral Epistles*. NCBNT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

_____. "The Background of Mark 10:45." In *New Testament Essays*. Ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959. Pp. 1-18.

Barth, Markus. *Ephesians 1–3*. AB 34B. New York: Doubleday, 1974.

Bassler, Jouette M. *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.

_____. "A Plethora of Epiphanies: Christology in the Pastoral Letters." *PSB* 17 (1996) 310-25.

Bauer, Bruno. *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*. 1850 repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1972.

Baur, F. C. *Die sogennanten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht.* Stuttgart: Catta'sche, 1835.

Beker, J. Christiaan, *Heirs of Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Bellis, Alice Ogden. "The New Exodus in Jeremiah 50:33-38." In *Imagery and Imagination in Biblical Literature: Essays in Honor of Aloysius Fitzgerald F. S. C*. CBQMS 32. Ed. Lawrence Boadt and Mark S. Smith. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2001. Pp. 157-68.

Bergsma, John S. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran*. VTSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Bertram, M. H. "Theological Nuances of ἁμαρτία in the LXX." *TDNT* 1:286-89.

Bertram, G. "παιδεύω, etc." *TDNT* 5:596-612, 621-25.

Best, Ernest. *Ephesians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

Brickle, Jeffrey. *Aural Design and Coherence in the Prologue of First John*. LNTS. formerly JSNTSup 465. New York: T & T Clark, 2012.

Brox, Norbert. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. RNT 7. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1969.

Büchsel, Friedrich. "θυμός., etc." *TDNT* 3:171.

_____. "λύτρον." *TDNT* 4:340-56.

Bultmann, Rudolph. *The Theology of the New Testament*. Trans. K. Grobel. Vol. 2. London: SCM, 1955.

_____. "ἀφίημι, etc." *TDNT* 1:508-12.

_____. "φαίνω, etc." *TDNT* 9:8-10.

Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. SacPag 6. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Campbell, Douglas. *Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3:21-26*. JSNTSup 65. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Caragounis, Chrys. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. WUNT 167. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.

Carter, Warren and John Paul Heil. *Matthew's Parables*. CBQMS 30. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1998.

Carson, D. A. "Paul's Mission and Prayer." In *The Gospel to the Nations*. Eds. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000. Pp. 175-84.

Cazelles, H. "פדה." *TDOT* 11:485.

Collins, Raymond F. *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: John Knox, 2002.

_____. *First Corinthians*. SacPag 7. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999.

_____. "On Reading the Pastoral Epistles." In *Forschungen zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt: Festschrift für Albert Fuchs*. Ed. Christoph Niemand. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2002. Pp. 367-81.

_____. *Letters that Paul did not Write: The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Pseudepigrapha.* Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988.

_____."The Theology of the Epistle to Titus." *ETL* 76 (2000) 56-72.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

_____. "χαίρω, etc." *TDNT* 9:393.

Davies, W. D. and Dale Allison. *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*. ICC. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.

De Silva, David A. *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. Eds. Stanley Porter, Richard Hess and John Jarick. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Deissmann, Gustav Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East: the New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World.* Trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan. With Sixty-Eight Illustrations. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

De Lacey, David. "Jesus as Mediator." *JSNT* 29 (1987) 101-21.

De la Potterie, Ignace. "Le chrétien conduit par L'Espirit dans son cheminement eschatologique (Rom 8:14)." In *The Law of the Spirit in Rom 7 and Rom 8.* Ed. L. de Lorenzi. Rome: St. Paul's Abbey, 1976. Pp. 211-29.

Dijkstra, Meindert. "YHWH as Israel's *Go'el*: Second Isaiah's Perspective on Reconciliation and Restitution." *ZABR* 5 (1999) 236-57.

Donelson, Lewis R. *Colossians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

_____. *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. HUT 22. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1986.

_____. "The Structure of Ethical Argument in the Pastorals." *BTB* 18 (1988) 108-13.

Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles.* Trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro Collins. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

Donfried, Karl. "Rethinking Scholarly Approaches to 1 Timothy." In *1 Timothy Reconsidered*. COP 18. Ed. by Karl Donfried. Leuven: Peeters, 2008. Pp. 3-17.

Dornier, Pierre. *Les Épîtres Pastorales*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1968.

Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon.* NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

_____. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus*. NIB 11. Nashville: Abingdon, 2000.

_____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

_____. *Romans 1–8*. WBC 38a. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.

Easton, Burton Scott. *The Pastoral Epistles: Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Word Studies.* New York: Scribner, 1947.

