



**This electronic thesis or dissertation has been
downloaded from Explore Bristol Research,
<http://research-information.bristol.ac.uk>**

Author:

Hoag, Gary G

Title:

The teachings on Riches in 1 Timothy in light of Ephesiaca by Xenophon of Ephesus

General rights

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author, unless otherwise identified in the body of the thesis, and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement. It is permitted to use and duplicate this work only for personal and non-commercial research, study or criticism/review. You must obtain prior written consent from the author for any other use. It is not permitted to supply the whole or part of this thesis to any other person or to post the same on any website or other online location without the prior written consent of the author.

Take down policy

Some pages of this thesis may have been removed for copyright restrictions prior to it having been deposited in Explore Bristol Research. However, if you have discovered material within the thesis that you believe is unlawful e.g. breaches copyright, (either yours or that of a third party) or any other law, including but not limited to those relating to patent, trademark, confidentiality, data protection, obscenity, defamation, libel, then please contact: open-access@bristol.ac.uk and include the following information in your message:

- Your contact details
- Bibliographic details for the item, including a URL
- An outline of the nature of the complaint

On receipt of your message the Open Access team will immediately investigate your claim, make an initial judgement of the validity of the claim, and withdraw the item in question from public view.

**The Teachings on Riches in 1 Timothy
in light of *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus**

Gary G. Hoag

**A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol and Trinity College in
accordance with the requirements for award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Faculty of Arts.**

May 2013

**Word count: 79,868
(text only, excluding preliminary
pages, footnotes and bibliography)**

Abstract

Scholars are divided on reading the teachings on riches in 1 Tim. Evidence that has been largely overlooked in NT scholarship, *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus, suggests that the topic be revisited. *Ephesiaca* is a story about a rich Ephesian couple. This text brings to life what is known from ancient sources about the social setting and cultural rules of the rich in Ephesus and adds details to enhance our knowledge of life and society.

Recent scholarship has dated *Ephesiaca* to the mid-first century CE. If the Acts narrative is reliable, this locates the story in broadly the same timeframe as the ministry of Paul in Ephesus. Interestingly, the story contains some of the same general themes *and* rare terms found in the teachings on riches in 1 Tim. My argument does not focus on locating specific dates for 1 Tim or *Ephesiaca*, but rather, my aim is to analyze these two texts alongside each other and extant ancient sources.

My dissertation begins by introducing *Ephesiaca* and the socio-rhetorical methodology used to explore it alongside other evidence and 1 Tim. The methodology has five parts: social and cultural texture, inner texture, intertexture, ideological texture, and sacred texture. The first texture is helpful for locating a *Sitz im Leben* of the rich in Ephesus, the social and cultural *context* that preceded the *texts* of 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*.

The four remaining textures are employed to scrutinize five passages: 1 Tim 2:9-10; 3:1-13; 6:1-2a; 6:2b-10; and 6:17-19. The findings of this study reveal a fresh perspective on these texts. The teachings on riches in 1 Tim appear to call followers of Jesus to handle riches in a counter-cultural manner that is consistent with the trajectory of other NT teachings when read in light of ancient sources and *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus.

Dedication and Acknowledgements

I dedicate this dissertation to God. It is my gift to Him. Though, in the words of C.S. Lewis, He is “sixpence none the richer” in receipt of my gift, because it was only possible through His generous provision of strength, wisdom, and perseverance. Nonetheless, my prayer is that this work—my gift—pleases Him.

I was not prepared to go where this research journey would take me, so with deep gratitude I acknowledge my advisors, Philip Towner and Stephen Finamore. They have been brilliant thinkers and helpful counselors each step of the way. I must also thank Craig Williford, Craig Blomberg, and Craig Smith for inspiring me to begin this project and Abraham Malherbe for exhorting me to read ancient material, a charge that put me on the path of discovery that eventually led me to *Ephesiaca*.

Lastly, I want to thank my family and friends for their generous love and support, though they are too numerous to list by name. I must, however, acknowledge my parents, John and Patricia Hoag, for their faithful prayers for me; my brother and sister, David and Heather, for their encouragement; and my wife, Jenni, and our two children, Samuel David and Sophie Victoria, whose love and support inspired me to run this race from start to finish.

Authors' Declaration

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the University's Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes and that it has not been submitted for any other academic award. Except where indicated by specific reference in the text, the work is the candidate's own work. Work done in collaboration with, or with the assistance of, others, is indicated as such. Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author.

SIGNED: DATE:.....

CONTENTS

List of Tables	ix
List of Abbreviations	ix
Introduction	1
Chapter One <i>EPHESIACA</i> BY XENOPHON OF EPHESUS AND SOCIO-RHETORICAL INTERPRETATION	15
1.1 <i>Ephesiaca</i> by Xenophon of Ephesus	15
1.1.1. Author and Provenance	16
1.1.2. Date, Genre, and the Scholarly Conversation	17
1.1.3. The Storyline of the <i>Ephesiaca</i>	19
1.1.4. Summary: Engaging Xenophon of Ephesus	26
1.2. Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation	27
1.2.1. The Socio-Rhetorical Methodology of Vernon K. Robbins	27
1.2.2. Adapted Socio-Rhetorical Methodology for this Study	30
1.2.3. Summary: Socio-Rhetorical Methodology, 1 Timothy, and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	32
1.3. Conclusion	32
Chapter Two THE SOCIAL SETTING AND CULTURAL RULES OF THE RICH IN EPHESUS IN THE FIRST CENTURY CE	35
2.1. The Rich in Ephesus: The First and Greatest Metropolis of Asia	35
2.1.1. Artemis, the Artemisium, and the Rich in Ephesus	36
2.1.1.1. Ancient Sources on Artemis, the Artemisium, and the Rich in Ephesus	37
2.1.1.2. Xenophon of Ephesus on Artemis, the Artemisium, and the Rich in Ephesus	42
2.1.2. The Rich in the Roman Imperial Capital of Asia	46
2.1.2.1. Ancient Sources on the Rich in the Roman Imperial Capital of Asia	47
2.1.2.2. Xenophon of Ephesus on the Rich in the Roman Imperial Capital of Asia	50
2.1.3. The Multicultural Mediterranean Hub for Transportation, Trade, and Traditions	52
2.1.3.1. Ancient Sources on the Rich in the Multicultural Mediterranean Hub of Ephesus	53
2.1.3.2. Xenophon of Ephesus on the Rich in the Multicultural Mediterranean Hub of Ephesus	56
2.1.4. Summary: Xenophon of Ephesus and the World of the Rich in Ephesus	57
2.2. Cultural Rules, the Rich in Ephesus, and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	58
2.2.1. Honor and Shame in Ephesus and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	59
2.2.2. Identity in Ephesus and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	62
2.2.3. Kinship in Ephesus and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	64
2.2.4. Exchange and Benefaction in Ephesus and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	66
2.2.5. Envy in Ephesus and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	68
2.2.6. Purity in Ephesus and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	69
2.2.7. Summary: Xenophon of Ephesus and Conformity to Cultural Rules	71
2.3. <i>Sitz im Leben</i> of the Rich in Ephesus in light of <i>Ephesiaca</i>	71
2.4. Conclusion	72

Chapter Three	
WOMEN WITH WEALTH AND 1 TIMOTHY 2:9-10: GODLY DECORUM AND GOOD DEEDS	75
3.1. Inner Texture of 1 Timothy 2:9-10	76
3.1.1. Text and Translation	76
3.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources	76
3.1.2.1. Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World	77
3.1.2.2. Prohibitions	80
3.1.2.3. Expectations	83
3.1.3. Summary	87
3.2. Intertexture	87
3.2.1. Terms Common to 1 Timothy 2:9-10 and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	88
3.2.2. Analysis of Common Terminology	88
3.2.3. Summary	95
3.3. Ideological Texture	96
3.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in <i>Ephesiaca</i>	96
3.3.2. Rich Women in the Ephesian Culture and 1 Timothy 2:9-10	98
3.3.3. Summary	100
3.4. Sacred Texture	100
3.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text	100
3.4.2. Reading the Text in the Context of other NT Teachings	102
3.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Three Rich Women in Acts	104
3.4.4. Summary	107
3.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Timothy 2:9-10 in light of <i>Ephesiaca</i>	107
Chapter Four	
LEADERS AND 1 TIMOTHY 3:1-13: AVOID GREED AND SHAMEFUL GAIN SERVING AS FAITHFUL STEWARDS	111
4.1. Inner Texture of 1 Timothy 3:1-13	112
4.1.1. Text and Translation	112
4.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources	113
4.1.2.1. Virtue/Vice Lists in the Greco-Roman World	114
4.1.2.2. Virtue/Vice Lists in Ancient Jewish Literature	117
4.1.2.3. Epigraphic Evidence related to Religious Leaders in Ephesus	122
4.1.3. Summary	127
4.2. Intertexture	128
4.2.1. Themes Common to 1 Timothy 3:1-13 and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	128
4.2.2. Analysis of Common Themes	128
4.2.3. Summary	133
4.3. Ideological Texture	134
4.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in <i>Ephesiaca</i>	134
4.3.2. Rich Leaders in the Ephesian Culture and 1 Timothy 3:1-13	136
4.3.3. Summary	137
4.4. Sacred Texture	138
4.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text	138
4.4.2. Reading the Text in the Context of other NT Teachings	141
4.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Jesus' Teaching on Benefaction and Service	143
4.4.4. Summary	144
4.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Timothy 3:1-13 in light of <i>Ephesiaca</i>	144

Chapter Five	
SLAVES AND MASTERS IN 1 TIMOTHY 6:1-2A: HONORABLE SERVICE AND THE SOURCE OF BENEFICENCE	147
5.1. Inner Texture of 1 Timothy 6:1-2a	148
5.1.1. Text and Translations	148
5.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources	150
5.1.2.1. Beneficence in the Ancient Mediterranean World and in Ephesus	152
5.1.2.2. Giving, Receiving, and Enjoying Beneficence	158
5.1.3. Summary	163
5.2. Intertexture	164
5.2.1. Terms and Themes Common to 1 Timothy 6:1-2a and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	164
5.2.2. Analysis of Common Terms and Themes	164
5.2.3. Summary	169
5.3. Ideological Texture	170
5.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in <i>Ephesiaca</i>	171
5.3.2. Slaves, Masters, and Benefaction in the Early Church	173
5.3.3. Summary	174
5.4. Sacred Texture	175
5.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text	175
5.4.2. Reading the Text in the Context of NT Teachings to Slaves and Masters	176
5.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Beneficence in the NT	177
5.4.4. Fresh Translation of the Disputed Phrase in 1 Timothy 6:1-2a	179
5.4.5. Summary	179
5.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Timothy 6:1-2a in light of <i>Ephesiaca</i>	180
Chapter Six	
FALSE TEACHERS IN 1 TIMOTHY 6:2B-10: GODLINESS, GREED, AND THE SACRED MESSAGE OF <i>EPHESIACA</i>	183
6.1. Inner Texture	184
6.1.1. Text and Translation	184
6.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources	185
6.1.2.1. Godliness in Antiquity and Ephesus	187
6.1.2.2. Wise Sayings on Contentment in the Ephesian Context	190
6.1.2.3. Myths, Teachings, and the Rich in Ancient Ephesus	195
6.1.3. Summary	197
6.2. Intertexture	198
6.2.1. Terms and Themes in 1 Timothy 6:2b-10 and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	198
6.2.2. Analysis of Common Terms and Themes	198
6.2.3. Summary	206
6.3. Ideological Texture	208
6.3.1. The Author, the Audience, and Culture in <i>Ephesiaca</i>	208
6.3.2. The Artemisium Collection, <i>Ephesiaca</i> , and 1 Timothy 6:2b-10	210
6.3.3. Summary	211
6.4. Sacred Texture	212
6.4.1. God, the Rich and Riches in the Text	212
6.4.2. False Teaching in the Context of 1 Timothy and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	213
6.4.3. Reading the Text and <i>Ephesiaca</i> alongside related NT Teachings	216
6.4.4. Summary	219
6.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Timothy 6:2b-10 in light of <i>Ephesiaca</i>	220

Chapter Seven	
THE RICH IN 1 TIMOTHY 6:17-19: HOPE IN GOD, ENJOY AND SHARE ALL GOD RICHLY PROVIDES, AND GRASP LIFE	223
7.1. Inner Texture of 1 Timothy 6:17-19	224
7.1.1. Text and Translation	224
7.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources	224
7.1.2.1. The Rich in the Present World of Ancient Ephesus	226
7.1.2.2. Two Prohibitions	228
7.1.2.3. God, the Benefactor	231
7.1.2.4. Expectations regarding Sharing	232
7.1.2.5. Storing up Treasure in Ephesus	236
7.1.2.6. The <i>ἵνα</i> clause in Benefaction Inscriptions	237
7.1.3. Summary	238
7.2. Intertexture	239
7.2.1. Terms Common to 1 Timothy 6:17-19 and <i>Ephesiaca</i>	239
7.2.2. Analysis of Common Terminology	240
7.2.3. Summary	245
7.3. Ideological Texture	246
7.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in <i>Ephesiaca</i>	247
7.3.2. The Riches of the Rich in Ephesus	248
7.3.3. Summary	249
7.4. Sacred Texture	250
7.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text	251
7.4.2. Reading the Text in light of a Pivotal Passage in the Gospels	251
7.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Teaching from the Pauline Tradition	255
7.4.4. Reading the Text in light of the Early Church in Ephesus	256
7.4.5. Summary	257
7.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Timothy 6:17-19 in light of <i>Ephesiaca</i>	259
Conclusion	263
Ancient Literary Sources and Epigraphic Collections	271
Bibliography	275

List of Tables

Table #1: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 2:9-10	76
Table #2: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 3:1-13	112
Table #3: <i>Curetes</i> Inscriptions of the First Century CE (<i>IvE</i> 1001-1020)	124
Table #4: Greek Text and English Translations of Phrase in 1 Tim 6:2a	149
Table #5: Greek Text and Fresh Rendering of Disputed Phrase in 1 Tim 6:2a	179
Table #6: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 6:2b-10	184
Table #7: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 6:17-19	224

List of Abbreviations

1 Tim	1 Timothy
2 Tim	2 Timothy
AB	Anchor Bible
<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AJS</i>	<i>American Journal of Semiotics</i>
ALA	Argonaut Library of Antiquities
<i>AN</i>	<i>Ancient Narrative</i>
<i>AncSoc</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentary
ATLA	American Theological Library Association
<i>BAGD</i>	W. Bauer, W. Arndt, F. Gingrich, and F. Danker, eds., <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i>
BCE	Before the Common Era
BCH	Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BMEA	The British Museum: Egyptian Antiquities (London, 1832-36)
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BST	Bible Speaks Today
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
<i>C&M</i>	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CE	Common Era
CIG	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum (Berlin, 1828-77)
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum
<i>CTST</i>	<i>Current Trends in Scripture Translation: United Bible Societies</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Church Quarterly</i>
DNTB	Dictionary of New Testament Background
<i>DDSR</i>	<i>Duke Divinity School Review</i>
EBib	Etudes bibliques
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
<i>EDNT</i>	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i>

EGT	Expositor's Greek Testament
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ErJb</i>	<i>Eranos Jahrbuch</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>FiE</i>	<i>Forschungen in Ephesos</i>
<i>FGRH</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GIBM	Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum (Oxford, 1874-1916)
Hermeneia	Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible
<i>Hermes</i>	<i>Hermes: Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie</i>
<i>Historia</i>	<i>Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IGR	Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes (Paris, 1852-1937)
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>IvE</i>	<i>Die Inschriften von Ephesos</i> (Berlin, 1979-84)
IVPNTC	InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary
<i>JAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
Jahresh	Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JÖAI</i>	<i>Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>JRA</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSNTS	Supplement Series for <i>Journal for the Study of New Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	H. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Jones, and R. McKenzie, eds., <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i>
LXX	Septuagint
NA ²⁷	Novum Testamentum Graece, 27 th ed., German Bible Society
NAC	New American Commentary
NCBC	New Clarendon Bible Commentary
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i>
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTAbh</i>	<i>Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen</i>
NTIC	New Testament in Context
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NT	New Testament
NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary
<i>NZ</i>	<i>Numismatische Zeitschrift</i>
OGIS	Oriens Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (Leipzig, 1903-05)
<i>OLDD</i>	James Morwood, ed. <i>Oxford Latin Desk Dictionary</i>
OT	Old Testament

<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PE	Pastoral Epistles
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia graeca</i>
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
PW	Supplement to A.F. Pauly and G. Wissowa, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
RE	Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>Scrip</i>	<i>Scriptura: International Journal of Bible, Religion, and Theology in Southern Africa</i>
SIG	Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum (Leipzig, 183-1915)
SP	Sacra Pagina
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SNTSMS	Society For New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses</i>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>TANZ</i>	<i>Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae
<i>TLNT</i>	<i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentary
TWAS	Twayne's World Authors Series
TZNT	Texte zum Neuen Testament
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UaLG	Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte
UBS ⁴	The Greek New Testament, 4 th rev. ed., United Bible Societies
WA	Martin Luthers Werke; kritische Gesamtausgabe
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

INTRODUCTION

How should the teachings on riches in 1 Tim be understood in light of the rest of the New Testament? The *status quaestionis* is an unresolved debate among 1 Tim scholars with proponents divided largely into three camps.¹ Some scholars view the teachings on riches in 1 Tim as *consistent* with the trajectory of other NT teachings on riches.² Others read them as *inconsistent* with related NT instructions based on the terms and themes employed.³ Lastly, some consider these teachings as *alternating* when compared to other NT passages with riches in view, that is, sometimes sounding consistent and sometimes sounding inconsistent.⁴

Before discussing the scope of this dissertation and the outline it follows, we must review these three perspectives in 1 Tim scholarship. This brief history of interpretation sets the stage for the fresh research this study will undertake.

View #1 – Consistent with NT Teachings on Riches

The teachings on riches in 1 Tim have been interpreted throughout church history as *consistent* with the trajectory of other NT passages where riches are in view.⁵ This position dominated 1 Tim scholarship from the Early Church until the modern era.

¹ These three interpretive camps largely coincide with the three main views on the authorship of 1 Tim. Some say the teachings sound like Paul, others choose to locate them more broadly within the Pauline tradition, and some believe they represent movement beyond the thinking and milieu of Paul. Since the authorship question cannot be answered conclusively based on evidence available to us, it will not be addressed within the bounds of this study. I may refer to "Paul" as the author of 1 Tim only as that is how he is described in the prescript (1 Tim 1:1). Cf. Craig A. Smith, *Timothy's Task, Paul's Prospect* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006) 3.

² Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) 429; I. Howard Marshall and Philip H. Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) 670-74; Craig L. Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Material Possessions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 206-11.

³ Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, Hermeneia (ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972) 91.

⁴ Reggie M. Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A "Bourgeois" Form of Early Christianity?*, vol. 122, SBLDS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 157-58; L. William Countryman, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations* (New York: E. Mellen Press, 1980) 151-54; Mark Harding, *What Are They Saying about the Pastoral Epistles?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2001) 57-60; David Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*, vol. 71, SBLDS (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983) 74-75.

⁵ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation and Introduction*, vol. 35, AB (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 20-42. In Johnson's exploration of the history of interpretation, he sums up this reception of 1 Tim aptly, 23: "the use of the letters focuses on where the letters themselves focus: on moral life, especially the dangers of the love of money and the need to share possessions (1 Tim 6:7-10, 17-19)."

Patristic writers such as Polycarp (69-155), Clement (c. 150-215), and Chrysostom (c. 347-407) allude to or quote 1 Tim. They use the paraenetic texts alongside other NT writings to teach rich people how to relate to money and the polemic passages to combat sinful behaviors tied to riches.⁶ Augustine (354-430) also uses 1 Tim alongside gospel passages urging his listeners to show concern for the poor by generous sharing, to be content rather than aspire to be rich, and to avoid the destructive force of pride that often accompanies riches through almsgiving.⁷

Through the Middle Ages, Venerable Bede (672-735), Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), and Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471) mention the teachings on riches in 1 Tim in their writings and expound on them in harmony with other NT passages.⁸ They speak out unashamedly against avarice and urge Christian leaders to despise earthly things. They call for radical generosity in the form of sharing with the needy and doing good deeds to demonstrate the Christian faith and to grasp true life.

Leading voices in the Reformation era rely on the teachings in 1 Tim along with other NT passages to refute heresy and cry for reform. Martin Luther (1483-1546) proclaims it is idolatry to trust in things rather than God, citing 1 Tim 6:10 and related NT texts.⁹ John Calvin (1509-1564)¹⁰ and others echo the command in 1 Tim 6:17 urging the rich to avoid pride and use wealth for charity versus luxury.¹¹

⁶ Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 4.1 (1 Tim 6:7, 10); Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 2:3 (1 Tim 6:10), *Stromata* 1.9 (1 Tim 6:3-5); Chrysostom, *Homily 18 on First Timothy* (1 Tim 6:13-21). Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, ed. and trans. *Apostolic Fathers I*. LCL, vol. 24 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003); Kirsopp Lake, ed. and trans. *Apostolic Fathers II*. LCL, vol. 25 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976).

⁷ Augustine, *To you has the poor man abandoned himself, you will be guardian for the orphan* Sermon 14.2, 6-7 (1 Tim 6:7-10, 17); *Do not delay to turn to the Lord, nor put it off from day to day* Sermon 39.2-5 (1 Tim 6:7, 9, 17-19); *Eight Beatitudes in the Gospel* Sermon 53A.3-6 (1 Tim 6:6-10, 17-19); *On the words of the Gospel of Matthew 7:7-11: Ask and you will be given* Sermon 61.9-13 (1 Tim 6:7-10); *On the words of the Apostle, Galatians 6:2-5: Bear your burdens for each other* Sermon 164.8 (1 Tim 6:17-19); *On the Birthday of the Holy Scillitan Martyrs* Sermon 299A.3-4, 7 (1 Tim 6:6-9). Cf. Ramsay, Boniface, ed. *Essential Sermons: The Works of Saint Augustine*. A Translation for the 21st Century. trans. Edmund Hill, Hyde Park: New City Press, 2007.

⁸ Venerable Bede, *Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 5.16.11-12 (1 Tim 6:7); in this same general timeframe, see also: (E)cumenius of Tricca, *Pauli Apostoli ad Timotheum Prior Epistola* PG 119:153 (1 Tim 6:10, 17-19). Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Humility and Pride* 1.1 (1 Tim 6:19); Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ* 3.32 (1 Tim 6:12).

⁹ Martin Luther, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (WA) 14:612, 29-613, 16. Cf. Brian S. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 34.

¹⁰ "How to Use the Present Life and the Comforts of it" in John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (ed. trans. Henry Beveridge; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1846)10.4-5 (1 Tim 6:17-19).

In the Puritan period, Richard Baxter (1615-1691) calls ministers away from the love of money and implores them to be “addicted” to doing good.¹² John Flavel (1628-1691) exhorts ministers of the gospel not to allow earthly business to distract them from their work and quotes 1 Tim 6:9 as the basis for this instruction.¹³ For these leaders, the teachings on riches were taught harmoniously with other NT texts.

In the Revival era, David Brainerd (1718-1747) echoes 1 Tim in challenging God’s servants not to focus on growing rich but rather on doing good.¹⁴ John Wesley (1703-1791) speaks of money and giving from 1 Tim along with other NT passages in his sermons, and his zealous preaching was matched with a lifestyle of sacrificial, generous giving.¹⁵ Later, A.C. Gaebelien (1861-1945) ties the Sermon on the Mount to 1 Tim texts with riches in view proclaiming: “The exhortations in the Epistles are but a continuation by the Holy Spirit of this word of our Lord.”¹⁶

Today, Craig Blomberg and Luke Timothy Johnson are leading advocates of this view. On riches in 1 Tim, Blomberg writes:

Paul may not issue any of Jesus’ wide-ranging or radical calls to abandon everything, although we have already argued that none of those calls was intended to be normative for all believers in the first place. But he does insist that Hellenistic Christians be equally counter-cultural in rejecting the systems of patronage and reciprocity so endemic in their culture. And he calls all believers to act as generous benefactors regardless of their net worth and with no thought of any material reward in this life. Should they fall into acute need, they should be able to count on their fellow believers to minister to them, even as they are expected to give from their surplus at the moment. In short, Paul commands generosity simply because it honours God; the only guaranteed reward awaits in the life to come. Paul as much as Jesus recognizes the danger of mammon as an idol and its potentially damning effects. Christ must be served rather than money.¹⁷

¹¹ For example, Francis de Sales (1567-1622), leans on 1 Tim 5:3-16 alongside other NT texts to argue that riches should be spent on the care of widows. Francis de Sales, *Introduction to the Devout Life* (ed. Allan Ross; Mineola: Dover, 2009) 213-15.

¹² Richard Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor*, 5th ed. (ed. William Brown; London: The Religious Tract Society, 1862) 165 (1 Tim 6:10).

¹³ See: “Mystery of Providence” in John Flavel, *The Whole Works of the Rev. Mr. John Flavel, Late Minister of the Gospel at Dartmouth, Devon* (London: W. Baynes and Son, 1820) 391.

¹⁴ David Brainerd, *Letter III: To his brother Israel, written from Kaunaumeek on January 21, 1743-4* in Edward Hickman, ed., *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (London: Ball, Arnold, and Company, 1840) 436.

¹⁵ John Wesley, *The Danger of Riches Sermon 87* (1 Tim 6:9) in Albert C. Outler and Richard P. Heitzenrater, ed., *John Wesley's Sermons: An Anthology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991)

¹⁶ A.C. Gaebelien, *The Gospel of Matthew: An Exposition* (New York: Our Hope Publication Office, 1910) 146. He reads 1 Tim 6:9-10, 17-18 as consistent and connected to Matt 6:19-34.

¹⁷ Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, 212. This view on the relationship between the teachings on riches in the Jesus tradition and the Pauline tradition will be revisited in chapter seven of this dissertation.

Blomberg understands the teachings on riches in 1 Tim as *consistent* or harmonious based on a reading of the Gospels that does not see the “radical calls” of Jesus as normative for all believers. He, along with others who hold the *consistent* view, calls rich Christians to live counter-culturally and serve as “generous benefactors.”¹⁸

Johnson sees the teachings on riches in 1 Tim as influenced by the Greco-Roman world of moral exhortation.¹⁹ In his view, though these teachings reflect their ancient context, they can be read as *consistent* with other NT teachings because “the language in the Gospels” is present.²⁰ Johnson interprets these teachings as calling the rich to be detached *from* and become generous sharers *of* possessions.²¹

These examples illustrate the *consistent* view.²² This perspective prevailed from the Early Church until the modern era when the *inconsistent* view surfaced.

View #2 – Inconsistent with other NT Teachings on Riches

Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann argue that the theology, ethics, and literary character of 1 Tim, including the teachings on riches, are *inconsistent* as compared to the Gospels and the Pauline homologoumena.²³

In their thinking, 1 Tim depicts a world where the perceived delay of the *parousia* had contributed to diminished eschatological expectations. In response, the Church settled respectfully into its cultural setting, institutionalizing itself using the

¹⁸ Cf. Bruce W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 9-78; Paul R. Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 406. Both of these views will be revisited in chapter seven of this dissertation, that is, whether or not the “radical calls” of Jesus can be understood as normative for all believers and whether or not 1 Tim is calling Christians to be generous benefactors.

¹⁹ Cf. Abraham J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*, 1st ed., Library of Early Christianity (ed. Wayne A. Meeks; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986) 14, 82-83, 109, 138-41, 154-57.

²⁰ Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 311.

²¹ Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *Sharing Possessions: What Faith Demands* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2011).

²² For another present day proponent, see: Bruce W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) 149.

²³ Their thinking regarding the authorship and instructions in 1 Tim was influenced by: Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über den sogenannten Ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus: Ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J.C. Gass* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1807); Johann G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Weidmanischen Buchhandlung, 1812); Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Die Sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus* (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1835). On the literary character of these “instructions and congregational rules” as inconsistent with other Pauline writings, see: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1.

²⁴ Martin Dibelius, *Urchristentum und Kultur* (Heidelberg: C. Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928) 1-36.

language and standards of society.²⁴ The church made “adjustments for a prolonged stay in the world in the face of the evolution of both orthodoxy and heresy within the Christian communities.”²⁵ From their perspective, the theological character of 1 Tim, including the teachings on riches, reflects this institutionalization.

As Reggie Kidd points out, the Church in 1 Tim had changed in three ways in the thinking of Dibelius and Conzelmann. It had become (1) *socially ascendant*, that is, comprised of “members of a Christian bourgeoisie;” (2) *culturally accommodative*, in contrast to the more culturally critical position reflected in the undisputed Pauline writings; and (3) *unheroically conservative*, or static in its enthusiasm.²⁶ Dibelius and Conzelmann thought it took time for this to happen, which is why they date 1 Tim in the late first or early second century CE and argue for pseudonymous authorship.²⁷

The instructional focus of 1 Tim for Dibelius and Conzelmann is *christliche Bürgerlichkeit*, Christian good citizenship.²⁸ From their perspective, the inclusion of new theological terminology, the use of virtue lists, the adaptation of Greco-Roman house codes, and the use of terms like moderation and prudence in relationship to riches (1 Tim 2:9-15), appear to call Christians to conform to the cultural norms of their surroundings.²⁹

Dibelius and Conzelmann understand the polemic section on handling riches (1 Tim 6:2b-10) as reflecting the realm of moral exhortation rather than the Jesus

²⁵ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 8.

²⁶ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 9-25.

²⁷ Other proponents of this pseudonymous view of authorship include: Norbert Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1969); Lewis R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986); Jürgen Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, EKKNT (Zürich: Benziger, 1988); Michael Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition*, vol. 146, FRLANT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); and Benjamin Fiore, *The Pastoral Epistles*, vol. 12, SP (ed. Daniel J. Harrington; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007). Though views on authorship differ widely, the audience of 1 Tim is broadly understood as directed to the Ephesian context based on the internal reference in 1 Tim 1:3.

²⁸ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 39-41.

²⁹ As teachings such as 1 Tim 6:10 can be located in the thinking of moral philosophers such as Bion the Sophist in Stobaeus, *Eclog* 10.36-7; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.50; Democritus in *De Gnomologio Vaticano inedito* 265; Apollodorus Comicus 4; Diodorus Siculus 21.1; and, Plutarch, *Moralia* 108A-B, 525C; Dibelius reads 1 Tim as reflective of the culture rather than the Gospels. Cf. Hans von Campenhausen, “Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe,” in *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1963) 228, for a similar view of cultural maxims in antiquity and Polycarp’s allusion to 1 Tim 6:10 in *To The Philippians* 4.1.

tradition in the Gospels. Regarding the paraenetic passage (1 Tim 6:17-19) he adds: “one should not overlook the fact that the judgment concerning the rich is not nearly as sharp as in James 1:10, 11; 5:1ff; further, it avoids any ideology of poverty (one may compare Luke 12:21).”³⁰ In their thinking, the Christian world reflected in 1 Tim had experienced the *Verweltlichung*, “secularization,” of ethics.³¹ The radical gospel ethics of the Early Church had been replaced with ethics that were more secular, which, according to Dibelius and Conzelmann, explains why the teachings in 1 Tim seem *inconsistent* with other NT instructions on handling riches.

In the 1980s, *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* came under heavy fire. Philip Towner showed that apparent contradictions between the terms and themes in 1 Tim and other NT passages can be explained as being mission-focused, and in so doing, demonstrated that the theology and ethics of 1 Tim can be understood as consistent with undisputed Pauline writings.³² Kidd looked specifically at riches in the Pastoral Epistles and showed inconsistencies in the thinking of Dibelius and Conzelmann.³³ In separate works produced in the same timeframe, Towner and Kidd refuted this view of riches in 1 Tim and significantly challenged the adequacy of *christliche Bürgerlichkeit*. This opened the door for a third view, the *alternating* position.

View #3 – Alternating in Relationship to other NT Teachings on Riches

The *alternating* view posits that the teachings on riches in 1 Tim vacillate. Sometimes they sound consistent with the trajectory of other NT teachings on riches and sometimes they do not. William Countryman first put forth this position. Kidd also advocates for this view, which is gaining proponents in 1 Tim scholarship.

Countryman presents the rich Christian in the Early Church in the Early Empire broadly using the terms *contradictions* and *accommodations*. In his thinking,

³⁰ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 91.

³¹ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 171; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 39.

³² Philip H. Towner, *The Goal of our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 256-57.

³³ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 195-203.

the rich are welcome in the congregation in so far as they give alms generously, but also viewed as a potential danger as they may expect honor and respect in the church because they received such perks as members of clubs and as benefactors in the patron-client society.³⁴ For Countryman, this understanding of the rich Christian in the ancient world corresponds with the socio-historical evidence.³⁵

In reading 1 Tim, Countryman concludes that the Early Church leaders had to wrestle with two competing realities in the teachings on riches: The church cannot live with the rich due to the implications of their social status, and simultaneously, cannot live without their almsgiving.³⁶ In other words, sometimes the presence and behavior of the rich is confronted, and other times it is accommodated.

Kidd takes a different approach to examining riches in 1 Tim but arrives at a similar conclusion. Discontent with the *christliche Bürgerlichkeit* label that Dibelius and Conzelmann had affixed to 1 Tim and its teachings on riches, Kidd dismantled their three-part dictum that the church had become *socially ascendant, culturally accommodative and unheroically conservative*.³⁷

The claim that the Early Church in 1 Tim had become *socially ascendant* or controlling related to riches was rooted in the notion that the church initially did not warmly welcome the rich but then later tolerated them in their midst. Kidd responds to this claim of Dibelius and Conzelmann by offering a more compelling

³⁴ Countryman, *The Rich Christian*, 165. By *contradictions*, Countryman refers to way the behavior of the rich posed potential problems in the church setting in light of their social status. By *accommodations*, he emphasizes how the behavior of the rich must be tolerated because their support was vital to meeting the needs of the church.

³⁵ Key influences on Countryman's thinking include: E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation*, [1st ed. (London: Tyndale Press, 1960)]; Peter Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970); Martin Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974); Gerd Theissen, "Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des hellenistischen Urchristentums." *ZNW* 65 (1974): 155-72; John G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975).

³⁶ Countryman, *The Rich Christian*, 154-55, notes: Rich women appear to have breached church order in 1 Tim 2:9-10, whereas in 1 Tim 6:17-19, their "proper role" is explained: "to support the church generously."

³⁷ Kidd accomplished this task building on the work of Countryman, E.A. Judge, and David Verner and by responding to the *Christian humanism* explanation for the "bourgeois" flavor of 1 Tim of Ceslas Spicq. Cf. E. A. Judge, "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." *JRH* 11 (1980): 201-217; and, Verner, *Household of God*, 83-126. For more on Kidd's response to the *Christian humanism* explanation, see: Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 25-29. Cf. Ceslas Spicq, *Saint Paul: les Épîtres Pastorales*, EBib (Paris: Gabalda, 1969) 295.

reconstruction of the social world of the Early Church in Asia Minor, by identifying the levels of rank and status in the society, and by demonstrating that the rich had been there all along.³⁸ He refuted the claim that the Early Church had *become* socially ascendant by sketching the social world of the Early Church as having levels of *institutional differentiation* with rich and poor present from its inception.³⁹

In challenging the *culturally accommodative* position of Dibelius and Conzelmann as it pertained to wealth and riches, Kidd turns to 1 Tim 6:17-19, and sees it as a “pivotal passage.”⁴⁰ On one side, Kidd acknowledges that the text sounds consistent with gospel teaching, but on the other hand, he struggles with how it does not fit, in his mind, within the social setting, which functioned by way of the exchange between incentives and reciprocities.⁴¹ In his view, the behavior called for by the author of 1 Tim is not culturally accommodative as Dibelius and Conzelmann have argued, but he also believes that “no one should suggest that the Pastorals’ answers are scandalously radical.”⁴² Consequently, Kidd takes a middle position.

Thirdly, Dibelius and Conzelmann had suggested that the church and life for the wealthy *Bürger* had become *unheroically conservative*. The rich had become comfortable living life in the status quo.⁴³ Against this point, Kidd cites various passages in the PE and states that “the rich are to invest themselves and their resources in a community of people who are beneath them, awaiting a return—the conferring of real life—at the epiphany of the Lord Jesus, rather than looking to the

³⁸ For a more developed picture of the thinking contributed to the formation of Kidd’s view, see: E. A. Judge, “Rank and Status in the World of the Caesars and St. Paul,” in *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays* by E.A. Judge, ed. David M. Scholer (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008) 137-56.

³⁹ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 74-75; cf. Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003) 51-73.

⁴⁰ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 124.

⁴¹ Cf. John H. Elliott, “Patronage and Clientism in Early Christian Society: A Short Reading Guide.” *Forum* 3/4 (1987): 39-48; Ronald F. Hock, “Paul’s Tentmaking and the Problem of his Social Class.” *JBL* 97 (1978): 555-64; Wayne A. Meeks, *The Moral World of the First Christians* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986) 32-39.

⁴² Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 157. Cf. Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 14, TNTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2007) 129.

⁴³ Cf. Stephen Charles Mott, “The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence,” in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney*, ed. G.F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975)60-72. On the rich in the NT world, see: Richard Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963); John E. Stambaugh and David L. Balch, *The New Testament in its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986).

building up of social capital in the reciprocal bonds of patron-client relations.”⁴⁴ In the ethical instructions for the different groups, rich people included, Kidd shows the themes to be both heroic and conservative, though in his mind, sometimes at variance with the more radical tradition in the Gospels.

For Kidd, the teachings on riches in 1 Tim have both *bürgerlich* and anti-*bürgerlich* characteristics. Like Countryman, he believes that sometimes they sound consistent with the trajectory of other teachings on riches in the NT and sometimes they do not. The *alternating* view is growing in popularity in current scholarship though many still embrace the *consistent* position.⁴⁵

Scope and Aim of this Study

How should the teachings on riches in 1 Tim be understood in light of their social setting? Is the author of 1 Tim with his view of riches calling followers of Jesus to assimilate to the Ephesian social norms, to handle riches differently from the cultural rules that governed the behavior of rich Ephesians, or somewhere in between?

This survey of scholarship reveals that proponents of the *consistent* and *alternating* positions have dismantled the pillars of the *inconsistent* view; however, the discussion between the two remaining views seems to have stagnated. The current divide appears to center on how scholars understand the relationship between the terms and themes in the text of 1 Tim and the social setting.

This study seeks to offer new input to this debate rooted in fresh research. Rather than dissecting each of these views further, which moves beyond the limits of this study, we will explore ancient material alongside a document that has been largely overlooked in NT scholarship: *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus.

⁴⁴ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 193.

⁴⁵ Harding, *What Are They Saying*, 54-60. Scholars such as Mark Harding appear to comply with the *alternating* view, and no scholars to my knowledge have offered evidence to overturn it. See also: Mark Harding, *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Peter Lang, 1998) where Harding evaluates the literary and rhetorical forms employed in 1 Tim and describes ways in which they shape the “Pauline tradition.” The alternating position reflects some of the tensions of a tradition rooted in Paul and continued by others after him.

The *editio princeps* of *Ephesiaca*, also known as *Anthia and Habrocomes*, was released in 1726. Until recently, classical scholars codified it as an ancient Greek novel from the second or third century CE.⁴⁶ This may explain why NT scholars have paid little attention to this story about a rich Ephesian couple. Its value for interpreting the teachings on riches in 1 Tim comes into view as the story contains some of the rare terms and themes that are also found in 1 Tim.

Furthermore, in 1994, James O'Sullivan argued convincingly that an earlier date, mid-first century CE, might be more likely for *Ephesiaca*. This brings the story into broadly the same timeframe as Luke's Acts locates the ministry of the Apostle Paul in Ephesus. These findings helped define the scope and aim of my research: to see what this source might offer to the unresolved debate on interpreting the teachings on riches in 1 Tim.⁴⁷

The scope of this study is to present *Ephesiaca* alongside other ancient evidence using a socio-rhetorical methodology to show how Xenophon of Ephesus may aid scholars in understanding the teachings on riches in 1 Tim. The aim of this dissertation is to show that the teachings on riches in 1 Tim can be understood as *consistent* with the trajectory of other NT teachings on riches when read in light of ancient evidence in general and *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus in particular.

Chapter Outline

The argument of this dissertation unfolds in seven chapters.

Chapter One – *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus and Socio-Rhetorical

Interpretation. The opening chapter introduces Xenophon of Ephesus and the socio-rhetorical methodology we will use to examine *Ephesiaca* alongside other

⁴⁶ James N. O'Sullivan, *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*, UaLG Band 44 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995) 9.

⁴⁷ In this study I am not claiming to have unearthed a Rosetta Stone *per se* that unlocks all the mysteries of 1 Tim. Instead, I am simply sharing how I came upon fresh evidence that sheds light on life and society for the rich in Ephesus and offers both interesting and original input to this interpretive debate.

ancient evidence and 1 Tim. We will consider issues related to the scholarly reception of *Ephesiaca* and explain the parts or textures of the methodology. The chapter will conclude by listing the passages in 1 Tim with riches in view that we will scrutinize in this study: 1 Tim 2:9-10; 3:1-13; 6:1-2a; 6:2b-10; and 6:17-19.

Chapter Two – The Social Setting and Cultural Rules of the Rich in Ephesus in the First Century CE. We will explore the social setting of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE based on what is known from other sources, and highlight what emerges about Ephesian life and society from Xenophon of Ephesus. We will also see how *Ephesiaca* depicts the cultural rules or institutions that governed behavior for rich Ephesians, which are known from numerous ancient sources. Taken together, this study of the social setting and cultural rules will help us sketch a *Sitz im Leben* of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE, the social and cultural *context* that preceded the *texts* of 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*.

Chapter Three – Women with Wealth and 1 Timothy 2:9-10: Godly Decorum and Good Deeds. This chapter will scrutinize the function and meaning of rare terms such as πλέγμασιν, “plaits or braids,” linked to the decorum and deeds of women with the help of ancient sources and *Ephesiaca*. As a result, we will discover social realities that may have been in view and discern how rich women may have heard this teaching. We will conclude this chapter by viewing the findings that emerge beside related NT texts that mention leading Christian women.

Chapter Four – Leaders and 1 Timothy 3:1-13: Avoid Greed and Shameful Gain serving as Faithful Stewards. This chapter concentrates on two themes that pertain to handling riches in the leadership qualifications lists: *greed* and *stewardship*. We will observe these two themes in virtue/vice lists in the Greco-Roman world and ancient Jewish literature as well as alongside Ephesian epigraphic evidence and *Ephesiaca*. In so doing, a fresh perspective on how rich leaders may

have understood these criteria emerges in light of cultural fixtures that surface in the social setting of Ephesus in the first century CE.

Chapter Five – Slaves and Masters and 1 Timothy 6:1-2a: Honorable Service and the Source of Beneficence. This chapter examines the instructions for slaves and masters. We will study this passage because the author uses benefaction language that has been difficult for scholars to interpret. Many consider it from the “Masters as Benefactors” position, while others embrace the “Slaves as Benefactors” perspective. By analyzing the words of the text in antiquity and *Ephesiaca*, a third interpretation emerges, the “God as Benefactor” view, which represents a possible solution for interpreting and translating the disputed phrase in this passage.

Chapter Six – False Teachers in 1 Timothy 6:2b-10: Godliness, Greed, and the Sacred Message of *Ephesiaca*. Here we will consider the specific facets of the polemic passage on riches. We will evaluate the function and meaning of εὐσέβεια, the wise sayings on relating to riches, and the myths and teachings in Ephesus in the first century CE in light of inscriptions, literary evidence, and *Ephesiaca*. In so doing, a plausible explanation of the identity of the false teachers who desire “to stay rich” comes into view as well as evidence of a different doctrine promoted by the rich in Ephesus.

Chapter Seven – The Charge to the Rich in 1 Timothy 6:17-19: Hope in God, Enjoy and Share all God Richly Provides, and Grasp Life. This chapter appraises the prohibitions and expectations in the charge to the rich in light of Ephesian evidence and *Ephesiaca*. Against the rich background provided by Xenophon of Ephesus, we will consider how the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE may have heard this charge as having radical implications in light of their *Sitz im Leben*. In the end, the interpretation that surfaces sounds *consistent* with the trajectory of key NT teachings on riches in the Gospels and the Pauline tradition.

Conclusion. Here we will reassemble the findings of this research. We will summarize how *Ephesiaca* adds to our understanding of the social and cultural world of the rich in Ephesus. We will also present the fresh perspective that Xenophon of Ephesus gives readers of five passages in 1 Tim that contain teachings on riches where scholars have been divided. In light of ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca*, this study will offer an original contribution to the unresolved debate on understanding the teachings on riches in 1 Tim in light of the rest of the NT.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER ONE

Ephesiaca by Xenophon of Ephesus and Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation

Ancient historians and poets,⁴⁸ benefaction inscriptions,⁴⁹ numismatic evidence,⁵⁰ and other artifacts have shaped our modern understanding of the social and cultural world of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE. Additionally, NT scholars have examined primary sources with innovative methodologies and have shed light on the ancient cultural context in order to enhance our understanding of social realities in texts such as 1 Tim.⁵¹

There is one work, however, an ancient Greek novel, that NT scholars have largely overlooked: *Ephesiaca* ascribed to Xenophon of Ephesus. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce *Ephesiaca* (1.1.) and present the multifaceted, socio-rhetorical methodology that will guide the examination of this literary work and other ancient evidence alongside the teachings on riches in 1 Tim (1.2.).

1.1. *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus

Ephesiaca is a dramatic love story about a prominent young couple, Anthia and Habrocomes, who fall in love in Ephesus and endure a series of adventures that test their character and commitment to one another. A closer examination reveals clues that reinforce what we know about the social and cultural world of the rich in

⁴⁸ A search of the root Εφεσ- in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG)* reveals hundreds of instances where Ephesus is mentioned by historians and poets in classical literature; cf. Christine M. Thomas, "At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesus in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period," in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995) 84, 116-17; Richard Oster, *A Bibliography of Ancient Ephesus*, vol. 19, ATLA (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1987).

⁴⁹ This study extensively mines the ten volumes of *IvE*: H. Engelmann, R. Merkelbach, and Hermann Wankel, ed., *Die Inschriften von Ephesos: Inschriften Griechischer Städte Aus Kleinasien* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1984). Cf. G. H. R. Horsley, "The Inscriptions of Ephesos and the New Testament." *NovT* 34 (1992): 105-68; Greg Woolf, "Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire." *JRS* 86 (1996): 22-39.

⁵⁰ For historical research, see: Barclay Vincent Head, *On the Chronological Sequence of the Coins of Ephesus* (London: Rollin & Feuardent, 1880) 1-85. For current numismatic findings linked to Ephesus, see: Kenneth Sheedy, "The Coinage of Ephesus," Macquarie University, <http://learn.mq.edu.au/webct/RelativeResourceManager/15043963001/Public%20Files/about.htm>. [Accessed 28 April 2010]. Cf. Australian Centre for Ancient Numismatic Studies: http://www.mq.edu.au/research/centres_and_groups/acans/

⁵¹ For an example of this related to 1 Tim scholarship, see: Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 97-140.

Ephesus from other sources, while also disclosing new data.⁵² Before seeking to determine how Xenophon of Ephesus may enhance our knowledge of the world of the rich in Ephesus, we will review the issues of authorship provenance, date, and genre that may have influenced the scholarly reception of *Ephesiaca*.⁵³

1.1.1. Author and Provenance

Ξενοφῶν Ἐφέσιος, ἱστορικός. Ἐφεσιακά·
ἔστι δὲ ἐρωτικά βιβλία ἰ' περὶ Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας·
καὶ Περὶ τῆς πόλεως Ἐφεσίων, καὶ ἄλλα.

Xenophon of Ephesus, historiographer. *Ephesian Story*.
It is a love story in ten books about Abrocomes and Anthia;
Also *The City of the Ephesians* and other works.

Hesychius of Miletus, a fifth/sixth century CE historian,⁵⁴ is the lone witness to credit authorship of *Ephesiaca* to a person named Xenophon with a provenance of Ephesus.⁵⁵ His testimony is recorded in *Suda*, the tenth century Byzantine Greek historical encyclopedia of the ancient Mediterranean world.⁵⁶

The *Suda* citation describes Xenophon of Ephesus as an historian or historiographer who authored the history of the city of Ephesus among other writings. As no copy of *The City of the Ephesians* or any other work by Xenophon of Ephesus has survived, scholars have questioned the reliability of this reference. The accuracy of the *Suda* citation can neither be proved nor disproved at present.

With only one ancient reference to authorship, at least two other theories have emerged: pseudonymous authorship and the epitomist theory. As the *Suda*

⁵² My initial research on *Ephesiaca* followed the Greek text in *TLG* and the English translation in: Graham Anderson, "Xenophon of Ephesus: An Ephesian Tale," in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. B.P. Reardon (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) 125-69, based on: Georges Dalmeyda, ed., *Xénophon d'Ephèse: Les Ephésiaques* (Paris: Budé, 1924) and A. D. Papanikolaou, ed., *Xenophon Ephesus: Ephesiacorum Libri V*. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1978). In 2009, while I was drafting this dissertation, the story was published in the LCL.

⁵³ For more on the reception of *Ephesiaca*, see: Tim Whitmarsh, "The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre." *AJP* 126 (2005): 587-611; O'Sullivan, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, 1-19.

⁵⁴ For this original Greek testimony, see: (*TLG*) Xenophon Scr. Erot., *Testimonion*, 0641.002, and Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (FGrH) #419* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

⁵⁵ For this English translation of the testimony of Hesychius, see: Jeffrey Henderson, ed. and trans. *Daphnis and Chloe by Longus; Anthia and Habrocomes by Xenophon of Ephesus*. LCL, vol. 69 (Cambridge: Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009) 208.

⁵⁶ Stoa Consortium, "Suda," www.stoa.org/sol/ Keyword: Ephesiaca. [Accessed 25 August 2009].

citation falls between two other novelists named Xenophon: Ξενοφῶν Ἀντιοχεύς, author of Βαβυλωνιακά, and Ξενοφῶν Κύπριος, author of Κυπριακά, Hans Gärtner posits that the name “Xenophon” was a pseudonym adopted by authors of erotica to mimic the famous writer, Xenophon of Athens.⁵⁷ Gärtner, however, offers no further support for the pseudonymous authorship theory.

The epitomist theory emerged because *Suda* cites the love story as containing “ten books” and the only copy of *Ephesiaca* that has survived, a thirteenth century manuscript, contains only five books. To explain this discrepancy, Gottfried Bürger⁵⁸ and Erwin Rohde⁵⁹ have argued that *Ephesiaca* is a second or third century CE epitome of a longer work. This was the majority view for more than a century.

Tomas Hägg⁶⁰ later expressed discontent with the epitome theory. Both he and James O’Sullivan⁶¹ have explained the discrepancy as possibly resulting from either a scribal error in the transmission of the testimony of Hesychius or the *Suda* or simply that the copy of the book available to Hesychius was divided differently than the thirteenth century extant manuscript.

As the alternative theories on authorship cannot be verified with further evidence, we will follow the current scholarly consensus that considers it reasonable to accept the *Suda* citation plainly as referring to an author named Xenophon with a provenance of Ephesus.

1.1.2. Date, Genre, and the Scholarly Conversation

The mixed views on authorship have not only shaped the scholarly reception of *Ephesiaca*. They have also significantly influenced discussions on date and genre.

Those who embrace the epitomist theory have tended to date the story as the

⁵⁷ Hans Gärtner, “Xenophon of Ephesos.” *PW IX*. A2 (1967): 2055-89.

⁵⁸ Gottfried Bürger, “Zu Xenophon von Ephesus.” *Hermes* 27 (1892): 36-67.

⁵⁹ Erwin Rohde, *Der Griechische Roman und Seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1876).

⁶⁰ Tomas Hägg, “Die Ephesiaka des Xenophon of Ephesus: Original or Epitome?” *C&M* 27 (1966): 118-61; and *The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983) 21.

⁶¹ O’Sullivan, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, 134.

work of a second or third century CE epitomist. Those who argue that the text is intact and authored either pseudonymously or by Xenophon of Ephesus have tended to argue for a slightly earlier, mid-second century CE date. Adherents to the latter view, such as B.P. Reardon, for example, base their position on date and genre on the standard classification of the five early Greek novelists. They are divided into two groups: the *Presophistic* (Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus) and the *Sophistic* (Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Heliodorus).⁶²

As there is tremendous overlap in language and style between the two *Presophistic* works, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Chariton and *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus, scholars agree that either one borrowed from the other or both drew independently on some other source. For decades the prevailing opinion put forth somewhat subjectively by Gärtner, Reardon, and others was that *Chaereas and Callirhoe* pre-dated *Ephesiaca*.⁶³

In 1995, O'Sullivan analyzed Xenophon's composition technique and concluded that he used formulaic phrases and repeating themes, sometimes under the influence of oral storytelling, to create a new genre, the "novel," which others such as Chariton would refine. Additionally, based on clues within the text, O'Sullivan reversed the chronology of the *Presophistic* works and suggested new dates: 50 CE for *Ephesiaca* and 55 CE for *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.⁶⁴

If accepted, this position on dating would place Xenophon of Ephesus or the pseudonymous author and *Ephesiaca* in the same general timeframe and location as the ministry of the Apostle Paul in Ephesus. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor suggests that

⁶² Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, 5-9. Cf. Niklas Holzberg, *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 1995) 21-45.

⁶³ Tomas Hägg, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius* (Stockholm: Svenska institutet i Athen, 1971)

⁶⁴ O'Sullivan, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, 30-98, 145-70 relies on archaeological findings to date the story. Cf. Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 209, notes that *Charaeas and Callirhoe* is referenced in *Persius* 1.134, thus, it is probable that Chariton was well known by 60 CE. Ewen Bowie, "The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B. E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions." *AN* 2 (2002): 47-63, argues based on references to events between 37-66 CE that both Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus were written no later than 50-70 CE. Presently, the classical scholarly consensus locates *Ephesiaca* broadly in the mid-first century CE.

Pauline mission was centered there from c. 52-54 CE based on clues from Luke's Acts of the Apostles.⁶⁵

The scholarly consensus on dating *Ephesiaca* has shifted with O'Sullivan.⁶⁶ In 2006, Bridget Gilfillan Upton locates *Ephesiaca* as "roughly contemporary to Mark's Gospel."⁶⁷ By 2009, Jeffrey Henderson appears to concur with the findings of composition analysis stating that Xenophon of Ephesus may actually pre-date Chariton in his introduction to *Anthia and Habrocomes* in the LCL:

If the narrative elements that both novels share is the result of borrowing, it is impossible to tell who borrowed from the other: is what we find in X. [Xenophon of Ephesus] a clumsy borrowing from Chariton or something clumsy that Chariton found in X. and improved? Or did both draw independently from an existing stock of novelistic elements. In any event, it is clear that X. and Chariton treat their material, whatever its sources, differently, and if overall sophistication is a sign of progress in genre, then X. should be dated earlier than Chariton.⁶⁸

Based on the *Suda* reference to authorship and provenance, composition analysis and other recent scholarship on dating, it is reasonable for us to consider *Ephesiaca* as a first century CE literary work of either a person named Xenophon or a pseudonymous author with a provenance of Ephesus. This notion creates space to see how *Ephesiaca* might aid readers of works like 1 Tim from the Pauline tradition.

1.1.3. The Storyline of *Ephesiaca*

Though much of ancient Greek literature looked backwards to the glory days of Greece, as is the case with *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Chariton, *Ephesiaca* is set in its present context. Graham Anderson believes *Ephesiaca* "produces a vivid picture

⁶⁵ My interest here is not cause this study to digress to the issues of authorship and dating of Acts or 1 Tim but to show that recent scholarship has located *Ephesiaca* in broadly the same timeframe as the ministry of Paul in Ephesus, the location where Timothy is urged to remain in 1 Tim 1:3. Cf. "Paul's Years in Ephesus" in: Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus: Texts and Archaeology* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2008) 201-02.

⁶⁶ This study has not located any opposition to O'Sullivan's view on the mid-first century CE date for *Ephesiaca*. For further support for an earlier date from recent classical scholarship, see: David Konstan, "Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and Narrative in the Novel," in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, ed. J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (New York: Routledge, 1994) 49. About the same time that O'Sullivan was doing his research, Konstan adds this comment, which serves as another testimony reflecting the shift in the scholarly consensus on dating *Ephesiaca* earlier than *Chaereas and Callirhoe* based on the composition of the text: "this may be the earliest of the surviving Greek novels."

⁶⁷ Bridget Gilfillan Upton, *Hearing Mark's Endings: Listening to Ancient Popular Texts through Speech Act Theory* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) xv. Mark is dated broadly within the mid-first century CE.

⁶⁸ Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 209-10.

of contemporary popular religious attitudes.”⁶⁹ Henderson concurs, saying it “feels contemporary.”⁷⁰

This book-by-book synopsis reveals the storyline featuring a rich Ephesian couple, Anthia and Habrocomes. We will summarize the story here to sketch how Xenophon of Ephesus illustrates the social and cultural world of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE in a detailed manner not found in other ancient sources.

Book 1

The story begins with Habrocomes, the sixteen-year-old son of wealthy Ephesian citizens, leading the procession of *Ephebes* to the temple during the festival of Artemis. He is an arrogant young man and openly disrespectful of Eros, which ignites the fury of the god and causes Eros to contrive a plan to capture him. With a crowd of Ephesians and visitors from the Mediterranean world looking on, Anthia also appears at the head of the procession of young women, possessing divine beauty as the richly dressed fourteen-year-old daughter of another notable Ephesian couple, Megamedes and Euipe. When the procession reaches the temple everyone gathers to offer a sacrifice. The two see each other and are instantly captivated. Anthia is bold to voice her feelings and abandon her modesty before Habrocomes, who is smitten by her beauty. When the festival ends, the two return to their homes. Habrocomes acknowledges the victory of Eros while Anthia is overcome with emotion having fallen in love with a man so handsome and yet so proud.

To remedy the situation of their lovesick children, both sets of parents consult Apollo at Colophon and receive the same oracle regarding Anthia and Habrocomes: the two would flee across the sea, endure great suffering, and be delivered by Isis, to whom they would offer rich gifts in gratitude. In response, their parents host their wedding, which is a community affair. They send them off in a

⁶⁹ Anderson, *An Ephesian Tale*, 127.

⁷⁰ Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 203.

ship with rich provisions and their loyal slaves, Leucon and Rhode. Anthia and Habrocomes pledge their fidelity to each other regardless of what the future holds.

Their ship arrives in Rhodes where Anthia and Habrocomes receive a royal welcome and tour the city and the temple of Helios located there. In return, they offer a gift made of gold to Helios and inscribe it with their names. Upon their departure, the whole city bids them farewell, which draws the attention of Phoenician pirates. The pirates, led by Corymbus, capture the ship and the couple. En route to their lair, ruled by Apsyrtus, Corymbus becomes infatuated with Habrocomes and his comrade, Euxinus is smitten with Anthia; together, they conspire together to win the hearts of their captives. Neither the commands of their new masters nor the promise of money win over Anthia and Habrocomes.

Book 2

Just as Anthia and Habrocomes determine together that death would be better than submission to the lustful desires of the pirates, Apsyrtus the pirate chief, claims them as his own and takes them, along with Leucon and Rhode, to his home in Tyre. While Apsyrtus is away, his daughter, Manto, falls for Habrocomes and expresses her love in a letter. Habrocomes rejects her. Manto, filled with envy and jealousy, plots her revenge. When Apsyrtus returns home joined by Moeris, a young man he had arranged to be her husband, Manto shamelessly alleges that Habrocomes had raped her. Habrocomes is whipped and imprisoned while Anthia, Leucon, and Rhode are given to Manto who marries Moeris and moves to Syria. Upon arrival, Manto banishes Anthia to live in the country with a goatherd named Lampo who respects her chastity rather than forcing her to marry him.

Back in Tyre, Apsyrtus finds Manto's letter, releases Habrocomes and puts him in charge of his household. Meanwhile, Leucon and Rhode end up in Lycia, sold to an old man who treats them like his own children. In Syria, Moeris

frequently travels to see Lampo and falls for Anthia. Manto discovers this and orders Lampo to kill her. Not wanting to commit the shameful act of murder before the gods, Lampo decides instead to sell Anthia to Cilician merchants. They are shipwrecked and only Anthia and few others survive.

Next, a robber band, led by Hippothous, captures them and prepares to sacrifice Anthia to Ares. Perilaus, a peace officer from Cilicia, appears on the scene, overcomes the robbers and rescues her. Hippothous gets away. En route back to Tarsus, Perilaus falls for Anthia and urges her to marry him. She devises a plan to delay the wedding thirty days. While searching for Anthia, Habrocomes meets Hippothous, and travels with him.

Book 3

Accompanied by Habrocomes, Hippothous sets out to rebuild his band. While journeying together they exchange sad stories. Hippothous recounts his love for young Hyperanthes, whose untimely death led him to a life of brigandage. Habrocomes, in turn, shares that he is Ephesian, and tells all about his marriage to Anthia, the oracle, the pirates, and ultimately, their separation. Hippothous commits to helping Habrocomes find her.

Back in Tarsus, Anthia's thirty days are up, and Perilaus prepares for the wedding. About that time, Eudoxus, a doctor who had been shipwrecked while traveling to Egypt, visits Perilaus. He was begging local wealthy people for money and clothes. When Eudoxus says he is from Ephesus, Perilaus takes him to meet Anthia, who is eager to hear about her family. He had nothing to share having been away from Ephesus for a long time, though he longed to go home.

Anthia, desiring death over marriage to Perilaus, comes to Eudoxus and binds him by an oath to Artemis to assist her secretly to acquire poison; in return, she would give him gifts and money to return to Ephesus. He agrees, though provides sleeping potion instead. It appears to take her life. She is buried with much

gold. Pirates learn of this, raid her tomb, find her alive, and take her to Alexandria to sell her as a slave. Habrocomes discovers all this later and continues to pursue her.

Psammis, an Indian merchant, buys Anthia and tries to force himself on her. She refuses him claiming she has been consecrated to Isis from birth and is a year away from being of age to marry. He believes her and, out of respect for the goddess, stays away from Anthia. In pursuit, Habrocomes is shipwrecked, captured by local herdsmen and sold to Araxus, whose wife, Cyno, propositions him repeatedly. As upholding his chastity has brought Habrocomes nothing but harm, he agrees to marry Cyno, though before he does, Cyno promptly murders Araxus. Appalled by this shameless act, Habrocomes flees, but Cyno blames him for the murder of Araxus. Consequently, the prefect of Egypt arrests and imprisons him.

Book 4

As Hippothous' reconstituted band ransacks parts of Syria, Phoenicia and Egypt, Habrocomes is brought before the prefect of Egypt for the murder of Araxus who orders him to be crucified. While hanging on the cross, he prays to the Nile who delivers him twice: once by a strong wind that blows his cross into the river, and a second time, by water that rises up to drown flames about to burn him. Witnesses of his miraculous salvation return him to the prefect who incarcerates him while investigating the situation. Eventually, his case is heard, and he is released. The prefect gives him money for his misfortune and promises passage back to Ephesus. Habrocomes sails for Italy hoping to hear news of Anthia there.

Psammis decides to return to India and stops briefly in Memphis where Anthia visits the temple and prays to Isis, pleading with the goddess to honor her commitment to her chastity. Near the border of Ethiopia, Hippothous' band slays Psammis and captures Anthia, though Hippothous does not recognize her. While held in a cave, the guard Anchialus, tries to ravage her, and she kills him in self-

defense. Upon hearing of this, Hippothous has Anthia tossed in a trench with two fierce dogs. Yet again, Anthia is miraculously delivered. Her guard, Amphinomus, has pity on her, and feeds the dogs to pacify them and protect her.

Book 5

While headed for Italy, Habrocomes' ship is redirected by the wind to Syracuse in Sicily. There he lodges with Aegialeus, an old fisherman from a leading family in Lacedaemon, who also had been enrolled in the *Ephebes*. Aegialeus shares the story of Thelxinoe whom he had met at an all-night festival. Though her parents had arranged for her to be married to another man, he shares how they eloped and lived a poor life, though they believed they were rich having each other. He concludes telling Habrocomes that she had died, and shows him her embalmed body, which continues to console him. This leads Habrocomes to lament for his lost love, Anthia.

Hippothous' band shifts from robbing people in Ethiopia to attacking towns to the north in Egypt and Alexandria, while Amphinomus takes Anthia as far as Coptus. The prefect of Egypt marshals a large force, putting Polyidus, a brave kinsman, in charge. Polyidus turns back the band at Pelusium, though Hippothous escapes to Sicily. He apprehends Amphinomus and Anthia, whose beauty captivates him, despite the fact that he had a wife in Alexandria. When promises fail to win her in Memphis, he tries to force himself on her. She takes refuge in the temple of Isis where again she declares her chastity before the goddess. Then at the temple of Apis, Anthia asks the gods to reunite her with her husband. In response the Egyptian children prophesy that she would soon recover Habrocomes. This gives her hope.

In Alexandria, Polyidus' wife, Rhenaea learns of his love for Anthia, so she takes revenge by beating Anthia, cutting her hair, and giving her to Clytus, her slave, with instructions to ship her to Italy to be sold as a prostitute. Anthia begs Clytus to kill her rather than cause her to suffer such a fate. For fear of Rhenaea, Clytus sells

her to a brothel keeper of Tarentum in Italy. While on display awaiting sale to the highest bidder, Anthia pretends to be sick. The trick preserves her chastity.

Habrocomes continues his search for Anthia, yet without resources to live he subjects himself to physical labor in a quarry in Italy. Hippothous, also destitute, marries an old woman in Tauromenium for her money. Soon thereafter, she dies and leaves him with great wealth, which he spends on servants and other luxuries. He sails for Italy to search for Habrocomes with Cleisthenes, a young boy with whom he shared his possessions. In Tarentum, he sees Anthia, buys her from the brothel keeper, and learns her identity as the lost wife of Habrocomes. By this time the parents of Anthia and Habrocomes had died. Meanwhile, the Syrian masters whom Leucon and Rhode had been serving also died and left them a large estate.

Habrocomes decides to return to Ephesus and stops at Rhodes to revisit the temple of Helius. There he sees his slaves, Leucon and Rhode, who immediately turn the wealth they had received from the estate over to their master. Hippothous also determines to return Anthia to Ephesus, and they stop in Rhodes during the festival to Helius. Anthia offers a lock of her hair at the temple as an offering and encounters Leucon and Rhode who share the news about Habrocomes.

Finally the two lovers, Anthia and Habrocomes, are reunited. Together with their servants and with Hippothous and Cleisthenes, they share stories. While sailing back to Ephesus, Anthia and Habrocomes confirm their love and faithfulness to each other despite the difficulties they endured. Upon arrival in Ephesus, they honor Artemis with prayers and sacrifices, set up an inscription commemorating their adventures, and build tombs honoring their parents. Hippothous decides to spend the rest of his days in Ephesus and to adopt Cleisthenes as his son. As loyal servants, Leucon and Rhode share their possessions with their masters, and Anthia and Habrocomes live together in Ephesus happily ever after.

1.1.4. Summary: Engaging Xenophon of Ephesus

Ephesiaca represents a valuable source of information about the rich in Ephesus. We have observed at least three considerations that suggest we have space for further engagement with Xenophon of Ephesus.

The first consideration pertains to author and provenance. It is reasonable to regard the testimony of the lone ancient witness as valid until other evidence proves otherwise. According to Hesychius of Miletus, *Ephesiaca* is the work of Xenophon of Ephesus. Though *Ephesiaca* has been labeled as the work of a pseudonymous author or an epitomist for more than two centuries, recent scholarship has offered explanations for addressing these theories that lack compelling support.

The second consideration relates to dating and genre. For more than two centuries, *Ephesiaca* was dated somewhat subjectively to the second or third century CE, which may have caused Xenophon of Ephesus to receive little attention from NT researchers. O'Sullivan suggests that first century CE date is more probable, and other scholars concur. Also, composition analysis has revealed that the language and style of *Ephesiaca* may have influenced at least one other literary work, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. These points imply that *Ephesiaca* may have been more than an insignificant second or third century CE story. Further scrutiny may prove fruitful.

A third consideration for engaging Xenophon of Ephesus alongside other ancient voices comes from *Ephesiaca*. The storyline illustrates many of the social and cultural realities known from other ancient sources that shaped life for rich Ephesians and, if scrutinized, may enhance our knowledge of life and society.

Taken together, these considerations frame the rationale for engaging Xenophon of Ephesus and using *Ephesiaca* alongside other ancient evidence for examining the teachings on riches in 1 Tim. Next we will present the multi-faceted methodology that will guide this research.

1.2. Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation

Over the last century socio-historical criticism has helped bring the NT world to life, and rhetorical criticism has aided readers of biblical texts in understanding how language may have shaped communication in the ancient world.⁷¹ More recently, socio-rhetorical criticism has emerged as an approach that enables researchers to view texts through multiple lenses.⁷²

This study adapts the socio-rhetorical methodology developed by Vernon K. Robbins. We will use this model because its design allows modern readers to discern how terms and themes in ancient texts may have functioned in their particular social contexts.⁷³ Specifically, we want to determine how the terms and themes in the teachings on riches may have been understood in antiquity.

1.2.1. The Socio-Rhetorical Methodology of Vernon K. Robbins

Robbins' socio-rhetorical methodology has five parts: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture, and sacred texture. As this approach is not widely known, we will define each texture and its function below.

⁷¹ For examples, see: Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927); George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990); George A. Kennedy and Duane F. Watson, *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in honor of George A. Kennedy* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); Philip Francis Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social-scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (London: Routledge, 1994); Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*, vol. 4, BIS (ed. R. Alan Culpepper and Rolf Rendtorff; New York: Brill, 1994); Werner Thiessen, *Christen in Ephesus: Die historische und theologische Situation in vorpaulinischer und paulinischer Zeit und zur Zeit der Apostelgeschichte und der Pastoralbriefe*, vol. 12, TANZ (Tübingen: Francke, 1995); Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Carl Joachim Classen, *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*, vol. 128, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Annette Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*, vol. 52, NTOA/SUNT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

⁷² Ben Witherington III, *What's in the Word: Rethinking the Socio-Rhetorical Character of the New Testament* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009) 12-15. Witherington presents two methods of socio-rhetorical criticism that have emerged as useful for NT scholarship. The former and more common approach, pioneered by scholars such as George Kennedy, Hans Dieter Betz, *et al* (see n. 71 above), looks at how Greco-Roman rhetoric may or may not have influenced NT writings. The latter approach, championed by Vernon K. Robbins, applies modern rhetorical categories (*e.g.* inner texture, intertexture, etc) to the text as an exercise of modern hermeneutics.

⁷³ My methodological approach was adapted from: Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996) I, and informed by two other concurrent works by Robbins; *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1996); and, "The Dialectical Nature of Early Christian Discourse." *Scip* 59 (1996): 353-62.

Inner texture examines language and word patterns in a text. “The purpose of this analysis is to gain an intimate knowledge of words, word patterns, voices, structures, devices, and modes in the text, which are the context for meanings and meaning-effects that an interpreter analyzes with other readings of the text.”⁷⁴ Inner texture analysis appraises a variety of patterns, such as: repetition, progression, narration, opening-middle-closing configuration, argumentation, and sensory-aesthetic texture. Repetitive inner texture looks for words used multiple times. Progressive inner texture comes to light in language that expresses sequence of themes. Narrational inner texture surfaces in texts with voices and speech. Opening-middle-closing inner texture considers the connections between repetition, progression and narration in the flow of a text. Argumentative inner texture emerges in texts that contain arguments and counter-arguments. Lastly, sensory-aesthetic inner texture resides in texts with terms that relate to the senses.

Robbins applies inner texture analysis to the book of Mark and reveals the progressive pattern by which Jesus is presented as “the Teacher” who through repeated messages conveys specific teachings to the disciples.⁷⁵ For this dissertation, inner texture analysis will be applied to examine closely the terms and word patterns in five texts in 1 Tim with teachings on riches or the handling of wealth in view.

The second part of this socio-rhetorical methodology is intertexture. Intertexture analysis refers to how an ancient text interfaces with the social and cultural setting outside the text or overlaps with other texts. ‘In other words, the intertexture of a text is the interaction of the language in the text with “outside” material and physical “objects,” historical events, customs, values, roles, institutions,

⁷⁴ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 7.

⁷⁵ Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984). This socio-rhetorical method applied to the Gospel of Mark has been celebrated by scholars such as Jouette Bassler, “Book Review: *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* by Vernon K. Robbins.” *JBL* 106 (1987): 341. Bassler notes: “In it, Robbins has accomplished a remarkable feat. He has developed a methodology that permits a satisfying integration of the Jewish background of Mark’s Gospel, with its Greco-Roman background, while retaining a sensitivity to the literary dimensions of the text as well as an interest in its reader. Markan studies are certain to benefit greatly from this work.”

and systems.⁷⁶ As Robbins brings intertexture into view, the outside is engaged in various ways. Oral-scribal intertexture can take the form of recitation, recontextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification, and thematic elaboration of external material. Cultural intertexture surfaces through references, allusions or echoes. Social intertexture connects with social roles, institutions, codes and relationships that exist in the world. Historical intertexture mentions events that can be located in specific places and timeframes.

Others have employed intertexture analysis in NT studies with significant results. Abraham Malherbe, for example, has demonstrated the value of such analysis of texts from the Pauline tradition, looking at terms that reflect moral philosophy or medical imagery in that wider social context.⁷⁷ In this study, we will use intertexture analysis to examine language and themes that surface in both *Ephesiaca* and 1 Tim. This texture of Robbins' methodology will ensure that the findings are carefully viewed alongside extant evidence to discern possible intertexture connections between the texts and their ancient world.⁷⁸

The third texture in this methodology is social and cultural texture. Social and cultural texture pays specific attention to the larger social and cultural *context* that precedes *texts* in an effort to "locate" the social and cultural realities that may be in view in texts. This texture considers six ancient cultural features, institutions, and transactions in antiquity, commonly described by modern scholars using these terms: (1) honor/shame, (2) identity, (3) kinship, (4) exchange/benefaction, (5) envy,

⁷⁶ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 40. Cf. Thais Morgan, "Is there an intertext in this text?: Literary and interdisciplinary approaches to intertextuality." *AJS* 3 (1985): 1-40; Graham Allen, *Intertextuality: The New Critical Idiom* (London: Routledge, 2000); Thomas L. Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament: the Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2004).

⁷⁷ For instance, on the significance of reading medical terminology alongside the PE, see: Abraham J. Malherbe, "Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles," in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers.*, ed. W. Eugene March (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980) 19-35. Cf. *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) and *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989). In the early stages of my research, Townner suggested I meet with Malherbe, who urged me not to search ancient documents but to read them extensively as a basis for gaining intertextual insights: Personal Meeting with Abraham J. Malherbe, 5 October 2007.

⁷⁸ Cf. Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81 (1962): 2-13. To avoid the pitfall of "parallelomania" in this study, what is known from other ancient Ephesian evidence will be scrutinized alongside *Ephesiaca* and 1 Tim.

and (6) purity. These six features illustrate the social and cultural rules that governed behavior in ancient contexts like Ephesus. Numerous studies have demonstrated the value of this texture in NT research.⁷⁹

Ideological texture represents the fourth texture in this methodology. This texture shifts from focusing on the words of the text to examine the locations of people, such as the author and audience of a text. As a methodological lens, it allows the scholar to view people in relation to groups, modes of discourse, and spheres of ideology.⁸⁰ Because little is known about the author of *Ephesiaca*, his audience, and his relationship to groups, other ancient voices that may have been contemporaries with Xenophon of Ephesus will be brought into view in this phase of analysis. Their testimonies will assist us in determining the ideological implications of any findings for author, audience, and groups.⁸¹

Lastly, sacred texture focuses on God and/or the gods in a text and explores the relationship between the human and the divine. This texture considers deities, holy persons, and spirits, as well as the topics of divine history, human redemption, religious community, ethics, and human behavior in relation to the gods. The value of this aspect of Robbins' methodology is that it provides a frame of reference for any insights that emerge. All findings from considering 1 Tim in light of *Ephesiaca* will be examined alongside other NT texts to discern the message regarding riches.

1.2.2. Adapted Socio-Rhetorical Methodology for this Study

Robbins' methodology has been adapted for this study. He encourages this. "There is no requirement that a person follow the order in which the book presents the

⁷⁹ For example, see: Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*, 1st ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996); Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991); John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina, *Biblical Social Values and their Meaning: A Handbook* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993); or other works by members of the Context Group.

⁸⁰ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 95-119.

⁸¹ This study will draw on the testimony of ancient historians, philosophers and poets that may have been contemporaries with Xenophon of Ephesus.

textures.”⁸² The order has been altered as the social and cultural *context* of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE preceded the two ancient *texts* in question: 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*.⁸³ For studies like this, Robbins supports such a re-ordering:

A person may wish to begin with the social and cultural texture of the text. Especially interpreters who emphasize a sharp difference between ancient and modern society may wish to begin here. Social-scientific critics, who emphasize the evils of ethnocentricity and anachronism, consider the social and cultural texture of the text to be the most important mode of entry for North American and northern European interpreters. Again, it is important for interpreters to work significantly with at least two other textures in addition to its social and cultural texture to deepen the analysis and interpretation of the text.⁸⁴

Consequently, this study will begin with the social and cultural texture *and* utilize the four remaining textures to strengthen the methodological process.

Along these lines, chapter two of this dissertation will focus on the social and cultural texture, the *Sitz im Leben* of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE. Chapter two will also illustrate the cultural rules that governed social interaction using cultural fixtures or models as suggested by Robbins.⁸⁵

In chapters three through seven, the four remaining textures will be applied to five passages in 1 Tim in light of *Ephesiaca* following this four-part pattern. (1) The inner texture phase of analysis will examine the terms and themes that surface in 1 Tim based on what is commonly known from antiquity. (2) The intertexture phase of analysis will examine those same terms and themes as they occur in *Ephesiaca*. (3) The ideological texture will explore the implications of the findings for the author and audience of *Ephesiaca*. (4) The sacred texture will view the findings from this study in relationship to the larger literary context of the NT.

With this adapted socio-rhetorical methodology, five specific passages will

⁸² Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 5.

⁸³ Three general studies shaped my understanding of the larger social and cultural context of Ephesus: Tenney Frank, ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Vol. IV (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938); Ramsay MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); and Helmut Koester, ed., *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, Harvard Theological Studies (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995).

⁸⁴ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 5-6.

⁸⁵ *Sitz im Leben* means “setting in life” and originated with Hermann Gunkel, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1930). It began to be applied to 1 Tim scholarship by Martin Dibelius, *et al.*

be explored: 1 Tim 2:9-10; 3:1-13; 6:1-2a; 6:2b-10; and 6:17-19. We will scrutinize these five passages because three factors exist: (1) teachings on riches or the handling of wealth is in view; (2) scholars hold divergent opinions on interpreting these passages in relationship to the rest of the NT; and, (3) the specific terms or themes that appear in these passages linked to riches can also be found in *Ephesiaca*.

1.2.3. Summary: Socio-Rhetorical Methodology, 1 Timothy, and *Ephesiaca*

We have chosen Robbins' socio-rhetorical methodology to guide this research in order to shed new light on terms and themes linked to riches in 1 Tim that also appear in *Ephesiaca*. Our goal is to employ multiple lenses in order to discern more precisely how the terms and themes in these teachings may have been understood in antiquity. Because it has proved useful for researchers of other NT texts, it will serve as the socio-rhetorical methodology for this study.

1.3. Conclusion

Ephesiaca has been largely ignored in biblical scholarship because, until recently, it was considered as a second or third century CE literary work. Today, classical and NT scholars posit that a mid-first century CE date may be more accurate for this Ephesian document based on composition analysis and other archaeological evidence. If accepted, this places *Ephesiaca* in broadly the same timeframe that Luke's Acts of the Apostles dates as Paul's ministry in Ephesus, the location to which 1 Tim was directed. Finally, as *Ephesiaca* is the story of a rich, young couple from Ephesus, it is reasonable to suggest that further study of the teachings on riches in 1 Tim should be undertaken in light of *Ephesiaca* and other ancient evidence.

The socio-rhetorical methodology developed by Robbins will be employed in this study because it aids readers in discerning how terms and themes in *texts* may

have served as means for communication in social *contexts*. In accordance with the suggestion of Robbins regarding projects like this, we have re-ordered the textures and will start with the social and cultural phase of analysis (chapter two). Thereafter we will apply Robbins' four remaining textures (inner texture, intertexture, ideological texture, and sacred texture) to each of the five passages where wealth is in view in 1 Tim: 1 Tim 2:9-10 (chapter three); 3:1-13 (chapter four); 6:1-2a (chapter five); 6:2b-10 (chapter six); and 6:17-19 (chapter seven). This charts the work of the rest of this dissertation.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER TWO

The Social Setting and Cultural Rules of the Rich in Ephesus in the First Century CE

The first step of socio-rhetorical analysis examines social and cultural texture. This texture has two phases. The first phase scans primary sources other than Xenophon of Ephesus to establish what is known about the rich in the social setting of Ephesus in the first century CE (2.1.). Extant material from the years leading up to, during, and after this timeframe will be in view to ascertain what is commonly known. We will then determine what *Ephesiaca* adds to our knowledge of the social setting of the rich. The second phase of analysis explores the cultural rules that shaped the thinking and behavior of rich Ephesians in antiquity and *Ephesiaca* (2.2.). The purpose of this examination of the social setting and cultural rules is to sketch a *Sitz im Leben* of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE (2.3.), the *context* that preceded the *texts* of 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*.

2.1. The Rich in Ephesus: The First and Greatest Metropolis of Asia

πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας

The public record of inscriptions presents Ephesus as “the first and greatest metropolis in Asia” in the first century CE (*IvE* 647, 1541, 1543, 1551, 1555).⁸⁶ The city held this distinction in the Greco-Roman world for three primary reasons, each of which had implications for its wealthy inhabitants.

First, Ephesus was the sacred home of Artemis. The people in the Greco-Roman world, especially the rich whose wealth was stored in the Artemisium, would have known of this honor claimed for centuries.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ In this study, Greek inscriptions as well as words or phrases from the Greek NT are presented as they appear.
⁸⁷ The “Artemisium” is also referred to as the “Temple of Artemis” or the “Artemision” in different sources. Cf. Aelius Aristides, *Orations* 23.24; Dio Chrysostom, *Oration* 31.54-55.

Second, Augustus named Ephesus the Roman Imperial Capital of the province of Asia. Though the city was thoroughly Greek in its religious, social and cultural composition, by the first century CE, it had also become respectfully and reverently Roman. The rich, who were courted by Rome for their wealth, benefited from this Romanization because it gave them access to positions of local and regional leadership.

Third, as a key seaport, Ephesus was a multicultural Mediterranean hub for transportation, trade, and traditions. The rich were central to the prosperity of this financial center and often underwrote the community and association festivities enjoyed by residents and visitors.

Relevant ancient sources will be organized according to these three categories below. In each case, we will examine the testimony of Xenophon of Ephesus separately in order to elucidate the ways in which *Ephesiaca* enhances our knowledge of the world of the rich in Ephesus.

2.1.1. Artemis, the Artemisium, and the Rich in Ephesus

μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων

“Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!” As Luke recounts the story in Acts 19:23-41, this outcry (vv. 28, 34) was incited by Demetrius who was probably an influential association leader among silversmiths with some measure of wealth. He and his fellow silversmiths were concerned about more than their troubled trade. They judged that Paul’s proclamation and large following had tarnished the fame and reputation of Artemis, whom “all Asia and the world worship,” and that her temple, “may count for nothing” (Acts 19:27).⁸⁸ Ancient sources confirm the centrality of Artemis within Ephesian culture and her special relevance for the rich of that city.

⁸⁸ Cf. Larry Joseph Kreitzer, *Striking New Images: Roman Imperial Coinage and the New Testament World*, JSNTS 134 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 100-12. Coinage reveals imperial and local leaders had aligned with the goddess; thus, their prominence was intertwined with her fame. This may explain their fervor.

2.1.1.1. Ancient Sources on Artemis, the Artemisium, and the Rich in Ephesus

The belief in the greatness of Artemis of the Ephesians can be traced in history back to the legends that describe the birth of the goddess and the origin of the city.

Strabo identifies Ephesus as the birthplace of Artemis (*Geography* 14.1.20; 11.5.1-4). When Artemis was young, she is said to have addressed three wishes to Zeus: to remain a virgin, to receive a bow and arrows, and to have hounds accompany her. The wishes thus granted caused her to become known as the young huntress and protector of Ephesus. Also for having helped her mother deliver her twin brother, Apollo, she became known as the goddess of childbirth. Himerios declares her divine tie to the city: “When the leader of the Muses divided all the earth beneath the sun with his sister, although he himself dwells among the Greeks, he appointed that the inheritance of Artemis would be Ephesus” (*Oration* 60.3).⁸⁹

Plato suggests the name of Artemis came from **ἀρτημής**, meaning, “strong-limbed” (*Cratylus* 406B).⁹⁰ Numismatic evidence supports that assertion as coins present Artemis with arms outstretched.⁹¹ Strabo reports a different etymological explanation: Artemis makes people **ἀρτεμής**, that is, “secure and healthy” (*Geography* 14.1.6).⁹² Coins also illustrate this by showing Artemis holding the temple in her hand.⁹³ Other coins depict her as a huntress, often adding the term, **ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ**, meaning “savior.”⁹⁴ In the Greek mind, Artemis was the strong source of security, and she must be respected.⁹⁵

⁸⁹ Cf. Thomas, “At Home in the City of Artemis,” 97.

⁹⁰ Richard Oster, “The Ephesian Artemis as an Opponent of Early Christianity,” *JAC* 19 (1976): 24-44.

⁹¹ Bill Welch, “Forum Ancient Coins: Diana the Huntress, Bringer of Light,” http://www.forumancientcoins.com/moonmoth/reverse_diana.html. [Accessed 26 September 2007]; Kreitzer, *Striking New Images*, 104.

⁹² Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 14. Cf. LSJ for yet another root word: **ἀρτάμος**, meaning, “butcher.” This definition can be justified by the widely known ancient story that the god, Actaeon, having seen Artemis naked, was turned into a stag by her, and subsequently ripped to pieces by her hounds. For further reading on that reputation of Artemis, see: Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* 9.2.3.

⁹³ Sheedy, “The Coinage of Ephesus”. [Accessed 28 April 2010].

⁹⁴ Welch, “Forum Ancient Coins: Diana the Huntress, Bringer of Light”. [Accessed 26 September 2007]. Cf. John Yonge Akerman, *Numismatic Illustrations of the Narrative Portions of the New Testament*, ALA (Chicago: Argonaut, 1966).

⁹⁵ Though the origin of the Artemisium falls outside the argument of this study, its history explains its centrality to the city. Callimachus, *Hymns* 3.237 and Pomponius Mela, *De Chorographia* 1.78 claim the Amazons established the city and the sanctuary. Pliny, *Natural History* 34.19.53, adds “statues of Amazons stood in the

Ironically, the Artemisium, the sacred home of the goddess who kept everyone safe and secure was destroyed in 356 BCE as Plutarch explains.⁹⁶

“Hegesias the Magnesians made an utterance frigid enough to have extinguished the great conflagration. He said, namely, it was no wonder that the temple of Artemis was burned down, since the goddess was busy bringing Alexander into the world” (*Alexander* 3.6). Murphy-O’Connor captures this sentiment in plain terms: “Had Artemis been at home in Ephesus, the disaster would not have happened.”⁹⁷ Because the temple was central to life in Ephesus, it was magnificently restored.

Antipater of Sidon called Artemis the “Queen of the Ionians” and named her temple one of the “Seven Wonders of the World,” ascribing to it penultimate status.

I have set my eyes on the wall of lofty Babylon, on which is a road for chariots, and the statue of Zeus by the Alpheus, and the hanging gardens, and the Colossus of the Sun, and the huge labor of the high pyramids, and the vast tomb of Mausolus, but when I saw the house of Artemis that mounted to the cloud, those other marvels lost their brilliancy, and I said, “Lo, apart from Olympus, the Sun never looked on aught so grand!” (*Greek Anthology* 9.58)

Visitors with the means to travel in the ancient Mediterranean world came to see this sight and honor the goddess. Others came to receive an oracle as Strabo recounts.