Edwards, J. Christopher. "Reading the Ransom Logion in 1 Tim 2:6 and Titus 2:14 with Isaiah 42:6-7 and 49:6-8." *Bib* 90 (2009) 264-66.

Ellis, E. Earle. "Traditions in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Brownlee*. Eds. Craig Evans and Hugh Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars' Press, 1987. Pp 237-53.

Everts, J. M. "Hope." *DPL,* 415-16.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

_____. *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*. NIBC 13. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

Feuillet, A. "Le logion sur la rançon." *RSPT* 51 (1961) 365-402.

Fiore, Benjamin. *The Pastoral Epistles*. SacPag 12. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.

_____. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles.* AnBib 105. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “The Savior God: The Pastoral Epistles.” In *The Forgotten God: Perspectives in Biblical Theology*. Eds. Andrew Das and Frank Matera. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002. Pp. 181-96.

_____. *Paul and his Theology: A Brief Sketch*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1989.

Forster, W. “εὐσέβεια.” *TDNT* 7:180-81.

Gill, Malcolm. *Jesus as Mediator: A Study of the Cultural Understanding of the Role of Mediator in First Century Asia Minor and Its Implications for the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:1-7*. Ph.D. diss. Dallas Theological Seminary, 2007.

Guthrie, Donald. *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

Hanson, Anthony. *The Pastoral Epistles: Based on the Revised Standard Version*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

_____. “The Mediator: 1 Timothy 2:5-6.” In *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles*. London: SPCK, 1968. Pp. 56-64.

Harding, Mark. *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*. SBL 3. New York: Peter Lang, 1998.

Harris, Murray. “Titus 2:13 and the Deity of Christ.” In *Pauline Studies.* Eds. Donald Hagner and Murray Harris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980. Pp. 262-72.

Harrison, P. N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. Humphrey: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Harvey, John D. *Listening to the Text: Oral Patterning in Paul’s Letters*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Haubeck ,Wilfrid. *Loskauf durch Christus. Herkunft*, *Gestalt, und Bedeutung des paulinischen Loskaufmotivs*. TVGMS 317. Giessen: Brunnen, 1985.

Hasler, Victor. *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (Pastoralbriefe*). ZBNT 12. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1978.

_____. “Epiphanie und Christologie in den Pastoralbriefen.” *TZ* 33 (1977) 193-209.

Hays, Richard. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

_____. *First Corinthians*. Louisville: John Knox, 1989.

Hearon, Holly. "The Implications of the Orality for the Study of Biblical Text." In *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory and Mark*. Eds. Richard Horsley, Jonathan Draper and John Foley. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006. Pp. 3-20.

Hill, David. *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms.* SNTSMS 5. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.

Ho, Chiao Ek. "Mission in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastorals.* Eds. Andreas Köstenberger and Terry Wilder. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group, 2010. Pp. 241-67.

Hoehner, Harold. "Did Paul Write Galatians?" In *History and Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Dr. E. Earl Ellis on his Eightieth Birthday*. Ed. Sang-Won Son. London: T & T Clark, 2006. Pp. 150-69.

Hooker, Morna. *Jesus and the Servant*. London: SPCK, 1959.

_____. *The Son of Man in Mark*. London: SPCK, 1967.

Houldren, J. L. *The Pastoral Epistles*. TPINTC. London: SCM, 1976.

Hubbard, Robert L. "The *Go'el* in Ancient Israel: Theological Reflections on an Israelite Institution." *BBR* 1 (1991) 3-19.

Hultgren, A. J. *Christ and his Benefits: Christology and Redemption in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Pastoralbreife*. NTD. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975.

_____. "Das Lösengeld für Viele (Mark 10:45)." In *Abba: Studien zur neutestamenlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966. Pp. 216-229.

_____. *New Testament Theology*. Trans. John Bowden. New York: Scribner, 1971.

_____."πολλοί." *TDNT* 6:536-45.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*. New Testament in Context. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996.

_____. *First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 35A. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

_____. "First Timothy 1,1-20: The Shape of the Struggle," In *1 Timothy Reconsidered*. Ed. Karl Paul Donfried. COP 18. Leuven: Peeters, 2008. Pp. 18-39.

Karris, Robert. "The Background and Significance of Polemic in the Pastoral Epistles." *JBL* 92 (1973) 549-64.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Trans. Geoffrey E. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Kelly, J. N. D. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1960.

Keesmaat, Sylvia C. *Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition.* JSNTSup 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Kertelge, Kurt. "ἀπολύτρωσις." *EDNT* 1:138-40.