When the Phocaeans were setting sail from their homeland an oracle was delivered to them, it is said, to use for their voyage as a guide received from the Ephesian Artemis. Accordingly, some of them put in at Ephesus and inquired in what way they might procure from the goddess what had been enjoined upon them. Now the goddess in a dream, it is said, had stood beside Aristarcha, one of the women held in very high honor, and commanded her to sail away with the Phocaeans taking with her a certain reproduction [of Artemis] which was among the sacred images. This done, and the colony finally settled, they not only established the temple, but also did Aristarcha the exceptional honor of appointing her priestess. Further, in the colonial cities [of Marseilles] the people everywhere do this goddess honors of the first rank. (*Geography* 4.1.4-5)

While there is limited evidence that visitors received oracles at the Artemisium, this instance sheds light on how the goddess recruited the rich and relied on their

sanctuary of Artemis from the classical age to the Roman period” demonstrating the longstanding ties between the Ephesus, the Amazons and Artemis. See also Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 8, 22, and 97. Herodotus 1.92; Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 7.16; Pliny, *Natural History* 7.38.125. Pausanias, *Guide* 7.2.7 credit Croesus for establishing the temple that measured 142 x 72 meters compared to the Parthenon at Athens that measured 69.5 x 30.9 meters. It took 120 years to complete and Pliny, *Natural History* 16.79.213; 36.21.95, attests that “the whole of Asia” worked on it.

⁹⁶ This is also an ancient example depicting Artemis as the goddess of childbearing, cf. 1 Tim 2:15. This will take on relevance in chapter three of this dissertation which looks at 1 Tim 2:9-10 in the context of 1 Tim 2:8-15.

⁹⁷ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 22.

assistance to extend her first-rank fame throughout the ancient world.⁹⁸ Additionally, this oracle would have pleased the silversmiths as their livelihood was making reproductions of the goddess (cf. Acts 19:23-41).

The cult of Artemis expected the support of civic leaders. Vitruvius reports that a magistrate was fined for failing to perform an annual sacrifice where a shepherd found the marble that was used in the Artemisium (*On Architecture* 10.2.11-15). Notable gifts from prominent people were housed in the Artemisium, such as the “Psaltery” of Alexander of Cythera (Athenaeus, *The Diepnosophists* 183c) and two famous paintings of Apelles (Pliny, *Natural History* 35.36.79-97).⁹⁹ Pausanias depicts this collection of gifts as a historical and cultural museum (*Guide to Greece* 10.38.6). Artemis *owned* the rich and the rich *owned* Artemis. Maria Aurenhammer notes that the rich of the slope houses, the homes where the some of the wealthy of Ephesus are thought to have resided, did not have to go to the temple to see the goddess; they had statues of her at home.¹⁰⁰ They believed that the goddess watched over them, their riches, and secured their future.

Rich people also gave money to ensure the perpetual honor of Artemis, and in return, they were lauded for their **εὐσέβεια**, “piety,” to the goddess with public proclamations and inscriptions that celebrated their beneficence. In 104 CE, the **εὐσέβεια** of Gaius Vibius Salutaris, a rich Ephesian, is honored nine times in *IvE* 27 for establishing annual lotteries, distributions, and a procession of statues in honor of the birth of Artemis.¹⁰¹ Upon approval of the **βουλή**, “the council,” and the **δῆμος**, “the people,” his gift of money was put in her treasuries to underwrite annual events.

⁹⁸ Strabo affirms that temples of Ephesian Artemis were located in other cities. Towns founded by Marseilles on the eastern coast of Spain mentioned in *Geography* include: Hemeroscopeium, 3.4.6; Rhodus and Emporium, 3.4.8; and on an island in the delta of the river Rhone, 4.1.8. Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 6.

⁹⁹ The two murals were “Alexander the Great holding a Thunderbolt” and “Heracles with Face Averted.”

¹⁰⁰ Maria Aurenhammer, “Sculptures of Gods and Heroes from Ephesos,” in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 276, figures 2-3.

¹⁰¹ For the Greek text and English translation, see: Guy M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London: Routledge, 1991) Appendix I. The **εὐσέβεια** of Gaius Vibius Salutaris is celebrated nine times: *IvE* 27.14-19, 84-90, 114-119, 366-369, 384-389, 414-418, 427-430, 431-442.

Another inscription, *IvE* 430, demonstrates how rich benefactors who honored Artemis received perpetual honor in return. P. Afranius Flavianus lauds C. Claudius Verulanus Marcellus by the authority of Artemis of Ephesus for donating a tapestry for the public to enjoy.¹⁰² The inscription honors Marcellus along with his wife, Scaptias Phirmilla, high priestess of Asia, and Claudius Bepeneikianos. In this instance (*IvE* 430), the rich person was both high priestess and benefactor, and the giving was not an individual act but a group effort. For another example of group giving, see *IvE* 49.¹⁰³

Rich families, such as that of Ulpia Eudoia Mudiane received honors for funding the priesthood of Artemis, and *IvE* 989 acknowledged the deceased for providing such support: Vibius Bassus, Servilius Menander, Vedia Iusta, Claudius Zeno, and Claudius Salvius. Likewise in *IvE* 681, the council and the assembly paid tribute to Claudia Ammion, the high priestess, and P. Gavius Capito, the high priest of Asia, for their faithful service and support of Artemis.¹⁰⁴ Rich Ephesians gave money and served as *κουρήτες*, “priests,” to Artemis and received honor for their *εὐσέβεια*. Gifts made to the goddess were held on deposit or used to generate income through low-risk loans such as mortgages. The Artemisium became known internationally as a safe place to invest.¹⁰⁵

Dio Chrysostom notes that the wealthy people of the world entrusted their money to Artemis and honored her for providing them with financial security.¹⁰⁶

You know about the Ephesians, of course, and that large sums of money are in their hands, some of them belonging to private citizens and deposited in the temple of Artemis, not alone money of the Ephesians, but also of aliens and of persons from all parts of the world, and in some cases of commonwealths of kings, money which all deposit there in

¹⁰² *IvE* 430. Cf. In *IvE* 27.115, 328-29, P. Afranius Flavianus is noted as the *legatus pro praetore* responsible for the execution in the Gaius Vibius Salutaris foundation gift, Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 157, 171.

¹⁰³ *IvE* 49 lauds Helvidia Paula, a priestess and benefactor, *et al.* for paying for the construction of a building.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. E. A. Judge and James R. Harrison, "Ethical Terms in St. Paul and the Inscriptions of Ephesus," in *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays*, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 377.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. T. Robert S. Broughton, "Roman Asia," in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. Tenney Frank (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938) 889-90; Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 65.

¹⁰⁶ This oration dated broadly between 97 and 112 CE reflects the reputation of the Artemisium in the first century CE.

order that it may be safe, since no one has ever yet dared to violate that place, although countless wars have occurred in the past and the city has often been captured. (*Oration* 31.54)

Dio Chyrsostom may be alluding to the historical record that both Scipio and T. Amplius had tried to take sums of money from the Artemisium but failed thanks to the intervention of Julius Caesar (cf. Julius Caesar, *Civil Wars* 3.33; 3.105). In gratitude, the Ephesians had immortalized him in 48 BCE:

“The cities in Asia and the [townships]
and the tribal districts honor Gaius Julius Caesar,
son of Gaius, Pontifex, imperator,
and Consul for the second time,
descendant of Ares and Aphrodite,
our God Manifest and Common Savior
of all human life” (*IvE* 251).¹⁰⁷

Aelius Aristides soon thereafter applauded the security of the Artemisium, describing it as “the general bank of Asia” (*Orations* 23.24).¹⁰⁸

As temples were also considered inviolable places of asylum, people also found personal security in the Artemisium. So many had done so by the first century CE that Apollonius of Tyana expressed this concern: “But I do condemn the people who by night and by day share the home of the goddess. Otherwise I should not see issuing thence thieves and robbers and kidnappers and every sort of wretch or sacrilegious rascal. For your temple is a den of robbers” (*Letter* 65).¹⁰⁹ Indeed, as Achilles Tattius suggests, it had become known as the “last hope of desperate individuals, a haven of possible security for those battered by fate” (*Leucippe and Clitophon* 7-8).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982) 213-14, offers further comments on this translation.

¹⁰⁸ The term “depository” may be better than “bank” as wealth stored there for security could not be used for any other purposes without the permission of the depositor. Cf. Marty E. Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: the Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006) 137-41.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 25, 136. In *Geography* 14.1.23, Strabo testifies that the Artemisium was a prominent place of asylum though the parameters of protection had been downsized to their traditional limits under Augustus. Suetonius, *Tiberius* 37: “Tiberius abolished the traditional rights of sanctuary throughout the Empire;” at least that is, until those sanctuaries could prove back in Rome in 22 CE that they had traditionally offered asylum; cf. Tacitus, *Annals* 3.60-63. Cf. for examples of this expression, “den of robbers,” in biblical texts, see: Jer 7:11; Mark 11:15-17 and pars.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Thomas, “At Home in the City of Artemis,” 102.

In *Guide to Greece*, dated to the second century CE, Pausanias' reflection on the greatness of Artemis and the city that claimed her as its own aptly sums up the ancient evidence in this section.

All cities worship Artemis of Ephesus, and individuals hold her in honor above all the gods. The reason, in my view, is the renown of the Amazons, who traditionally dedicated the image, also the extreme antiquity of this sanctuary. Three other points as well have contributed to her renown, the size of the temple, surpassing all buildings among men, the eminence of the city of the Ephesians and the renown of the goddess who dwells there. (4.31.8)

Ephesus was the city of Artemis, and the rich championed her fame. They made offerings, funded her priesthood, performed duties in her service, and trusted her with their wealth and safety. Below we will see that Xenophon of Ephesus shares these sentiments and exceeds them in his depiction of the city, its goddess, and the rich who religiously served her.

2.1.1.2. Xenophon of Ephesus on Artemis, the Artemisium, and the Rich in Ephesus

From the beginning of *Ephesiaca* to the end, Anthia and Habrocomes honor Artemis supremely. Throughout the story, the goddess is the focus of feasts, prayers, oaths and sacrifices. Eight scenes add to our knowledge of the relationship between Artemis, the Artemisium, and rich Ephesians.

First, the opening scene recounts the festival of Artemis and the procession to the Artemisium. Anthia heads a procession of young girls richly adorned, and Habrocomes leads the line of young men.¹¹¹

The local festival of Artemis was in progress, with its procession from the city to the temple nearly a mile away. All the local girls had to march in procession, richly dressed, as well as all the young men of Habrocomes' age—he was around sixteen, already a member of the Epebes, and took first place in the procession. There was a great crowd of Ephesians and visitors alike to see the festival, for it was the custom at this festival to find husbands for the girls and wives for the young men. So the procession filed past—first the sacred objects, the torches, the baskets, and the incense; then horses, dogs, hunting equipment...some for war, some for peace. And each of the girls was

¹¹¹ Anderson, *An Ephesian Tale*, 129. The following excerpt and others in this chapter follow Anderson's translation unless otherwise noted.

dressed as if to receive a lover. Anthia led the line of girls; she was the daughter of Megamedes and Euipe, both of Ephesus. Anthia's beauty was an object of wonder, far surpassing the other girls'. She was fourteen; her beauty was burgeoning, still more enhanced by the adornment of her dress. Her hair was golden—a little of it plaited, but most hanging loose and blowing in the wind. Her eyes were quick; she had the bright glance of a young girl, and yet the austere look of a virgin. She wore a purple tunic down to the knee, fastened with a girdle and falling loose over her arms, with a fawnskin over it, a quiver attached, and arrows for weapons; she carried javelins and was followed by dogs. Often as they saw her in the sacred enclosure the Ephesians would worship her as Artemis. (1.2.2-7)

Here Xenophon of Ephesus offers detail of the annual sacred procession from the perspective of participants not found elsewhere. He names prominent families and leaders of the procession and adds information about them, such as: their ages, educational background, and adornment. Up until this point, our understanding of this event has been limited to Guy Rogers' reconstruction of the instructions for the procession and festivities as outlined in *IvE* 27.¹¹² Also, in saying that “all” the youth participated and the prominent ones led the way, Xenophon of Ephesus gives insight into the expectations of rich Ephesians in relationship to Artemis. Locals and visitors alike joined in the celebration. All honored Artemis together.

Second, the procession culminated with a sacrifice to Artemis. *Ephesiaca* describes this ritual honoring the goddess as a community affair: “And so when the procession was over, the whole crowd went into the temple for the sacrifice, and the files broke up; men and women and girls and boys came together” (1.3.1). The crowds who looked on joined those who processed, and Xenophon of Ephesus states that everyone at the festival participated in the sacrifice to Artemis.

Third, Xenophon of Ephesus writes that prior to their wedding, the lovesick couple saw one another daily in the temple, apparently fulfilling their responsibility to serve the goddess: “When it was day, Habrocomes went off to his usual exercises, while Anthia went as usual to worship the goddess...they spent day after day looking at each other in the temple...Each of them privately prayed the same prayers to the

¹¹² Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 80-126.

goddess.” (1.5.1-5). Not only do Anthia and Habrocomes perform daily duties in the Artemisium, they also learned to recite specific prayers to Artemis as young Ephesians. Such religious routines, in this case associated with leading citizens of Ephesus, add to our knowledge of life there.

Fourth, Xenophon of Ephesus portrays Anthia and Habrocomes feasting and performing sacrifices to Artemis and other purity rituals prior to their union.

And so the time for their marriage arrived; there were all-night celebrations and a feast of sacrifices to [Artemis]. And so when these had been performed, night came (everything seemed to slow for Habrocomes and Anthia); they brought the girl to the bridal chamber with torches, sang the bridal hymn, shouted their good wishes, brought the couple in, and put them on the couch. (1.8.1)

Here, Xenophon of Ephesus illustrates customary activities that were both enjoyed and expected of a marriage that honored Artemis not recorded elsewhere.

Fifth, shortly after their wedding, the parents of Anthia and Habrocomes prepare to send them across the sea in obedience to the oracles they had received about the young couple. Prior to departure, they offer sacrifices to Artemis.

And so all the preparations went ahead for their departure; they had a great ship with its crew ready to sail, and all they needed was being put aboard: a large selection of clothes of all kinds, a great deal of gold and silver, and a great abundance of food. There were sacrifices to Artemis before they set sail; the whole population prayed and wept at the impending loss as if they regarded the children as their own...And when the day came for their departure, many of the servants and handmaidens went aboard; when the ship was about to sail, the whole population of Ephesus came to see them off, including many of the priestesses with torches and sacrifices. (1.10.4-5)

Again, Xenophon of Ephesus describes ritual sacrifices preceding another event in the lives of these young lovers. Apparently, it was the duty of the priests or priestesses, perhaps people of wealth, to officiate at such community affairs.

Sixth, while Anthia and Habrocomes are separated, Anthia is banished to the country to live with Lampo the goatherd. Later, Manto orders Lampo to kill Anthia, but he determined that he could not commit such a horrible act before the gods and decides instead to sell her as a slave. In response, Anthia ‘cried and clung to his feet. “Gods,” she prayed, “and you, Artemis, goddess of Ephesus, reward the goatherd for

this act of kindness;” and she begged him to sell her’ (2.11.8). With these words, Xenophon of Ephesus depicts the belief in the authority of the gods over human affairs: Artemis was thought to reward those who acted honorably and respected to her supplicants.

Seventh, when Anthia is in the custody of Perilaus, a leading peace officer of Cilicia who is forcing her to marry him against her will, Eudoxus, an old Ephesian doctor, arrives at the door.¹¹³ Having just suffered shipwreck, he approaches looking for aid from fellow rich people. Thrilled to meet another Ephesian, Anthia welcomes the doctor and, in turn, procures what she believes is a poison from him. She plans to take her own life to avoid losing her chastity; she could not wed another man while still married to Habrocomes. Xenophon of Ephesus writes: “She took him to a private room, fell at his knees and implored him to report none of the conversation to anyone, and bound him by an oath by their ancestral goddess, Artemis, to cooperate with everything she asked” (3.5.5). Eudoxus grants her request, though he substitutes a sleeping potion for the poison. This scene portrays Ephesians as a tight group with expectations of each other before the gods. When a person made a request of another, bound by an oath to Artemis, the person expected the request to be granted. No other ancient sources record a negotiated exchange like this between rich Ephesians that is bound by an oath to the goddess.

Eighth, after enduring trials and separation, Anthia and Habrocomes are reunited and return to Ephesus to honor Artemis.

And when they disembarked, they immediately went just as they were to the temple of Artemis, offered many prayers, and made their sacrifice, and among their offerings they set up an inscription to honor the goddess, commemorating all their sufferings and all their adventures. (5.15.2)

The couple offers more than prayers and sacrifices to Artemis, as prior scenes have recorded. They set up an inscription in her temple for all to see, and they celebrate

¹¹³ Cf. Anderson, *An Ephesian Tale*, 146, notes: “The mention of an “eirenarch” (peace officer) is one of the few indications of Xenophon’s date: the officer is first mentioned as far as is known, in an inscription of A.D. 116-117 found not far from Ephesus.”

Artemis, as the one who delivered them from their troubles. Xenophon of Ephesus concludes *Ephesiaca* by presenting Artemis as one who cares for those who honor her. In return, her servants use their wealth to exalt her openly.

Xenophon of Ephesus adds to our knowledge about the relationship between Artemis, the Artemisium, and rich Ephesians throughout *Ephesiaca*, and specifically, in these eight scenes. His portrayal gives access to the thoughts and actions of rich Ephesians not contained in other sources. We see leading young men guiding sacred processions in honor of Artemis, and prominent young women adorning themselves to imitate the goddess. Rich people make sacrifices at feasts and other customary occasions. They offer personal prayers to Artemis in times of need and set up inscriptions in public to celebrate her salvific intervention in their lives. They negotiate exchanges and make oaths with other Ephesians in her name. The rich serve Artemis daily in her temple and praise her for watching over them. They respect her authority over every aspect of life and teach others to do the same.

2.1.2. The Rich in the Roman Imperial Capital of Asia

πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας
καὶ β' νεωκόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν

Numerous inscriptions describe Ephesus as the “first and greatest metropolis of Asia,” and as the Roman Imperial Capital of the Asia in the first century CE, Ephesus was also “the temple warden of the Imperial cult of the Sebastoi” (*IvE* 647, 1541, 1543, 1551, 1555). Ephesians respected Roman authority and worshiped the emperor. Ancient sources depict rich Ephesians as enforcing this political status quo because they owed their prominence in leadership precisely to the Romanization of the city. This factor ensconced them in leadership for generations.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ For a detailed history of the city and its rise to prominence outside the bounds of this study, see: David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (New York: Arno Press, 1975); Helmut Koester, *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*, 2 vols., vol. 1, Introduction to the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

2.1.2.1. Ancient Sources on the Rich in the Roman Imperial Capital of Asia

In 133 BCE, Ephesus became part of the Roman Republic. In 126 BCE Manius Aquilius restructured the government in Ephesus, implementing a two-house system with a council fixed at 450 members, and an ἐκκλησία τῶν δήμου, “assembly of the people,” led by a γραμματεὺς, “secretary.”¹¹⁵ Murphy-O’Connor discloses Rome’s motives in this shift.

Rome was too clever to modify the traditional institutions of the Greek cities, because that would have been deeply resented. Instead it preserved the form while radically changing the content. It introduced a property qualification for membership in the *ekklesia* and tended to grant its members life tenure. Thus Rome ensures that whatever power the city retained was wielded by those with an aversion to change and a strong personal interest in preserving the *status quo*.¹¹⁶

Rome intentionally changed the role of the council from that of an executive committee of a rotating assembly to that of a powerful perch where rich property owners could sit for life. Though the people ruled Ephesus during the Republic, the rich ruled it in the Empire and were rewarded for showing respect to Rome.

In 29 BCE, Augustus named Ephesus the capital of the province of Asia and set up sacred precincts to *Dea Roma* and *Divus Iulius*.¹¹⁷ Oversight of the Imperial cult was handled by the κοινόν, “the new provincial nobility.” This cadre of wealthy people became the interface between Rome and Asia, and by way of reciprocity, its members could be admitted into the equestrian order.¹¹⁸ Augustus rewarded the zeal of the Ephesian leaders to support Rome by commissioning building projects. This continued into the first century CE, as rich Ephesian leaders remained loyal to the Roman emperor through the Julio-Claudian era, 27 BCE to 68 CE.¹¹⁹

This growth came with challenges. Greed surfaced among rich leaders, and debt was a concern of institutions. A proclamation of the proconsul of Asia, Paullus

¹¹⁵ Broughton, “Roman Asia,” 814.

¹¹⁶ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 34.

¹¹⁷ Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*, 14.

¹¹⁸ This benefit was enjoyed by wealthy Ephesians through the first century CE and into the second century, as *IvE* 27 shows that this was a privilege that the rich people such as Gaius Vibius Salutaris and his friends enjoyed in 104 CE. Cf. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 9.

¹¹⁹ Benefaction inscriptions that honor Ἰούλιος or Κλαύδιος illustrate this: *IvE*, Teil VIII 2.88-99, 104-11.

Fabius Persicus (c. 44 CE) targeted these two problems.¹²⁰ The edict forbade the sale of priesthoods to public officials and limited the loans that would be granted from funds in the Temple to Artemis. This act was intended to limit the greed of those who profited from such loans, members of the Ephesian elite, and govern the selling of debt instruments to protect the fiscal stability of the Artemesium.

Rich Ephesian leaders possessed authority. For example, the **γραμματεὺς**, an influential figure, seems to have settled the riot in Acts 19:23-41 with a simple statement. As Paul's ministry in Ephesus flourished, it threatened not only the name of Artemis throughout Asia, but also the standing of the city with Rome. Apparently, neither this leader nor the people wanted word of a riot to reach Rome. Instead, he urged them to quiet down and work through the courts rather than try to settle the matter themselves and be charged with subverting Roman structures. The rich leaders in Ephesus were respectfully Roman, which secured their place locally, their status provincially, and their prominence internationally.

In Acts 19:35, the **γραμματεὺς** describes Ephesus as **νεωκόρος**, "temple warden." This term can be located in antiquity as a title given to a person as well as the descriptor given to a city with an imperial temple.¹²¹ The former usage surfaces in inscriptions linked to wealthy people who competed for the privilege of serving as priests and priestesses and whose giving funded temple activities.¹²² Rich Ephesians are given other titles as well. Near the remains of Domitian's temple, the benefactor Lucius Antonius Marcus is lauded as "patron and savior" for his cultic support.¹²³

¹²⁰ *IvE* 17-19. Cf. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 11.

¹²¹ For an exhaustive study of the "temple warden" label affixed to Ephesus, see: Steven Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia, and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World (Leiden: Brill, 1993). See also "The Cult of the Roman Emperors in Ephesos: Temple Wardens, City Titles and the Interpretation of the Revelation of John," in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 234; and, Josef Keil, "Die erste Kaiserneokorie von Ephesos." *NZ* 12 (1919): 115-120.

¹²² Halvor Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 35.

¹²³ The term "savior," ordinarily reserved for the gods and the emperors is ascribed to an Ephesian benefactor. *IvE* 614A cites a parallel inscription in Pergamum: S. Hepding, IGR IV 400.1: **πάτρωνα καὶ σωτήρα**.

The latter usage appears on coins possessed by the rich: ΕΦ ΝΕΟΚΟΡΟΝ.¹²⁴ Ephesus served Roman Asia as a religious center. In return, the city and its leaders enjoyed the honor of νεωκόρος status. Larry Kreitzer notes that Paul's ministry posed a threat to the provincial prestige of Ephesus and the fame of Artemis, which prompted city leaders to stamp out the foreign influence.¹²⁵

The title εὐεργέτης, "benefactor," ascribed status in the Greco-Roman world to anyone who conferred divine gifts on the community out of devotion to the gods.¹²⁶ In antiquity, this ascription was approved by the council and the people and then set in stone, affixing that status to the benefactor in perpetuity.¹²⁷ For example, during the reign of Nero, C. Stertinius Orpex, a rich Ephesian freedman, gave gifts from his foundation for lotteries and distributions to pay for community activities (IvE 4123).¹²⁸ On another occasion, Orpex, along with his daughter, gave statues of Asklepios, Hygeia, and Hyponos for placement in the gymnasium for the benefit of the people (IvE 2113).¹²⁹ In each instance, honor was the reward of generosity.

A. R. Hands explains the rules of reciprocity in effect here: "Gifts, benefits or favors in question are to be conferred upon somebody who *can* make a return, so that a return, even though it may no longer decently be asked for, is confidently expected."¹³⁰ Such favors were a part of the liturgies, or community distributions, that the *Ephebes*, the prominent youth in the Greco-Roman world, were taught to provide upon ascent to civic leadership.

Consequently, the testimony of the ancient sources shows that by the first century CE, Ephesus had become respectfully and reverently Roman as both the capital of the province of Asia and temple warden of the Imperial cult. The

¹²⁴ Barbara Burrell, *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 59-60. Cf. Acts 19:35.

¹²⁵ Cf. Larry Joseph Kreitzer, "A Numismatic Clue to Acts 19.23-41." *JSNT* 30 (1987): 59-70.

¹²⁶ For a list of terms related to εὐεργέτης, see John H. Elliott, "Patronage and Clientage," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 152.

¹²⁷ For more on "The Form of the Benefaction Inscription," see: Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26-27.

¹²⁸ Cf. IvE 27 for an example of similar lotteries and distributions set up by Gaius Vibius Salutaris.

¹²⁹ Cf. Aurenhammer, "Sculptures of Gods and Heroes from Ephesos," 266.

¹³⁰ A. R. Hands, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1968) 30-31, 118-20; cf. Jouette M. Bassler, *God & Mammon: Asking for Money in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991) 17f.

leadership of the city had been Romanized and wealth had become a prerequisite of leadership, though history reports it led some to become greedy. Those who ascended to power enjoyed the benefits, including titles such as savior, ordinarily ascribed only to the gods or the Roman emperor. In return, they followed the example of the emperors in extending benefactions according to culturally defined expectations. Their reverence to Rome had also been reciprocated with the honor of having an imperial temple, giving this city provincial prominence. Before the city had become Romanized, the people *owned* the city. By the first century CE the rich leaders *owned* Ephesus, and because of the culture of benefaction and reciprocity with inherent obligations, Ephesus *owned* them.

2.1.2.2. Xenophon of Ephesus on the Rich in the Roman Imperial Capital of Asia

Xenophon of Ephesus elucidates two social realities tied to this leading Roman city: the prominence of Ephesus in the ancient world and the international prestige accorded to its rich citizens. Three specific scenes explore these two social realities in an original manner.

First, the opening scene of *Ephesiaca* describes the lineage of Habrocomes, the benefits that he enjoys, and the leadership role he expects to attain as a result.

Among the most influential citizens of Ephesus was a man called Lycomedes. He and his wife, Themisto, who also belonged to the city, had a son Habrocomes; his good looks were phenomenal, and neither in Ionia nor anywhere else had there ever been anything like them. This Habrocomes grew more handsome every day; and his mental qualities developed along with his physical ones. For he acquired culture of all kinds and practiced a variety of arts; he trained in hunting, riding, and fighting under arms. Everyone in Ephesus sought his company, and in the rest of Asia as well; they had great hopes that he would have a distinguished position in the city. (1.1.1)

Xenophon of Ephesus portrays Lycomedes and Themisto as leading, influential citizens who “belonged to the city” of Ephesus. He also presents their son, Habrocomes, as skilled and trained in all facets of life and society. This set the stage

for Habrocomes to attain prominence among his peers and anticipate a prestigious position in the city. This example illustrates the ancient perspective that the rich thought they *owned* the city and the city *owned* them in reciprocity, as they were expected to serve in distinguished roles.

Second, when Anthia and Habrocomes visit Rhodes, they receive royal treatment and make a gift in return. The inscription that they underwrite emphasizes their status as citizens of Ephesus.

So they toured the whole city and gave as an offering to the temple of Heli^{us}, a gold panoply and inscribed on a votive tablet an epigram with the donors' names.

THE VISITORS DEDICATED TO YOU
THESE WEAPONS OF BEATEN GOLD,
ANTHIA AND HABROCOMES,
CITIZENS OF SACRED EPHEBUS.

After making these offerings, they stayed a few days...but at the sailors' insistence they took on supplies and put to sea. The whole population of Rhodes saw them off. (1.12.2-3)

Ephesus was the capital of Roman Asia. In *Ephesiaca* the city's leading citizens emerge as privileged people who enjoy regal hospitality on their visit to Rhodes and fulfill their social obligation as rich guests by making an offering with an inscription in the temple.

Third, there are two scenes that illustrate a related point about the *Ephebes*, a civic group that trained participants to serve for the greater public good in the Roman Empire. In the opening procession, Habrocomes is presented as a young man around sixteen, "already a member of the *Ephebes*" (1.2.2). Later, he meets Aegialeus, who is also an *Ephebe*.

Habrocomes, my child, I am neither a settler nor a native Sicilian, but a Spartan from Lacedaemon, from one of its leading families. I was very prosperous and when I was a young man, enrolled in the *Ephebes*. I fell in love with a Spartan girl called Thelxinoe, and she with me. We met at an all-night festival in the city (a god guided both of us), and we found the fulfillment of the desire that had brought us together. For some time our relationship was a secret, and we often made pacts to be faithful to death. But one of the gods, I suppose, was envious. While I was still an *Ephebe*, her parents arranged to marry her to a young Spartan... (5.1.2)

There are striking similarities between the stories of the two characters: Habrocomes and Aegialeus. Both had love relationships influenced by the gods, both were from leading wealthy families, and both were enrolled in the *Ephebes*.

Acceptance of this period of education came to be regarded, not so much as a privilege extended by the state, but rather as a burden undertaken in the interests of the state—the *Ephebeia* being a kind of showpiece demonstrating the intellectual, religious, and social aspects of a city's life in the persons of those few wealthy enough to afford to belong to it, and competing with its counterpart in other cities.¹³¹

As the rich in the Greco-Roman world and in *Ephesiaca* were *owned* by their cities, the *Ephebes* came from the privileged rich and were *owned* by the state. Xenophon of Ephesus depicts Habrocomes and Aegialeus as wealthy, competitive, and confident citizens and enhances our view of this civic group.

Xenophon of Ephesus corroborates current assumptions derived from other ancient sources about the prominence of the city of Ephesus and its leading citizens. He also adds to our knowledge by providing fresh illustrations. We see the types of training future leaders received to excel in a competitive world. We gain insight into the roles they expected to fill and the duties that corresponded to those roles. We learn how the rich were viewed in the ancient world. At home, they belonged to their cities and their cities belonged to them. Internationally, leading Ephesians enjoyed royal hospitality. In return, they made offerings to local gods.

2.1.3. The Multicultural Mediterranean Hub for Transportation, Trade, and Traditions

ἡ δὲ πόλις τῇ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα εὐκαιρία τῶν τόπων αὐξεται καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἐμπόριον οὐσα μέγιστον τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου.

Ephesus in the first century CE was linked to the entire world as a multicultural Mediterranean hub for transportation, trade, and various traditions. Strabo comments, “And the city, because of its advantageous situation in other respects,

¹³¹ Hands, *Charities and Social Aid*, 119.

grows daily more prosperous, and is the largest emporium in Asia this side of the Taurus” (*Geography* 14.1.24).

This section sketches how ancient sources present Ephesus as a key port that connected people of different ethnic and economic backgrounds together. It also illustrates the embedded existence of the social realities of work and worship.¹³²

2.1.3.1. Ancient Sources on the Rich in the Multicultural Mediterranean Hub of Ephesus

In the first century CE, Ephesus was a transportation hub and a leading center of trade. Ephesus was located at the intersection of two main roads and its harbor was the gateway to the world. Strabo (*Geography* 14.2.29) and Pliny (*Natural History* 2.242-43) cite Artemidorus, an Ephesian geographer, who tells of these two roads: the “common highway” which connected East and West, India to Ephesus, and the North-South road in western Asia Minor.¹³³

Though the harbor had a history of silting, which may have hindered tourism and merchant traffic, Tacitus credits Marcius Barea Soranus, proconsul in Asia, with having “industriously cleared the harbor of Ephesus” in 61 CE (*Annals* 16.23).¹³⁴ Between the harbor and the international roads lay the quay area and the path to the emporium where merchants brought their items to market.

Philip Harland notes inscriptions that reveal the presence of associations for various goods and services.¹³⁵ Business in Ephesus boomed between merchants and

¹³² Steven S. H. Chang, *Fundraising in Corinth: A Socio-Economic Study of the Corinthian Church, the Pauline Collection and 2 Corinthians*, Department of Divinity and Religious Studies (Unpublished PhD: University of Aberdeen, 2000) 46, offers explanation outside the bounds of this study to the way in which ancient economies were places where religion, politics, economics, and relationships were all “embedded” or interconnected. Cf. Richard L. Rohrbaugh, “The Preindustrial City,” in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 107-25; Douglas E. Oakman, “The Ancient Economy,” in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 126-43.

¹³³ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 37. Paul probably arrived in Ephesus via the “common highway” from Galatia in 52 CE. Pliny the Younger traveled both by sea and by the north-south road, cf. *Letters* 10:17A.

¹³⁴ Cf. Strabo, *Geography* 14.1.24; Richard Oster, “Ephesus.” *ABD* 2 (1992): 543.

¹³⁵ Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003) 38-44.

traders (*IvE* 800, 3079); silversmiths (*IvE* 425, 457, 585-6, 2212, 2441; cf. Acts 19:23-41); hemp workers, linen weavers and wool dealers (*IvE* 454, 3803); bakers (*IvE* 215); wine tasters (*IvE* 1109, 1110);¹³⁶ potters (*IvE* 2402);¹³⁷ clothing sellers (*IvE* 3063); bed builders (*IvE* 2213); bankers (*IvE* 454); physicians (*IvE* 719, 1161-67, 2304, 4101A-B); carpenters and builders (*IvE* 2215, 3075); and other workers (*IvE* 3216). Some of these associations may have had offices in the “portico of corporations.”¹³⁸

The associations were comprised of people of different ethnic backgrounds and stations. For example, this stele cites a diverse group of association members who contributed to the fishery tax (c. 54-59 CE). Murphy O'Connor notes:

It records the contributions of the members of an association of fishermen and fishmongers toward the construction of a customs house at the harbor for the collection of the fishery tax...

The original list contained perhaps a hundred names, of which eighty-nine remain clear enough to be studied. The breakdown reveals a wide range of social and legal status. There were forty-three or forty-four Roman citizens, which can be further subdivided into those of Roman/Italian descent (eighteen or nineteen), Greeks who were granted citizenship (nine), and those bearing slave names, who won their citizenship through military service or manumission (sixteen). In addition, there were between thirty-six and forty-one Greeks, presumably citizens of Ephesus, and between two and ten slaves. Nothing can be said about the remaining names. In other words, the membership of the fishery association reflected the diversity of the city's inhabitants.¹³⁹

This list reflects the multicultural mix of this metropolis. People from a wide range of social positions and ethnic backgrounds worked together.¹⁴⁰

Harland explains the blending between work life and spiritual life and suggests that feasting with friends or co-workers and honoring the gods were natural components of association life in the late first and early second centuries CE. Not only did diverse groups of people work together, they ate and worshiped together.

¹³⁶ Cf. Strabo, *Geography* 14.1.15, “Ephesian wines are good.” Contra: Pliny, *Natural History* 14.9.74-75, “the vintage of Ephesus...proved to be unwholesome.”

¹³⁷ Susanne Zabeihlicky-Scheffenecker, “Subsidiary Factories of Italian Sigillata Potters,” in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 217-28.

¹³⁸ Broughton, “Roman Asia,” 842.

¹³⁹ Translation: Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 28.

¹⁴⁰ S. R. Llewelyn and G. H. R. Horsley, ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Linguistic Essays, with Cumulative Indexes to Vols. 1-5*, Vol. 5 (North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1989) 108-09.

The well-attested “sanhedrin” (*synedrion*) of physicians at Ephesus incidentally reveals in only one of its surviving inscriptions what was central to its ongoing internal life—sacrifice and accompanying ritual feasts—in referring to itself as the “physicians who sacrifice to ancestor Askelpios and to the *Sebastoi*,” the revered emperors as gods.¹⁴¹

The fishery tax inscription already observed above is another example of this blending. This inscription had two altars with a special shrine to the gods of Samothrace deemed the “divine protectors of those at sea” and the “patron deities of the fishermen and fish dealers” (*IvE* 20.70-71). Work and worship were intertwined in Ephesus, and rich leaders are immortalized in inscriptions for financially underwriting association activities and feasts.¹⁴²

The rich also paid for larger community events in Ephesus. Entertainment options included artists that were part of the worldwide group of Dionysiac performers (*IvE* 22), athletes of Heracles (*IvE* 1084, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1909, 1122), and gladiators (*IvE* 225, 240, 241). Strabo reports: “A general festival is held there annually. And by certain custom the youths vie for honor, particularly in the splendor of their banquets” (*Geography* 14.1.20).¹⁴³ The celebration of the birth of Artemis was among the biggest events of the year.

Ancient sources reveal that life for the rich in the metropolis of Ephesus the first century CE consisted of travel, shopping, making offerings, and sacrifices at temples, enjoying entertainment with friends, attending association meetings and feasts with colleagues of different ethnic backgrounds, and hosting community activities that honored Artemis and the gods for citizens and visitors from around the world.

¹⁴¹ Harland, *Associations*, 69. Cf. *IvE* 719.

¹⁴² Heinrich Zabelhicky, “Preliminary Views of the Ephesian Harbor,” in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 201-15. See: *IvE* 2061, 3066. Cf. Harland, *Associations*, 40.

¹⁴³ See also *IvE* 27. Contra: Dieter Knibbe, “Via Sacra Ephesiaca,” in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 154. Knibbe states that *IvE* 27 had “no relationship to the cult of Artemis.” This is surprising as he acknowledges the work of Guy Rogers on *IvE* 27 and actually cites *Ephesiaca*. A possible explanation for this may be that though he mentions both Rogers and *Ephesiaca*, he interacts with neither at length, because Rogers outlines the connections between *IvE* 27 and the cult of Artemis, and *Ephesiaca* illustrates them, 141-55.

2.1.3.2. Xenophon of Ephesus on the Rich in the Multicultural Mediterranean Hub of Ephesus

Ephesus is the hub in the story told by Xenophon of Ephesus. *Ephesiaca* begins and ends in this multicultural Mediterranean city. Three specific scenes portray Ephesus as a key port for travel, trade, and traditions. The details presented in these scenes augment what is known of the world of the rich in Ephesus and bring it to life by offering fresh perspectives on ancient realities.

First, the opening scene of the story features the festival of Artemis, an event attended by locals and people from around the ancient Mediterranean world.

The local festival of Artemis was in progress, with its procession from the city to the temple nearly a mile away... There was a great crowd of Ephesians and visitors alike to see the festival, for it was the custom at this festival to find husbands for the girls and wives for the young men... (1.2.2-3)

And so when the procession was over, the whole crowd went into the temple for sacrifice, and the files broke up; men and women and girls and boys came together. (1.3.1)

Xenophon of Ephesus depicts what other literary sources and epigraphic evidence suggest: people from many nations and social strata took part in festivities following certain customs and worshiped Artemis together. *Ephesiaca*, however, adds three key reasons for this annual festival not known from other sources: (1) youth participated to find spouses, (2) the rest of the community joined in the festivities including visitors from around world, and (3) the event culminated in a corporate sacrifice to the goddess.¹⁴⁴ Religion and social life are intertwined in *Ephesiaca*.

Second, the marriage ceremony hosted by the parents of Anthia and Habrocomes is portrayed as a community celebration rather than merely a family affair. This description reveals how rich Ephesians approached this tradition.

Already the revelry filled the city; there were garlands everywhere, and the impending marriage was on everyone's lips. Everybody congratulated Habrocomes on the prospect of marrying such a wife as Anthia; they congratulated her in turn because she was to be the bride of such a handsome young man... (1.7.3)

¹⁴⁴ If *IvE* 27 provides the script details for this annual event, then Xenophon expands our knowledge by bringing it to life like a motion picture.

And so the time for their marriage arrived; there were all night celebrations and a feast of sacrifices to the god...The chamber had been prepared: a golden couch had been spread with purple sheets, and above it hung and awning with an embroidered Babylonian tapestry. (1.8.1-2)

This text offers a glimpse into the rituals surrounding the wedding. It also shows that such festivities were topics of citywide conversations: the activities of prominent people were public events. In mentioning purple sheets and Babylonian tapestry, Xenophon of Ephesus implies the regal bedding that could be bought in the emporium. This scene from *Ephesiaca* presents a unique example of the rich as honoring the gods with sacrifices, paying for the all-night community celebrations, and enjoying the best wares of the world, while also receiving accolades in return.

Third, when the parents made preparations to send Anthia and Habrocomes across the sea, they did not merely pay for their passage on a ship; they gave them a fully loaded ship (1.10.4). The emporium was the place they were able to purchase the supplies for this trip. Xenophon of Ephesus again features the whole community attending the festivities, in this case, a farewell gathering.

Ephesiaca begins and ends in Ephesus (1.1.1; 5.15.4). Xenophon of Ephesus depicts this seaport as the place where people work, play, and worship together in an embedded existence. The rich are prominent in community gatherings. The story presents an array of wares that would have been available in the emporium. For Xenophon of Ephesus, rich Ephesians can be found enjoying lavish luxuries while observing the traditions and cultural norms expected of them.

2.1.4. Summary: Xenophon of Ephesus and the World of Rich in Ephesus

Ephesiaca illuminates our understanding of life for the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE and enhances our knowledge of the social setting in three areas.

First, Xenophon of Ephesus provides fresh examples of the centrality of Artemis in the life of rich Ephesians. The story illustrates how they led sacred

processions, served daily in her precincts, honored her at community events, made sacrifices, pledged oaths, offered prayers, and even set up inscriptions to celebrate her as their savior. While other sources provide data on the Artemis cult, *Ephesiaca* reveals that the rich respected her authority over their lives like no other source.

Second, *Ephesiaca* depicts the international prominence of leading Ephesians as attested by other ancient testimonies. They are citizens of a “sacred” city. The story portrays rich, young citizens receiving training as *Ephebes*, but goes further than what is commonly known by exhibiting the broad spectrum of mental and physical instruction they received as young leaders and how from generation to generation they anticipated serving in positions of provincial prominence. The ancient sources demonstrate that the rich owned the city and the city owned them, but *Ephesiaca* brings this idea to life as the story shows them fulfilling their duties and reaping the benefits tied to their status both in Ephesus and the Roman world.

Third, as a hub for transportation, trade, and traditions, *Ephesiaca* presents rich Ephesians living in a port city, enjoying the bounty of the emporium, and hosting events and multicultural celebrations. While other sources present people of different ethnic and economic levels working and worshipping together, *Ephesiaca* illustrates the way in which the thinking and behavior of the rich was dictated by culture and tradition. The community processions, weddings, farewells, and other festivities followed cultural rules and norms that will be examined next.

2.2. Cultural Rules, the Rich in Ephesus, and *Ephesiaca*

Καταστείλας δὲ ὁ γραμματεὺς τὸν ὄχλον φησὶν ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι,
τίς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων ὃς οὐ γινώσκει
τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν νεωκόρον οὖσαν τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρτέμιδος

‘But when the town clerk had quieted the crowd he said, “Citizens of Ephesus, who is there that does not know that the city of the Ephesians is temple-keeper of the

great Artemis...” (Acts 19:35a). This rhetorical question illustrates that Ephesian leaders believed that there were values or customs of the city that would have been commonly known and understood. What were they? How did they govern the behavior of the people in Ephesus in the first century CE? And how may Xenophon of Ephesus augment our knowledge of them?

To answer these questions, we will examine how *Ephesiaca* brings to light six fixtures or social institutions that embody and inscribe the cultural norms and rules that governed life and society for rich Ephesians. Evident also in numerous ancient sources, these cultural fixtures are: (1) honor/shame, (2) identity, (3) kinship, (4) exchange/ benefaction, (5) envy, and (6) purity.

Bruce Malina underscores the value of such social and cultural institutions or models in our search for meaning in texts such as *Ephesiaca* or 1 Tim.

So what we need in order to understand our hypothetical group of foreigners—the New Testament writings and the behavior of the people portrayed in them—are some adequate models that would enable us to understand cross-culturally, that would force us to keep our meanings and values out of their behavior, so that we might understand them on their own terms. If you recall, the purpose of models is to generate understanding.¹⁴⁵

These models, to use Malina’s term, will each receive brief treatment below with illustrations from antiquity and *Ephesiaca*.

2.2.1 Honor and Shame in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*

The first and foremost cultural rule for the rich in Greco-Roman world was to uphold honor. This cultural fixture can be traced to Aristotle (*Nichomachean Ethics* 3.1.11). Seneca states this succinctly: “The one firm conviction from which we move to the proof of other points is this: that which is honorable is held dear for no other reason than because it is honorable” (*On Benefits* 4.16.2).¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁵ Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001) 19.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Seneca’s specific regard for Ephesus is attested in *Letters* 102.21.

In ancient Ephesus, words like δόξα, “glory,” and τιμή, “honor,” were used to convey this concept related to the gods, to persons, or groups of people.¹⁴⁷ People received honor by way of birth or through excellence in social and public performance.¹⁴⁸ Shame was related to honor, as it represented respect for the honor of others.¹⁴⁹ “Shame can signify a positive character trait, evidenced by sensitivity to the opinion of the group and avoiding actions that bring disgrace.”¹⁵⁰ Rich people who acted honorably enjoyed a place of honor below the gods and atop the hierarchy of persons in the ancient mindset.

Xenophon of Ephesus describes Anthia and Habrocomes as the recipients of honor by birth, as the children of prominent citizens. They anticipated advancement to distinguished positions in the city because of inherited status and by excelling in peer competition. In *Ephesiaca*, they received honor from the crowds during the procession for their excellent external appearance, as compared to other young men and women, and they were captivated by each other’s δόξα at first sight (1.2.9).

For Xenophon of Ephesus, upholding honor was foundational for all social relations. Rich Ephesians showed “first-rank” respect to Artemis, to other gods and to one another in the hierarchy of social interaction.¹⁵¹ Failure to observe these cultural rules was considered shameless. The honorable rich in Ephesus were expected to lead the way in respecting the gods and in serving the goddess, Artemis, who possessed ultimate authority over people. Though not necessarily rich, Lampo behaves with εὐσέβεια before Artemis and the gods by showing respect for the

¹⁴⁷ Pliny the Elder honorably describes Ephesus as the “great luminary of Asia” in *Natural History* 5.31.120. Cf. David Arthur deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000) 23-28.

¹⁴⁸ Malina, *The New Testament World*, 32-43.

¹⁴⁹ Moxnes, “Honor and Shame,” 19-37. Cf. Julian Pitt-Rivers, “Honour and Social Status,” in *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. John G. Peristiany (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965) 21-77

¹⁵⁰ deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*, 25. For further study of honor related to the NT, see: Halvor Moxnes, “Honor and Shame: A Reader’s Guide.” *BTB* 23 (1993): 167-76; David Arthur deSilva, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, vol. 152, SBLDS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) chapters 2-3.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Strabo, *Geography* 4.1.4-5. This “first-rank” esteem of Artemis was not limited to prominent Ephesians.

honor of Anthia when in his care (2.11.1-9). On the other hand, at the beginning of the story Habrocomes behaves shamelessly by arrogantly dishonoring Eros; thus, the god devises a plan to teach him a lesson (1.1.5-2.1).

In antiquity, the rich retained honor through behavior consistent with their gender status (Suetonius, *Augustus* 34.40.5; Horace, *Odes* 4.5.15).¹⁵² For a rich young woman like Anthia, demonstrating chastity and public silence were paramount in maintaining status. Upon meeting Habrocomes at the temple, Anthia, “paid no attention to modesty” and “what she said for Habrocomes to hear, and she revealed what she could of her body for Habrocomes to see” (1.3.2). This moment of immodesty positioned Anthia alongside Habrocomes to receive the same oracle before the gods: she too would embark on a journey on which she would suffer and have to defend her chastity.

Possessing riches did not guarantee that a person was honorable in the ancient world. According to Isocrates: “Honor with pleasure is a great good, but pleasure without honor is the worst evil” (*To Demonicus* 17). In *Ephesiaca*, Anthia and Habrocomes both encountered people who were rich and yet shameless, that is, disrespectful of the honor of others. Riches could increase one’s status, but not necessarily one’s honor.

Xenophon of Ephesus sends clear messages to the rich about honor and shame. Maintain your status in the social hierarchy by respecting the gods! Exhibit noble behavior appropriate to your gender. Riches may provide status, but honor comes from honorable behavior. The ancient audience, especially rich Ephesians, would have understood these cultural expectations tied to social realities, and *Ephesiaca* reveals afresh the consequences that awaited anyone who failed to observe them.

¹⁵² For further discussion, see: Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 39-58.

2.2.2. Identity in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*

In ancient Ephesus, a person's relationships or connections largely shaped their identity. For example, Ignatius of Antioch described followers of Jesus in Ephesus as *συμμύσται*, "fellow-initiates" in the *μυστήρια*, "mysteries" of Christ (*To the Ephesians* 12.2).¹⁵³ Language such as this describes the identity of these people as defined by their bonds to each other and to Christ.

Benefaction inscriptions attest that the identity of rich Ephesians were linked to the gods, the emperor, and the people. There was a high degree of social pressure to conform to the expectations of those to whom one was connected: this affected the words one would say, the clothes one would wear, the offerings and sacrifices one would make, and the place or role one held in society.¹⁵⁴ To maintain one's identity, a person was required to follow the social and cultural rules associated with one's status.

In *Ephesiaca*, the identity of Anthia and Habrocomes is framed based on their relationships to the gods, their families, and their fellow Ephesians. Anthia was also the daughter of a prominent couple. She adorned herself to appear like the goddess (1.2.6-7) and performed daily rituals in the Artemisium (1.5.1-4). Her fervent and frequent prayers to Artemis illustrate that she believed she could count on the goddess to reward those who served her.

Habrocomes was also the son of leading citizens and aspired to attain a position of community leadership. He was also an *Ephebe*. This meant he received educational training for public service reserved for leading youth. As compared to his peers, he excelled in competition, and this added to the prominence of his identity. One could say Habrocomes *was* the future of the city (1.1.2-4).

¹⁵³ Cf. Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* (New York: T & T Clark, 2009) 47-48.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Peter Garnsey and Richard Saller, "Patronal Power Relations," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1997) 96.

The rich couple lost their place when they failed to conform to two cultural norms: honoring the gods and behaving with modesty. Habrocomes exhibited arrogance toward Eros and Anthia presented herself immodestly. These actions led to their demise. Lost and lovesick in a patriarchal setting, their fathers both went to the Temple of Apollo in Colophon to seek an oracle from the gods (1.6.1).

Why do you long to learn the end of a malady, and it's beginning? One disease has both in its grasp, and from that remedy must be accomplished. But for them I see terrible sufferings and toils that are endless; both will flee over the sea pursued by madness; they will suffer chains at the hands of men who mingle with the waters; and a tomb shall be the burial chamber for both, and fire the destroyer; And beside the waters of the river Nile, to Holy Isis, the savior you will afterwards offer rich gifts; but still after their sufferings a better fate is in store. (1.6.2)

Though saddened by the oracle, the parents arranged the marriage of their children and sent them across the sea, demonstrating submission to the authority of the gods. The parents knew their place. They also believed that by way of the journey outlined in the oracle, their children would also learn their place.

Leucon and Rhode, honorable slaves who started and ended the adventure with Anthia and Habrocomes, did not forget their identity in society. Interestingly, though they came upon wealth after being separated from the couple they served, upon being reunited with Habrocomes, Xenophon of Ephesus writes: “[Leucon and Rhode] took [Habrocomes] with them, and brought him to their lodgings, made over their possessions to him, took care of him, looked after him and tried to console him” (5.10.12). Here, Leucon and Rhode provide a fresh ancient example of how the identity of slaves defined their relationships and shaped their behavior.

The message for the rich audience of *Ephesiaca* is explicit linked to identity: relationships, rather than riches, determine your identity and place in society. To maintain your identity and status as prominent rich citizens, conform to the cultural rules for relationships and for handling riches.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Bruce J. Malina, *The Social World of Jesus and the Gospels* (New York: Routledge, 1996) 35-96.

2.2.3. Kinship in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*

Kinship rules outlined in *lex Julia* and *lex Papia* governed kinship behavior in the Greco-Roman world. Leading Ephesians, however, were to do more than merely follow these rules. To maintain their prominence in Roman Asia in the first century CE, their citizens were expected to serve as role models for the people of the region.

Kinship rules identified how people related to one another by law and lineage using terms such as parent, child, marriage, wife, husband, household, steward, brother, sister, and slave.¹⁵⁶ In antiquity, parents supplied everything for their children, including a mate. In tough times, they would hide the shame of their children rather than expose it. In response, children were to obey and honor their parents.¹⁵⁷ The model husband provided for his wife, often working outside the home and serving as the head of the household; whereas, the ideal wife lived a life of submission and seclusion often taking the primary role in raising the children at home, while presenting herself with modesty and silence in public.¹⁵⁸ Life outside the kinship group was also very competitive; yet, inside the group, there was cooperation, sharing, and close ties between siblings. Stewards and slaves submitted to the authority of the head of the household in which they lived.¹⁵⁹ Xenophon of Ephesus reinforces and illuminates these rules in numerous scenes in *Ephesiaca*.

Anthia's lineage can be traced to a leading couple, Megamedes and Equippe, and Habrocomes was the son of prominent citizens, Lycomedes and Themisto (1.1.1-5). Prior to their union, their parents fulfilled their cultural roles by providing what Anthia and Habrocomes needed to excel in competition with their peers. They also hosted a grand wedding with sacrifices to the gods, and covered the shame of the oracle with a lavish send-off (1.7.2-8.3; 1.10.1-10). In the end, having

¹⁵⁶ On kinship and household codes in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*, see: Verner, *Household of God*, 54-56.

¹⁵⁷ Kenneth C. Hanson, "BTB Reader's Guide: Kinship." *BTB* 24 (1994): 183-94.

¹⁵⁸ deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*, 178-90. Cf. Halvor Moxnes, ed., *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (London: Routledge, 1997) 25.

¹⁵⁹ deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*, 190-91. Cf. Kenneth C. Hanson, "Kinship," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 62-79.

discovered that their parents had died while the two were across the sea, the children reciprocated by honoring them with large tombs (5.15.3).

Kinship rules linked to marriage also surfaced in *Ephesiaca*. The marriage between the two represented a merging of the honor of two families.¹⁶⁰ Kinship relations were paternalistic, which meant the female was embedded in the honor of a male. Separation from Habrocomes would leave Anthia exposed to danger and cause Habrocomes to feel devastated that he could not provide for his bride. While they were apart, Anthia repeatedly had to fight to defend her chastity, and Habrocomes, his honor, because the two had not only lost each other, they had lost their place in the ancient world.

When the couple was in the custody of Apsyrtus, the household concept comes into view (2.2.5; 2.10.1-4). Apsyrtus was the feared master of his household, which included his wife, children, and slaves. The steward served as the leading slave responsible for managing the household. Those in a household were deemed insiders, which gave them privileged access to the resources of the master. Those outside the group were considered as outsiders: they were alone in a competitive world. Habrocomes experienced such a displaced position in Italy, which caused him to resort to manual labor to provide for his needs (5.8.3-6).

In *Ephesiaca*, Xenophon of Ephesus affirms the kinship rules of the ancient Mediterranean world that were strictly observed. Those who lived in accordance with them maintained insider status and enjoyed the benefits of being in the group. Outsiders were exposed to harm, alone without resources, and forced to resort to brigandage or hard labor to scrape to survive in a harsh world. For rich Ephesians, preserving your kinship ties would take priority over preserving your wealth, as

¹⁶⁰ deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*, 174-78. For example, 178, he notes the ancient example of Pseudo-Phocylides, *Sentences* 199-200: "Do not bring as a wife into your home a bad and wealthy woman, for you will be a slave of the wife because of the ruinous dowry." As marriage was the merging of honors, her character would adversely affect his honor, and the wealth of such a wife may make difficult to divorce her. On marriage, also: Raymond F. Collins, "Marriage (NT)." *ABD* 4 (1992): 569-72.

maintaining these relationships is the key to prosperity.¹⁶¹ The greedy in *Ephesiaca* focused on preserving their wealth over kinship ties.

2.2.4. Exchange and Benefaction in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*

In the ancient Mediterranean world, exchanges were negotiated vertically and horizontally in reciprocal relationships.¹⁶² Keeping these relationships balanced helped people maintain their status. The rich saw themselves as benefactors, saviors, and patrons who provided for clients who in return could offer honor and benefits.¹⁶³

In *Ephesiaca*, on their visit to Rhodes, Anthia and Habrocomes were received like royalty, and in return, they dedicated a gift made of gold in the temple of Helios. For this act, the couple was honored in an inscription as “citizens of holy Ephesus” (1.12.2).¹⁶⁴ Conferring benefactions like this helped Anthia and Habrocomes maintain their honor and status.

As exchange was governed by the rules of reciprocity, at least three honorable processes can be identified. First, one could request something vertically from the gods by way of a mediator. Second, one could work through people in patron-client relationships, in which the clients offered reciprocal obligations. Third, one could request things horizontally from people of the same status through collegial arrangements.

Ephesiaca envisions both vertical and horizontal relationships and the reciprocity rules apply to each configuration. Vertically, both sets of parents approached the gods to seek oracles for Anthia and Habrocomes through their

¹⁶¹ The “happily ever after” ending takes place only after kinship ties are restored near the end of the story: *Ephesiaca* 5.15.3. At that point, Xenophon of Ephesus presents life “celebrated like a festival.”

¹⁶² John H. Elliott, “Patronage and Clientage,” 148-49. See also: Halvor Moxnes, “Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991) 241-68; Brian E. Daley, “Position and Patronage in the Early Church.” *JTS* 44 (1993): 529-53.

¹⁶³ Cf. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26-27. Winter maps the form the benefaction inscriptions followed. The inscription both honored the benefactor while outlining benefits to be conferred for their beneficence. To view a few Ephesian examples, see: *IvE* 27, 49, 681, 989.

¹⁶⁴ Anderson, *An Ephesian Tale*, 136. Cf. Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 239, translates this phrase, “citizens of sacred Ephesus.”

mediators, the priests (1.6.2). Horizontally, to get what they wanted, Corymbus and Euxinus aligned with each other to try to win the favor of Habrocomes and Anthia (1.15-16). Similarly, Manto worked with Rhode to try to attain Habrocomes as her husband (2.3.1-5). Characters formed horizontal and vertical relationships governed by the rules of reciprocity to get things they wanted and/or to preserve their place in society.

In antiquity, rich leaders expected honor in return for executing their giving obligations.¹⁶⁵ In *Ephesiaca*, Habrocomes was a member of the *Ephebes*, a group that served the state in part through liturgies, for which the society was grateful and reciprocated with honor and status (1.2.2). Rich leaders also underwrote community events such as festivals, weddings, and the farewell in *Ephesiaca*. In fulfilling such civic obligations, they maintained their station, and elicited a return of honor.

Honorable people followed reciprocity rules, whether patron or client, because good was perceived as limited in the ancient world. Paul Furfey notes that most rich people in the ancient Mediterranean world attained their wealth by inheritance or amassed it as merchants or landowners who did not have to work with their hands.¹⁶⁶ To get rich was perceived as causing others to get poor and so was viewed as dishonorable. Characters such as the pirates or robbers in *Ephesiaca*, who clearly did not follow the social and cultural rules, were presented as greedy and having a complete disregard for the welfare of the group (1.13.1-14.1; 4.1.1).

The only way for the rich to preserve their place of honor and status in Ephesus, according to *Ephesiaca*, was for them to follow the reciprocity rules and fulfill the obligations that pertained to their social rank. Prominent citizens did that by receiving the beneficence of the emperor and the gods and sharing benefits with their community. This is how Xenophon of Ephesus and other ancient witnesses

¹⁶⁵ Hands, *Charities and Social Aid*, 89-115, offers interesting examples of the basic commodities and necessities rich leaders were expected to provide for their cities, the most common being, corn, oil, and monetary resources.

¹⁶⁶ Paul H. Furfey, "ΠΑΟΥΣΙΟΣ and Cognates in the New Testament." *CBQ* 5 (1943): 241-63.

understood the system to work. Greedy people, however, should be avoided as they may resort to shameless acts driven by envy to get what they want.

2.2.5. Envy in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*

The ancients who observed the Mediterranean world regarded envy as the most insidious evil to threaten human relationships. In the words of Plutarch: “envy is pain at another’s good” (*Talkativeness* 518C; cf. *On Envy and Hate*). This perspective is also attested in the tractates of Aristophanes (*Fragment* 607), Athenaeus (*Diepnosophists* XII), and Heliodorus (*Aethiopica* 3.7-9), among others.

In social interaction, when a person enjoyed a fortuitous situation, social equals might deem this as unfair, and thus, envy that person.¹⁶⁷ This often led them to defend the honor of the group by retaliating through some form of negative challenge, to reduce the person’s fortunes and social location. The channel for such a challenge was often described as the evil eye, and envious behaviors included ostracism, gossip, feuding, litigation, and even murder.¹⁶⁸

Ephesiaca is filled with examples of envy. When Habrocomes and Anthia fell into the hands of robber chief, Apsyrtus, his daughter Manto became infatuated with Habrocomes. When he rejected her advances, Manto “felt envy, jealousy, grief, and fear, and was planning how to take her revenge on the man who was turning her down” (2.5.5). Envy drove her to falsely accuse Habrocomes of accosting her. When Apsyrtus returned with Moeris, a husband for Manto, he believed her story and had Habrocomes flogged and put in chains. To make matters worse, Moeris fell in love with Anthia and confided his love to Lampo, the goatherd. When Manto learned of this, she ordered Lampo to take Anthia out and kill her, a task Lampo would not do for fear of the gods, choosing rather to sell her to some Cilician merchants who

¹⁶⁷ Bruce J. Malina, “Limited Good and the Social World of Early Christianity.” *BTB* 8 (1979) 162-76.

¹⁶⁸ Malina, *The New Testament World*, 118-19.

agreed to take her far away from there (2.11.1-9). Envy led Manto to treat Habrocomes and Anthia horribly!

Envy also drove Aristomachus to stoop to bribery in order to steal young Hyperanthes away from his friend, Hippothous (3.2.5-8). Envy motivated Cyno to murder her husband, Araxus, and have Habrocomes crucified for rejecting her (3.12.4-6). Anthia as well often tried to get away from envious suitors, such as Euxinus (1.15.5-16.7), Perilaus (2.13.5-8), Psammis (3.11.3-4), and Anchialus (4.5.1-6) who desired her sexually.¹⁶⁹ The message of Xenophon of Ephesus to the rich in Ephesus regarding envy would have been clear: avoid its destructive power.

2.2.6. Purity in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*

Purity in antiquity was linked with that which was sacred or holy, and in Ephesus, purity rites were linked to Artemis.¹⁷⁰ This cultural fixture was associated with that which was clean, in place, or in order within the group; conversely, something could be considered profane or unholy if it was dirty, out of place, or outside the group.¹⁷¹ Pausanias described the attendants of Artemis as living in sexual and ritual purity for one year (*Guide to Greece* 8.13.1). Purity rules governed behavior and took the form of oaths, oracles, and other rituals in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*.

Oaths were commitments before men in which a person invoked the name of a god or gods. Consider Anthia's oath at sea, made in the name of Artemis.

I swear to you by the goddess of our fathers the great Artemis of the Ephesians, and this sea we are crossing, and the god who has driven us mad with the exquisite passion for each other, that I will not live or look upon the sun if I am separated from you even for a short time." That was Anthia's oath; Habrocomes swore too, and the occasion made their oaths still more awesome. (1.11.5-6)

¹⁶⁹ Interestingly, Xenophon presents the death of Anchialus as a "fitting penalty for his evil passion."

¹⁷⁰ Steven M. Baugh, "Cult Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal." *JETS* 42. 3 (1999): 443-60, see especially 453-60, regarding the social and cultural expectations in relation to Artemis.

¹⁷¹ For terms linked to purity and pollution, see: Jerome H. Neyrey, "Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and the System of Purity," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996) 82-83. Cf. the purity rituals of the suppliants of Artemis in Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 8.6.11-14. Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 150-51.

Habrocomes also uttered this oath at sea, and alluded to it in his prayer to the Nile for deliverance (4.2.4-6). In the Greek mind, people believed the gods had authority over them, so people uttered oaths in the name of the gods to communicate their commitment to purity before those gods. This also demonstrated their dependence on the gods for assistance to help carry out their oaths.

If a rich person wanted to get advice or make a request of the gods, they would seek an oracle at a specific temple or from a mediator known for providing oracles.¹⁷² As noted previously, Strabo mentions an occasion when a prominent Phocaeen, Artistarcha, received an oracle from Artemis of Ephesus (*Geography* 4.1.4-5). Oracles represented direct messages from the gods, and purity rules dictated that these messages be respected and followed. There are two notable oracles in *Ephesiaca*: the oracle from the temple of Apollo in Colophon that foretold of the trials the couple would endure (1.6), and the response to Anthia's prayer in the precincts of Apis prophesied by the Egyptian children (5.4.10).

Rich people were also obliged to observe other purity rituals. They were to make sacrifices or offerings and show respect to statues of the gods to honor them; failing to do so, as Habrocomes did when he showed disrespect to Eros, would put a person in danger of the vengeance of the gods (1.1.6-2.1). For a positive example, when Habrocomes and Anthia were finally reunited, they visited the temple of Isis in Rhodes, and proclaimed: "To you, greatest goddess, we are grateful for our salvation. Thanks to you, goddess that we esteem most of all, we have reclaimed each other" (5.13.4).¹⁷³ They bowed at the altar and paid homage in her precincts.

Rich Ephesians exposed to *Ephesiaca* knew that those who observed purity rules received mercy and grace, the favor of the gods, and those who violated purity rules put themselves in danger. Purity rules existed for the maintenance of peaceful

¹⁷² Trevor Cunow, *The Oracles of the Ancient World: A Comprehensive Guide* (London: Duckworth Archaeology, 2004) 1-5.

¹⁷³ This citation follows Henderson's translation, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 361.

relationships between the gods and the people. Peer groups exerted tremendous amounts of pressure to ensure their members lived in conformity. The danger for a rich Ephesian tied to purity was not merely losing money, but losing the favor of the gods and/or the people through not following the social and cultural rules.¹⁷⁴

2.2.7. Summary: Xenophon of Ephesus and Conformity to Cultural Rules

Xenophon of Ephesus reinforces the widely accepted cultural rules of the ancient Mediterranean world. His story articulates and solidifies social expectations for the rich in his audience. Six models illustrate this in ancient Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*.

By repeating specific terms and themes, Xenophon of Ephesus emphasizes the importance of preserving honor and avoiding shameful behavior. He illustrates that honorable behavior secures a person's status in society. *Ephesiaca* demonstrates that one's identity was tied primarily to relationships rather than wealth, and that preserving kinship ties would keep a person's place secure within the group. The story also shows that the expectations and obligations of the rich were governed by rules of balanced reciprocity and negotiated exchange, and in turn, for sharing their resources they would enjoy many benefits. Avoiding envy and staying pure are also portrayed as vital for a rich Ephesian to maintain their place in the ancient world.

2.3. *Sitz im Leben* for the Rich in Ephesus in light of *Ephesiaca*

Xenophon of Ephesus depicts rich Ephesians in the first century CE as religiously Greek while also being respectfully Roman. Politics connected them to the Roman authorities, and the desire to preserve peace and provincial authority kept it that way.

Prominent citizens, like Habrocomes, expected to ascend to and retain positions of power for generations. The systems of benefaction and reciprocity

¹⁷⁴ For further insight on the dangers associated with "ritual uncleanness" see: Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966) 8-35; David P. Wright and Hans Hübner, "Unclean and Clean." *ABD* 6 (1992): 729-41.

guaranteed them honor and status in perpetuity for sharing and supplying the needs of their fellow Ephesians in accordance with cultural expectations.

Xenophon of Ephesus also presents rich Ephesians as submitted supremely to Artemis. They were privileged to lead the way in honoring her at festivals, to give her offerings, to serve in her precincts and to offer oblations at every occasion. They worked together, play together, and worshiped together. They honored the goddess both at family functions and community events. They also honored other gods whose statues were placed throughout the city, as the gods were thought to have authority over the affairs of men. The gods spoke through oracles, which should be respected; failing to honor them would put a person at risk.

In *Ephesiaca*, rich Ephesians enjoyed their place in society, ensconced in power and privilege in the capital of the Roman province of Asia. They lavished benefactions in abundance and received honor and benefits in return. Rich Ephesians did not merely follow the cultural rules linked to their honor and status, they modeled conformity and taught them to their children. The rich youth were also trained as *Ephebes* to prepare to serve their city and all of Asia in distinguished roles. In *Ephesiaca*, the rich *owned* Ephesus, and in balanced reciprocity with obligations and expectations, Ephesus *owned* them. Failure to follow these social and cultural rules put people at risk of losing their identity and place in society in relation to the gods and the people.

2.4. Conclusion

This first phase of socio-rhetorical analysis began by scrutinizing primary sources other than Xenophon of Ephesus to establish what is known about the rich in the social setting of Ephesus in order to see what *Ephesiaca* adds to the mix.

We conclude that Xenophon of Ephesus brings the ancient world to life. The storyline of *Ephesiaca* promotes the centrality of Artemis and provides illustrations of rich Ephesians engaging in social realities by leading processions and seeking oracles with more detail than other testimonies from antiquity. Other sources reveal that rich Ephesians were ensconced in positions of power. *Ephesiaca* demonstrates the expectations and obligations of rich Ephesians with more data than other ancient sources.

Additionally, Xenophon of Ephesus illustrates the cultural rules of the ancient Mediterranean world and uses repetition in *Ephesiaca* to emphasize the importance of conformity to those rules. To maintain your honor, preserve your identity, and secure your place in society, you must conform to the cultural expectations tied to your social location. If you possess wealth and status, you are trained to perform your duties and expect honor in return, but you must avoid envy and stay pure by performing rituals dictated by the culture, especially those that honored the hierarchy of gods in the ancient mindset.

Ephesiaca brings the world of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE to life like no other ancient source. Additionally, this social and cultural analysis provides the data for sketching a *Sitz im Leben* of the rich in light of ancient voices and Xenophon of Ephesus. This completes the first phase of analysis and sets the stage for looking at two texts, 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*, in light of this context.

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER THREE

Women with Wealth and 1 Timothy 2:9-10: Godly Decorum and Good Deeds

The first passage we will examine in light of *Ephesiaca* is 1 Tim 2:9-10. This text provides instruction regarding the adornment and behavior of women. The language indicates that women with wealth are specifically under consideration. Though the words in this text point to cultural realities in the ancient Mediterranean world, some terms are not found in the rest of the NT or the LXX, so their function in the Ephesian context is unclear. When scholars have scrutinized these terms in light of other ancient documents and inscriptions from the greater Greco-Roman world, their explanations have been mixed.¹⁷⁵ Because there is considerable lexical overlap between 1 Tim 2:9-10 and *Ephesiaca*, further analysis may shed new light on how Ephesian women understood the message of this text.

Following the methodology chosen for this study, the analysis will proceed through four phases. Inner texture will present the Greek text, a translation, and research on how ancient sources have contributed to our knowledge of the terms in the text (3.1). Intertexture analysis will explore common terms between 1 Tim 2:9-10 and *Ephesiaca* (3.2). Ideological texture will consider the teaching in 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of the perceived social location of the author and in relationship to the audience and the culture as found in *Ephesiaca* (3.3).¹⁷⁶ Lastly, sacred texture will examine the findings in light of the rest of the NT (3.4). The chapter will conclude with a fresh interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of *Ephesiaca* (3.5).

¹⁷⁵ While scholars may hold different views on reading this passage, there does not appear to be an argument that women with wealth are in view. Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 46; Countryman, *The Rich Christian*, 118; Sharon Hodgkin Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991) 125-28; Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 437; Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 199; Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 201; Alan Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Tim 2:8-15 in Social Context." *Int* 41 (1987): 19-31; Fiore, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 70; Ben Witherington III, *Jesus and Money: A Guide for Times of Financial Crisis* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2010) 125.

¹⁷⁶ Outside this study, to examine the ideological texture of a parallel text related to women in 1 Corinthians, see Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 117-19.

3.1. Inner Texture of 1 Tim 2:9-10

Inner texture analysis inspects words in a text as mediums of communication. This step explores words in their context before considering the meaning of the text.

3.1.1. Text and Translation

Table #1: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 2:9-10

<p>⁹ Ὡσαύτως [καί] γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδους καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, ¹⁰ ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν. (NA²⁷)</p>	<p>⁹ Also that women should dress themselves modestly and decently in suitable clothing, not with their hair braided, or with gold, pearls, or expensive clothes, ¹⁰ but with good works, as is proper for women who profess reverence for God. (NRSV)</p>
---	--

3.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources

The words in this text carry a message to women about adornment. This teaching is located within the literary context of 1 Tim 2:8-15, which speaks to the behavior of men and women ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, “in every place” (v. 8),¹⁷⁷ and specifically in the context of prayer. Women in the community of faith are to demonstrate σωφροσύνης, “modesty or chastity” (vv. 9, 15), and the language implies a distinct teaching for women regarding their decorum and deeds in 1 Tim 2:9-10.

This teaching is directed toward γυναῖκας, “women or wives,” within the household of God. In antiquity this term is used broadly to encompass females ranging from unmarried virgins to elderly married women.¹⁷⁸ They are instructed to κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, “dress or adorn themselves,” in καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ, “respectable

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Mal 1:11; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 203. In his view, the intertextuality may be designed to create a sense of God’s presence as “regularity” as in numerous uses of the phrase in OT in reference to the cultus. It is a way of “normalizing” the behavior enjoined by linking it to God’s expectations wherever God’s people are and wherever worship takes place. For further exploration of this point, see: Hans W. Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtbildungen: Studien zu den Pastoralbriefen* (Hamburg: Reich, 1965) 48; Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 130; Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 130-31.

¹⁷⁸ The rendering of γυναῖκας dates to the fifth century BCE: Euripides, *Orestes* 309 of Electra. Cf. BAGD, 168. Contra: Hodgkin Gritz, 158, posits that γυναῖκας only be translated, wives.

or suitable clothing or apparel,” **μετὰ αἰδους καὶ σωφροσύνης**, “with modesty and decency.” The instructions are further clarified in two ways:¹⁷⁹ first, with a negative list: **μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ**, “not with braided hair or not in plaits, with gold, pearls, or expensive clothes;” and then a positive one: **ἀλλ’ ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι’ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν**, “but with good works or deeds fitting women who profess piety to God.”

Such instructions could be understood in as many different contexts as they are read. Thus, in this phase of analysis, which examines what the text says, we will explore these words in antiquity in three sections as they occur: (1) adornment in the ancient Mediterranean world; (2) prohibitions; and, (3) expectations. In each of these sections, we will explore the language in light of ancient resources and then later in light of *Ephesiaca*.

3.1.2.1. Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World

ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδους καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς

The term, **κοσμέω**, meaning “adorn or decorate,” describes any female using **κοσμῶ**, “finery,” for beautification dating back as early as Hesiod (eighth century BCE). He used it repeatedly to depict how the goddesses clothed themselves with elaborate decorum.

And the goddess bright-eyed Athene girded and *clothed* (**κόσμησε**) her, and the divine Graces and queenly Persuasion put necklaces of gold upon her, and the rich-haired Hours crowned her head with spring flowers. And Pallas Athene bedecked her form with all manners of *finery* (**κόσμῳ**). (*Works and Days* 69-76)

Such adornment of the female form celebrates the beauty of the face, hair and body with precious items such as gold, silver, or flowers.

In his writings, Hesiod reveals yet another reason for rich female adornment in ancient Greek thinking.

¹⁷⁹ For the definitions of the terms in these instructions, see: *BAGD*, 3, 22, 306, 358, 376, 445, 491, 667, 690, 699, 802, 888.

And the goddess bright-eyed Athene girded and *clothed* (κόσμησε) her with silvery raiment, and down from her head she spread with her hands a brodered veil, a wonder to see; and she, Pallas Athene, put about her head lovely garlands, flowers of new-grown herbs ...

he brought her out, delighting in the *finery* (κόσμῳ) which the bright-eyed daughter of a mighty father had given her, to the place where the other gods and men were. And wonder took hold of the deathless gods and mortal men when they saw that which was sheer guile, not to be withstood by men. (*Theogony* 573, 587)

Adornment captivated the gods *and* men; neither could withstand its allure. This would become an avenue for women to gain power in the patriarchal ancient world.

Raymond Collins uncovers a parallel sentiment from ancient Judaism in *The Testament of the Reuben*: spurious motives were suspected of women who adorned themselves elaborately (c. 137-107 BCE).¹⁸⁰

By reason of their lacking authority or power over man, [women] scheme treacherously how they might entice him to themselves by means of their looks...Accordingly, order your wives and your daughters not to adorn their heads and their appearances so as to deceive men's sound minds. (5:1, 5)

I. H. Marshall and Towner believe external adornment was often linked to enticement or deceit in the first century CE, citing this testimony of Philo.¹⁸¹

When [women] heard this, they ceased to think of or to pay the very slightest regard to their character for purity of life, being quite devoid of all proper education, and accordingly they consented, though during all the rest of their lives they had put on a hypocritical appearance of modesty, and so now they adorned themselves with costly garments, and necklaces, and all those other appendages with which women are accustomed to set themselves off, and they devoted all their attention to enhancing their natural beauty, and making it more brilliant (for the object of their pursuit was not an unimportant one, being the alluring of the young men who were well inclined to be seduced), and so they went forth into public. (*On the Virtues* 39)

Bruce Winter describes this trend toward elaborate adornment as evidence of the appearance of the “new Roman women” and identifies them in relationship to the dress codes in Roman law and society. Highlighting the sumptuary laws, *lex Fannia* (161 BCE) and *lex Licinia sumptuaria* (143 BCE), which represent Rome's proactive efforts to define modest adornment for women, Winter concludes that the women in view were simply not following the rules (cf. Plutarch, *Advice to the*

¹⁸⁰ Raymond F. Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002) 68.

¹⁸¹ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 450; Cf. Seneca, *On Benefits* 7.9. Cf. John W. Basore, ed. and trans., *Seneca: Moral Essays III*. LCL, vol. 310 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

Bride and Groom 139C).¹⁸² They were exceeding the bounds of that which was socially and culturally appropriate.

An ancient perspective on this alternative behavior surfaces in a letter from Seneca to his mother (c. 41-49 CE).¹⁸³

Unchastity, the greatest evil of our time, has never classed you with the great majority of women. Jewels have not moved you, nor pearls . . . you have not been perverted by the imitation of worse kind of women that leads even the virtuous into pitfalls . . . You have never blushed for the number of children, as if it mocked your age . . . You never tried to conceal your pregnancy as though it was indecent, nor have you crushed the hope of children that were being nurtured in your body. You have never defiled your face with paints and cosmetics. Never have you fancied the kind of dress that exposed no greater nakedness by being removed. Your only ornament, the kind of beauty that time does not tarnish, is the great honor of modesty. (*Ad Helvium* 16.3-5)

Exhibiting chastity was the goal of modest adornment for honorable Roman women. By the first century CE, it was under attack from “new Roman women” whose unchastity, according to Seneca, was “the greatest evil” of his time.

The author probably chose the term αἰδώς, “discretion,” to discourage respectable women from clothing themselves in sexually enticing ways; it occurs nowhere else in the NT and only a few times in the LXX.¹⁸⁴ Paul Zanker points out that a modest Roman woman wore a στολή, “a robe,” as a symbol of chastity to differentiate herself from the ἐταῖραι, “courtesans or prostitutes,” who wore the *toga* in society (cf. Horace, *Satires* 1.1.62-63).¹⁸⁵ Thus, the term καταστολή coupled with the adjective κοσμίῳ and μετὰ αἰδους appears to call women to adorn themselves with sexually modest clothing versus seductive or revealing apparel.

Epictetus sums up this perspective on the decorum of women: “Make them understand that they are honored for nothing else but appearing decent and modest”

¹⁸² Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 97-109. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, vol. 9, TZNT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 21. Jeremias also reads this text as calling women to follow the Roman municipal modesty codes: “die Gemeindeordnung Schamhaftigkeit in der Kleidung der Frau.”

¹⁸³ Cf. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 98.

¹⁸⁴ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 449. Cf. Ezek 23:20 and 3 Macc 1:19, 4:5. In *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 206, Towner points out that αἰδώς is often linked with σωφροσύνης in the paradigm of the respectable matron, cf. TLNT 1:41-44; TDNT 1:169-71; and S.R. Llewelyn, ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of Greek Inscriptions and Papyri*, Vol. 3 (North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1978) §8, 11, 13.

¹⁸⁵ Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988) 165. The

(*The Enchiridion* xl).¹⁸⁶ In the first century CE, Roman women were expected to dress modestly and “new Roman women” were appearing whose adornment was pushing the bounds of what was culturally acceptable for women of status. “In classical antiquity, you were what you wore.”¹⁸⁷ Thus, dress codes were necessary for women. Based on Clifford Ando’s research on imperial ideology and provincial loyalty, Winter thinks the situation would have been the same in Ephesus as in Rome. Consequently, the scholarly consensus understands 1 Tim 2:9 as calling Ephesian women to respect Roman codes for female decorum.¹⁸⁸

3.1.2.2. Prohibitions

μη̄ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῶ πολυτελεῖ

The text urges women to avoid specific types of adornment: μη̄ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῶ πολυτελεῖ, that is, “braids or plaits with gold, pearls, and costly clothing.” The common explanation for this prohibition associates these hairstyles or forms of ornamentation with ἑταῖραι.¹⁸⁹

A closer look at ornamentation in the Greco-Roman world in the first century CE reveals that it was becoming more widely accepted for modest women to wear gold, purple, to dye their hair or wear it elaborately; however, the line between appropriate and inappropriate adornment was unclear.¹⁹⁰ Valerius Maximus (14-37 CE) attests that liberty had turned to license: sumptuous adornment had become the primary joy and focus of women (*Memorable Doings and Sayings* 2.1.5).¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁶ Note the use of the term αἰδώς in 1 Tim 2:9 and Epictetus, *The Enchiridion* xl: “ἐπ’ οὐδένι ἄλλῳ τιμῶνται ἢ τῷ κόσμῳ φαίνεσθαι καὶ αἰδήμονες.”

¹⁸⁷ Thomas A.J. McGinn, *Prostitution, Sexuality and the Law in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) 162.

¹⁸⁸ Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 97. Cf. Clifford Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000) 233. See also *IvE* 6.14, which honors the καταστολῆς καὶ σωφροσύνης, “modesty and decency,” of the wife of Diodorus, the gymnasiarch. Cf. Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 127, who reads 1 Tim 2:9-10 as a Christianization of prevailing cultural dress codes.

¹⁸⁹ Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 97-122; McGinn, *Prostitution, Sexuality and the Law*, 154-70.

¹⁹⁰ Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 103. Cf. Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 5.12.

¹⁹¹ In the words of Valerius Maximus: “a woman’s only joy and glory was in her dress and ornaments that were called *mundus muliebris*.” cf. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 103-04.

In addition to the sumptuary laws that dictated discreet behavior, Rome took other measures to define modesty in first century CE. Susan Wood points out that Rome would illustrate the standards linked to dress and hair on coinage and statues.¹⁹² The fashion in which imperial wives were presented on coinage and statues modeled appropriate and modest adornment. There is evidence of this throughout the Empire *and* in Ephesus. Peter Scherrer cites a statue of Livia, the wife of Augustus, located in one of the terraced or slope houses in Ephesus, homes where the rich families were thought to have resided. Livia's hairstyle was uncovered on the statue as if to encourage others to imitate it.¹⁹³

The first prohibition regarding *πλέγμασιν*, “plaits or braids,” points to a hairstyle, though the term appears only here in the NT. It comes from the root word, *πλέκω*, referring to “something twisted.”¹⁹⁴ In search of the meaning of *πλέκω*, most scholars point to 1 Peter 3:3-4, though different words are used there: *ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν*, “braided hair.” Scholars presume this prohibition is calling rich women in the ancient world to avoid ostentatious or elaborate hairstyles.¹⁹⁵

Steven M. Baugh describes Roman hairstyle trends citing Juvenal in his sketch of Ephesus in the first century CE.¹⁹⁶

Greek hairstyles for women during this period were for the most part simple affairs: hair was parted in the middle, pinned simply in the back or held in place with a scarf or headband. Roman coiffures were similar until the principate. The women of the imperial household originated new styles; by the Trajanic period they had developed into elaborate curls, braids, high wigs, pins, and hair ornaments that were quickly copied by the well-to-do throughout the empire: “See the tall edifice rise up on her head in serried tiers and storeys.” (*Satires* 6)

¹⁹² Susan E. Wood, *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 69* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 1.

¹⁹³ Peter Scherrer, *Ephesus: The New Guide* (Turkey: Austrian Archaeological Institute, 2000) 199, fig. 2. Cf. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 104. Statues like this in the terraced houses testify to the respect rich Ephesians had for Rome.

¹⁹⁴ BAGD, 667. Cf. *πλέκω* in Matt 27:29, Mark 15:17, John 19:2 referring to the “twisted” crown of thorns.

¹⁹⁵ Jerome D. Quinn and William C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*, ECC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 196; Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 200; Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus*, 406.

¹⁹⁶ Steven M. Baugh, “A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005) 47-48.

Jerome Quinn and William Wacker prefer the word “coiffure” in translating the plural πλέγμασιν based on its absence in the NT and LXX, and its use in Euripides, Plato, Philo, and Josephus, where the term points to items woven elaborately or with intertwined ornamentation.¹⁹⁷ In the prohibited coiffure the hair may have been braided or woven with valuables.

A reading suggested by William Mounce may support this view. He understands the structure of the prohibition phrase, μή ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, as referring to only two negative characteristics rather than multiple prohibitions because of the placement of the ἢ which is repeated twice: πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις, “braided hair that is adorned with gold or pearls, ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, “or costly clothing.”¹⁹⁸ The language seems to prohibit some type of coiffure, though the function of πλέγμασιν has eluded scholars.

The first form of ornamentation, χρυσίῳ, “gold,” often refers to coins in the NT. Gold is among the decorum to be avoided in 1 Peter 3:3, though μαργαρίταις, “pearls,” are not mentioned there. No doubt, gold and pearls were valuable.¹⁹⁹ Johnson suggests this prohibition may have been linked to their cost or showiness.²⁰⁰ Lorenz Oberlinner believes it was to prevent social divisions between the rich and poor in the church.²⁰¹ Again views are mixed on locating the meaning of these terms.

Winter links adornment with pearls in antiquity to shameful sumptuousness, citing ancient examples such as Juvenal.²⁰² “There is nothing that a woman will not permit herself to do, nothing that she deems shameful, when she encircles her neck

¹⁹⁷ Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 196. Cf. Euripides, *Ion* 1393; Plato, *Laws* 734E, *Timaeus* 79D; Philo, *Drunkennes* 101, *Dreams* 1.204, 206, *Life of Moses* 2.111; Josephus, *Antiquities* 2.220, 221, 224, 246 and 12.72, 79. Cf. The shift in the NIV from “braided hair or gold or pearls” (1984) to “elaborate hairstyles or gold or pearls” (2010) may reflect agreement with Quinn and Wacker’s rendering.

¹⁹⁸ William D. Mounce, *The Pastoral Epistles*, vol. 46, WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000) 114.

¹⁹⁹ Both gold and pearls, presumably as adornments, appear as part of the cargo of the merchants of the harlot city of Rev 17:4, 18:12. Later in 21:21, gold and pearls also appear as beautiful features in the New Jerusalem.