_____. "λύτρον." *EDNT* 2:366.

Kidd, Reggie M. "Titus as *Apologia*." *HBT* 21 (1999) 185-209.

Klöpper, A. "Zur Soteriologie der Pastoralbriefe (Tit 3:4-7; 2 Tim 1:9-11; Tit 2:11-14)." *ZWT* 47 (1904) 57-88.

Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.

Lappenga, Benjamin. "'Zealots for Good Works': The Polemical Repercussions of the Word ζηλωτής in Titus 2:14." *CBQ* 75 (2013) 704-18.

Lavergne, Ceslas. *Diagnoses des Suffixes Grecs du Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Gabalda, 1977.

Lau, Andrew. *Manifest in Flesh: The Epiphany Christology of the Pastoral Epistles*. WUNT 2/86. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996.

Lee, Margaret and Bernard Scott. *Sound Mapping the New Testament*. Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2009.

Lincoln, Andrew. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.

Lock, Walter. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles.* New York: Scribner, 1924.

Luck, U. "φιλανθρωπία." *TDNT* 9:107-12.

Lührmann, Dieter. "Epiphaneia: Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte eines griechischen Wortes." In *Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971. Pp. 185-99.

Malherbe, Abraham."Paraenesis in the Epistle to Titus." In *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*. BZNW 125. Eds. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004. Pp. 297-317.

_____."Soteriology in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives in Soteriology*. NovTSup 121. Ed. Jan van der Watt. Leiden: Brill, 2005. Pp. 331-58.

Marshall, I. Howard. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999.

_____. "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament." In *Jesus the Savior: Studies in New Testament Theology.* London: SPCK, 1990. Pp. 239-57.

_____. "'Sometimes Only Orthodox'—Is There More to the Pastoral Epistles?" *Epworth Review* 20.3 (1993) 12-24.

_____. "Salvation, Grace and Works in the Later Writings of the Pauline Corpus." *NTS* 42 (1996) 339-58.

_____. "Recent Studies in the Pastoral Epistles." *Themelios* 23 (1997) 3-29.

_____. "Salvation in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. 3 vols. Eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996. Pp. 3:449-69.

Martin, Dale. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Matera, Frank. *God's Saving Grace: A Pauline Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

_____. *Romans*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Merkel, Helmut. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. NTD 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991.

Metzger, Bruce L. "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." *ExpTim* 70 (1958-59) 91-94.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 23–27.* AB 3B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Miller, Patrick D. *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents*. SNTMS 93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Minto, Andrew L. *1 Timothy 2:1-7 and Paul's Letter to the Romans.* Ph.D. diss. Catholic University of America, 1999.

Montague, George T. *First and Second Timothy, Titus*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Moo, Douglas. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Mohrlang, R. "Love." *DPL,* 576.

Morris, Leon. *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. London: Tyndale, 1957. Pp. 9-60.

Mott, Stephen Charles. "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10-14 and III 3-7." *NovT* 20 (1978) 22-48.

Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles*. WBC 46. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.

Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.

Nineham, D. E. *The Gospel of St. Mark*. PNTC. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

Oberlinner, Lorenz. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. 3 Vols. HTKNT 11. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.

_____. "Die 'Epiphaneia' des Heilswillens Gottes in Christus Jesus: Zur Grundstruktur der Christologie der Pastoralbriefe." *ZNW* 71 (1980) 192-213.

_____. "Ein ruhiges und ungestörtes Leben führen.' Ein Ideal für christliche Gemeinden?" *BK* 46 (1991) 98-106.

O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Oepke, Anthony. “μεσίτης.” *TDNT* 4:604; 617-18.

Pax, Elpidius. “Der Loskauf. Zur Geschichte eines neutestamentlichen Begriffes.” *Anton* 37 (1962) 239-78.

Perkins, Pheme. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. NIB 11. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.

Pitre, Brant. *Jesus the Tribulation and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the End of the Atonement.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Porter, Stanley E. “Peace, Reconciliation,” *DPL,* 695-99.

Procksch, O. “λύω.” *TDNT* 4:328.

Quinn, Jerome D. *The Letter to Titus: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary and An Introduction to Titus, I and II Timothy, The Pastoral Epistles.* AB 35. New York: Doubleday, 1990

_____. *First and Second Letters to Timothy.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000

_____. “Jesus as Savior and Only Mediator (1 Tim 2:3-6): Linguistic Paradigms of Enculturation.” In *Fede E Cultura Alla Luce della Bibbia: Atti della Sessione Plenaria 1979 della Pontificia Commissione Biblica.* Ed. J. D. Barthélemy. Turin: Editrice Elle di Ci, 1981. Pp. 249-60.