²⁰⁰ Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 200. Cf. Jam 2:2; 1 Pet 3:1-3.

²⁰¹ Lorenz Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994) 90; cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 451.

²⁰² Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, 104-05.

with green emeralds, and fastens huge pearls to her elongated ears” (*Satires* 6.458-9). Modest women avoided such accoutrements.

The final prohibition, ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, “expensive apparel or costly clothing,” connotes either imprudent ostentation or apparel associated with the prostitutes or promiscuous women. Towner supports this view citing Philo.²⁰³

For two women live within each individual among us, both unfriendly and hostile to one another, filling the whole abode of the soul with envy, and jealousy, and contention; of these we love the one looking upon her as being mild and tractable, and very dear to and very closely connected with ourselves, and she is called pleasure; but the other we detest, deeming her unmanageable, savage, fierce, and most completely hostile, and her name is virtue. Accordingly, the one comes to us luxuriously dressed in the guise of a harlot and prostitute, with mincing steps, rolling her eyes about with excessive licentiousness and desire, by which baits she entraps the souls of the young, looking about with a mixture of boldness and impudence, holding up her head, and raising herself above her natural height, fawning and giggling, having the hair of her head dressed with most superfluous elaborateness, having her eyes penciled, her eyebrows covered over, using incessant warm baths, painted with a fictitious colour, exquisitely dressed with costly garments, richly embroidered, adorned with armlets, and bracelets, and necklaces, and all other ornaments which can be made of gold, and precious stones, and all kinds of female decorations; loosely girdled, breathing of most fragrant perfumes, thinking the whole market her home; a marvel to be seen in the public roads, out of the scarcity of any genuine beauty, pursuing a bastard elegance. (*The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain* 21)

This ancient description of two contrasting women—pleasure and virtue—aptly sums up the scholarly consensus on interpreting 1 Tim 2:9-10. The prohibitions regarding adornment appear to call women to virtue rather than pleasure. Shortly, we will test this notion in light of *Ephesiaca*.

3.1.2.3. Expectations

ἀλλ ὃ πρέπει γυναῖξιν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι ἔργων ἀγαθῶν

The text further clarifies the decorum of modest women. They should adorn themselves with good deeds befitting women who profess reverence to God.

While evidence may show the term adornment had been used to refer to more than clothing and ornamentation in antiquity, the question remains how the

²⁰³ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 209. Cf. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 200.

expectations of the modest woman in 1 Tim 2:9-10 compare to the cultural norm for Roman women living in Ephesus in the first century CE.

We see an expanded usage of the term, **κοσμέω**, beyond decorum to deeds by the Jewish scribe Ben Sirach (second century BCE), who refers to the “wondrous deeds” of Elijah.

How glorious you were, Elijah, in your wondrous deeds! Whose glory is equal to yours? You raised a corpse from death and from Hades, by the word of the Most High. You sent kings down to destruction, and famous men from their sickbeds. You heard rebuke at Sinai and judgments of vengeance at Horeb. You anointed kings to inflict retribution, and prophets to succeed you. You were taken up by a whirlwind of fire, in a chariot with horses of fire. At the appointed time, it is written, you are destined to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and to restore the tribes of Jacob. Happy are those who saw you and were adorned (**κεκοσμημένοι**) with your love! For we also shall surely live! (Sirach 48:4-11)

Likewise, Diodorus Siculus, pointed past external array (first century BCE).

The Corinthians, concluding that it was only right to assist people who were offshoots of themselves, voted to send as general Timoleon, son of Timaenetus, a man of highest prestige amongst his fellow citizens for bravery and sagacity as a general and, in a word, splendidly equipped with every virtue. (16.65.2)

This expression, “splendidly equipped,” refers to adornment with qualities highly esteemed as virtuous and appears to echo the call of the Stoic philosophers.

The Stoics urged their listeners to adorn themselves with four cardinal virtues: **σοφία, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη**, translated respectively as “wisdom, courage, uprightness and chastity.”²⁰⁴ In actuality, men often focused on titles and positions, and the women primarily attended to their ornamentation, which led Stoics such as Epictetus to ask (*Fragment 18*): “Can it be that the human is the only creature without a special virtue but must resort to his hair, clothes and ancestors?”²⁰⁵ Rather than developing inward virtues, wealthy people tended to focus on outward appearance and reputation. They would weave gold in their hair, wear costly garb such purple clothing, and pay for inscriptions and statues that lauded their **εὐσέβεια** to Rome, and in Ephesus to Rome *and* Artemis (cf. *IvE* 430, 492).

²⁰⁴ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 207.

²⁰⁵ Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 68.

The idea of reverence for **θεοσέβειαν**, “piety to God,” must be understood in light of **εὐσέβεια**, which in Ephesus commonly referred to works expected of those in priestly service to Artemis.²⁰⁶ Female priesthoods in Ephesus had four different titles: **ιερεία Ἀρτέμιδος**, **κοσμήτειρα**, **πρύτανις**, **ἀρχιερεία Ἀσίας**, translated respectively as “priestess of Artemis, Kosmeteira, Prytanis and High Priestess of Asia.” These roles all entailed financial commitments for underwriting cult activities at the Artemisium, putting up decorations for cult festivals, and ensuring the imperial cultic duties were managed well.²⁰⁷ One inscription from the **κουρήτες** list, *IvE* 1017.3, celebrates the **εὐσέβεια** of Vedia Marcia, and acknowledges that she held three of the four female roles (c. 97-100 CE).

ἐπι πρυτάνεως Οὐδίας Πο[πλίου]
 θυγατρὸς Μαρκίας ἱερῆς καὶ ἀ[ρχιερεί-]
 ας τῆς Ἀσίας· κουρήτες εὐσεβε[ῖς φιλο-]
 σέβαστοι· Γ. Γεμίνιος Παῦλος· Α. []
 Νείκων· Βάσσος Με[ν]εκλέους τοῦ []
 ος τῆς φορτουνάτος [Μ]ενεκλέους· [Που-]
 τούμιος Πρεῖσχ[ο]ς· Π. Βήδιος [Διαδου-]
 μενός· ἱερούργοι· Π. Κορνήλιος [Ἀρισ-]
 των ἱεροσκόπος· Μουνδικίος [ἱερο-]
 φάντης· Ἐπικράτης ἱεροκηρυξ· [Ἄττικὸς]
 ἐπι θυμνατροῦ· Τ[ρ]όφιμος σπον[δαύλης]

In contrast, but using similar language as found in 1 Tim 2:9-10, Dibelius and Conzelmann cite *Pseudo-Clement* (second century CE) which features the adornment of the prudent Christian woman: “The prudent woman adorns herself for the Son of God as her bridegroom, clothed with holy light as a beautiful mantle, dressed in chastity, wearing precious pearls, the prudent words, and she appears in bright light, when her mind shines” (*Homilies* 13.16).²⁰⁸ Beyond apparel, the prudent woman is adorned with words. Her clothing matches her message. Her piety and commitment to God shines through her lips and lifestyle.

²⁰⁶ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 171-75, for excursus on **εὐσέβεια**. For examples of **εὐσέβεια** to Artemis or the Imperial cult, see: *IvE* 11, 17, 21, 24, 26, 27, 203, 217, 233, 236, 237, 296, 302-4a, 314/5, 666a, 680, 683a, 690, 702, 824, 853, 886, 892, 941/2, 957, 989a, 1001-6, 1008-10, 1012-24, 1028-30, 1032-8, 1040-44, 1047-51/3, 1065-7/8, 1084, 1352, 1380, 1480, 1538, 1565, 1578b, 1579, 1588, 1598, 1859, 2090, 2426, 3041, 3059, 3118, 3263, 3408, 3419, 4336.

²⁰⁷ Baugh, “A Foreign World,” 35-36. Cf. *IvE* 27; Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus*, 39-72.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 46.

Clement of Alexandria (second century CE) also urges the rich to show their faith by deploying their riches through good works.²⁰⁹

It seems to me an act far kinder than servile attention to the rich and praise that does them harm, if we share the burden of their life and work out salvation for them by every possible means; first by begging them from God, who unfailingly and gladly accords such gifts to His own children, and then by healing their souls with reason, through the Savior's grace, enlightening them and leading them on to the possession of the truth. For only he who has reached the truth and is distinguished in good works (*ἐργοῖς ἀγαθοῖς*) shall carry off the prize of eternal life. (*The Rich Man's Salvation* 1.6-7)

The good works in view are acts of generosity toward God's people. Rather than hoarding or flaunting their possessions, the rich were urged to share them; gold should be given away for the good of God's people, as Clement continues.

For he who holds possessions and gold and silver and houses as gifts of God, and from them ministers to the salvation of men for God the giver, and knows that he possesses them for his brothers' sakes rather than his own, and lives superior to the possession of them; who is not the slave of his possessions, and does not carry them about in his soul, nor limit and circumscribe his own life in them, but is ever striving to do some noble and divine deed; and who, if he is fated ever to be deprived of them, is able to bear their loss with a cheerful exactly as he bore their abundance—this is the man who is blessed by the Lord and called poor in spirit, a ready inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, not a rich man who cannot obtain life. (16.5)

In these statements, Clement provides early insight as to how the rich were to work out their salvation: by deploying the possessions in their care to serve God's people.

Interestingly, in Clement's thinking, the rich were to manage riches wisely with *σωφροσύνης*, "moderation,"²¹⁰ and *εὐσέβεια* (*italics* mine).

A man must say good-bye, then, to the injurious things he has, not to those that can actually contribute to his advantage if he knows the right use of them; and advantage comes from those that are managed with wisdom, *moderation* and *piety*. We must reject what is hurtful... (15.8-9)

Clement seems to echo 1 Tim 2:9-10, calling the rich to show their faith in God through generous deeds. These examples from Clement serve as a vivid contrast to the good works celebrated in Ephesian inscriptions, where the rich were praised not for *θεοσέβειαν*, but rather for their *εὐσέβεια* to Artemis and/or the Imperial cult.

²⁰⁹ Translation of Clement of Alexandria follows: G.W. Butterworth, ed. and trans. *The Rich Man's Salvation by Clement of Alexandria*. LCL, vol. 92 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919). Cf. Robert A. Markus, *Christianity in the Roman World* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1974) 45-47.

²¹⁰ Scholars seem to focus on function of *σωφροσύνης* in the Greco-Roman world, but this term also appears frequently in the LXX and the NT: 4 Macc 1:3, 6, 18, 30, 31; 2:2, 16, 18; 3:17; 5:23; 15:17; Wis 8:7; Mark 5:15; Luke 8:35; Acts 26:25; Rom 12:3; 2 Cor 5:13; 1 Tim 3:2; 2 Tim 1:7; Tit 1:8; 2:2, 4, 5, 6, 12; 1 Pet 4:7.

3.1.3. Summary

Inner texture analysis has looked at the words in the text in light of ancient evidence. As a result, three interpretive issues remain unclear in reading this passage.

First, regarding adornment: Should we understand the call for women in the household of God to dress modestly as a call to comply with Jewish cultural norms? Should we consider 1 Tim 2:9-10 as reinforcing cultural expectations for modest Roman women as outlined in household codes? Or might these instructions refer to another social reality in Ephesus?

Second, on prohibitions: Should we interpret these terms as referring to the “new Roman women” in the Greco-Roman world of the first century CE? Or perhaps should we view them as a call to avoid sumptuous apparel or ostentatious hairstyles worn by prostitutes or courtesans? Or may something else be in view?

Third, pertaining to expectations: Should we consider them as consistent with the cultural norms for rich Ephesian women who served Artemis and the Imperial cult? Or might the text urge radically different behavior for women within the household of God as compared to their social and cultural setting?

A look at 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of *Ephesiaca* may offer suggestions for resolving these issues. This is the task of intertexture analysis, which comes next.

3.2. Intertexture

Intertexture will seek to illuminate the terminology of this text in light of *Ephesiaca* for the purpose of offering another ancient perspective on how an Ephesian audience may have heard this language in its cultural context. This phase of analysis does not argue for direct interplay between 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*, but rather appraises the words that are present in both *texts* as a basis for considering them in the milieu of Ephesus in the first century CE.

3.2.1. Terms Common to 1 Tim 2:9-10 and *Ephesiaca*

The language of 1 Tim 2:9-10 is present in *Ephesiaca*. These common Greek terms will be examined below: **γυναῖκας, κοσμέω/κόσμος, πλέγμασιν, χρυσίω, σωφροσύνης, πολυτελεῖ, πρέπει, ἔργων, ἀγαθῶν, and θεοσέβειαν.**

3.2.2. Analysis of Common Terminology

First, **γυναῖκας**, is the most common overlapping term between 1 Tim 2:9-10 and *Ephesiaca*. Of the thirty-one total instances, it is translated eighteen times as “wife or wives,” eleven times as “woman,” once referring to “an old woman,” and on one occasion the term refers to Anthia when she was yet unmarried (1.7.3). These usages in *Ephesiaca* reflect its general reception in antiquity: **γυναῖκας** primarily refers to a wife or a married woman but its broader usage includes any female from an unmarried girl of marriageable age to an elderly woman.²¹¹

The second term, **κοσμέω**, “adorn,” occurs eight times in the verb form in *Ephesiaca*. It appears in four contexts: three times in reference to adorning a corpse for burial, three times portraying adornment for a lover, once linked to wearing the apparel of a prostitute, and once related to dressing to imitate Artemis in the annual procession to the Artemisium.²¹² The noun form, adornment, also appears eight times in *Ephesiaca*.²¹³ This term refers to the female finery or decorations and gold in each of the four aforementioned contexts, which are explored at length below.

²¹¹ In *Ephesiaca*, Anthia leads the procession described not as a **γυνή** but with the related term **παρθένος**, an unmarried girl of marriageable age seeking to become a wife. The purpose of the procession appears, in part, to be for girls of marriageable age to find a mate. In antiquity, unmarried girls of marriageable age can be referred to as **παρθένος** or with the term **γυναῖκας**. This is the case with Anthia, as **γυνή** is used of her in *Ephesiaca* 1.7.3, before her marriage. The terms appear interchangeably in antiquity and in *Ephesiaca*.

²¹² The term **κοσμήσει** appears in 2.7.5 linked to decking out a corpse; **κοσμήσας** appears in 5.7.1 referring to dressing as a prostitute with lots of gold; and **κεκοσμημένος** appears in 1.8.3 related to Ares adornment for his lover Aphrodite; **κεκοσμημένας** appears in 1.2.2 linked to Anthia processing sumptuously adorned; **ἐκόσμησε** appears in 3.9.8 as lavishly adorned for burial; **ἐκεκόσμητος** appears in 1.2.4 referring to the girls in the procession adorned as for lovers, and in 3.5.1 referring to Anthia adorned in bridal array; and, **ἐκόσμει** appears in 3.7.4 referring to Anthia adorned with lots of gold for burial.

²¹³ Of the eight instances: **κόσμον** appears in 3.7.4; 3.8.3; 3.8.4; 3.9.8; **κόσμος** appears in 1.2.5; 1.3.1; 3.8.3; and **κόσμη** appears in 3.5.1.

It was common in antiquity to adorn a corpse richly for burial, and this cultural phenomenon occurs in *Ephesiaca*.²¹⁴ Perilaus had planned to marry Anthia, and just prior to their wedding, he found her dead (or so he thought). So he dressed her in fine clothes and adorned her with finery and gold and placed her body in a tomb as vividly portrayed in this scene.²¹⁵

Meanwhile some pirates heard that a girl had been given a lavish burial and that a lot of female finery (κόσμος) as well as much silver and gold was interred with her. After nightfall, they went to the tomb, carried off the finery (κόσμον), and saw that Anthia was still alive. Thinking this was too great a windfall, they raised her up and wanted to take her away. But she rolled at their feet and repeatedly entreated them. "Gentlemen, whoever you are," she said, "take away this finery (κόσμος), all there is of it, and everything buried with me, but spare my body." (3.8.3-4)

While *Ephesiaca* illustrates the cultural institution of elaborately adorning female corpses with finery, Xenophon of Ephesus places greater emphasis on female decorum related to certain occasions or to send certain messages. For instance, when Anthia was on display in front of the whorehouse, the pimp "dressed her up (κοσμήσας) in a beautiful costume and lots of gold" with the hope of getting much money for her as a prostitute (5.7.1). Such adornment, though not described in detail, advertised immodesty.

Xenophon of Ephesus also presents bridal adornment in a manner that follows ancient cultural norms that celebrated the modesty and purity of marriage. This is evident in the scene that describes Anthia's adornment in preparation for her marriage to Perilaus (3.5.1.3). For a modern parallel, we might liken this to the elaborate yet modest white wedding dress that represents customary bridal array in the modern Western world.

The final usages of this term surface both in the verb and noun forms in reference to the adornment of Anthia as she led the annual procession to the Artemesium.

²¹⁴ Rick Jones, "Backwards and Forwards in Roman Burial." *JRA* 6 (1993): 427-32.

²¹⁵ See Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 297, for this quote. Others in this chapter follow his translation.

A local festival for Artemis was underway, and from the city to her shrine, a distance of seven stades, all the girls had to march sumptuously adorned (**κοσμημένας**), as did all the epebes...(1.2.2)

The procession marched along in file, first the sacred objects, torches, baskets, and incense, followed by horses, dogs, and hunting equipment, some if it martial, most of it peaceful <...> each of the girls was adorned (**έκεκόσμητο**) as for a lover. Heading the line of girls was Anthia, daughter of Megamedes and Euipe, locals. Anthia's beauty was marvelous and far surpassed the other girls. She was fourteen, her body was blossoming with shapeliness, and the adornment (**κόσμος**) of her dress enhanced her grace. (1.2.4-5)

Often when seeing her at the shrine, the Ephesians worshiped her as Artemis, so also at the sight of her on this occasion the crowd cheered... (1.2.7)

In the festival for Artemis, customs called for the wearing of specific attire to honor the goddess who *owned* Ephesus. Because of her exceptional beauty and prominent parents, Anthia leads the way in the procession. Georges Dalmeyda proclaims, "*Anthia représente, en effet, Artémis.*"²¹⁶

In appearing *as* Artemis, Anthia also wore her hair in a specific way.

Interestingly, the term that describes her hairstyle is the same root word used in 1 Tim 2:9-10, **πλέγμα**.

Her hair was blonde, mostly loose, only little of it braided (**πεπλεγμένη**), and moving as the breezes took it. Her eyes were vivacious, bright like a beauty's but forbidding like a chaste girl's; her clothing was a belted purple tunic, knee-length and falling loose over the arms, and over it a fawnskin with a quiver attached, arrows <...>, javelins in hand, dogs following behind. (1.2.6)

Previously, scholars have broadly viewed this term as braided or plaited hair associated with immodest or ostentatious women, and they have not connected this rare term in *Ephesiaca* with 1 Tim 2:9-10. In the Ephesian context, Xenophon of Ephesus uses it to refer to a hairstyle or coiffure worn by those who served and desired to imitate Artemis.

As mentioned previously, O'Sullivan suggests a date for *Ephesiaca* in the first century CE rather than the second century CE.²¹⁷ Murphy-O'Connor adds this comment: "Anthia's dress and accoutrements in no way resemble the cult statues of

²¹⁶ Georges Dalmeyda, *Xenophon d'Éphèse. Les Éphésiaques ou le Roman d'Habrocomès et d'Anthia* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926) 5, translated, "Anthia is, indeed, Artemis!"

²¹⁷ O'Sullivan, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, 169.

Ephesian Artemis that are dated to the second century CE.”²¹⁸ Harland mentions a surviving statue of Artemis that seems to match the description Anthia in the procession in *Ephesiaca*.²¹⁹ Furthermore, Hägg offers evidence that Anthia’s description matches extant statuettes of Artemis from the first century CE.²²⁰ Taken together, these samplings of archaeological evidence suggest that this depiction of Anthia as Artemis fits in the first century CE.

The term, **πλέκω**, “weave or plait,” also appears in the bridal chamber of Anthia and Habrocomes.

The chamber had been prepared for them: a golden bed had been spread with purple sheets, and above the bed a Babylonian canopy had been finely embroidered: there were Cupids at play, some attending to Aphrodite, who was also represented, some riding mounted on sparrows, some plaiting (**πλέκοντες**) garlands, some bearing flowers. These were on one part of the canopy; on the other was Ares, not armed but garlanded and wearing a fine cloak, dressed for his lover Aphrodite; Eros, holding his lighted torch, was leading him on his way. Under the canopy itself they brought Anthia and Habrocomes, put her on her bed, and closed the doors. (1.8.2-3)

While it is unclear exactly what the plaiting or braiding garlands looked like, Xenophon of Ephesus employs this word in depicting the realm of the gods.²²¹

The next term, **χρυσίον**, “gold,” occurs fourteen times in *Ephesiaca*. It describes the bedspread in the bridal suite of Anthia and Habrocomes (1.8.2). In four instances, gold serves as the primary provision for a person taking a journey and sometimes becomes the target of pirates (1.10.4; 1.13.1; 2.7.3; 4.3.2). Also, gold was gift that Anthia and Habrocomes dedicated in the temple of Helios.

They were accorded public prayers, and the Rhodians offered many a sacrifice and celebrated their visit like a festival. They toured the whole city and in the temple of Helios dedicated a golden (**χρυσήν**) panoply and had an inscription from its donors inscribed on a plaque:

THE VISITORS DEDICATED TO YOU
THESE WEAPONS OF BEATEN GOLD (**χρυσήλατα**),
ANTHIA AND HABROCOMES,
CITIZENS OF SACRED EPHEBUS (1.12.2)

²¹⁸ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 179. In making this statement, he does not date *Ephesiaca* to the first century CE, but simply notes that Anthia’s description does not match second century CE depictions.

²¹⁹ Harland, *Associations*, 7.

²²⁰ Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity*, 27, features an image of a terracotta statuette of Artemis that is quite similar to the description of Anthia’s adornment in *Ephesiaca*.

²²¹ For more on this coiffure that links it to the realm of the gods, see: Athaneaus, *The Diogenists* 525E.

And, as has already been mentioned, gold was part of the female finery used to adorn prostitutes (5.7.1) as well as corpses for burial (3.7.4; 3.8.3). One woman in *Ephesiaca* was even named Χρυσιού, “Goldie.” She was an old lady who was the member of Hippothous’ gang who led them to the gold in Anthia’s tomb (3.9.4; 3.9.8).²²²

The next word, σωφροσύνη, “chastity,” is a repeated theme in the greater literary context of 1 Tim 2:9-15 (vv. 9, 15). It is used twenty-one times in *Ephesiaca* in different forms. There are also three additional instances where the opposite behavior is highlighted.²²³ Chastity occurs thirteen times associated with Anthia, eight times in relationship to Habrocomes, once linked to Manto, and once referring to Anchialus who lacked it.

In the procession that begins the story, Xenophon of Ephesus portrays Anthia (1.2.6) and Habrocomes as chaste (1.4.4). Upon meeting each other, Anthia puts “maidenly decorum out of her mind” and Habrocomes “fell captive to the god.”²²⁴

And so when the procession was over, the whole crowd repaired to the shrine for the sacrifice, the order of the procession was dissolved, and men and women, Epebes and girls, gathered in the same spot. There they saw each other. Anthia was captivated by Habrocomes, and Habrocomes was bested by Eros. He kept gazing at the girl and though he tried, he could not take his eyes off her: the god pressed his attack and held him fast. Anthia too was in a bad way, as with eyes wide open she took in Habrocomes’ handsomeness and as it flowed into her, already putting maidenly decorum out of her mind: for what she said was for Habrocomes to hear, and she uncovered what parts of her body she could for Habrocomes to see. He gave himself over to the sight and fell captive to the god. (1.3.1-2)

In a moment of passion both characters abandon discretion, and this scene sets the stage for the oracle, their marriage, and the adventures that would follow as a consequence from the gods for their actions. Most of the instances of σωφροσύνη

²²² As a gold-digger herself, Goldie’s name may reflect one of the many names in *Ephesiaca* with double meaning.

²²³ In the Roman setting, women were expected to exhibit σωφροσύνη tied to codes for deportment and decorum. Based on a closer look at terms that accompany σωφροσύνη in the Ephesian context, modesty was closely tied to following cultic norms. In 1 Tim 2:9-10, σωφροσύνη appears to call people away from the goddess as well as heresies and practices associated with her. For recent research that points to the Artemis cult in the literary co-text, 1 Tim 2:11-15, see: Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003).

²²⁴ See also 1.4.1 where καταφρονῶν reflects Habrocomes’ contemptuous lack of discretion.

refer to Anthia or Habrocomes defending their faithfulness to each other.²²⁵ For Xenophon of Ephesus, people preserved their identity and place in society by remaining chaste or modest. Losing this trait put characters at risk in relationship to the gods and other people.

The term **πολυτελής**, meaning “expensive or costly,” occurs in *Ephesiaca* five times. In 1 Tim 2:9-10 it refers to clothing. Xenophon of Ephesus uses it four times concerning a woman’s costly clothing and appearance, and one time in reference to a lavish dinner before a wedding. In the procession to the Artemisium, Anthia is described as **κεκοσμημένης πολυτελῶς**, “sumptuously or expensively dressed” (1.2.2). Perhaps this costly attire matches the clothing in view in the prohibition in 1 Tim 2:9-10.

Later, Perilaus hosts a **πολυτελής**, “lavish,” dinner only to find that his bride had died (so he thought), so he adorns her **πολυτελῶς**, “lavishly,” for burial (3.5.1; 3.9.8). Soon thereafter, pirates raid her tomb, take her alive, and sell her to merchants who **πολυτελῶς**, “keep her at great expense,” to care for her appearance (3.11.1). Wealthy people in *Ephesiaca* possess the resources to buy costly clothing. They also use their riches to maintain external beauty and to offer meals for guests.

The word, **πρέπω**, meaning “fitting, seemly, or suitable,” occurs twice in negative forms in *Ephesiaca*.²²⁶ It appears first when Anthia inappropriately abandons modesty and maidenly decorum in revealing parts of her body for Habrocomes to see in their moment of love at first sight (1.3.2). Later, in her lovesick state, she proclaims that her lovesickness is “inappropriate” (1.4.6). Xenophon of Ephesus portrays her behavior and the consequences of it as unfitting for a maiden.

²²⁵ For Habrocomes, see: *Ephesiaca* 2.1.3; 2.1.4; 2.1.4; 2.5.7. For Anthia, see: 1.9.3; 3.5.6; 3.10.1; 4.3.4; 5.5.5; 5.5.6; 5.7.2; 5.8.7; 5.8.9.

²²⁶ BAGD, 699.

The final three words, ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, “good works,” and θεοσέβειαν, “reverence for or piety toward God,” will be examined together because they are employed in *Ephesiaca* in relationship to each other. These two terms surface in *Ephesiaca* linked together similar to their usage in 1 Tim 2:9-10.

The term, ἔργον, has a broad range of meanings, such as “deed, work, action, occupation, that which is brought into being by work, or deeds of men exhibiting a consistent moral character.”²²⁷ In *Ephesiaca* the term appears fifteen times describing tasks, specific opportunities, deeds that others may do or do to another person, and even hard labor that is not normally fitting to a rich young man like Habrocomes.²²⁸ The lexical rendering that speaks of works as deeds of moral character matches its occurrence in 1 Tim 2:9-10 most closely. This usage also indirectly links ἔργων ἀγαθῶν and θεοσέβειαν, with related term, εὐσέβεια.

After Manto banishes Anthia to the country with instructions for Lampo, the goatherd, to kill her in the woods, Xenophon of Ephesus discloses the reason the goatherd would not perform such an act.

“But I ask you, goatherd Lampo, since you have thus far behaved respectfully (εὐσέβησας), if you kill me, give me at least a shallow grave in the ground nearby, put your hands on my eyes, and invoke Habrocomes repeatedly as you bury me: for me this would make me a happy funeral, in the presence of Habrocomes.” At this the goatherd was moved to pity, aware that he was about to do an unholy deed (ἀνόσιον ἔργον ἐργάσεται) by killing a girl who had done no wrong and was beautiful. Indeed when he seized the girl, the goatherd could not abide a murder, but said this to her: “Anthia, you know that my mistress Manto ordered me to seize and murder you. But I fear heaven (θεοῦς) and feel pity at your beauty, so I would rather sell you somewhere far from this country, in case Manto finds out that you are not dead and becomes ill disposed toward me.” She clung to his feet in tears, and said, “Please, you gods, and Artemis of my fatherland reward the goatherd for these good deeds (θεοὶ καὶ Ἄρτεμι πατρίδα, τὸν αἰπόλον ὑπὲρ τούτων τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀμειψασθε),” and begged to be sold. (2.11.5-8)

Lampo could not perform an unholy deed before the gods because he feared them; instead, he exhibited εὐσέβεια. In response, Anthia prays to the gods and to Artemis to reward him for his good deeds, that is, works witnessed by the gods deserving of

²²⁷ BAGD, 307-08.

²²⁸ To view the occurrences, see: *Ephesiaca* 1.6.2; 1.15.1; 1.15.4; 1.16.4; 2.3.7; 2.4.1; 3.8.2; 4.3.4; 5.8.2; 5.8.3; 5.8.3; 5.8.3.

honor. This adds to our knowledge of **εὐσέβεια** from other ancient sources. Yet again, *Ephesiaca* provides fresh, vivid illustrations of ancient social realities envisioned with specific terms.

3.2.3. Summary

Nearly every word in 1 Tim 2:9-10 appears in *Ephesiaca*. While most occurrences reinforce our modern understanding of the ancient cultural realities related to the rich in Ephesus, intertexture analysis has produced at least three fresh insights for NT researchers. Additionally, these three findings correlate to the interpretive issues that emerged in the inner texture phase.

First, **πλέγμασιν** may represent more than a prohibition of ostentatious hairstyles. It may point to abstaining from wearing one's hair to look like the goddess, Artemis. As Anthia led the procession imitating the goddess Artemis, **πεπλεγμένη** is the term used to describe her hairstyle. It is plausible that the author of 1 Tim had this phenomenon in mind. Imitating Artemis is portrayed in *Ephesiaca* as a cultural expectation for all young women, especially prominent ones.

Second, while the "new Roman women" may partially be in view regarding the prohibitions outlined in 1 Tim 2:9-10, in light of *Ephesiaca* the call to avoid adornment with costly clothing also seems to point to the cultural norm of dressing to imitate and serve Artemis. As Anthia processed in **κεκοσμημένας πολυτελῶς**, "sumptuous adornment," along with *all* the other young women of Ephesus, she was celebrated and worshiped as Artemis. In this light, the prohibited coiffure coupled with this call to stop wearing costly clothes may represent instruction to cease participation in cultic activities that honored Artemis.

Third, 1 Tim 2:9-10 calls for decorum in the form of good deeds fitting women who profess reverence for or piety to God. In *Ephesiaca*, fear and respect for

the gods, εὐσέβεια, motivated Lampo to demonstrate good deeds. Based on the usage of θεοσέβειαν in 1 Tim 2:9-10, women with wealth in the community of faith are urged to shift from the cultural expectation of doing good deeds to exhibit piety and service to Artemis to doing good deeds that show their allegiance and service to the one true God.

The implications of these findings will be considered next.

3.3. Ideological Texture

Our attention now moves to ideological texture. We will shift from looking at the two texts, 1 Tim 2:9-10 and *Ephesiaca*, to looking at people in this larger context. “The issue is the social, cultural and individual location and perspective of writers and readers.”²²⁹ The purpose of this phase is to consider the findings from the intertexture phase in light of the author, audience, and culture of *Ephesiaca*.

3.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in *Ephesiaca*

Based on extant evidence, O’Sullivan contends the author, audience and background of *Ephesiaca* is impossible to definitively pin down.²³⁰ Hägg notes that modern critics locate Xenophon of Ephesus all over the spectrum in the ancient cultural setting. Some consider him poor and untalented while others see his simplicity as the work of a skilled and educated artist.²³¹

Despite these varied opinions, this study has revealed that Xenophon of Ephesus offers keen insight into the world of the rich. Regardless of whether he was among the rich or one of them, his testimony reinforces what is known from other ancient sources while also enhancing our picture of ancient life and society by adding details not available elsewhere.

²²⁹ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 95.

²³⁰ O’Sullivan, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, 2.

²³¹ Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity*, 25.

For example, consider his detailed description of the role of wealthy women in the procession that honors Artemis. This scene in *Ephesiaca* includes graphic details not found in the Gaius Vibius Salutaris inscription of 104 CE that describes this annual religious celebration.²³² Xenophon of Ephesus recounts the participants, describes the crowds, lists the activities, and does so in a manner that makes readers feel like they are in Ephesus for the festivities. In offering data from the cultural setting about life for the rich, he demonstrates the value of his voice, despite the fact that his socio-economic status or place in the ancient world is disputed.

Though scholars also hesitate to pinpoint an audience for *Ephesiaca*, it is not unreasonable to believe it was widely known, especially as it influenced at least one other literary work, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Chariton. With this literary reach, the audience of *Ephesiaca* would have encompassed a wide range of people of differing measures of wealth, including rich Ephesian women.

As we have seen, the social and cultural rules governing the behavior of rich Ephesian women required them to celebrate their religious beliefs by wearing specific decorum and performing good deeds in service to Artemis and/or the Imperial cult. In light of this, how might rich women understand 1 Tim 2:9-10?

To view our findings in their ideological context, let us consider the testimony of another source, Athenaeus. He offers an ancient Greek perspective for understanding the expectations of women in relationship to Artemis.

Leto once in Delos, as they say, did two great children bear,
Apollo with the golden hair, Bright Phoebus, god of day.
And Artemis mighty huntress, virgin chaste,
On whom all women's trust is placed.
(*The Diepnochists* 15.694D)

Notice that “all” women placed their trust in Artemis. Of course, this is a broad statement, but it reflects ancient thinking. Women served the goddess with piety, and she watched over them.

²³² *IvE* 27. Cf. Guy Rogers in *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 80-115.

Culturally, there was a strong sense of pressure to conform to the cultural rules surrounding Artemis, the virgin chaste. Achilles Tatius illustrates this with the legendary test of virginity.²³³ Any young woman who did not honor Artemis by remaining chaste put herself in mortal danger.

After inventing his pipes, Pan hung up the instrument, shutting it up in a cave. Some time after he made a gift of the whole spot to Artemis, making a compact with her that it should be entered by no woman who was no longer a virgin. If therefore any girl is accused of being of doubtful virginity, she is sent by public decree to the door of the grotto, and the pan-pipes (*syrinx*) decides the ordeal for her. She goes in, clad in the proper dress, and the door is closed behind her.

If she is in reality a virgin, a clear and divine note is heard, either because there is some breeze in the place which enters the pipes and makes a musical sound or possibly because it is Pan himself who is piping. And after a short time, the door of the grotto opens of its own accord, and out comes the virgin with a pine wreath on her head.

But if she has lied about her virginity, the pan-pipes are silent, and a groan comes forth from the cave instead of a musical sound. On the third day after, a virgin priestess of the temple comes and finds the pan-pipes lying on the ground, but there is no trace of the woman. (*Leucippe and Clitophon* 8.6.11-14)

For Ephesian women, the ancient voices proclaim: “Don’t mess with Artemis.”

3.3.2. Rich Women in the Ephesian Culture and 1 Tim 2:9-10

From an ideological perspective, the language of 1 Tim 2:9-10 calls women to reject cultural expectations associated with adornment. To do so would require women to abandon the security of their place in the ancient world and to find their place in the community of faith. The language of the text also alludes to the way in which women previously dressed and functioned in the context of worship to Artemis and instructs them on how to adorn themselves and act in the household of God.

In *Ephesiaca*, Anthia leads procession to the Artemisium sumptuously dressed with her hair plaited as the daughter of rich citizens who honored Artemis through their words and deeds. Xenophon of Ephesus testifies: “Often when seeing her at the shrine, the Ephesians worshiped her as Artemis, so also at the sight of her on this occasion the crowd cheered; the opinions of the spectators were various,

²³³ Cf. Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 150-51.

some in their astonishment declaring that she was the goddess herself..." (1.2.7).

On the contrary, the text of 1 Tim 2:9-10 seems to call rich women like Anthia to show the shift of their allegiance from Artemis to God by changing their outward decorum and by demonstrating deeds that show their service to God. This may explain why the author of 1 Tim 2:9-10, βούλομαι, "desired," that women dress modestly, avoid specific decorum and exhibit deeds that show their service to God: because they were no longer imitators, priestesses and servants of Artemis.²³⁴

The focus of 1 Tim 2:9-10 seems to relate to decorum and deeds in the context of worship *and* everyday life.²³⁵ Support for this reading comes from the literary (vv. 8-15)²³⁶ and cultural contexts. The text opens with 1 Tim 2:8: "I desire, then, that in every place the men should pray, lifting up holy hands without anger or argument." As 1 Tim 2:9 begins with ὡσαύτως, "likewise," the instructions point to the decorum and deeds of women in the context of worship. However, our research on the cultural context has revealed that worship and life were embedded together.

For rich women in the Ephesian culture, obedience to this teaching would change more than just their hairstyle, wardrobe and giving patterns; it would alter their identity, their relationships, their place in society, and put them in danger of the vengeance of Artemis and the gods.²³⁷ In this light, 1 Tim 2:9-10 calls for radically counter-cultural behavior in the context of worship *and* life.²³⁸

²³⁴ Cf. For Paul, Christians must exemplify their faith; thus, he desired for them to follow these instructions. Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986).

²³⁵ In Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 204, Towner notes that scholars are mixed as to whether or not this calls for decorum and deeds in the context of worship or in everyday life. This study has demonstrated that both are true: to exhibit decorum and deeds in *worship* was to do it in *everyday life*; the two were interconnected.

²³⁶ Cf. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer not a Woman*, for recent research that supports my reading of 1 Tim 2:9-10 in the larger literary context of vv. 9-15. The evidence the Kroegers mined on vv. 11-15 seems to complement my findings. Contra: Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, *Women in the church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995) 88. While Schreiner, *et al*, pose disagreements with the Kroegers, they do not interact with the evidence sufficiently in their arguments.

²³⁷ As Artemis was renowned as the goddess of childbearing, to cross her would be to put your life at risk. This may be the reason the larger literary context ends with the assurance that women who continue in the faith will be saved through childbearing (v. 15).

²³⁸ For a second century CE testimony that Christianity leads converts to "display" a "wonderful and confessedly striking mode of life," see: H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1951) 205-06.

3.3.3. Summary

Analysis of the ideological texture reveals that 1 Tim 2:9-10 instructs Christian women to make a radical shift in light of the social and cultural realities of their context. They must no longer plait their hair and adorn their bodies with costly clothing to imitate Artemis, and they should cease supporting her cult. Instead their modest decorum and good deeds will demonstrate their reverence for God. Despite the cultural pressures of losing their place in society and their standing with others and Artemis in converting to Christianity, their decorum and deeds will show they are at home in God's church.

3.4. Sacred Texture

Sacred texture represents the final phase of our methodological approach. As ideological texture shifted our attention to people, that is, the author and audience in their cultural setting, this step looks for God in the text.²³⁹ Sacred texture appraises the ties between people and the divine in the text to see how our interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of *Ephesiaca* compares to related NT passages.

3.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text

God appears overtly in 1 Tim 2:9-10 with the term, **θεοσέβειαν**. The terms in the text exhort rich Ephesian women to behave not as those associated with priestly service and piety to Artemis, **ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναῖξιν ἐπαγγελλόμεναις θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν**, "but with good works, as is proper for women who profess reverence for God." To obey these instructions regarding decorum and deeds meant violating the cultural rules and social expectations for wealthy women.

This radical view of God, the rich, and riches in 1 Tim 2:9-10 is relevant for the unresolved debate that introduced this study. Dibelius and Conzelmann argue

²³⁹ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 120.

that the teachings on riches in 1 Tim are *inconsistent* with other NT teachings and call the rich to accommodate to the culture. Without the aid of *Ephesiaca*, they interpret the text as calling women to follow prevailing cultural rules for modesty and avoid the deportment of harlots, though they provide no lexical evidence to prove this connection.²⁴⁰

Countryman has suggested that the teachings on riches in 1 Tim are *alternating*, that is, sometimes consistent with other NT teachings on handling riches, and sometimes not. In his view, wealthy women in 1 Tim 2:9-10 were tolerated in the church because their funding was needed, but adds that he believes they had used their wealth and influence to breach church order.²⁴¹ He offers this theory without any concrete evidence.

While scholars like Johnson and Marshall interpret the teachings on riches in 1 Tim as *consistent* with other NT teachings, they conclude that Christian women are to live a “life of productive virtue” as benefactors who focus on the “benefit of others.”²⁴² Interestingly, while 1 Tim 2:9-10 calls for good deeds that exhibit faith in God, the text does not necessarily instruct rich women to follow the cultural rules. This study reveals a reading of the text that sounds *consistent* with the trajectory of other NT teachings; yet, it refines the perspective of proponents of this position.

The lexical findings from this study show that the prohibitions and expectations in 1 Tim 2:9-10 bring the relationship between rich women in Ephesus and Artemis into view. Consequently, it is most compelling to consider this passage as *consistent* with other NT teachings on riches, rather than *inconsistent* or *alternating*. The text teaches wealthy women to abandon their decorum and deeds tied to Artemis and adopt new ways of worship and living that reflect their commitment to God.

²⁴⁰ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 46.

²⁴¹ Countryman, *The Rich Christian*, 151-57.

²⁴² Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 200; Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 452.

3.4.2. Reading the Text in the Context of other NT Teachings

The NT contains other teaching on the decorum and deeds of women.²⁴³ Regarding modest decorum, the most common passage viewed alongside 1 Tim 2:9-10 is 1 Peter 3:3-4, which reads: “³ Do not adorn yourselves outwardly by braiding your hair, and by wearing gold ornaments or fine clothing; ⁴ rather, let your adornment be the inner self with the lasting beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in God’s sight.”²⁴⁴

Exegesis of this parallel text reveals that modest adornment for women should be internal rather than external. Elaborate hairstyles, expensive jewelry and fine clothes are the measure of worth in the world, but before God inner beauty is what counts.²⁴⁵ There are, however, two significant differences between the teachings for women located in 1 Peter 3:3-4 and 1 Tim 2:9-10: (1) the prohibitions employ different terms, and (2) the calls to action, though they sound consistent, contain different instructions.²⁴⁶

First, the prohibition to plaiting hair in 1 Tim 2:9-10 employs the term, *πλέγμασιν*, which appears to point to the coiffure associated with Artemis and the gods. The prohibition in 1 Peter 3:3-4 to avoid *ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν*, “elaborate hairstyles,” and external adornment perhaps more closely envisions avoiding the dress of the worldly “new Roman women” or prostitutes.

Second, the call to action in 1 Peter 3:3-4 is to cultivate the beauty of the inner self; whereas, 1 Tim 2:9-10 calls women to adorn themselves with good deeds. Clearly different and yet complementary responses are noted. The former is a general call for women to cultivate inner beauty, while the latter may be better

²⁴³ Cf. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, on similar passages: 1 Cor 11:2-16; 1 Tim 5:11-15, and Tit 2:3-5.

²⁴⁴ Most scholars link these two passages not based on the themes present. Cf. Edward G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1946) 432-35; Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 217-18; Hermann von Lips, “Die Haustafel als ‘Topos’ im Rahmen der urchristlichen Paränese: Beobachtungen an Hand des 1 Petrusbriefes und des Titusbriefes.” *NTS* 40 (1994): 261-80.

²⁴⁵ Peter H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) 117-19.

²⁴⁶ Though the terms 1 Pet 3:3-4 and 1 Tim 2:9-10 are different, scholars in at least two of the three interpretive camps on reading riches in 1 Tim consider them as referring to the same social realities. Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 47; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 208.

understood as teaching women to expend their wealth on good deeds that demonstrate allegiance to God instead of sumptuous adornment that reflects piety to Artemis.

Good deeds are commonly associated with genuine faith in the NT. In Acts 26:20, Paul testifies that among the Gentiles he preached that they should repent and perform deeds that correspond to their faith. In Ephesians 2:8-10, good works are not the source of one's salvation, but evidence of that salvation, that is, what Christians were created to do.²⁴⁷

⁸ For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith—and this is not from yourselves, it is the gift of God—⁹ not by works, so that no one can boast. ¹⁰ For we are God's handiwork, created in Christ Jesus to do good works (**ἔργους ἀγαθοῖς**), which God prepared in advance for us to do.

Other NT writers add that good works represent mandatory fruit for the believer. Consider this strong statement in James 2:14-17.

¹⁴ What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if someone claims to have faith but has no deeds (**ἔργα**)? Can such faith save them? ¹⁵ Suppose a brother or a sister is without clothes and daily food. ¹⁶ If one of you says to them, "Go in peace; keep warm and well fed," but does nothing about their physical needs, what good is it? ¹⁷ In the same way, faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action (**ἔργα**), is dead.

Peter Davids says the rhetoric of this statement (v. 14): "What good is it?" expects a negative answer.²⁴⁸ In other words, there is nothing good about faith without works!

Blomberg and Mariam Kamell believe that the rhetorical dialogue reveals that those with wealth are "acknowledging the desperate need, but then not doing anything to help alleviate the situation."²⁴⁹ Brothers *and* sisters in the community of faith must exhibit their faith through good deeds. "The salvific faith must show itself

²⁴⁷ Frank Thielman, *Ephesians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 145-46. Some question whether the expression "good deeds" can be read as Pauline. Thielman believes it can in light of the expression "doing good" in the Paul of the undisputed letters (Gal 6:10; 2 Cor 9:8; Rom 2:7, 10; 13:3; cf. Phil 1:6). Commentators that speak of the un-Pauline character of the expression "good works" note that it appears only in the PE (1 Tim 2:10; 5:10, 25; 6:18; Tit 2:7, 14; 3:8, 14), cf. Ernest Best, *Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) 231; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, vol. 42, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1990) 115; Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, vol. 17, SP (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2000) 234; Rudolf Schnackenberg, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary* (trans. H. Heron; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991) 99. This dissertation does not argue for a view on authorship of the expression, but rather regarding how women with wealth in the Ephesian context may have understood the expression in the text in light of ancient evidence.

²⁴⁸ Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 120

²⁴⁹ Craig L. Blomberg and Mariam J. Kamell, *James*, ZECNT (ed. Clinton E. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008) 130.

in the world and carry exact external and visible form; otherwise it is not faith at all.”²⁵⁰

Good works have financial implications. Providing food, clothing, or other forms of sustenance or care often comes at great cost. Interestingly, leading women in the Early Church developed a reputation for exhibiting these types of good deeds.

3.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Three Rich Women in Acts

While no wealthy women are specifically named in the 1 Tim 2:9-10, there are three rich female contemporaries to the Apostle Paul mentioned in Acts who could represent the rich among the audience of this text: Dorcas, Lydia and Priscilla.²⁵¹ The accounts of these women as recorded by Luke sound consistent with this fresh interpretation.

Dorcas of Joppa comes in view in Acts 9:36: “She was full of good works (ἔργων ἀγαθῶν) and acts of charity.” Here Luke employs the same term that describes the deeds expected of women in 1 Tim 2:10. Undoubtedly, the good works of Dorcas came at a financial cost, and she was always willing to pay the price. As saint and seamstress, she is presented as blessing widows in the community of faith with fine garments.²⁵² Jouette Bassler believes that such good deeds would be viewed as counter-cultural based on the rules of benefaction. The rich simply did not give to people like widows: “they do *not* give to just anyone.”²⁵³ The generosity of Dorcas demonstrates her piety toward God.

Lydia of Thyatira appears in Acts 16:14. Luke refers to Lydia as “a seller of purple goods” and a “worshiper of God.” The association to “purple goods” implies

²⁵⁰ Helen Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty and Early Christian Formation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012) 91. Cf. Leo Raditsa, “The Appearance of Women and Contact: Tertullian’s *De Habitu Feminarum*.” *Athenaeum* 63 (1985): 305.

²⁵¹ Dorothy Irvin, “The Ministry of Women in the Early Church: The Archaeological Evidence.” *DDSR* 45 (1980): 76-86.

²⁵² Ben Witherington III, *Women in the Earliest Churches*, SNTSMS (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 149-51.

²⁵³ Bassler, *God & Mammon*, 19.

she may have been a person of high status.²⁵⁴ In the ancient world, sellers of purple were clothiers with some measure of wealth.²⁵⁵ Purple cloth was expensive and could only be possessed by people with resources and worn by those with some measure of status. Also, Lydia may have possessed sufficient wealth to travel, as she enters the scene in Philippi, far from her hometown in Asia Minor.

Though the term, **θεοσέβειαν**, is not used, Lydia is described with a related expression, **σεβομένη τὸν θεόν**, “one revering God or a God-fearer.” After hearing Paul, Silas, and Timothy, Luke offers this response of Lydia in Acts 16:15: “When she and her household were baptized, she urged us, saying, ‘If you have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come and stay at my home.’ And she prevailed upon us.” Regarding her generous hospitality, Johnson concludes: “as always, Luke connects spiritual dispositions to the disposition of possessions.”²⁵⁶ As a God-fearer, she uses her financial resources to serve Paul, Silas, and Timothy.

The hospitality of Lydia is mentioned twice (Acts 16:15, 40). Luke portrays her as a wealthy woman who fears God and performs deeds such as hospitality despite the potential danger for doing so in her cultural setting. Women were often seen and not heard in the ancient world, and Lydia comes into view both vocal *and* hospitable.²⁵⁷ Her faith has filled her with enthusiasm to extend support to those advancing the gospel of Jesus Christ. Ironically, Timothy is present along with Paul in the Acts account. The lifestyle of Lydia offers a vivid example of generous deeds of a woman who fears God as envisioned in 1 Tim 2:9-10.

²⁵⁴ David Schaps, “The Women Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women’s Names.” *CQ* 27 (1987): 323-30. Cf. A. J. Marshall, “Roman Women and the Provinces.” *AncSoc* 6 (1975): 108-27; James Wiseman, “A Distinguished Macedonian Family of the Roman Imperial Period.” *AJA* 88 (1984): 567-82.

²⁵⁵ David G. Peterson, *Acts of the Apostles*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 458. Purple cloth reflects some measure of wealth though it is difficult to be certain about her social status.

²⁵⁶ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 5, SP (ed. Daniel J. Harrington; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 297.

²⁵⁷ Ramsay MacMullen, “Women in Public in the Roman Empire.” *Historia* 29 (1980): 208-18; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998) 334-39.

Priscilla is mentioned in Acts 18. She had been expelled from Rome along with her husband, Aquila (vv. 1-3). In most cases, her name comes before her husband, which may reflect that she held a higher social status than her husband.²⁵⁸ As tentmakers and travelers with Paul, Priscilla and Aquila possessed some wealth and used it to support Pauline mission. Whether they were artisans or more upper class leaders is often disputed.²⁵⁹ Of interest to this argument is where Luke locates Priscilla in Ephesus and what can be deduced about her from her use of the resources she possessed.

After being instructed by Paul to remain in Ephesus, Acts 18 records that Priscilla and Aquila heard Apollos speak “in the synagogue” (v. 26). As there is evidence of Jewish communities in Asia Minor,²⁶⁰ Priscilla’s presence in the synagogue reveals allegiance to God rather than the goddess, Artemis. Additionally, in co-laboring with Paul, with whatever wealth she possessed, Priscilla exhibits her faith in God through her behavior. Though she may have lost her place in the ancient world having been expelled from Rome, Priscilla appears at home in God’s church.

Little else is known about Dorcas, Lydia, and Priscilla. Yet the clues we have in the Acts narrative reveal that they were three women of wealth whose lives were full of good works, and who demonstrated their faith in God by offering generous hospitality and gracious help to teachers of the gospel. Their reputation sounds consistent with this fresh interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of *Ephesiaca* and radically counter-cultural as compared to the kinds of deeds ascribed to other women of wealth in their day.

²⁵⁸ John P. Polhill, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Nashville: Broadman, 1992) 382; cf. Witherington, *Acts of the Apostles*, 539.

²⁵⁹ To explore this dispute further, see: Ronald F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980). This dissertation highlights Priscilla based on how she is listed with her husband and the mention of their trade, though it must be noted that her measure of wealth and status cannot be pinpointed conclusively.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Paul R. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

3.4.4. Summary

Sacred texture analysis reveals God squarely in the center of this text. Women must adorn themselves with modest decorum and good deeds so that they appear in a manner that exhibits their piety toward God.

Elsewhere in the NT, specifically in 1 Peter 3:3-4, women are called to chaste behavior and modest adornment for similar reasons and yet with different calls to action. Women are urged to shift their focus from external beauty to inward beauty. Rather than beautifying their physical appearance with perishable items, they are to cultivate the hidden person of their heart with imperishable traits. When read against the background of descriptions of wealthy women in Ephesus and *Ephesiaca*, it seems likely that the language of 1 Tim 2:9-10 implies a similar shift, from external adornment and deeds that show piety to the goddess to meeting the needs of others, the exercise of which is, metaphorically-speaking, adornment in good deeds.

This radical understanding of 1 Tim 2:9-10 sounds *consistent* with the example of three wealthy women in Acts whom Luke mentions as contemporaries to the Apostle Paul: Dorcas, Lydia, and Priscilla. These women are known for their good works and counter-cultural deeds of generosity extended to people that the culture categorized as unworthy of assistance. Their good works reveal their devotion to God. Each of these three women epitomizes the expectations of rich Christian women in 1 Tim 2:9-10.

3.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of *Ephesiaca*

The purpose of this chapter has been to examine 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of the social and cultural world of Ephesus as presented in ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca*. In so doing, this study has resulted in a fresh socio-rhetorical reading of the text.

Inner texture analysis brings into view three issues that have been unclear:

- (1) On adornment – Should we interpret the text in light of the social expectations of modesty for Roman women or might other social and cultural realities be in view?
- (2) Concerning prohibitions – Should we understand the prohibitions as referring to apparel and jewelry of prostitutes, courtesans, or the “new” women that had emerged on the scene in the Greco-Roman world of the first century CE? Or, may something else be in focus?
- (3) Pertaining to expectations – Should we consider the decorum and deeds expected of women with wealth in God’s church as consistent with cultural cues for rich Ephesian women, radically different, or somewhere in between?

Intertexture analysis revealed significant lexical overlap between 1 Tim 2:9-10 and *Ephesiaca* and three key insights came to light: (1) The term, **πλέγμασιν**, “plaits or braids,” may refer to the hairstyle of Ephesian women who served Artemis. (2) The instruction to avoid wearing **ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ**, “costly clothing,” may be calling women to cease participation in cultic activities which, in *Ephesiaca*, were led by prominent women. (3) The expectation to exhibit modest decorum and do good deeds motivated by **θεοσέβειαν**, “piety to God,” sounds quite counter-cultural in a setting where women were expected to dress to imitate the goddess and perform good deeds out of **εὐσέβεια**, “piety,” to Artemis and the gods.

Ideological texture looked at people, the author, and audience within the culture. Other ancient testimonies, along with Xenophon of Ephesus, confirmed that Artemis *owned* the rich women of Ephesus and the rich women of Ephesus *owned* Artemis. Numerous ancient sources attested to the tremendous social pressure exerted on women to behave according to cultural rules. They were expected to fulfill religious obligations such as serving Artemis as priestesses and funding cultic practices in the context of prayer and worship. This analysis affirmed a culturally

subversive reading of 1 Tim 2:9-10. The text calls women to show their allegiance to God in the context of worship *and* life by avoiding the decorum associated with Artemis and directing, or perhaps re-directing, their resources from her service to the service of God.

Sacred texture pointed to God as the object of female piety in the text. The author of 1 Tim 2:9-10 desires that women dress modestly and avoid decorum and deeds that exhibit piety to Artemis. Despite the social pressures and cultural expectations related to wealth in Ephesus, women should instead do good deeds to demonstrate their piety toward God. In reading 1 Tim 2:9-10 in light of *Ephesiaca* and the rest of the NT, the text exhorts women to a counter-cultural lifestyle that reflects their commitment to God. Dorcas, Lydia, and Priscilla of Acts represent prominent women in the Early Church who illustrate this.

IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER FOUR

Leaders and 1 Timothy 3:1-13:

Avoid Greed and Shameful Gain serving as Faithful Stewards

The second passage we will scrutinize in light of *Ephesiaca* is 1 Tim 3:1-13. This text outlines the qualifications for *leaders*, including the attitudes leaders *must* and *must not* have towards riches. The general term *leaders* will be used in this study to encompass two types of religious leaders mentioned in 1 Tim 3:1-13: (1) anyone desiring the role of ἐπίσκοπος, “bishop or overseer,” in God’s church (3:1-7); and, (2) the διακόνους, “deacons or servers,” with specific responsibilities in the community of faith (3:8-13). Leaders with some measure of wealth are in focus based on the language of the text and the aforementioned social and cultural pattern that rich people held leadership positions in Ephesus in the first century CE.

Scholars have tended to interpret this text as calling leaders in God’s church to follow the prevailing Greco-Roman cultural rules because it seems to mirror the virtue/vice lists or duty codes found in documents and inscriptions from the ancient Mediterranean world (4.1).²⁶¹ We will not argue against the existence of lexical similarities but will explore other ancient influences that may have shaped the language of 1 Tim 3:1-13. We will examine Greco-Roman virtue/vice lists, Jewish virtue/vice lists, and inscriptions referring to religious leaders in Ephesus alongside *Ephesiaca* (4.2.). This process will help us gain new insight for considering these criteria for leadership in light of the social setting (4.3.) and related NT texts (4.4.) as basis for offering a fresh interpretation (4.5.).

²⁶¹ On *Pflichten* or *Tugenden*, Obligations or Virtues, see: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 50-59; Roland Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum im Neuen Testament?* (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983) 45-67; Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 473. On virtue/vice lists see: J. Daryl Charles, “Vice and Virtue Lists,” in *DNTB*, ed. Porter S. E. & Evans C.A. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000): 1252-57; N. J. McLaney, “The Vice Lists in the Pastoral Epistles.” *CBQ* 36 (1974): 203-19. For more on the *Haustafeln* tradition in recent scholarship, see: James P. Hering, *The Colossian and Ephesian Haustafeln in Theological Context: An Analysis of Their Origins, Relationship, and Message* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007) 157-202. Cf. Verner, *Household of God*, 83-111; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 271.

4.1. Inner Texture of 1 Tim 3:1-13

This step starts with the Greek text and translation, followed by analysis based on ancient witnesses. The aim of this phase is to revisit key terms and themes in antiquity where the handling of wealth or stewardship of resources is in view.

4.1.1. Text and Translation

Table #2: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 3:1-13

<p>¹ πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπὴς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ, ² δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλιον σώφρονα κόσμιον φιλόξενον διδασκῆτικόν, ³ μὴ πάροινον μὴ πλήκτην [μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ]²⁶² ἀλλὰ ἐπεικῆ ἄμαχον ἀφιλάργυρον, ⁴ τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ, μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος ⁵ (εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται), ⁶ μὴ νεοφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθεῖς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου. ⁷ δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὄνειδισμόν ἐμπεση καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου.</p> <p>⁸ Διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνοὺς, μὴ διλόγους, μὴ οἶνω πολλῶ προσέχοντας, μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, ⁹ ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει. ¹⁰ καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, εἶτα διακονείτωσαν ἀνέγκλητοι ὄντες. ¹¹ Γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς, μὴ διαβόλους, νηφάλιους, πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν. ¹² διάκονοι ἔστωσαν μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρες, τέκνων καλῶς προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων. ¹³ οἱ γὰρ καλῶς διακονήσαντες βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιῶνται καὶ πολλὴν παρρησίαν ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (NA²⁷)</p>	<p>¹ The saying is sure: whoever aspires to the office of bishop desires a noble task. ²Now a bishop must be above reproach, married only once, temperate, sensible, respectable, hospitable, an apt teacher, ³not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, and not a lover of money. ⁴He must manage his own household well, keeping his children submissive and respectful in every way—⁵for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how can he take care of God’s church? ⁶He must not be a recent convert, or he may be puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil. ⁷Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, so that he may not fall into disgrace and the snare of the devil.</p> <p>⁸Deacons likewise must be serious, not double-tongued, not indulging in much wine, not greedy for money; ⁹they must hold fast to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience. ¹⁰And let them first be tested; then, if they prove themselves blameless, let them serve as deacons. ¹¹Women likewise must be serious, not slanderers, but temperate, faithful in all things. ¹²Let deacons be married only once, and let them manage their children and their households well; ¹³for those who serve well as deacons gain a good standing for themselves and great boldness in the faith that is in Christ Jesus. (NRSV)</p>
---	--

²⁶² Included in MSS 326, 365, 614, 630, 2495: [μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ].

4.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources

The teaching in these verses comes in the form of ancient virtue/vice lists, which contain far more criteria than qualifications associated with handling riches. For this reason, two sets of terms or themes will be examined in this dissertation.

First, the theme codified hereafter as *greed* emerges in both lists with a variety of terms. A bishop must be ἀφιλάργυρον, “not greedy or not a lover of money” (v. 3), and deacons should be μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, “not avaricious, eager for shameful gain, fond of dishonest gain, or greedy for money” (v. 8).²⁶³

Second, terms in the semantic domain of *stewardship* also surface in both lists. These words occur in reference to the role of the leader in the context of household management: τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, “governing or managing his household well” (vv. 4-5); and, similarly for deacons as: καλῶς προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων, “those who manage their household well” (v. 12).²⁶⁴ This theme, labeled as *stewardship* in this study, presupposes that the candidates for these roles were householders, possessing some measure of wealth.²⁶⁵

These two themes, *greed* and *stewardship*, will be reviewed in antiquity.²⁶⁶

The extant material will be divided into three general categories: (1) virtue/vice lists in the Greco-Roman world, (2) virtue/vice lists in Jewish literature, and (3) epigraphic evidence related to religious leaders in Ephesus. After an examination of these three types of evidence, we will compare the findings with the testimony of Xenophon of Ephesus to see how *Ephesiaca* may aid us in reading 1 Tim 3:1-13.

²⁶³ On φιλαργυρία, “love of money,” or φιλάργυρος, “loving money,” see: *TLNT* 2:446-7; cf. 1 Tim 6:10, *BAGD*, 157. The expression may derive from an ancient comedy author, see: Steven T. Byington, “1 Timothy VI,10.” *ExpTim* 56 (1944): 54. On μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, see *TLNT* 1:45-8; *BAGD*, 29. Cf. Tit 1:7; Polybius, *Histories* 6.46.3; 6.46.9; 6.47.4. Cf. Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum* 57-58; Spicq, *TLNT* 1:65-68.

²⁶⁴ On προϊστημι, see also *TDNT* 6:700-03. Cf. Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*, 1st ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997); August Strobel, “Der Begriff des ‘Haus’ im griechischen und römischen Privatrecht.” *ZNW* 56 (1965): 91-100.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Verner, *Household of God*, 133. Household holders were often people of noble birth. While household holders may have expected leadership roles in the cultural setting, the criteria may change for leadership roles in God’s house.

²⁶⁶ Cultural norms led household holders to expect to ascend to leadership. For exploration of these themes in the Corinthian context, see: Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006); Robert S. Dutch, *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians: Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman context* (London: T & T Clark, 2005).

4.1.2.1. Virtue/Vice Lists in the Greco-Roman World

This section reviews ethical catalogs in the Greco-Roman world to determine how the themes of *greed* and *stewardship* appear in the virtue/vice lists in antiquity.

Discussions on ἀρετή, “virtue,” can be traced to the ethical teachings of Socrates (469-399 BCE). Shortly thereafter, Plato (c. 429-347 BCE) explains ἀρετή using the terms: σωφροσύνη, “temperance,” φρόνησις/σοφία, “prudence/wisdom,” ἀνδρεία, “fortitude or courage,” and δικαιοσύνη, “justice” (*Protagoras* 330b). Later, in *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle (384-322 BCE) classified the virtues and vices in elaborate categories. Zeno (384-322 BCE), founder of the Stoa, is credited for pioneering the use of ethical catalogs or lists.²⁶⁷ Stoics such as Chrysippus, (280-210 BCE) used words like ἐπιστήμη, “knowledge,” in place of ἀρετή, however, the four divisions of virtue remained consistent through the Republic and into the Empire, as Cicero (106-43 BCE) attests:

Virtue is a habit of the mind, consistent with nature, and moderation, and reason. Wherefore, when we have become acquainted with all its divisions, it will be proper to consider the whole force of simple honesty. It has then four divisions: prudence (*prudential*), justice (*iustitia*), fortitude (*fortitudo*), temperance (*temperantia*). (*De Inventione* 2.53.159-2.54.163)

Seneca captures the centrality of virtue in the Greco-Roman mind in the first century CE with this statement (c. 4 BCE-65 CE): “If virtue precede us, every step will be safe.”²⁶⁸ Ephesian inscriptions reveal these virtues were celebrated there as well.²⁶⁹ To ensure virtues were present (and vices were absent) in candidates for positions of leadership in antiquity, the evidence reveals that qualification lists were employed.²⁷⁰

The Greco-Roman ethical catalogs or qualification lists in the days of the Empire included the themes of *greed* and *stewardship*. For example, in *De Coniuratione Catilinae*, Sallust, a Roman historian (86 BCE-35 BCE), employs the

²⁶⁷ Charles, “Virtue and Vice Lists,” 1252-57.

²⁶⁸ “Agedum vertis antecedit, tutum erit omne vestigium.” Cf. Jon R. Stone, ed., *The Routledge Dictionary of Latin Quotations* (New York: Routledge, 2005) 135.

²⁶⁹ For illustrations of this in the library in Ephesus, see: Volker Michael Strocka, *The Celsus Library in Ephesus* (Freiburg: Sonderdrucke aus der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, 2003) 33-43.

²⁷⁰ Cf. C. Bradford Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy* (New Haven, Prague: Kondakov Institute, 1934) for discussion on leadership appointments in the Hellenistic period.

term, *avaritia*, Latin for “greed,” ten times, naming it a primary vice that contributed to the downfall of the Republic (*italics mine*):

But when, by perseverance and integrity, the Republic had increased its power; when mighty princes had been vanquished in war; when barbarous tribes and populous states had been reduced to subjection; when Carthage, the rival of Rome’s dominion, had been utterly destroyed, and sea and land lay everywhere open to her sway, Fortune then began to exercise her tyranny, and to introduce universal innovation. To those who had easily endured toils, dangers, and doubtful and difficult circumstances, ease and wealth, the objects of desire to others, became a burden and a trouble. *At first the love of money, and then that of power, began to prevail, and these became, as it were, the sources of every evil. For avarice subverted honesty, integrity, and other honorable principles, and, in their stead, inculcated pride, inhumanity, contempt of religion, and general venality.* Ambition prompted many to become deceitful; to keep one thing concealed in the breast, and another ready on the tongue; to estimate friendships and enmities, not by their worth, but according to interest; and to carry rather a specious countenance than an honest heart. These vices at first advanced but slowly, and were sometimes restrained by correction; but afterwards, when their infection had spread like a pestilence, the state was entirely changed, and the government, from being the most equitable and praiseworthy, became rapacious and insupportable. (*De Coniuratione Catilinae* 10)

Later in this same work, Sallust describes two groups as possessing *avaritia*, “avarice,” namely: *de avaritia magistratum* (40) and *avaritia nostrorum civium* (52), that is, “the magistrates and the leading citizens.” Their charge is described as *magistratus praessent* (30), suggesting the magistrates’ management role. In Sallust’s thinking, *greed* must play no part in the management or the *stewardship* of a leader, as it is the source of every evil. Other ancient voices in the Greco-Roman world share this view of greed.²⁷¹

From 49 CE we have an example that features both *greed* and *stewardship*. Onasander, a Greek philosopher, includes ἀφιλάργυρον as a virtue that must be present in candidates for στρατηγός, “general,” as it would affect the leader’s ability to manage. Dedicated to consul Quintus Veranius Nepos, this list, *De imperatoris officio*, outlines the qualifications for a general in section one and offers explanation of ἀφιλάργυρον in section eight.

²⁷¹ Cf. 1 Tim 6:10, which will be explored further in chapter six of this dissertation. For more Greco-Roman uses of “the love of money” as the source of great evil, see: Diodorus Siculus 21.1; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.50; Dio Chrysostom, *On Kingship* 4.84; Epictetus, *Discourses* 2.45.6. See also: Luke Timothy Johnson, *Letters to Paul’s Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*, NTIC (Valley Forge: Trinity Press 1996) 141-58.

§1. I believe, then, that we must choose a general, not because of noble birth (γένη κρίνοντας) as priests are chosen, nor because of wealth as the superintendents of the gymnasias, but because he is temperate (σώφρονα), self-restrained, vigilant, frugal, hardened to labour, alert, free from avarice (ἀφιλάργυρον), neither too young or too old, indeed a father of children if possible, a ready speaker, and a man with a good reputation.

§8. Free from avarice (ἀφιλάργυρον); for this quality of freedom from avarice will be valued most highly, since it is largely responsible for the incorruptible and large-minded management (προστασθαι) of affairs. For many who can face the shields and spears of a host with courage are blinded by gold; but gold is a strong weapon against the enemy and effective for victory.²⁷²

In Onasander's view, leaders must be free of *greed* that could hinder in the execution of one's *stewardship* of affairs. Because the language in 1 Tim 3:1-13 mirrors the virtues expected of leaders in lists such as Onasander's, Dibelius and Conzelmann aver that "a fixed pattern, a schema," underlies the teaching in 1 Tim: "In this list, which is strikingly similar to the list in 1 Tim 3:2ff, we find scarcely one virtue which would be especially appropriate to a military commander."²⁷³ Thus, they believe the pattern for choosing leaders in God's church came from the prevailing Greco-Roman culture.

Ben Witherington seems to concur: "What this shows is that the character description here of the overseer has some significant overlap with the desirable traits of other holders of high office in that culture. In some respects the church had adopted some of the higher standards of the surrounding culture."²⁷⁴ Had this taken place? Marshall believes any overlap between the lists stems from the desire to keep the church from falling into disrepute, which Johnson suggests may have already taken place.²⁷⁵ Roland Schwarz sees any alignment "with Greco-Roman exhortation as a strategy to counter the influence of false teachers."²⁷⁶ Opinions are mixed.²⁷⁷

²⁷² Cf. Onasander, *De imperatoris officio* §1, 8, in Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 158-59; cf. William Oldfather, ed. *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander*. LCL, vol. 156 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923).

²⁷³ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 50-51, 160. They draw on two other examples to support this view: Libanius, *Progymnasmata in Loci communes* 3.7 and Lucian, *De saltatione* [Pantomimus] 81.

²⁷⁴ Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2 Timothy and 1-3 John*, vol. 1 (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006) 236.

²⁷⁵ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 473; Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 286-88.

²⁷⁶ Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum*, 156-58; Harding, *What Are They Saying about the Pastoral Epistles?* 55.

²⁷⁷ Cf. Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991) for more on how Christian discourse was shaped by its context.

Clearly, lexical similarities exist between the expectations of leaders in Sallust, Onasander, and other qualification lists when compared to 1 Tim 3:1-13. And, relevant to this study, 1 Tim 3:1-13 seems to mirror the Greco-Roman virtue/vice lists in which *greed* was a vice that adversely affected the execution of one's *stewardship*. There is, however, a significant difference between 1 Tim 3:1-13 and the Greco-Roman qualification lists that scholars have not pointed out, which surfaces in *De imperatoris officio*.

Onasander does *not* state that there are character-related qualifications for religious leaders, but rather declares that they ascend to their roles by way of noble birth. If this was the cultural norm, then despite the lexical similarities between Greco-Roman qualification lists and the list in 1 Tim 3:1-13, the author of 1 Tim may be outlining qualifications for religious leaders that represent a departure from social and cultural norms: character instead of genealogy.

This raises questions to explore: Would rich Ephesians expect to ascend to religious leadership roles in *Ephesiaca* based on noble birth? Do religious leaders in *Ephesiaca* demonstrate *greed* or the desire for shameful gain? Does the theme of faithful household *stewardship* occur in the story? And, does 1 Tim 3:1-13 reflect adoption of cultural standards for choosing leaders, or may other sources have influenced the list, such as Jewish virtue/vice lists? In other words, might ancient evidence support that the moralists were not the only ones to mention *greed* and *stewardship* in their lists? A survey of ancient Jewish evidence comes next.

4.1.2.2. Virtue/Vice Lists in Ancient Jewish Literature

Virtue is a topic not only celebrated by Greco-Roman philosophers; it also emerges in ancient Jewish literature. In various Jewish writings and virtue/vice lists, terms in the semantic domain of *greed* and *stewardship* occur.

This excerpt from Wisdom of Solomon (c. 220 BCE to 50 CE) asserts desirable virtues in a fashion that reflects Stoic influence:

If riches are a desirable possession in life, what is richer than wisdom, the active cause all things? And if understanding is effective, who more than she is fashioner of what exists? And if any one loves righteousness, her labors are virtues; for she teaches self-control and prudence, justice and courage; nothing in life is more profitable for mortals than these. (8:5-7)

J. Daryl Charles believes that the language of this text reveals Hellenistic influence on Judaism, though influence should not be misinterpreted as the source of such thinking as the text itself cites the source as “the wisdom of God” and not the moral philosophers (8:21-10:14).²⁷⁸

Wisdom of Solomon also mentions the vice of *greed* and the virtue of *stewardship*. On *greed*, it states that “lovers of evil things” declare that “life is a festival held for profit” and that “one must get money however one can, even by base means” (15:6, 12). This sounds like the “profiteering” posture leaders are urged to avoid in 1 Tim 3:8.²⁷⁹ On *stewardship*, it says the “souls of the righteous” will “govern nations and rule over peoples, and the Lord will reign over them forever” (3:1, 8). The language of faithful governance exercised under the authority of God sounds similar to the leadership called for in God’s church in 1 Tim 3:4-5, 12.

Consider another Jewish example. The vice list in the Qumran Community Rule located among documents dated broadly between the third century BCE and 68 CE employs the term *greed* atop an abominable vice list:

But the ways of the spirit of falsehood are these: greed, and slackness in the search for righteousness, wickedness and lies, haughtiness and pride, falseness and deceit, cruelty and abundant evil, ill-temper and much folly and brazen insolence, abominable deeds (committed) in a spirit of lust, and ways of lewdness in the service of uncleanness, a blaspheming tongue, blindness of eye and dullness of ear, stiffness of neck and a heaviness of heart, so that man walks in all the ways of darkness and guile. (1QS 4:3-11)

Though this ethical list, at first glance, may read like the literary-rhetorical pattern of Greco-Roman vice lists, Charles believes this ethical teaching was molded by the

²⁷⁸ Charles, “Vice and Virtue Lists,” 1254.

²⁷⁹ Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 281.

dualism of light and darkness or righteousness and unrighteousness in Qumran theology.²⁸⁰ Again, what on the surface sounds like the Hellenistic moralists, may actually represent teaching deeply rooted in ancient Judaism.

Philo of Alexandria (20 BCE – 50 CE) refers to *greed* in his writings and vice lists. He connects **φιλαργυρία** to his instruction on idolatry in Leviticus 19:4 (cf. 1 Tim 6:10).

All the needy who are possessed by that grievous malady, the desire for money (**φιλαργυρία**), though they have no wealth of their own on which they may bestow worship as its due, pay awe-struck homage to that of their neighbors, and come at early dawn to the houses of those who have abundance of it as though they were the grandest temples, there to make their prayers and beg for blessing from the masters as though they were gods. To such he says elsewhere “Ye shall not follow idols and ye shall not make molten gods,” thus teaching them in a figure that it is not fitting to assign divine honours to wealth. (*Special Laws* 1, 24.3)

With vivid detail Philo illustrates the practice of benefaction with reciprocal relationships in which those without money would give honor to rich benefactors in return for benefits. He roots his instruction in the OT Law and unmasks the unrighteous motives that drive the system of benefaction, labeling it **φιλαργυρία**. He portrays this as directing worship to other gods. From his perspective, leaders must be free of *greed* and not participate in the cycle of benefaction because those who do are guilty of idolatry.²⁸¹

The theme of *greed* also emerges in Philo’s vice lists. It appears in the life of one who commits whoredom: “...the lowest depths of outrageous conduct, into wine-bibbing and gluttony, into the love of money (**φιλαργυρία**), of reputation, of pleasure, and numberless other forms of passion and soul-sickness and vice” (*Special Laws* I, 281.3-7). He also uses the term in *Every Good Man is Free* in reference to, what he calls, the bad man: “...the bad man has a multitude of encumbrances, such as love of money (**φιλαργυρία**) or reputation and pleasure, while the good man has none at all” (21.3-6). Elsewhere, Philo catalogs no less than

²⁸⁰ Charles, “Vice and Virtue Lists,” 1254.

²⁸¹ Cf. Col 3:5; Eph 5:5. See also: Rosner, *Greedy as Idolatry*, 34.

150 vices, and among them: **αἰσχροκερδεὴς**, “avaricious,” (cf. 1 Tim 3:8d) is included (*Sacrifices of Abel and Cain* 32).

Stewardship language also appears in Philo with the qualifications and expectations for an overseer of the people of God (cf. Leviticus 19:16):

The law lays upon anyone who has undertaken to superintend and preside (**προστάσιαν**) over public affairs a very just prohibition when it forbids him to “to walk with fraud among the people,” for such conduct shows an illiberal and thoroughly slavish soul which disguises its malignant ways with hypocrisy. The ruler should preside (**προεστάναι**) over his subjects as a father over his children so that he himself may be honoured in return as by true-born sons, and therefore good rulers may be truly called the parents of states and nations in common, since they show a fatherly and sometimes more than fatherly affection. (*Special Laws* IV, 183-4)

For Philo, those who preside must do so in a manner both consistent with the OT Law and like a father cares for his children. It is reasonable to believe Philo’s perspective reflects the kind of Jewish thinking that may have influenced the call for leaders to manage their own home well before ascending to leadership in God’s church in 1 Tim 3:1-13.

In describing the titles of religious leaders, Philo uses *stewardship* language with a term found often in the Ephesian context, **νεωκόρος**: “The high priest, the president of the temple servants (**προεστηκότι τῶν νεωκόρων**), that of the commanders of divisions, being the gift of captains, to the captain all, even God” (*Life of Moses* I, 318). The **προεστηκότι**, “overseer of the temple servants,” managed the temple servants in submission to God. Though Philo notes elsewhere that there were times when Jewish religious leaders had become corrupt.

There were certain temple attendants, servitors of the sanctuary (**νεωκόροι καὶ ἱερόδουλοι**), appointed to the office of gate-keepers. These persons filled with insensate ambition rose against the priests whose privileges they claimed should belong to themselves. They adopted as a leader (**προστησάμενοι**) of the sedition the senior (**πρεσβύτατον**) from among them, who also with a few fellow madmen had been the instigator of the presumptuous enterprise, and leaving frontage and the outermost parts of the building proceeded toward the innermost parts of the sanctuary intending to displace those whom divine utterances had adjudged the priesthood (*On Rewards and Punishments* 74.4-7, 75).

Philo mentions religious offices, leaders, and attendants or priests, similar to the overseers and deacon roles in 1 Tim 3:1-13. Joachim Jeremias thinks that the core of corruption among the Jewish religious leaders was *greed* and a desire for worldly gain. He cites Josephus in support.²⁸²

King Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) warned his wife, as he lay dying, against the hypocrites who appeared like Pharisees (and most of the scribes were Pharisees) but were actually wicked and greedy (b. *Sot.* 22b). Their zeal was directed towards the things of this world and not of the next... (*Antiquities* 13.400)

In Josephus' thinking, Jewish religious leaders had become motivated by *greed*.²⁸³ It is reasonable to conclude that the qualification in 1 Tim 3:1-13 that leaders must avoid *greed* and exhibit faithful *stewardship* in God's church may, in part, have been established in response to historical problems.

In reading ancient Jewish literature alongside the Greco-Roman moralists, the common language in virtue/vice lists has led many to think that the people of God were using the same criteria as the surrounding Greco-Roman culture for qualifying leaders. Anton Vögtle contends, "By the sheer number and length of the virtue/vice lists, Philo seems to have achieved the measure of the Stoic popular philosophers."²⁸⁴ Charles concurs describing Philo as being "at home in both worlds," that is, the realm of the Stoic moral philosophers and Hellenistic Judaism.²⁸⁵

Along these lines, Philo himself makes this comment: "We may well suppose that the fountain book from which Zeno drew his thought was the law-book

²⁸² Though we cannot verify the specific details of this comment by Josephus, we must include it in this exploration of ancient evidence because it represents an ancient Jewish witness attesting to the greed of the religious leaders. Joachim Jeremias, Freda Helen Cave, and Cyril Hayward Cave, *Jerusalem in the time of Jesus*, 3rd ed. (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969) 114.

²⁸³ Cf. Luke 16:14. Halvor Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2004) 1-9. "Were the Pharisees lovers of money?" Moxnes suggests instead to ask: "What did Luke intend by this statement?" He makes two points: (1) "The accusation against the Pharisees that they were "money lovers" was part of a *topos* of accusations against opponents known both in Jewish and Greek polemics. In Hellenistic and early Christian discourse it was especially used of false teachers." (2) "This accusation was frequently combined with that of seeking glory, honor, and praise from men, that is, the same accusation that Jesus makes in Luke 16:15, that the Pharisees want to look righteous before men."

²⁸⁴ Anton Vögtle, "Die Tugend und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament " *NTAbh* 16, 4-5 (1936): 107.

²⁸⁵ Charles, "Vice and Virtue Lists," 1254.

of the Jews” (*Every Good Man is Free* 57.1-3). In Philo’s thinking, the moralists were also influenced by the OT Law and not necessarily just the other way around.

Rather than reading Jewish literature as imitating the moral philosophers, or *vice versa* as Philo reports, we have found that both the Stoa *and* Torah, that is, moral philosophy *and* ancient Jewish thinking, may have influenced ethical catalogs and qualification lists in the years leading up to and including the first century CE. If accepted, both moral philosophy and ancient Jewish thinking may have influenced writings such as 1 Tim 3:1-13.

This raises more questions for *Ephesiaca*: How may social realities in the Ephesian setting have shaped 1 Tim 3:1-13? Did religious leaders in Ephesus in the first century CE participate in the institution of benefaction, which was described by Philo as rooted in **φιλαργυρία** and considered a practice that directly violated the OT Law? Was their *stewardship* driven by *greed*, which is idolatry (cf. Ephesians 5:5; Colossians 3:5)? Before looking at *Ephesiaca*, our focus turns to Ephesian inscriptions linked to religious leaders.

4.1.2.3. Epigraphic Evidence related to Religious Leaders in Ephesus

Ephesus in the first century CE was the city of Artemis and the religious or cultic leaders who served the goddess had a variety of titles. In revisiting the inscriptions and literary evidence, Jan Bremmer concludes that Ephesus had a leading priestess with other female priestly attendants, male priests, and **κουρητες** or *curetes*.²⁸⁶

Of interest to this study are any possible clues or qualifications for becoming the leading priestess, or a priest, or one of the *curetes*. Does the evidence support noble birth as the primary criteria for religious or cultic leadership or were there

²⁸⁶ Jan N. Bremmer, "Priestly Personnel of the Ephesian Artemision: Anatolian, Persian, Greek and Roman Aspects," (2008), http://theol.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/FILES/root/2008/Priestly_1/Bremmer-Priests.pdf [Accessed 30 March 2009] 37-53. On the leading female priestess, see also: Aristarche in Strabo, *Geography* 4.1.4; and references to other leading ladies in: Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 6.8.14; Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* 1.22; *Apollonius of Tyre* RA48. On male priests, see: *IvE* 18b. "Curetes" is the term used by scholars to speak of the **κουρητες**, religious leaders also known as "priests," who were responsible for various cultic duties.

character qualifications? Also, how may the themes of *greed* and/or *stewardship* emerge in the evidence linked to religious leaders in Ephesus?

Inscriptions reveal that the foremost female priestess was responsible for the distributions of money from temple funds on the birthday celebration of Artemis, for wreathing the temple, and performing public sacrifice; she could even reorganize the temple cult.²⁸⁷ On occasion, she used personal resources to pay cultic expenses,²⁸⁸ and in the case of Helvidia Paula, funded the construction and dedication of a building (*IvE* 492).²⁸⁹ Bremmer notes that this would have been a position “of great honour and by far the most common office taken on by upper-class woman.”²⁹⁰ Rogers agrees that the female chief priestess would have been a woman of noble birth. In support, he cites first and second century CE examples of leading women.²⁹¹

Others from among the Ephesian elite performed similar duties alongside this leading lady in rising to the roles of priestess and priest.²⁹² Pertinent to this project, language surfaces in the semantic domains of *greed* and *stewardship*. Language linked to *ἀδίκό ἐπιθυμίαν*, “unjust desire,” for shameful gain and corrupt *προϊσταμένων*, “management,” in the priesthood appears in the edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus, the Roman proconsul of Asia, in 44 CE (*IvE* 18b.8-18).

The priestesses and priests of Artemis were using the house of the goddess as a front for activities that helped them make a profit for themselves. They “had started to create priesthoods in order to enable the elite to enrich itself through the perquisites assigned to these priesthoods,” and Bremmer concludes that by about

²⁸⁷ *IvE* 27, 987, 3059. Cf. Bremmer, “Priestly Personnel,” 42.

²⁸⁸ Philip A. Harland, “Honours and Worship: Emperors, Imperial Cults and Associations at Ephesus (first to third centuries CE).” *SR* 25 (1996): 319-34.

²⁸⁹ On the use of personal funds for cultic activities, see: *IvE* 989, 1139, 3072. On Helvidia Paula, c. 89/90 CE, see *IvE* 492. Cf. Rogers, *Sacred Identity of Ephesus*, 54-55; 75, note 74.

²⁹⁰ Bremmer, “Priestly Personnel,” 42.

²⁹¹ Rogers, *Sacred Identity of Ephesus*, 54; 75, note 73. For examples, see: *IvE* 411, 617, 637, 661, 690, 892, 894, 897, 980, 983, 984, 1068, 3072.

²⁹² Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, 77-113. The Kroegers suggest that the high priestess and/or other leading women in the Artemis cult may also have had teaching responsibilities. They believe such women may have been promoting heresy regarding the origin of man among other teachings. While their view has been refuted by many, I have not found a response to the evidence they put forth that is more convincing than their position.

104 CE, “priests were still so prestigious that they belonged to the class of the ‘gold bearing’ citizens.”²⁹³ *Greed* may have motivated the abuse of their *stewardship*.

Closely related to the priestly leaders were the *curetes*. The *curetes* served to protect the sacred reputation of Ephesus. That is to say, if Artemis gave the city its distinction, they endeavored to keep it that way.²⁹⁴ They held different titles, probably tied to respective religious duties, but the details of their work remains a mystery to researchers. What were the qualifications for joining? Does the evidence support noble birth as the primary criterion for cultic leadership? Can evidence support appointment based on character qualifications or genealogical lines?

Die Inschriften von Ephesos, Teil IV 1001-1080b, lists *Kureteninschriften und verwandte Texte*, that is, the catalog of *curetes* inscriptions with related text dated between the reign of Emperors Tiberius (14-37 CE) and Alexander Severus (222-235 CE).²⁹⁵ A closer look at the *curetes* inscriptions of the first century CE (*IvE* 1001-1020) reveals five offices (or roles) with family ties and specific recurring rhetoric.²⁹⁶ The *curetes* lists contain nothing regarding qualifications *per se*.