_____. “The Last Volume of Luke: The Relation of Luke-Acts to the Pastoral Epistles,” In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Ed. C. H. Talbert. Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978. Pp. 62-75.

Ringgren, H. “גאל.” *TDOT* 2:351.

Roloff, Jürgen. *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*. EKKNT 15. Zürich: Benzinger, 1988.

Ruiz, Delio. “Se Manifesto la Gracia Salvadora de Dios (Tit 2:11-14).” *RevistB* 65 (2003) 119-214.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Saracino, Francesco. “Risurrezione in Ben Sira?” *Henoch* 4 (1982) 185-203.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Über den sogennanten Ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus: Ein kritisches Sensschreiben an J. C. Gass.* Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1807.

Schnelle, Udo. *Apostle Paul*. Trans. Eugene M. Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Schweitzer, Albert. *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*. Trans. W. Montgomery 1912. repr. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Seitz, Christopher. *The Book of Isaiah 40–66*. NIB 6. Nashville: Abingdon, 2001.

Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Spicq, Ceslas. *Les Épîtres Pastorales*. Paris: Gabalda, 1966.

_____. "ἐπιφαίνω, etc." *TLNT* 2:66.

_____. "ἡσυχάζω, etc." *TLNT* 2:178-83.

_____. "κοσμέω." *TLNT* 2:335.

_____. "λούω, etc." *TLNT* 2:410-14.

_____. "μεσίτης." *TLNT* 2:466.

_____. "σεμνός, etc." *TLNT* 3:248.

_____. "φιλανθρωπία." *TLNT* 3:440-45.

_____. "χάρις, etc." *TLNT* 3:500-506.

_____. "χρηστεύομαι, etc." *TLNT* 3:511-16.

Stettler, Hanna. *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*. WUNT 2/105. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.

Strathmann, H. "μάρτυς, etc." *TDNT* 4:485.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Vicariously Giving his Life for Many, Mark 10:45 (Matt 20:28)." In *Reconciliation, Law and Righteousness*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986. Pp. 16-29.

Stumpff, A. "ζῆλος, etc." *TDNT* 2:877.

Tachau, Peter. *Einst und Jetzt im Neuen Testament.* FRLANT 105. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1972.

Thiselton, Anthony. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Tolmie, D. Francois. *Persuading the Galatians: A Text-Centered Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter.* WUNT 2/190. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2005.

Towner, Philip H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

_____. "The Present Age in the Eschatology of the PE." *NTS* 32 (1986) 427-48.

_____. *The Goal of our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles*. JSNTSup 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Trummer, Peter. *Die Paulustradition der Pastoralbriefe*. BBET 8. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978.

Van Neste, Ray. *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles*. JSNTSup 280. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.

Verner, David C. *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*. SBLDS 71. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Watts, John D. *Isaiah 34–66*. Revised ed. WBC 25. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987.

Watts, Rikki E. "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited." In *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Eds. William Bellinger Jr., and W. R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998. Pp. 125-51.

_____. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. WUNT 2/88. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997.

Weiss, K. "χρηστότης, etc." *TDNT* 9:489-90.

Wennemer, K. "*Apolytrosis* Römer 3:24-25a." *SPCIC* 1:283-88.

Westermann, Klaus. *Isaiah 40–66*. Trans. David Stalker. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Wieland, George M. *The Significance of Salvation: A Study of Salvation Language in the Pastorals*. PBM. Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006.

_____. "The Function of Salvation in the Letters to Timothy and Titus." In *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastorals.* Eds. Andreas Köstenberger and Terry Wilder. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group, 2010. Pp. 153-72.

Wilcox, M. "On the Ransom Saying in Mark 10:45c, Matt 20:28c." In *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70.Geburtstag*. 3 vols. Eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996. Pp. 3:173-86.

Wilder, Terry L. "Pseudonymity, the New Testament and the Pastoral Epistles," in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*. Eds. Andreas Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group, 2010. Pp. 28-51.

Williams, Sam K. *Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept.* Missoula, MT: Scholars' Press, 1975.

Witherington, Ben. *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2 Timothy, and 1-3 John*. 2 vols. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic Press, 2006.

_____. *Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wolter, Michael. *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition.* FRLANT 146. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988.

Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

_____.*Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

_____. *The Letter to the Romans*. NIB 10. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

Young, Frances. *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. NTT. Cambridge, UK—NewYork: Cambridge University Press, 1994.