Table #3: *Curetes* Inscriptions of the First Century CE (*IvE* 1001-1020)

<i>IvE</i> (CE date)	ιεροφάντης	ιεροσκόπος	ἐπί θυμιάτρου	ιεροκήρυξ	σπονδαύλης
1001 (14-37)	--	--	--	--	Ἀλέξανδρος
1002 (14-37)	--	--	--	Καπίτων	Ἀλέξανδρος
1003 (- -)	--	--	--	[Καπίτων]	Μητράς
1004-07 (41-68)	--	Μάρκος	᾽Ολυμπικός	Καπίτων	Μητράς
1008 (54-59)	--	Μάρκος	᾽Ολυμπικός	Μηνόδοτος	Μητράς
1009 (- -)	--	Μάρκος	᾽Ολυμπικός	Μηνόδοτος	--
1010 (92)	--	Μάρκος	᾽Αττικός	Μηνόδοτος	Παρράσιος
1011-14 (92-97)	--	Μάρκος	᾽Αττικός	Μηνόδοτος	Τρόφιμος
1015 (95-98)	Μουνδίκιος	᾽Αρίστων	᾽Αττικός	Θευδᾶς	Τρόφιμος
1016 (96-99)	Μουνδίκιος	--	[᾽Αττικός]	Θευδᾶς	Τρόφιμος
1017-20 (97-103)	Μουνδίκιος	᾽Αρίστων	᾽Αττικός	᾽Επικράτης	Τρόφιμος

²⁹³ Bremmer, “Priestly Personnel,” 48. Cf. *IvE* 27.456.

²⁹⁴ Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 145-46, et al.

²⁹⁵ *IvE* 1001 is dated by Knibbe: *zeit des Tiberius*. *IvE* 1080 is dated by Knibbe: *etwa unter Alexander Severus*.

²⁹⁶ Chart adapted from *Chronologische Ordnung der Kuretentexte nach dem Kultpersonal in IvE*, Teil IV, 56.

This chart names for each of five offices and the dates they were ensconced in those roles in the first century CE.

What was the general nature of these five offices: *ιεροφάντης*, *ιεροσκόπος*, *ἐπιθυμιάτρου*, *ιεροκήρυξ*, and *σπονδαύλης*? What duties were associated with the *curetes*? Furthermore, what is the significance of recurring terms?

Prior to the time of Augustus, the *curetes* are found to have performed a variety of political *and* cultic responsibilities; however, Christine Thomas believes “that the transfer of the *curetes* from the Artemision to the Prytaneion during Augustan times corresponded with a reduction of their responsibilities from the political and cultic to the cultic alone.”²⁹⁷ Cultic duties may have represented a broad range of responsibilities from the liturgical to the administrative, from the privilege of offering sacrifices to Artemis to the upkeep of the temple precincts, statues and sacred objects to the execution of lotteries and distributions for banquets and festivals held in her honor. Though the evidence is fragmentary in places, when names are mentioned in these *curetes* lists, their family ties within the association of *curetes* are also cited. It seems that leading families *owned* this role in perpetuity.

On *IvE* 1002, Dieter Knibbe notes that Alexandros is the brother Olympos and Asklepiades, and his grandfather, Memnon, is also listed. Another example, *IvE* 1009, lists the names of *curetes* holding offices and mentions both a son and nephew in the ranks. *IvE* 1015 may well be the best example that participation in the leadership ranks of Artemis followed family ties among those of noble birth:

[ἐπι πρυτάνεως ... κουρήτες]
 ευσε[β]εῖς [φιλοσέβαστοι· Ἄρ]τέμων Ἄρτέμων
 νος τοῦ Ἄρ[τέ]μωνος· Σέλευκος Ἄρτεμι-
 δώρου ὁ κα[ὶ] Σε]κοῦνδος· Διόδοτος Μελαν-
 κόμα· Χρυ[σόγ]ονος Ἀλεξάνδρου· Συνφέρων
 Ἀλεξάνδ[ρου· Ἄ]ῦδος· Παψέννιος Φηλεικίων·
 Ἀρίστω[ν ἱεροσ]κόπος· Θευδᾶς ἱεροκήρυξ·
 Ἀττικὸς ἐπι θυμιάτρου· Τρόφιμος σπονδαύλης
 Μουνδίκιος ἱεροφάντης (*IvE* 1015)²⁹⁸

Knibbe notes that the full name of Ariston, on line 7, is Publius Cornelius Ariston, a

²⁹⁷ Thomas, “At Home in the City of Artemis,” 111. Cf. Dieter Knibbe, “Der Staatsmarkt: Die Inschriften des Prytaneions.” *FiE* 9.1 (1981): 74-79, 96-100.

²⁹⁸ Cf. *IvE* 1006 which appears to list four sons among the Prytanis *curetes*; however, the names may refer to a brother, uncle, or father.

Roman citizen of noble birth and adds, “the Prytanis, whose name is lost, was probably related to the two mentioned in line 5, the sons of Alexandros.”²⁹⁹ Tracing the lineage of leaders like Alexandros and Ariston in inscriptions reveals that a few noble families with Greek, Roman, and even Egyptian heritage had a lock on the cultic leadership roles among the *curetes*.³⁰⁰ The *curetes* lists log the family trees of a few prominent families committed to each other *and* to Artemis for generations through the first century CE.

Zeal for Artemis emerges in the recurring rhetoric in the *curetes* lists.

The **κουρήτες εὐσεβείς**, or “reverence of the *curetes*,” to perform their five roles, is celebrated in 17 of the 20 first century CE *curetes* inscriptions.³⁰¹ As in *IvE* 1015, these terms occur at the beginning of each inscription honoring the priestly leaders and highlighting their faithful service to Artemis.

This review of first century CE epigraphic evidence related to religious leadership in Ephesus reveals much about the priesthood and the *curetes*. There is evidence of a leading priestess coupled with other priestesses and priests. They attained their roles by noble birth, served as benefactors, and performed cultic duties in service to Artemis. On at least one occasion, terms tied to *greed* and *stewardship* surface in relationship to these religious leaders, as a mid-first century CE edict declared they had abused their stewardship motivated by a desire for unjust gain.

Related to the *curetes*: five offices, family ties, and recurring rhetoric come into view in the epigraphic evidence, which clarify two points: (1) ascension to cultic service was related to genealogy rather than character qualifications; and (2) retaining religious posts and sharing them with progeny was associated with pious service to Artemis and her temple cult. Keeping religious leadership roles came at a

²⁹⁹ On Ariston, see Knibbe’s notes on *IvE* 1015, cf. *IvE* 1017: “Der Prytanis, dessen Name verloren ist, war vermutlich verwandt mit den beiden in Zeile 5 genannten Söhnen des Alexandros.”

³⁰⁰ In Knibbe’s notes on *IvE* 1015, he also adds this comment regarding line 6: “Papsennis war ein Ägypter, der Vater des Lydus Felicio.”

³⁰¹ *IvE* 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1020.

cost. Leaders were expected to serve as pious benefactors to the Artemis cult, and they were honored in return for their generosity and service to the goddess.

4.1.3. Summary

Inner texture analysis of three categories of evidence identified three interpretive issues in considering the qualifications for religious leaders that pertain to *greed* and *stewardship* in 1 Tim 3:1-13.

First, regarding ascension to religious leadership roles: Should we conclude the qualifications lists for leaders found in 1 Tim 3:1-13 reflect assimilation to or departure from cultural norms or is there a third alternative in which degrees of similarity and difference exist together? Upon review of virtue/vice lists from the Greco-Roman world and ancient Judaism, the evidence shows that both may have influenced the language of 1 Tim 3:1-13. Furthermore, religious leaders in the culture ascended to leadership by noble birth, *not* by meeting a set of qualifications.

Second, on *greed*: Jewish voices and Ephesian evidence reveals that *greed* and a desire for shameful gain had been issues, at times, among the religious leaders in Judaism *and* among cult leaders in Ephesus. If accepted, could these themes in 1 Tim 3:1-13 be interpreted as instructions to ensure that the leaders of God's church refrain from *greed* that had corrupted *both* of those priesthoods in the larger social and cultural setting?

Third, on *stewardship*: The epigraphic evidence shows that cultic leaders in Ephesus ascended to leadership by noble birth and maintained the stewardship of their posts by exhibiting piety to the goddess as generous benefactors. In this light, 1 Tim 3:1-13 calls for different behavior for ascending to and retaining religious leadership roles. Leaders in God's church should abandon the institution of benefaction, which may have been rooted in greed, and take a posture of service.

Will Xenophon of Ephesus assist in clarifying these interpretive questions?

That will be considered in intertexture analysis next.

4.2. Intertexture

This analysis will focus on terms in the semantic domains of *greed* and *stewardship* from the perspective of Xenophon of Ephesus. Additionally, we will scrutinize the cultural criteria for appointment of religious leadership in *Ephesiaca* and their relevance for understanding leadership in 1 Tim 3:1-13.

4.2.1. Themes Common to 1 Tim 3:1-13 and *Ephesiaca*

The words used in 1 Tim 3:1-13: ἀφιλάργυρον, “not greedy;” μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, “not eager for shameful gain;” and, προϊστημι, “governing or managing,” are not found in *Ephesiaca*. Interestingly, however, related terms referring to loving money, desiring dishonest gain, and faithful household management do occur. Additionally, religious leaders and those of noble birth are present throughout the story.

Do characters of noble birth expect to ascend to religious leadership roles?

Do cultic leaders demonstrate greed or an eagerness for shameful gain? Do they participate in the benefactor model? Do they demonstrate faithful household management? We will explore all these questions in the analysis below.³⁰²

4.2.2. Analysis of Common Themes

Greedy motives are evident in characters we might expect in *Ephesiaca*: pirates, gang leaders, bandits, an unnamed bad man, and even a pimp. Of keen interest to this study, avaricious behavior is also associated with religious leaders in *Ephesiaca*.

Xenophon of Ephesus portrays the pirates with greedy and lustful motives in this vivid scene:

³⁰² In this chapter, *Ephesiaca* citations follow Henderson’s translation in the LCL unless otherwise noted.

It so happened that in Rhodes some pirates of Phoenician origin were moored alongside [Anthia and Habrocomes] in a great trireme; they moored there as if carrying cargo and were a large and lusty lot. They discovered that there was gold, silver, slaves, and many valuable goods aboard the adjoining ship. So they decided to attack...(1.13.1-2)

The pirates' attack was successful. They took Anthia and Habrocomes along with the plunder, back to their leader, Apsyrtus, who demonstrates a desire for selfish gain in this scene back at their lair.

Meanwhile Apsyrtus, the leader of the gang, heard that Corymbus' men had returned with a lot of marvelous booty and went to their place. When he saw Habrocomes' group he was astounded by their good looks, and right away recognizing a large profit he claimed them for himself. The rest of the money, goods, and gifts that had been captured he distributed to Corymbus' men. (2.2.1-2)

The greedy behavior of these brigands and their leader befits their criminal career.

In a scene narrated by Hippothous, Aristomachus, a wealthy man from Byzantium, buys his dear Hyperanthes from the lad's father, who displays avarice:

Once in love [Aristomachus] could no longer restrain his love, but started by sending messages to [Hyperanthes], and when that was getting nowhere, since on account of his feelings for [Hippothous] Hyperanthes let no one approach, he won over the youth's father, a bad man with a weakness for money. (3.2.7)

Here Xenophon of Ephesus depicts as "bad" a man with a "weakness for money."

Pimps also exhibit their love for money and shameful gain through the desire for profit from selling the services of prostitutes as illustrated by this scene: "Anthia was taken to Tarentum, a city in Italy, where Clytus, anxious about Rhenaea's orders, sold her to a pimp. When he set eyes on such beauty as he had never before beheld, he reckoned the girl would make him a big profit..." (5.5.7-8). The pimp seeks profit at the expense of Anthia, and Xenophon of Ephesus describes this motive as shameful. Along with the pirates, their leader, and the bad man mentioned above, this love of money represents culturally unacceptable behavior.

Next, the religious leaders must also be examined for greedy or motives of shameful gain. In *Ephesiaca*, Xenophon of Ephesus presents the main characters, Habrocomes and Anthia, in priestly service in the precincts of the Artemisium along

with other unnamed priests as the story unfolds (1.5.1; 1.8.1). He depicts them as anticipating religious and community leadership roles tied to their noble birth and virtues. The story begins by highlighting the *καλὸς*, “handsome, good or noble,”³⁰³ traits of Habrocomes.

In Ephesus there was a man named Lycomedes, one of the most powerful people in the city. This Lycomedes and his wife Themisto, also a local, had a son, Habrocomes, a paragon of handsomeness without precedent in Ionia or anywhere else. This Habrocomes grew handsomer by the day, and his spiritual virtues blossomed along with his physical excellences, for he pursued every field of study and practiced a variety of arts, and hunting, riding, and training with heavy weapons were exercises familiar to him. He was much sought after by all Ephesians and by the inhabitants of the rest of Asia as well, and they had high hopes that he would be a citizen of distinction. They treated the young man like a god, and there were some who at the sight of him even bowed down and offered prayers. The young man held a high opinion of himself, glorying both in his spiritual accomplishments and even more so in his physical beauty. Everything generally reckoned fine he despised as inferior, and nothing seen or heard seemed worthy of Habrocomes. Whenever he was told that a boy was handsome (*καλὸν*) or a girl pretty, he would mock those who said so for not knowing that he alone was handsome (*καλὸς*). (1.1.4-5)

...at the sight of Habrocomes [the Ephesians] all forgot about [the procession of Anthia and the other young women] and turned their gaze to him, stunned at the sight and shouting “Handsomeness (*καλὸς*) Habrocomes...” (1.2.8)

Next to Habrocomes, no young Ephesian was as noble or handsome! Xenophon of Ephesus cites both his spiritual accomplishments and physical appearance presenting him as a noble citizen who could anticipate posts of distinction in both priestly and political service.

Anthia appears in *Ephesiaca* in similar supreme fashion: the people celebrate her noble birth as daughter of prominent locals, Megamedes and Euipe, and her physical beauty and even worship her as Artemis (1.2.7). Together, all of Ephesus perceives them as the perfect pair! After chanting “noble Habrocomes,” they add: “What a match Habrocomes and Anthia would make!” (1.2.9). Anthia’s personal attestation of nobility, later appears central to her plea for mercy from Lampo.³⁰⁴ In *Ephesiaca*, Habrocomes and Anthia qualify for civic leadership and priestly service by virtue of noble birth, extraordinary virtues, and external appearance.

³⁰³ Cf. *BAGD*, 400, which also renders this term, “noble.”

³⁰⁴ Anthia’s “*τὴν προτέραν εὐγένειαν*,” translated by Henderson as “her high estate,” serves as a leading reason why Lampo should spare her life (*Ephesiaca* 2.9.4). Cf. G. Dalmeyda, *Xenophon d’Éphèse*, 5

R. E. Witt suggests Anthia was “the leading priestess” at Ephesus worshiped in the procession as Artemis. He emphasizes, however, that Anthia serves both Artemis *and* Isis who have interchangeable roles in the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus. Witt thinks the two goddesses are depicted in this way because they were seen as unified in the ancient world.³⁰⁵ Elizabeth Hazelton Haight concurs pointing out two noteworthy examples that reveal this perspective: Xenophon of Ephesus portrays Anthia as garbed like Artemis (1.2.2-7) *and* mentions that she was consecrated by her parents as a priestess of Isis from birth (3.11.4-12.1).³⁰⁶

In Ephesus, Habrocomes and Anthia demonstrate their piety to Artemis by participating in the community sacrifice to the goddess (1.3.1), performing cultic duties daily in service to the goddess (1.5.1), hosting all night community activities and offering sacrifices at the time of their wedding (1.8.1), offering special sacrifices to Artemis at the time of their departure by the direction of the oracle (1.10.5), and by giving her all the credit for delivering them from danger on their adventures in a grand inscription:

The whole city had already heard the news of their salvation. As soon as they disembarked, they went just as they were to the temple of Artemis, offered up many prayers and made sacrifice, then set up dedications, among them dedicating to the goddess the inscription commemorating all that they had experienced and done.” (5.15.2)

In *Ephesiaca*, the author of the story repeatedly describes the couple as serving Artemis and believing that Artemis faithfully served them.

Outside of Ephesus, Habrocomes and Anthia also provided priestly service in the benefactor model to other gods, including Isis, presented as mystically one with Artemis. The oracle identifies Isis as their savior and the one to whom they will offer rich gifts, though they also extend this distinction to Artemis (1.6.2). Anthia describes herself as dedicated for service to Isis from birth, though she also appears in the story in service to the goddess, Artemis (3.12.1). In the temple in Memphis,

³⁰⁵ R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Ancient World* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997) 243.

³⁰⁶ Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, *Essays on the Greek Romances* (New York: Longmans & Company, 1943) 42-45.

Anthia prays twice to Isis for deliverance, while also often calling to Artemis for rescue in other scenes (4.3.3-4, 5.4.6-7). And, after Habrocomes and Anthia ultimately survive their adventures, Artemis *and* Isis are credited with saving them (5.13.4; 5.15.2).

Habrocomes and Anthia honored other gods as well. They offered gifts and experienced deliverance from Helios, the god of the sun. For example, after being welcomed by the people of Rhodes, they visit the temple, make a generous gift as would have been expected of rich guests, and in turn, they pay for an inscription which honors them, a typical act in the benefactor model (1.12.2).

Later, Habrocomes calls out to the sun, Helios in the Greek mind, and to the Nile to save him from unjust crucifixion and punishment (4.2.4-10). Miraculously, the gods delivered him twice: Habrocomes is depicted by Xenophon of Ephesus as if he had been crucified and risen from the dead.

Throughout *Ephesiaca*, Habrocomes and Anthia can be found performing priestly service to Artemis and the gods while participating in the benefactor model as expected of rich people. While they do not overtly display a desire for shameful gain, as other likely characters have, unnamed priests in the story actually do appear to be driven by such an unjust desire. Priests in *Ephesiaca* perform various duties in manners that seem customary *and* noble. However, at the homes of both Anthia and Habrocomes, their spiritual assistance is portrayed as ignoble.

Lycomedes and Themisto were considerably depressed, not knowing what had happened to Habrocomes but frightened by what they saw. Megamedes and Euipe had become equally frightened about Anthia as they saw her beauty fading away without an apparent reason for her affliction. Finally they brought seers and priests to Anthia to find relief from her terrible state. Upon arrival they sacrificed victims, made various libations, uttered exotic words to placate, so they said, certain divinities, and pretended that their terrible state came from the underworld gods. Lycomedes' household also made plenty of sacrifices and prayers for Habrocomes, but there was no relief for either of them from their terrible state... (1.5.5-8)

Though Xenophon of Ephesus does not label the seers and priests as greedy, he does unveil their activities as pretending to placate the gods. They can offer no aid but

still performed rituals in the homes of these two rich Ephesian couples. This probably came at a significant financial cost to the parents and likely betrays their shameful desire for gain.

Though *προϊστημι*, “household management,” does not appear in *Ephesiaca*, the idea occurs in one instance: when Apsyrtus realized that he had wrongfully punished Habrocomes for the wrongdoing alleged by Manto.

Take heart, young man: I believed a daughter’s allegations and wrongly condemned you. But now I will make you a free man instead of a slave, I will put you in charge of my own household, and will marry you to a daughter of one of our citizens; for your part, bear me no grudge over what has happened because I did not mean to wrong you. (2.10.2)

After Habrocomes was exonerated of wrongdoing and deemed trustworthy, Apsyrtus offered him the position of chief steward of his house. Had he taken it, it would have positioned him to make decisions related to the wealth of his master.

4.2.3. Summary

The themes of *greed* and *stewardship* found in 1 Tim 3:1-13 are also present in *Ephesiaca*. Furthermore, *Ephesiaca* illuminates anew the social and cultural setting of those aspiring to religious leadership in ancient Ephesus in two ways.

First, *Ephesiaca* affirms that prominent rich people would have expected to assume cultic or religious leadership roles linked to their noble birth. It reveals that rich nobility in Ephesus owned these leadership spots, retained their sacred roles through providing services and conferring benefactions, enjoyed associated perquisites for their commitment to the cult, and transferred their positions to their progeny. The path to leadership that comes into view in our survey of other ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca* delineates a social and cultural pattern quite different from the teachings in 1 Tim 3:1-13. In God’s church, leadership appointments must be related to character rather than noble birth.

Second, *Ephesiaca* has illustrated some of the services of religious leaders in ancient Ephesus not found elsewhere, and on one occasion, Xenophon of Ephesus presents them as pious, profiting pretenders. The parents of Habrocomes and Anthia called in the priests and seers, and rather than providing assistance, they faked placating the gods and undoubtedly received financial gain in return for the religious services rendered to the wealthy families. Though religious leaders were lauded for their service in antiquity, from Xenophon of Ephesus we surmise that greed may have been a key motivation of the religious fraternity. The insistence in 1 Tim 3:1-13 that leaders be known for their ἀφιλάργυρον would aim to ensure that the character and service of leaders in God's church not be prone to such vices.

4.3. Ideological Texture

Ideological texture shifts our focus from *Ephesiaca* and 1 Tim 3:1-13 to the people of Ephesus. How would they have heard this teaching? Might the path to religious leadership change? If the service of priests referred to as "gold-bearing citizens" would change, what would be different (*JvE* 27.456)? We must consider the implications of our findings in light of the author, audience, and culture next.

4.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in *Ephesiaca*

Classical scholars have put forth helpful theories regarding the author, audience and culture in *Ephesiaca* that related to religious leadership in Ephesus.

Reinhold Merkelbach and Witt aver that *Ephesiaca* is a "hieros logos," a sacred writing, and Witt adds this about the author: "Xenophon is not just a storyteller. He has a didactic and indeed a religious aim. His tale is that of the salvation of human lives through faith in divine powers that do intervene."³⁰⁷ In their thinking, *Ephesiaca* is more than a novella. Xenophon of Ephesus appears to call readers and

³⁰⁷ Witt, *Isis in the Ancient World*, 249-53.

hearers of his “sacred utterance” or “sacred story” to put their trust in Artemis by demonstrating that regardless of the challenges they face in life, the goddess will deliver those who trust in her.³⁰⁸

Gareth Schmeling adds: “It is possible that Xenophon wrote under the patronage of one or more wealthy individuals, perhaps a public official, or (if Merkelbach and Witt are right) perhaps the wealthy priests and priestesses of the Artemis/Isis cult in Ephesus.”³⁰⁹ If accepted, it is entirely plausible to suggest that *Ephesiaca* is a product of or linked to the cultic leaders of Artemis in Ephesus.

Regarding the religious and instructional purpose of *Ephesiaca*, which lays the foundation for understanding the audience, Witt comments:

Just as in the New Testament the purpose is to set forth the Gospel, the *Good News*, and to proclaim the *Mighty Works* of Christ’s *Messengers* (the *Acts of the Apostles*) so in the literature of Isiacism, of which the *Ephesiaca* is a fair specimen, the implied aim is to prove the redemptive power of faith.

The biggest drawback for Xenophon and the other authors of *Erotica*, from the standpoint of the comparative study of religion, is the baffling polytheism.³¹⁰

Xenophon appears to teach his audience to exalt Artemis in Ephesus, to see Isis in mystical unity with her, and to show respect to other gods both in Ephesus and in other places. But who was the audience for this sacred writing?

According to *Ephesiaca*, the audience for this polytheistic story would have been anyone who set foot into the Artemisium. Xenophon of Ephesus concludes the story with the statement that Habrocomes and Anthia dedicated “an inscription to the goddess commemorating all that they had experienced and done” (5.15.2). The internal evidence reveals that the couple paid to post the story; in so doing, they passed on its sacred principles.

³⁰⁸ For this definition of *hieros logos* and further discussion on sacred texts, see: Sarah Iles Johnson, ed., *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004) 634.

³⁰⁹ Gareth L. Schmeling, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, TWAS 613: Greece (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980) 131-32.

³¹⁰ Witt, *Isis in the Ancient World*, 253. It would be an interesting study outside the bounds of this dissertation to compare Luke-Acts with *Ephesiaca*. While the former contains comprehensive coverage of the monotheistic gospel of Jesus Christ and life in the Early Church, *Ephesiaca* appears to seek to preserve the interconnected way of life between the gods and the people in the culture of Ephesus in the first century CE. The “baffling” part about *Ephesiaca* as Witt puts it, is the polytheism. Perhaps that can be explained in what has surfaced so far: that life and the gods in the ancient Mediterranean world were all interconnected; they had to be honored *or else*.

Ephesiaca may well have been etched as a grand display of writing paid for by rich priests or even Xenophon of Ephesus himself to urge all who read or heard the story to serve Artemis supremely and respect the gods of the ancient world. If *Ephesiaca* represents a *hieros logos* rather than merely a sampling of erotica, its purpose may have been to solidify cultural rules and religious beliefs. Interestingly, *Ephesiaca* was not the only display of writing in Ephesus paid for by a wealthy leader for the purpose of preserving the religious reputation of the city.

4.3.2. Rich Leaders in the Ephesian Culture and 1 Tim 3:1-13

Epigraphic evidence offers insight into the thinking of rich Ephesian leaders concerned with the religious reputation of Ephesus in the ancient world. Consider this example: *IvE 27*, the Gaius Vibius Salutaris inscription of 104 CE.

This inscription represents the largest extant display of epigraphic evidence in Ephesus.³¹¹ It outlines the establishment of a foundation that funds the lotteries and distributions for the annual festival to honor Artemis, as well as instructions for the procession of statues to honor the gods. It also carefully extends respect to the Roman establishment while celebrating their Ionian heritage. Rogers believes that through this inscription and the activities it funded, Gaius Vibius Salutaris was seeking to define and preserve history of Ephesus and religious identity of the city.

I hope I have shown that, in the creation of that sacred identity, the Ephesians, whether by choice or compulsion—it hardly matters—left social room for foreigners, historical room for founders, and theological room for new gods. This room, even though it too had its boundaries, was probably the secret to the sacred vitality of the city of Ephesos—and, to a certain extent, classical civilization itself as well.³¹²

The same can be said of *Ephesiaca*. As long as the sacred identity of Ephesus is supremely honored, that is, Artemis, there is room for other gods in the Ephesian mind. When viewed together, *IvE 27* and *Ephesiaca* send a harmonious message.

³¹¹ Cf. Rogers, *Sacred Identity*, 186. *IvE 27* has 568 lines and is 208-430 cm in height and 494 cm in breadth.

³¹² *IvE 27*; Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 148-49.

IvE 27 outlines responsibilities for religious leaders to follow meticulously, and *Ephesiaca* brings them to life by illustrating them (1.1.1-1.3.1). Prominent Ephesians like Gaius Vibius Salutaris reinforce polytheistic thinking and tolerance of other gods and goddesses while upholding the preeminence of Artemis. Monotheistic thinking that excludes Artemis, as presented in NT writings such as 1 Tim 3:1-13, both contradicts cultural norms and represents potentially riotous thinking (cf. Acts 19:23-41).

In this *Sitz im Leben*, 1 Tim 3:1-13 symbolizes radical, counter-cultural thinking for rich Ephesians, both because it is monotheistic and because it calls for different criteria for religious leadership than described by ancient sources. Though the terms in the text reflect the lexical influence of virtue/vice lists both from the moral philosophers and Jewish literature, this review of evidence alongside *Ephesiaca* points to noble birth as the sole criterion for religious leadership in the culture, and specifically, for aspiring cultic leaders in Ephesus.

Additionally, the posture and nature of service 1 Tim 3:1-13 calls for appears antithetical to religious and social norms. Priestesses and priests of Artemis retained their roles by displaying piety and commitment to the system of balanced reciprocity and benefaction. Rich leaders like Gaius Vibius Salutaris spent huge sums of money to maintain this system and preserve the supreme reputation of Artemis. And, in a social setting where householders may have anticipated leadership roles linked to their experience, the qualifications list calls for more. Though stewardship skills are among the criteria in 1 Tim 3:1-13, the list calls for character traits in addition.

4.3.3. Summary

Ideological texture has looked at the author, audience, and culture. A closer look with aid from classical scholars has produced the notion that *Ephesiaca* may

embody a *hieros logos*, a sacred product of the prevailing priestly culture, which may have been inscribed in the Artemisium for religious instructional purposes.

We can envision *Ephesiaca* alongside other displays of writing funded by the rich to help the city maintain its sacred identity. Rich Ephesian leaders such as Gaius Vibius Salutaris paid for a similar inscription to ensure that cultural and religious beliefs were preserved despite the changes in political rule. That inscription, which also upheld the benefactor model, set in stone specific traditions and activities that religious leaders were instructed to continue in perpetuity in Ephesus. In light of the social setting and cultural rules, *Ephesiaca* emerges as a complementary cultural fixture; conversely, the teachings of 1 Tim 3:1-13 sound radically counter-cultural.

While the language may have sounded familiar, the instructions in 1 Tim 3:1-13 call for a new way of appointing religious leaders. This text also urges them to perform duties in accordance with a new frame of reference: a service model rather than the benefaction model. While rich Ephesians may have been accepting of other religious traditions, they were simultaneously quite protective of their heritage, rooted in Artemis, *and* their system of serving her, which was rooted in greed.³¹³

4.4. Sacred Texture

Sacred texture represents the final step in examining 1 Tim 3:1-13 through the lens of *Ephesiaca*. Our methodological focus shifts to looking at the relationship between God and people. This section will compare the findings with other NT passages.

4.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text

The qualifications list 1 Tim 3:1-13 pertains to leaders in God's church (v. 5).

Additionally, their service is rooted in faith that is in Christ Jesus (v. 13). Thus, God

³¹³ This monotheistic teaching, when viewed in the larger context of 1 Tim, calls the religious leaders in the Ephesian context, who have been identified as among the rich, to shift from having a reputation as "gold-bearing" citizens (*IvE* 27.456) to being known as "gold-sharing" citizens (1 Tim 6:17-19).

appears in the text as the basis for leadership, service, and faith. The rich are located in the text as those who may qualify for religious leadership if, among other criteria, they are detached from riches and serve as faithful household stewards. Riches also appear in the text in two dangerous forms: the love of money (v. 3) and the desire for shameful gain (v. 8). Furthermore, teachings related to God, the rich, and riches emerge in the text in a counter-cultural manner in light of ancient evidence.

In the larger literary context of 1 Tim, God is presented in a monotheistic fashion in a polytheistic world.³¹⁴ Culturally, prominent Ephesians anticipated appointment to religious leadership roles by virtue of noble birth, and they retained those roles by exhibiting piety to Artemis and the gods through their giving and service. In this setting religious leaders used riches as a tool to secure their place in society by means of the benefactor model. Conversely, the text calls for leaders that are free of *greed* and the corresponding benefactor model, and instead demonstrate faithful *stewardship* with a model rooted in humility and service (vv. 6-7, 13).³¹⁵

Dibelius and Conzelmann do not see it this way. They understand 1 Tim 3:1-13 as following a schema rooted in the “doctrines of virtue” of the Greco-Roman world as attested in literary and epigraphic evidence, which may be why they interpret these teachings as *inconsistent* with other NT teachings on riches.³¹⁶ In their view the church had assimilated to the norms of society.

We have demonstrated two points in response: (1) the themes in 1 Tim 3:1-13 can also be traced to ancient Jewish writings so they should not be understood as having been shaped solely by the moral philosophers; and (2) when this text is viewed alongside Ephesian evidence and *Ephesiaca*, noble birth and piety to

³¹⁴ This perspective can be drawn from looking at the opening-middle-closing texture as described by Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 19-20. The letter opens with this monotheistic statement in 1:17, contains a potent statement in 2:5 and closes with a monotheistic statement in 6:15-16.

³¹⁵ For analysis of this in Corinth, see: John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992) and “Patronage in Roman Corinth,” in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1997).

³¹⁶ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 51. Again, they seem to overlook the very clues they surfaced, such as the example put forth by Onasander, who actually presents noble birth and not character, *per se*, as the criteria for ascension to religious leadership roles.

Artemis appear as the local requirements for attaining and maintaining religious leadership roles, though other similar qualification lists may surface in antiquity.

Advocates of the *alternating* view such as Countryman approach it from a similar perspective as Dibelius and Conzelmann. Countryman believes that the rich ascended to religious leadership positions based on cultural rules, but rather than highlighting how this text comes into view as counter-cultural to that norm, he emphasizes how they would have caused trouble in God's church instead of learning a new way of life there.³¹⁷

Kidd seems to follow Countryman. He views these leadership qualifications as "couched in terms most readily understandable to them," but exegetes the implications of the teaching as only a "subtle transformation" of the benefactor ideal.³¹⁸ One can hardly consider it "subtle" to obey teachings that directly contradict the cultural norms in the social setting (cf. Acts 19:23-41).

The teaching in 1 Tim 3:1-13 sounds radically counter-cultural in light of the social setting and cultural rules and *consistent* with the trajectory of other NT texts (cf. Titus 1:6-9). Previously, the expectations of the benefactor model governed their religious service, and greed appears to have motivated or at least influenced their stewardship. Evidence demonstrates that the rich nobility *owned* the religious leadership roles, and the religious leadership roles *owned* the rich nobility. A new criteria for leaders would be necessary for God's church.

The teaching in 1 Tim 3:1-13 reflects a new set of rules for the rich nobility, and their relationship to riches match the criteria. In God's church the qualifications for religious leadership and the nature of service must be free of *greed* and characterized by faithful *stewardship* as attested elsewhere in the NT.

³¹⁷ Countryman, *The Rich Christian*, 151-73.

³¹⁸ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 139.

4.4.2. Reading the Text in the Context of other NT Teachings

There are numerous NT passages that support the notion that the leaders of God's people should avoid *greed* and the desire for shameful gain, while demonstrating faithful *stewardship* in a posture of service.³¹⁹ We will survey a sampling of them below.

In the Gospels, Jesus spoke about having a proper relationship with money and being a faithful steward.³²⁰ Luke 16:13 may be His most pointed statement on this topic: "No slave can serve two masters; for a slave will either hate the one and love the other, or be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and wealth."³²¹ Of interest to this study is the verse that follows, Luke 16:14: "The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all this, and they ridiculed him." Here Jesus describes the religious leaders as "lovers of money," perhaps because their service was rooted in the benefactor model driven by greed, which is idolatry (cf. Ephesians 5:5; Colossians 3:5).³²² Jesus warns His disciples not to follow their example in Mark 12:38-40.

³⁸As he taught, he said, 'Beware of the scribes, who like to walk around in long robes, and to be greeted with respect in the market-places, ³⁹and to have the best seats in the synagogues and places of honour at banquets! ⁴⁰They devour widows' houses and for the sake of appearance say long prayers. They will receive the greater condemnation.'

Jewish religious leaders are presented as abusing both their role and their stewardship responsibilities by functioning in the benefactor model like the culture and by using their perch for filthy gain.³²³ This was unacceptable for the leaders of

³¹⁹ For a broader examination of NT teachings, see: Blomberg, *Neither Poverty nor Riches*, 111-240. Cf. David Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus*, The Jesus Library (ed. Michael Green; Downers Grove: IVP, 1989) 76-80.

³²⁰ Cf. Matt 24:45-51; 25:14-30; Luke 16:1-8.

³²¹ N.T. Wright, *Luke for Everyone* (London: SPCK, 2001) 196, "this passage contains some of Jesus' strongest and most explicit warnings about the dangers of wealth, and experience suggests that neither the church nor the world has taken these warnings sufficiently to heart."

³²² Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* 13.400; The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, *The Testament of Judah* 18:2, 6; 19:1. Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom*, 151.

³²³ It was customary for religious leaders in Greco-Roman world and in Jewish tradition to honor the rich in inscriptions and give them preferred seats at banquets by social rank. In return religious leaders benefited from the rich, who provided them with buildings, meals and other resources. Cf. Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003) 136; Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (ed. Harold W. Attridge; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2007) 583; and David E. Garland, *Luke*, ZECNT (ed. Clinton E. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011) 658.

God's church. If unbridled, this would lead to the showing of favoritism, that is, serving the wealthy for what they could get in return. Evidence that the benefactor model was adversely shaping the Jerusalem church is reflected in James 2:1-9.³²⁴

¹My brothers and sisters, do you with your acts of favoritism really believe in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ? ²For if a person with gold rings and in fine clothes comes into your assembly, and if a poor person in dirty clothes also comes in, ³and if you take notice of the one wearing the fine clothes and say, 'Have a seat here, please', while to the one who is poor you say, 'Stand there', or, 'Sit at my feet', ⁴have you not made distinctions among yourselves, and become judges with evil thoughts? ⁵Listen, my beloved brothers and sisters. Has not God chosen the poor in the world to be rich in faith and to be heirs of the kingdom that he has promised to those who love him? ⁶But you have dishonored the poor. Is it not the rich who oppress you? Is it not they who drag you into court? ⁷Is it not they who blaspheme the excellent name that was invoked over you? ⁸You do well if you really fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' ⁹But if you show partiality, you commit sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors.

Gold-wearing people expected special treatment in the world, but they must not receive it in God's church. "The problem of discrimination is a perennial one for Christians because it is a tendency of basic human nature to favor those we serve to profit from the most."³²⁵ Wealth and noble birth defined "distinctions" among people in antiquity, but they were to consider one another as equals in God's church.³²⁶

God's leaders must serve the church humbly, valuing people over money or gain, a notion echoed in a parallel text in the PE, Titus 1:7. God's leaders must demonstrate that they are *μη̄ αἰσχροκερδῆ*, "not greedy for gain," (cf. 1 Tim 3:3, 8).³²⁷ In plain terms, candidates for leadership in God's church must show that they can *use money* and *serve people*, rather than appear as leaders who *use people* and *serve money*.³²⁸

³²⁴ Cf. Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 105-18.

³²⁵ John P. Polhill, "Prejudice, Partiality, and Faith: James 2." *RevExp* 83 (1986): 398.

³²⁶ Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*, 82-83, Smith offers the example that for the sacrificial meal in the community of faith, the posture or seating shifts from status to equality.

³²⁷ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 162, note that this could point to a number of issues in the setting of Titus: profit-seeking false teachers, ministry leaders who may have been "allowing financial compensation to become the chief motivation for ministry, or the faithful management of the churches finances."

³²⁸ This is my rendering of the opinion of Heinrich J. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe, Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1880) 471. Holtzmann suggests that this criterion is not so much about attaining gain dishonestly but that gain in and of itself should not be a factor that motivates those who desire to serve in the leadership of God's church. I find this view compelling based on the evidence available to us.

4.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Jesus' Teaching on Benefaction and Service

The text of 1 Tim 3:1-13 instructs leaders to avoid greed and the desire for unjust gain while serving as faithful stewards. This study has shown that such a call would require leaders to abandon the benefactor model for a service model.³²⁹ This idea sounds consistent with the instructions of Jesus in Luke's Gospel.

Jesus describes the posture from which His followers were to lead, not as benefactors, but as servants in Luke 22:24-26.

²⁴A dispute also arose among them as to which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest. ²⁵But he said to them, 'The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors (εὐεργέται). ²⁶But not so with you; rather the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like one who serves.

Jesus sets aside the institution of benefaction and instead calls for humble service.

"The greatest in the church are not to behave as the greatest in the world."³³⁰

Jesus' instructions sound similar to our fresh reading of 1 Tim 3:1-13 as brought to light by *Ephesiaca*: The leaders of God's church must no longer function under the benefactor model, linked to idolatry in the OT Law, rooted in greed and selfish gain, and focused on preserving one's place over people. Instead, they are to function under a stewardship model exemplifying humble service following the example of Jesus Himself.³³¹ Scholars who interpret this text as teaching that Christians are to serve as "benefactors" *per se* may not be considering texts such as Luke 22:24-26 in light of the institution of benefaction in the antiquity, but through the lens of their own modern social setting.³³²

³²⁹ Scholars are mixed on reading this text. Most view it as a negative portrayal of the benefactor model. Garland, *Luke*, 866. Peter K. Nelson, "The Flow of Thought in Luke 22:24-27." *JSNT* 43 (1991): 113-23, believes that it is not necessarily a negative portrayal. David J. Lull, "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness [Luke 22:24-30]." *NovT* 28 (1986): 289-305, argues unconvincingly that the servant-benefactor model is put forth as a positive model about doing the greatest good for the greatest number. For example, Paul set aside the benefactor model in 1 Cor 9, when he could have employed it. Jesus calls his followers to do good with a

³³⁰ Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, vol. 24, NAC (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1992) 549. Cf. Mark 10:35-45.

³³¹ J. Reumann, "Stewards of God": Pre-Christian Religious Application of Oikonomos in Greek." *JBL* 77 (1958): 339-49. "Great" leaders in God's church do good deeds not as Gentile lords but as humble servants.

³³² Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 767-69. Contra: Bruce W. Winter, "The Public Honoring of Christian Benefactors: Romans 13.3-4 and 1 Peter 2.14-15." *JSNT* 34 (1988): 87-103, does not read Jesus as against benefaction but calling for a different kind of benefaction. Others cite Acts 4:9 to support the notion that Christians need to be benefactors. The relationship between Acts 4:9 and the realm of benefaction will be explored further in the next chapter of this dissertation.

4.4.4. Summary

Sacred texture analysis reveals our radically subversive interpretation of 1 Tim 3:1-13 can be viewed as *consistent* with other NT teachings. God is the basis for faith, leadership and service, not money. Leaders of God's church are to avoid *greed* and exhibit faithful *stewardship*. They must be chosen based on character not noble birth. This would have been radically counter-cultural in light of the social setting.

Leaders in God's church were to use their position not for personal profit or shameful gain, but rather as a platform for service, not as the Gentile lords, but as humble servants. In Luke's Gospel, Jesus criticized the benefactor model and used Himself as the example for the disciples and the Early Church to follow. In this light, 1 Tim 3:1-13 appears as a set of leadership qualifications that can be viewed as *consistent* with the trajectory of His instructions.

4.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Tim 3:1-13 in light of Ephesiaca

The aim of this chapter has been to explore 1 Tim 3:1-13 in light of the social and cultural setting of Ephesus as reflected in ancient evidence and as presented in *Ephesiaca*. As a result, this research has culminated in an interpretation of the text that is subversive in light of the social setting and cultural rules for the rich in Ephesus and *consistent* with related NT teachings.

Inner texture analysis revealed three interpretative issues. (1) Regarding leadership qualifications – Should we view the text as mirroring the cultural path for qualifying candidates for religious leadership due to the common terminology also found in Greco-Roman virtue/vice lists or did religious leaders in the ancient world ascend to their posts by virtue of another criteria altogether, such as noble birth? (2) Concerning greed – As this text is commonly understood in light of the moral philosophers, whose roots go back to the Stoa, might the evidence show that 1 Tim

3:1-13 reflects the influence of ancient Jewish literature, with roots in the Torah, as well? (3) On stewardship – Might the benefactor model have been the cause of the problem as it was linked to greed and service for gain? Were religious leaders to avoid abusing their stewardship and lead with a different model rooted in service?

Intertexture analysis explored the themes of *greed* and *stewardship* in 1 Tim 3:1-13 and *Ephesiaca*, and two points surfaced in re-examining ancient evidence: (1) Prominent Ephesians would have aspired to ascend to religious leadership roles not by meeting qualifications but by virtue of noble birth; furthermore, they expected to retain those roles through providing pious support and service to Rome *and* Artemis. Leadership appointments in God's church should be different. (2) Religious leaders in *Ephesiaca* performed services through the benefactor model and, on at least one occasion, appear to have been motivated by shameful gain. The motivation for service in God's church, however, was to exhibit a different set of motivations. On these two points, the teaching in 1 Tim 3:1-13 spars with Ephesian norms, setting Christian values off from dominant pagan values, and the teaching may not necessarily be correcting abuses in God's church, but may rather be preventative.

Ideological texture queried how the author, audience, and culture may have understood these findings from 1 Tim 3:1-13 in light of *Ephesiaca*. With the aid of classical scholars, this study found that it is possible to consider *Ephesiaca* as a *hieros logos* inscribed on the walls of the Artemisium by the rich to preserve religious norms and values. Furthermore, epigraphic evidence reveals that a rich leader, Gaius Vibius Salutaris, paid for a display of writing with a similar purpose. In this light, 1 Tim 3:1-13 cannot be viewed as mirroring cultural norms for appointing religious leaders, though the language reflects cultural influence. The rich Ephesians would have heard these instructions as radically counter-cultural. While Dibelius and Conzelmann rightly made connections between realities in the

social setting and 1 Tim, this analysis in light of *Ephesiaca* reveals they may have compared 1 Tim with insufficient Ephesian evidence to draw the conclusion that the leadership qualifications in 1 Tim were following cultural norms.

Sacred texture revealed that this call for God's leaders to avoid greed and shift from a benefactor model to a service model appears to be *consistent* with the instructions of Jesus and other NT teachings. Religious leadership appointments must follow a new set of criteria, shifting from noble birth to requiring godly character. This promotes subversive thinking in the Ephesian setting. Additionally, the execution of their duties must no longer be motivated by personal gain, but for God's glory, and retaining their religious leadership roles would not be linked to being pious benefactors, but rather, faithful stewards.

CHAPTER FIVE

Slaves and Masters and 1 Timothy 6:1-2a:

Honorable Service and the Source of Beneficence

The next passage we will examine in light of *Ephesiaca* is 1 Tim 6:1-2a. We are exploring this text because benefaction language occurs, and scholars have mixed views on translating and interpreting the Greek terms in the last phrase.

One viewpoint interprets this text as celebrating the way in which masters serve as generous benefactors for their slaves. Another approach considers it as calling slaves to reverse the roles and serve as benefactors toward their masters. At present, scholars are divided on reading 1 Tim 6:1-2a in light of ancient evidence; that is, should they espouse the “Masters as Benefactors” position, the “Slaves as Benefactors” view, or yet another perspective.³³³

Remarkably, Xenophon of Ephesus presents interaction between slaves and masters using similar language to 1 Tim 6:1-2a. Will benefactions flow up, down, or in both directions in *Ephesiaca*? Might they originate from another source? We will revisit these questions after scrutinizing ancient evidence (5.1.) and see what *Ephesiaca* adds to the conversation (5.2.). This process will shed new light on the text considering the social setting (5.3.), add fresh insight into the NT interpretative discussion (5.4.), and suggest a fresh rendering of the disputed phrase (5.5.).

³³³ For an exposition of the “Masters as Benefactors” position and the “Slaves as Benefactors” view, see: Philip H. Towner, “Can Slaves Be Their Masters’ Benefactors? 1 Timothy 6:1-2a in Literary, Cultural, and Theological Context.” *CTST* 182/183 (1997). Proponents for the “Masters as Benefactors” position include: Bertram, *TDNT* II, 655; Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 204; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 82; Victor Hasler, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1978) 45; Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 359; Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 140-58; Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 267; Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 486; Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 324-25; Verner, *Household of God*, 140-45. Advocates for the “Slaves as Benefactors” reading include: Daniel C. Arichea and Howard A. Hatton, *A Handbook on Paul’s Letters to Timothy and to Titus*, UBS Handbook Series (New York: United Bible Societies, 1995) 139; Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 153; Danker, *Benefactor*, 324; Gordon D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 2nd ed., NIBC (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988) 139; Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 288-90; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, BNTC (London: A & C Black, 1963) 132; Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 632-33; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 329; Spicq, *les Eptres Pastorales*, 182-84; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 379-92.

5.1. Inner Texture of 1 Tim 6:1-2a

If we approach 1 Tim 6:1-2a from the perspective that only social superiors can confer benefits, then our bias will lead us to support the “Masters as Benefactors” view. Additionally, if we approach the text with a subversive lens, then our interpretation of the text will undoubtedly reflect the “Slaves as Benefactors” angle.

To seek to eliminate bias, this chapter will follow the methodology employed in this study and examine the words of the *text* as conduits for meaning, giving attention to how those words appear in ancient *contexts*. We will begin with the Greek text, highlighting various translations of the difficult phrase in 1 Tim 6:2a, and then we will scrutinize ancient evidence.

5.1.1. Text and Translations

Below we see the NRSV translation of 1 Tim 6:1-2a leading up to the phrase in question.

¹Let all who are under the yoke of slavery regard their masters as worthy of all honour, so that the name of God and the teaching may not be blasphemed. ²Those who have believing masters must not be disrespectful to them on the ground that they are members of the church...

Next comes the difficult section in the Greek text. At present, we can find almost as many renderings of this phrase as translations as Table #4 illustrates.

Bible translators are clearly divided on interpreting the final phrase 1 Tim 6:2a. Most seem to translate it with ambiguity or follow the “Slaves as Benefactors” view. Recently we observe a notable change in the NIV/TNIV translations. Between 1984 and 2005 and then repeated in 2011, the NIV/TNIV renderings appear to shift to the “Masters as Benefactors” view. Scholarly assertions on the “Masters as Benefactors” side of the debate during that timeframe may have influenced this change.

Table #4: Greek Text and English Translations of Phrase in 1 Tim 6:2a

<p>... ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δεουλεύεωσαν, ὅτι πιστοὶ εἰσιν καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι.</p>
<p>... rather they must serve them all the more, since those who benefit by their service are believers and beloved. (NRSV)</p>
<p>... rather they must serve all the better since those who benefit by their service are believers and beloved. (RSV)</p>
<p>... but must serve them all the more, because those who partake of the benefit are believers and beloved. (NAS)</p>
<p>... but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. (KJV)</p>
<p>... but rather serve them because those who are benefited are believers and beloved. (NKJV)</p>
<p>... instead, they should serve them more faithfully, because the people who benefit from your good service are believers who are loved. (CEB)</p>
<p>... rather, they should serve [them all the better] because those who benefit by their kindly service are believers and beloved. (AB)</p>
<p>... those slaves should work all the harder because their efforts are helping other believers who are well loved. (NLT)</p>
<p>... after all, they are also followers of Christ, and he loves them. So you should serve and help them the best you can. (CEV)</p>
<p>... rather they must serve all the better since those who benefit by their good service are believers and beloved. (ESV)</p>
<p>... instead, they are to serve them even better, because those who benefit from their service are believers, and dear to them. (NIV, 1984)</p>
<p>... instead, they should serve them even better because their masters are dear to them as fellow believers and are devoted to the welfare of their slaves. (TNIV, 2005)</p>
<p>... instead, they should serve them even better because their masters are dear to them as fellow believers and are devoted to the welfare of their slaves. (NIV, 2011)</p>

Which rendering should readers follow? What are the implications for biblical interpretation? We will offer answers to these questions by examining the language of this text alongside ancient evidence, and later, in light of *Ephesiaca*.

5.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources

The teaching in 1 Tim 6:1-2a is directed to slaves and masters. The text instructs slaves to extend *πάσης τιμῆς*, “all honor,” and it also mentions *εὐεργεσία*, “kindness, good deeds, or benefits.”³³⁴ Following the scholarly discourse, we will use the word *beneficence* for *εὐεργεσία*, which is often associated with riches.

The instructions for slaves to show all honor to their masters falls within the household or economy of God framework of 1 Tim in which “real widows” (5:3-16) and “elders who rule” (5:25) receive honor.³³⁵ For both these groups, the themes of showing respect and handling riches, that is, honor and good deeds, also appear.³³⁶

Real widows are “well-attested” for their good deeds (5:10). Such actions come at a cost and the author of 1 Tim states that such widows should be honored (5:3). Elders who rule, specifically those who labor in preaching and teaching, are worthy of “double honor” (5:17).³³⁷ Great care must be taken in their discipline, as their deeds both good and bad cannot be hidden (5:24-25). In the larger literary context, the showing of respect and the handling of riches are critical aspects of the instruction to groups in the community of faith.³³⁸ Thus, it is not surprising that these topics come in view in the instructions for slaves and masters.

³³⁴ BAGD, 319.

³³⁵ Cf. Frances Margaret Young, *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 31, depicts it as “welfare support” to widows. On this framework, see: Verner, *Household of God*, 147-75.

³³⁶ The “real” widows and “elders who rule” passages are not explored in this project in light of *Ephesiaca* as it is unclear whether or not Xenophon of Ephesus could add anything to the interpretive discussion in those areas.

³³⁷ Lips, *Glaube*, 109-10, interprets this as referring to “salary” though Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 363, notes that *τιμῆ* is not attested in this sense; cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 613; Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 308; J. Andrew Kirk, “Did ‘Officials’ in the New Testament Church Receive a Salary?” *ExpTim* 84 (1972-73) 105-08, notes that a form of support less sophisticated as a salary may be in view. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 252-54, interprets this construct as double respect. Arichea and Hatton, *A Handbook on Paul’s Letters*, 126; Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 129; and, Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 199, interpret double honor to possibly referring to respect and remuneration. As it is disputed whether riches are in view here and unclear how Xenophon of Ephesus could aid in the interpretive debate, this text will not be explored further.

³³⁸ Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 82.

Slavery was a significant social phenomenon in the Early Church as evident in NT letters and early Christian writings.³³⁹ S. Scott Bartchy believes slaves may have comprised the majority of society.³⁴⁰ It is sensible that 1 Tim would include behavioral instructions for slaves and masters.³⁴¹

In addressing slaves “under the yoke” (6:1a), A. T. Hanson, George Knight, and others have posited that the slaves in view are serving non-Christian masters.³⁴² While this may be the case, Marshall and others remind us that the text simply does not say that.³⁴³ Towner believes the expression “is traditional and stresses the harsh social and existential reality of the person who existed as the property of another (whether of an unbeliever or a believer).”³⁴⁴

The text states that slaves should show respect to their masters. The rationale for this emerges in the *iva* clause: “so that the name of God and the teaching may not be blasphemed” (6:1b). Scholars understand this as evidence that slaves were disrespecting their masters and bringing the name of God into disrepute.³⁴⁵ As equality messages eliminating social distinctions such as “slave” or “free” appear in other NT letters in settings where people were “in Christ Jesus,”³⁴⁶ slaves may have been questioning or ceasing service to their masters, specifically believing masters.

³³⁹ Eph 6:5-9; Col 3:21-41; 1 Pet 2:18-25; Tit 2:9; Phm 12-14; *Didache* 4:10f; Ignatius of Antioch, *To Polycarp* 4:3; *Barnabas* 19:7.

³⁴⁰ S. Scott Bartchy, *First Century Slavery and 1 Corinthians 7:21*, vol. 11, SBLDS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1973) 58, 183-84. Cf. Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen*, 146; Henneke Gülzow, *Christentum und Sklaverei in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Bonn: Habelt, 1969) 101-41.

³⁴¹ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 379, “In the early Christian literature, numerous passages instruct those in the situation of slavery, which can only mean that slavery was a difficult problem for the church.” For more on the institutional diversity of the Early Church, see: David M. Scholer, ed., *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays by E.A. Judge* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008); Margaret Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); and, Rebecca H. Weaver, “Wealth and Poverty in the Early Church.” *Int* 41 (1987): 368-81.

³⁴² A.T. Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1968) 105; George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 244; Walter Lock, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1952) 65; N. J. D. White, *The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus*, EGT (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910) 140.

³⁴³ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 629.

³⁴⁴ Plato, *Laws* 770E; Polybius, *Histories* 4.82.2. See also: Bertram and Rengstorff, *TDNT* 2:896-901. Cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 381; Spicq, *les Epîtres Pastorales*, 552.

³⁴⁵ For further discussion on the importance of the community’s witness to the world, see: Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 383; Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen*, 147-49; Towner, *The Goal*, 177; Spicq, *les Epîtres Pastorales*, 553. Cf. Willem C. van Unnik, “Die Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen als Motiv in der altchristlichen Paränese,” in *Sparsa Collecta* (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 307-22.

³⁴⁶ 1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11.

In focusing on possible issues between slaves and masters, modern scholars may be glossing over an interpretive clue in the *ἵνα* clause. If the text linked honoring masters to ensuring that the name of the master was not blasphemed, then the “Masters as Benefactors” view would make more sense. If the passage connected honoring and serving masters in order to maintain a good reputation as a slave, then the “Slaves as Benefactors” reading might be more compelling. Contextually, the *ἵνα* clause exhorts believing slaves to honor their masters so that the name of God and the teaching not be blasphemed. This plain reading suggests another approach, which will be referred to here as a third alternative, the “God as Benefactor” view. From this perspective, God is the implied subject and source of *beneficence*.³⁴⁷

All three views will be tested in light of evidence which we will explore in two sections: (1) *beneficence* in the ancient Mediterranean world and in Ephesus, and (2) giving, receiving, and enjoying *beneficence*.³⁴⁸

5.1.2.1. Beneficence in the Ancient Mediterranean World and in Ephesus

To understand *beneficence* broadly in the ancient Mediterranean world and specifically in Ephesus, we will review references to *εὐεργεσία* and related terms in antiquity and then look closely at extant Ephesian evidence.³⁴⁹

The term *εὐεργεσία* depicts a cultural fixture that surfaces as far back as Homer (c. 800 BCE). In *The Odyssey*, the term is translated in two ways: to repay kindness and as the doing of good deeds (XXII, 235, 374). These two renderings by Homer frame our understanding in two ways. The first usage, “to repay kindness,” reveals that *εὐεργεσία* functioned in the context of reciprocity relationships:

³⁴⁷ Readers may find it puzzling to read the phrase “God as Benefactor” after the cultural institution of benefaction was set aside in the previous chapter (cf. Jesus instructions to do so in Luke 22). This title is not to be confused with the cultural institution. As this chapter unfolds, we will find that *beneficence* in antiquity and in Scripture is linked to and flows from divine sources. In the polytheistic ancient world, the emperor and the gods were viewed as the sources of divine *beneficence* and given the title “benefactor.” Those who loved glory also desired to receive this honorific descriptor. In the monotheistic Scriptures, we will discover that God is the only One who receives this title, as all good flows from Him, though God’s people may enjoy and share His benefits.

³⁴⁸ BAGD, 74.

³⁴⁹ Cf. Danker, *Benefactor*, 323, on “the *euerg-*” family of words in inscriptions.

repaying kindness was considered an appropriate social and cultural response to the prior action of another. The second rendering, “the doing of good deeds,” captures the nuance that **εὐεργεσία** refers not to a one time act but a series of repeated acts or a way of life. In Homer’s thinking, doing good deeds stands in contrast to doing evil deeds. Thereafter, the term connotes a lifestyle of doing good deeds in reciprocity relationships, that is, in response to the good deeds of others, and it would become the expected behavior of virtuous people in antiquity.³⁵⁰

Aristotle (384-322 BCE) further adds to our knowledge of **εὐεργεσία** in this excerpt from *The Art of Rhetoric*.

Honour (**Τιμῆ**) is a token of a reputation for doing good (**εὐεργετικῆς**); and those who have already done good (**εὐεργετηκότες**) are justly and above all honoured, not but that he who is capable of doing good (**εὐεργετεῖν**) is also honoured. Doing good (**εὐεργεσία**) relates either to personal security (**σωτηρίαν**) and all the causes of existence; or to wealth (**πλοῦτον**); or to any other good things (**ἀγαθῶν**) which are not easy to acquire, either in any conditions, or at such a place, or at such a time; for many obtain honour for things that appear trifling, but this depends upon place and time. The components of honour are sacrifices, memorials in verse and prose, privileges, grants of land, front seats, public burial, State maintenance, and among the barbarians, prostration and giving place, and all gifts which are highly prized in each country. For a gift is at once a giving of a possession and a token of honour; wherefore gifts are desired by the ambitious and by those who are fond of money, since they are an acquisition for the latter and an honour for the former; so that they furnish both with what they want. (I, 9)

Those capable of doing good and who had the reputation as a patron received honor in return from their clients. Benefactors were expected to offer salvation, wealth, and other good things, and in return, they enjoyed benefits and honorific titles.

Through the days of the Republic and the Empire, *IvE* offers examples of this practice in Ephesus. The epigraphic evidence identifies three sources of beneficence: the gods, the emperors, and civic leaders linked to Rome. These benefactors are lauded as providers of **εὐεργεσία** using honorific titles such as **πάτρων**,³⁵¹ “patron;” **εὐεργέτης**,³⁵² “benefactor;” and/or **σωτήρ**, “savior.”³⁵³

³⁵⁰ Hands, *Charities and Social Aid*, 26-48. The benefits of the gods were to be shared broadly with people.

³⁵¹ *IvE* 614a (lacunae is rendered both “patron and benefactor” or “patron and savior” in antiquity), 630a, 663, 678, 1238, 1540, 2063, 2300a, 2941, 3006, 3047, 3151, 3902 (“patron and benefactor”).

³⁵² The term, **εὐεργέτης**, appears often and at times with other terms: *IvE* 22, 27, 277, 286a, 297, 298, 509, 614, 616, 619, 620, 621, 628, 632, 642, 651, 655, 660, 675, 683a, 698, 701, 704, 713 (“savior and benefactor”), 716,

Further scrutiny of Ephesian inscriptions highlighting the practice of distributing **εὐεργεσία** reveals that beneficence was thought to have originated from divine sources. Beneficence flowed from the gods (*IvE* 3466), from emperors exalted as gods from the first century BCE to the third century CE (*IvE* 212, 258, 1493), and from leaders with divine ties, such as Tiberius Claudius Balbillus, a procurator in the days of Nero (*IvE* 3041). References to leaders as benefactors, such as Balbillus, are of keen interest to this study. In *IvE* 3041 (below), the council and the people honored him for demonstrating piety to god by distributing divine benefits to the city.

[ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐ] τείμησεν
 [Τιβ.Κλαύδι] ον Βάλβιλλον
 [τὸν κράτιστον] ἐπίτροπον τοῦ
 [Σεβαστοῦ διὰ τῆ]ν ἀδιάλειπτον
 [αὐτοῦ εἰς τε τὴν] θεὸν εὐσέβειαν
 [καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλ]ιν εὐεργεσίαν

Frederick Danker’s research illuminates this notion that benefactions flowed from the divine. In *Benefactor*, he maps a semantic field of terms that serve as “signals that are well understood across the centuries in the Graeco-Roman world of religion, business and politics.”³⁵⁴ In examining five of the fifty-three documents in *Benefactor* linked to Ephesus, three insights regarding **εὐεργεσία** come into view that may be widely understood by the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE.³⁵⁵

First, benefits are depicted as “god-like favors” in Ephesian thinking, as illustrated by this translation of a decree that honors Tiberius Claudius Balbillus (c. 55-59 CE).³⁵⁶ Danker refers to it as “The Decree by the Inhabitants of Busiris, Egypt in Honor of Prefect Tiberius Claudius Balbillus” (*italics mine*).

730, 738, 739, 806, 809, 816, 821, 846, 849, 852, 854, 874, 885, 1312 (“savior and benefactor”), 1389, 1405, 1412, 1429, 1442, 1443, 1447, 1448, 1453, 1458, 1459, 1474, 1501 (“benefactor and savior”), 1541, 2059, 2065, 2941, 3022, 3023, 3031, 3036, 3040, 3046, 3050, 3070, 3075, 3079, 3080, 3088, 3091, 3436, 3707, 3902.

³⁵³ *IvE* 46, 251, 271, 272, 274, 298, 713, 799, 800, 1243, 1312, 1501, 1504, 1837, 3029, 3271, 3402, 3410, 3435, 4318, 4336. Cf. **σώτεια**: *IvE* 1255, 1265, 3220; **σωτηρία**: *IvE* 8, 26, 301, 1360, 2001, 3418a, 3803, 4301.

³⁵⁴ Danker, *Benefactor*, 317.

³⁵⁵ Four of these documents will be examined next and the fifth will be appraised later in this chapter.

³⁵⁶ For background on Tiberius Claudius Balbillus, see: Magie, *Roman Rule* 2:1398-1400. For an ancient literary references to his *arête*, see: Seneca, *Natural Science* 4.2.12.

With Good Fortune, WHEREAS Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator, the Good Divinity of the world, in addition to all the good benefits that he conferred in the past on Egypt has (once more) exercised his most brilliant foresight and sent to us Tiberius Claudius Balbillus as governor; and, owing to the latter's favors and benefactions, Egypt is teeming with all good things and sees the gifts of the Nile increasing annually and now all the more enjoys the equity with which the Nile-God floods the lands; (in view thereof) it was resolved by the inhabitants of Busiris, who live near the pyramids in the Leptolite district, and by the local and village clerks who serve in that area to pass a decree and erect a stone stele next to [the great God Helios] Harmachis, and (this stele) is [to reveal] by its inscribed list of benefits the philanthropy they have enjoyed; and from this recital everyone [will know] what wonderful service (Balbillus) has rendered [to all] of Egypt. Therefore it is appropriate that his *god-like favors* be inscribed in sacred letters for all time to remember. For when he came on official business to our district and worshiped Helios Harmachis, our Observer and Savior, he found delight in the majesty and magnificence of the pyramids [and took account of] the vast amount of sand accumulated in time's long passage | - - - and forthwith dispatched letters in praise of Egypt to God Augustus - - -. Recorded in the 'n'th - - - ship of Nero] Claudius [Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator - - -]. (*Document 35*)³⁵⁷

This epigraphic record portrays Balbillus as a gift to the city from “God Augustus,” and his benefactions as “god-like favors.”³⁵⁸ This illustrates the first point regarding benefactions in ancient thinking: they represent divine favors extended to humans.

A second insight emerges regarding *εὐεργεσία* from Danker's Ephesian documents. Benefactions were intended for the enjoyment of everyone and customarily took the form of activities or structures for the betterment of Ephesus and the welfare of the Ephesians. This comes to our attention in *Document 35* (above) as well as this excerpt of *Document 8* (below): “Letter of Emperor Pius to the Ephesians in Commendation of Benefactor Vedius Antonius” (c. 145 CE).³⁵⁹

I learned about the generosity that Vedius Antoninus shows toward you, but not so much from your letters as from his; for when he wished to secure assistance from me for the adornment of the structures he had promised you, he informed me of the many large buildings he is adding to the city...

I on my part [agreed] with every request that he made and was appreciative of the fact that he does not follow the [customary] pattern of those who discharge their civic responsibility with a view to gaining instant recognition by spending their resources on shows and doles and [prizes for the games]; instead he prefers to show his generosity through ways in which he [can anticipate] an even grander future for the city. (*Document 8*)³⁶⁰

³⁵⁷ Danker, *Benefactor*, 225-26.

³⁵⁸ The inscription credits Balbillus as the source of beneficence: “Egypt is teeming with all good things.” Contra: 1 Tim 6:17 lauds God, the Benefactor, as the One who provides “all good things.”

³⁵⁹ Editions: GIBM III, 491; SIG 3.850; Danker, *Benefactor*, 69-70. Cf. Frank Frost Abbott and Allan Chester Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1926) 101.

³⁶⁰ Cf. 1 Tim 6:17 and chapter seven of this dissertation. This document also features the high-spirited and arrogant “love of honor” attributed to benefactors who love gaining “recognition” for themselves.

Benefactions were divine gifts for everyone to enjoy and for the good of the future of the city. Here again, the local source of benefactions was a rich civic leader or benefactor whose supply source was the divine emperor himself.

A third insight comes to light in Danker's Ephesian documents: the honor of the benefactor gods must always be preserved. This notion stands out in two of his Ephesian sources, one from a positive angle and one from a negative perspective. The first source, "Letter from Lucius Pompeius Apollonios of Ephesos Requesting Permission for his City to Celebrate the Mysteries" (*Document 45*), records a request to perform cultic activities "in honor of Demeter, Bearer of Fruit and Giver of Laws, and in honor of gods Augusti" (c. 83-84 CE).³⁶¹ The performance of these mysteries honored their benefactor gods, while also maintaining the honor of the benefactor emperors.³⁶² The second reference, "Assessment of the Death Penalty for Sacrilege Against Artemis" (*Document 46*), contains a public announcement regarding those who had "violated the sanctity of the ceremonies and insulted the envoys" of Artemis (c. third century BCE).³⁶³ For this act, they were sentenced to death, the penalty for dishonoring the benefactor goddess or those who served her.

From *IvE* and Danker's Ephesian documents in *Benefactor*, three themes come to our attention regarding *εὐεργεσία* in ancient Ephesus: (1) benefactions flow from the gods, emperors, and rich leaders with divine ties; (2) benefits are "god-like favors" for *all* to enjoy; and, (3) the honor of benefactor gods, such as the Artemis or the Roman emperor, must always be preserved.

These themes also emerge in Seneca, *On Benefits* (c. 64 CE), the most common ancient lens used for considering *εὐεργεσία* in 1 Tim 6:1-2a.³⁶⁴ To consider *εὐεργεσία* in Seneca's thinking, we must start at the beginning of his

³⁶¹ *Document 45.7-8*. Cf. editions: SIG 3.820; BCH 1 (1877) 289-90.

³⁶² Danker, *Benefactor*, 287-90.

³⁶³ *Document 46.10-11*. Cf. edition: Dieter Knibbe in Jahresh 46 (1961-1963): 177-78.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Spicq, *les Epîtres Pastorales*, 182-84, *et al*, cite Seneca, *On Benefits* 3.18-20, to posit that anyone with capacity for virtue, including a slave, can extend divine benefits. On dating, see Basore's notes in the LCL, vii.

treatise where he offers a definition: “What then is a benefit? It is the act of a well-wisher who bestows joy and derives joy from the bestowal of it, and is inclined to do what he does from the prompting of his own will” (1.6.1). For Seneca, *εὐεργασία*, or in this instance in Latin, “a *beneficium*,”³⁶⁵ represents a freewill act in which someone simultaneously gives and receives joy.

In his thinking, benefactions represent acts undertaken by the immortal gods for the benefit of all people, both grateful and indifferent. Humans, though weak, should imitate this kindness.

...not even the immortal gods are deterred from showing lavish and unceasing kindness to those who are sacrilegious and indifferent to them. For they follow their own nature, and in their universal bounty include even those who are ill interpreters of their gifts. Let us follow these as our guides in so far as human weakness permits... (1.1.9)

All humans, including slaves, have the ability to receive and share divine benefits, in Seneca’s thinking, because of their capacity to possess virtue.³⁶⁶

He who denies that a slave can sometimes give a benefit to his master is ignorant of the rights of man; for, not the status but the intention, of the one who bestows is what counts. Virtue closes the door to no man; it is open to all, admits all, invites all, the freeborn and the freedman, the slave and the king... (3.18.2)

Seneca concludes in this manner: benefactors, whether slaves or a masters, imitate the gods by freely giving and receiving gifts.

Do as the gods, those glorious authors of all things, do; they begin to give benefits to him who knows them not, and persist in giving them to those who are ungrateful. Some reproach them with indifference to us, others with injustice; some place them outside of their world, and abandon them to sloth and languor, leaving them without light, without any task; others call the sun, to whom we owe the division of our hours of work and rest, and our escape from being plunged into darkness and the chaos of eternal night, who by his course regulates the seasons, nourishes our bodies, calls forth the crops, and ripens the fruits, merely a mass of stone or a fortuitous collection of fiery particles—anything rather than a god. Yet, nonetheless, like the best of parents, who only smile at the spiteful words of their children, the gods do not cease to heap their benefits upon those who are doubtful about the source of benefits, but distribute their blessings among the nations and peoples with unbroken uniformity. (7.31.2-5)

With this summary statement, Seneca reiterates the three themes that

³⁶⁵ *OLDD*, 23.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Towner, “Can Slaves Be Their Masters’ Benefactors?” 45–47.

emerged in the other ancient documents and adds a fourth point. In his thinking: (1) beneficence flows from the gods; (2) they represent divine blessings for all to enjoy (as that is how the gods “heap their benefits”); (3) the gods must be honored for their beneficence, as illustrated by his concluding charge (“Do as the gods, those glorious authors of all things, do...”); and, (4) people can mimic divine benefactors by freely receiving and sharing divine benefits.

5.1.2.2. Giving, Receiving, and Enjoying Beneficence

The term ἀντιλαμβάνω has a broad range of usages in antiquity, which may explain why scholars are divided on interpreting it in relationship to εὐεργεσία in 1 Tim 6:1-2a. Linked to beneficence, ἀντιλαμβάνω is translated “give, receive, or enjoy.” Yet, in the thinking of the Greco-Roman moral philosophers and in ancient Jewish literature, the term appears to vary in meaning by the context.

Kidd suggests that ἀντιλαμβάνω has “four basic nuances: (1) to receive a benefit; (2) to receive a return on a benefit; (3) to give a return on a benefit; and (4) to give a benefit.”³⁶⁷ This study will review the ancient evidence, comments by Kidd and others on the four nuances, and then offer an alternative to Kidd’s conclusion.

The basis for the first nuance: “to receive a benefit” appears in Philo and Plotina. Philo cites Moses celebrating the blessing “that we should be recipients ἀντιλαυβανοίμεθα) of even secondary privileges” (*Noah’s Work as a Planter* 133.1). Kidd comments that ‘the verb is used to express the “reception” of the benefactions God provides.’³⁶⁸ With the expression “secondary privileges” Philo refers to the ἀπόλαυσιν, “enjoyment,” of God’s creation (*Noah’s Work as a Planter* 132.2). Humans have the privilege of receiving, enjoying, and sharing God’s divine beneficence in creation.

³⁶⁷ Note §5.1.2.2. draws largely but not exclusively on evidence in: Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 144-58.

³⁶⁸ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 148. Cf. 1 Tim 6:17-18, God’s gifts to the rich are for their enjoyment and sharing.

In similar fashion, Plotina, the mother of Emperor Hadrian and patroness of the Epicurean school of Athens (c. 117-138 CE), expresses that the members of her school had received a benefit from a divine source, her son. She had convinced him to act benevolently by appointing a non-citizen to serve as the head of the school, a “benefit” of which they were not worthy (*Letter of Plotina*).³⁶⁹ In this instance, people receive a benefit from the emperor. In both Philo and Plotina, the benefit flows from a divine source and is received and enjoyed by people.

The second nuance: “to receive a return on a benefit” surfaces in Aristotle, Plutarch, Anacharsis, and Philo. In *Politics*, Aristotle (384-322 BCE) uses ἀντιλαμβάνω to point to a young man who will “get back” the value of his giving to the common fund (1332 b 40), and in *Nicomachean Ethics*, the term refers to people who will “receive back” what is owed to them (1164 b 12).

Plutarch (c. 46-120 CE) employs the term with a reciprocity focus saying this of lecturers who lacked substance but had plenty of style: “It is an empty pleasure they give, and an even more empty renown they acquire (κενοτέραν δόξαν ἀντιλαυβάντες)” (*On Listening to Lectures* 41D.10). In Plutarch’s thinking, what they distributed was empty so their return is empty.

Anacharsis, a Cynic, reveals similar thinking (c. 300-250 BCE). In this usage of the term, people protect the cattle, and in return, enjoy benefits such as milk and cheese from the cattle.

All of us possess the whole earth. What it freely gives, we accept (λαμβάνομεν). What it hides, we dismiss from our minds. We protect our cattle against wild beasts, and in return receive milk and cheese (βοσκήματα ἀπο θηρίων σφζοντες, γάλα καὶ τυρόν ἀντιλαμβάνομεν). (*To Croesus* 9.60-62)³⁷⁰

Three more examples of this second nuance come from Philo. In *Embassy to Gaius*, Philo uses the term multiple times to depict the unfair treatment the emperor

³⁶⁹ Editions: SIG 3; Jahresh 2 (1899): 270f. Cf. Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 148.

³⁷⁰ Text and translation from: Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*, vol. 12, SBLSPS (ed. Wayne A. Meeks; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 6, 47-51, cf. Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 145.

extended to Macro and Silanus who had served him in a variety of ways (60.1-6; 62.5). In Philo's thinking, Gaius Caligula was so evil that those who aided him received the most severe return for their service, death. In *Life of Moses*, Philo describes how different mental faculties interact: τὰς ὠφελείας ἀντιλαμβάνειν τε καὶ ἀτεκτίνειν, "mutually receiving and repaying benefits" (2.7). Lastly, in *Special Laws*, Philo describes those willing to cast aside their family ties to align with those who seek to honor God: "For those who are so minded will receive in exchange (ἀντιλήψονται) kinships of greater dignity and sanctity" (317.6). Philo, along with Aristotle, Plutarch, Anacharsis, illustrate the second nuance that ἀντιλαμβάνω refers to "receiving a return on a benefit."

The third nuance: "to give a return on a benefit" is rare in antiquity. Plutarch cites an example of a man who provides an honorable burial for a Pythagorean. The Pythagoreans desire "to give a return on the benefit" the deceased received, and offer him a gift (*Moralia* 582D-585D). Though the man subsequently refuses the gift because he is devoted to poverty as a philosophical ideal, this example illustrates the cultural practice of giving a return on a benefit.

The fourth nuance: "to give a benefit" surfaces numerous times in the LXX as well as in inscriptions and papyri.³⁷¹ Kidd notes:

The reader of the Septuagint will be more familiar with the use of ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι (middle voice) with a personal (genitive) object to mean: "take (someone's) part," "help," or "come to (someone's) aid." Of the 51 uses of the verb in the Septuagint some 38 bear this sense; most characteristically (23 times) the one who does the helping is God.³⁷²

Giving support is common in Scripture. Often such aid requires a financial cost. In the NT, consider Paul's charge to "support the weak" in Acts 20:34-35.

³⁴ You know for yourselves that I worked with my own hands to support myself and my companions. ³⁵ In all this I have given you an example that by such work we must support (ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι) the weak, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, for he himself said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive (λαμβάνειν)."

³⁷¹ For example, see: Ps 19:1-2 (Hebrew) / Ps 20:1-2 (English). Subsequent citations follow the English Bible.

³⁷² Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 150.

We must note, however, that this support does not refer to *εὐεργεσία per se*, as *beneficence* only flows from God in the canon.³⁷³

Kidd locates this fourth nuance in a Roman inscription from Egypt on the grave marker of a murder victim: ἀντιλα(β)ου, κύριε Σάραπι, “Lord Sarapis, help!”³⁷⁴ Likewise, Dibelius and Conzelmann also cite the Menas inscription honoring mid-third century BCE benefactor who “devoted himself to each individually and to all as a group.”³⁷⁵ This nuance suggests the offering of help.

In *IvE*, ἀντιλαμβάνω appears only once in what E.L. Hicks identifies as a fragment of a decree in which only a few words are legible (*IvE* 1478). Though little can be deduced from it, this finding traces the term to Ephesus in a similar usage as the Menas inscription.

Interestingly, after presenting four nuances of ἀντιλαμβάνω, Kidd opts for the “Masters as Benefactors” view on the basis of “contextual considerations” rather than seek to render the text in a manner that harmonizes these ancient uses.³⁷⁶ In so doing, he appears to set aside the diverse contextual evidence he mined.

With this conclusion, Kidd eschews Seneca’s testimony that slaves like their masters, can mimic the gods and share benefits (*On Benefits* 3.18-20).³⁷⁷ He simultaneously discards Danker’s notion that 1 Tim 6:2 represents a “dramatic language event.”³⁷⁸ Kidd considers both the “Masters as Benefactors” and the “Slaves as Benefactors” views in light of the social setting and is more compelled to embrace the “Masters as Benefactors” position. Surprisingly, he does not suggest the “God as Benefactor” reading based on the evidence.

³⁷³ Some put forth Acts 4:9-10, though Peter himself claims that he is not the source of *εὐεργεσία*, God is. Others may put forth these deutero-canonical references as support for lauding humans as benefactors: 4 Macc 8:6; 2 Macc 4:2; 6:13; Wis 19:14. These usages may reflect Hellenistic influence, because in the canon we find that God is the only source of *εὐεργεσία*, though people can enjoy and share His *εὐεργεσία* with one another. Edition: OGIS 697.1; Cf. Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 151.

³⁷⁵ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 82. Cf. editions: OGIS 339.31-32; Danker, *Benefactor*, 92-97, translates the Menas inscription as follows: “he devoted himself well and eagerly to the other elegant activity that went on in the gymnasium.”

³⁷⁶ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 155-56.

³⁷⁷ Towner, “Can Slaves Be Their Masters’ Benefactors?” 43-48.

³⁷⁸ Danker, *Benefactor*, 324.

Kidd cites Countryman who admits that the title *patronus* or **εὐεργέτης** is not conferred within the community of faith³⁷⁹ as Ceslas Spicq's research affirms.³⁸⁰ Yet Kidd chooses to interpret this text as a call for wealthy Christian masters to serve as devoted benefactors—a conclusion that contradicts the evidence and the usage of **εὐεργέτης** in the canon: *beneficence* only flows from God. Though people are presented as enjoying and sharing God's beneficence, they are never given the title benefactor *per se*.³⁸¹

According to *BAGD*, **ἀντιλαμβάνω** can also be rendered “to enjoy” benefits from God and adds that this translation “fits well in the context” of 1 Tim 6:1-2a.³⁸² This also aligns with the trend in the canon that **εὐεργεσία** represents benefits received from God intended for enjoyment *and* sharing.

Since the evidence shows that both slaves and masters can imitate the beneficence of the gods, rather than arguing for the “Slaves as Benefactors” view or the “Masters as Benefactors” position, we conclude that it is possible to read the text from a “God as Benefactor” perspective, again, because beneficence was thought to flow from the divine for everyone to enjoy and share. We are not saying that **ἀντιλαμβάνω** does not have varied meanings, but rather, we see that when combined with **εὐεργεσία**, the ancient mind was filled with thoughts of god-like favors flowing to people intended for universal enjoyment and sharing.

Kidd left the door open for further study with this statement: “Unless other

³⁷⁹ Countryman, *The Rich Christian*, 164-65.

³⁸⁰ Spicq, *TLNT* 2:107-113, footnote 25.

³⁸¹ Kidd's view is set forth prominently as it represents the current prevailing view. In contrast to my view, see: Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 11-78, who puts forth a “Christians as benefactors” view from these NT passages: 1 Pet 1:2-11; Rom 13:3-4; 1 Pet 2:14-15; 1 Thess 4:11-12; 2 Thess 3:6-13; 1 Tim 5:3-16. While these texts call Christians to demonstrate their faith through good deeds, in none of them are Christians called to serve as “benefactors.” The texts actually seem to call for a subversion of the cultural institution of benefaction. On Luke 22:25, the instance where Jesus explicitly calls his followers not to serve as “benefactors” *per se*, Winter adds, 40: “The point of Luke 22:25 is that Christians were not to operate in an overbearing and dictatorial fashion as Gentile kings and those in authority who were commonly called, ‘benefactors.’” I agree that Christians were to serve differently than the Gentile kings, but where I differ with Winter is his adherence to the “benefactor” model. It seems much more compelling to interpret Luke 22:25 as instructions from Jesus to the disciples to shift from functioning by way of the benefactor model and instead shift to a service-oriented model.

³⁸² Cf. *BAGD*, 74. Interestingly, to “enjoy” or “benefit by” is a rendering that “fits well in the context” though Kidd, for some reason, does not follow this rendering in the lexicon. Cf. 1 Tim 6:17-19.

considerations emerge, it is more natural to expect to see in ἡ εὐεργεσία at 1 Tim 6:2 the beneficence of the masters.”³⁸³ This dissertation seeks to offer “other considerations,” that is, input from *Ephesiaca*.

5.1.3. Summary

Inner texture analysis has surfaced findings that seem to support both the “Masters as Benefactors” and “Slaves as Benefactors” views. We have also noted that the “God as Benefactor” view may be more compelling in light of ancient evidence and the usage of εὐεργεσία and ἀντιλαμβάνω in the canon.

To come to this conclusion, we analyzed εὐεργεσία in light of ancient sources, and in so doing, four findings came into view: (1) εὐεργεσία only flowed from divine sources; (2) benefits were given for universal enjoyment; (3) the highest honor people extended to the gods as the sources of beneficence was to imitate them by not only receiving beneficence but also sharing benefits freely; and, (4) those who received benefactions always preserved the honor of their divine source. In light of this, we determined that the “God as Benefactor” view harmonizes these four findings. God is the implied subject of the εὐεργεσία in 1 Tim 6:1-2a.

Based on Kidd’s research that suggested four nuances of ἀντιλαμβάνω, we found that a “God as Benefactor” view may be preferred over the others as it encompasses the four nuances and finds support from a fifth when coupled with εὐεργεσία. This is significant for interpreting the final phrase of 1 Tim 6:1-2a because beneficence is not only to be understood as given by God and received by people, but is also intended for universal enjoyment and sharing.

This analysis brings key questions into view to explore in *Ephesiaca*: Do benefits flow down from masters? Do they flow up from slaves? Or is the divine viewed as the sole source of beneficence *per se*? How are benefits given, received,

³⁸³ Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 144.

and enjoyed in *Ephesiaca*? Does Xenophon of Ephesus use the terms in a manner consistent with the “God as Benefactor” explanation that benefits originate from divine sources and should be enjoyed and shared by all? We will look for these answers in *Ephesiaca* next.

5.2. Intertexture

Intertexture analysis invites Xenophon of Ephesus to the conversation. Here we will see how his testimony may aid modern readers in sorting this interpretive debate.

5.2.1. Terms and Themes Common to 1 Tim 6:1-2a and *Ephesiaca*

The language in 1 Tim 6:1-2a appears in *Ephesiaca*. Overlapping words and themes include: *δοῦλος*, *δεσπότης*, *ὄνομα*, *θεός*, and *εὐεργέτης*. And, though the specific term *ἀντιλαμβάνω* is not used, slaves and masters share possessions in the story.³⁸⁴

5.2.2. Analysis of Common Terms and Themes

In *Ephesiaca*, the term *δοῦλος*, “slave,” occurs nine times in two forms. Five times it refers to a man or woman owned by another person (1.4.1; 2.4.4; 2.10.2; 3.12.6; 5.11.4). The other usages capture the idea of enslavement or servitude (1.14.3; 2.1.5; 5.8.3; 5.8.8).

When Anthia, Habrocomes, and their servants are captured by Corymbus and his outlaw band, Xenophon inserts this comment attributed to the survivors of the brutal attack: “Blessed are those who will be lucky enough to die before they endure chains, before they know enslavement (*δουλείαν*) to brigands” (1.14.3).³⁸⁵ For Xenophon of Ephesus, enslavement represents an “unhappy,” “unfortunate,” “unseemly,” and even a “dangerous” condition for a person (5.8.8; 5.11.4).

³⁸⁴ Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 58-63, notes the value of exploring social realities in different texts.

³⁸⁵ In this chapter, *Ephesiaca* citations follow Henderson’s translation in the LCL unless otherwise noted.

Closely related to *δοῦλος*, the term *δεσπότης*, “master,” appears forty-two times in *Ephesiaca*. The occasions of this term can be categorized in four different ways in a hierarchical manner. First, in two usages of this word, the gods are masters over people: “You win, Eros! Here stands your great trophy over Habrocomes the Chaste. He is your suppliant. Now rescue one who takes refuge with you, the master (*δεσπότην*) of the universe” (1.4.5). In like fashion, Anthia offers a respectful prayer to Isis, referring to the goddess as, *ὦ δέσποινα Αἰγύπτου*, “Mistress of Egypt” (5.4.6). Xenophon of Ephesus portrays the gods and goddesses as masters and mistresses over men and women.

The second usage of the term emerges as the most common of the four: thirty-five times *δεσπότης* refers to “a person who owns another person.” Most of these usages point to the different oppressors from pirates to pimps who owned Anthia and/or Habrocomes during their adventures, people who forced them to obey or face harsh consequences.³⁸⁶ A few masters, however, were more kindly disposed to their slaves, such as Anthia and Habrocomes, the masters of Leuco and Rhoda (5.6.3; 5.6.4; 5.12.1; 5.12.5; 5.12.5), or the elderly master which Leuco and Rhoda served in Xanthus (5.6.3; 5.10.11). In the mind of Xenophon of Ephesus, masters who ruled over people could range from good to evil.

The third usage of *δεσπότης* occurs four times referring to the relationship between Habrocomes and Anthia. Consider the first instance from the lips of Anthia: “I have your affection, Habrocomes, and I am convinced that I am uniquely cherished by you. But please, master (*δέσποτα*) of my heart, do not betray yourself, do not succumb to barbarian wrath, but acquiesce in your mistress’ (*δεσποίνης*) desire” (2.4.5). Later, Anthia describes Habrocomes using this term again at the moment of their separation (2.7.4). Upon being reunited she uses it two more times in this intimate conversation. In *Ephesiaca*, the husband is master of his wife.

³⁸⁶ For examples, see: *Ephesiaca* 1.14.3; 5.5.6.

When everyone else had gone to sleep and there was absolute quiet, Anthia put her arms around Habrocomes and started to cry. “Husband and master (**δέσποτα**),” she said, “I have found you again after wandering over many a land and sea, after escaping threats from bandits, plots by pirates, insults from pimps, chains, pits, fetters, poisons, and burials. But I have come back to you, Habrocomes master (**δέσποτα**) of my heart, the same as I was when I first left for Syria from Tyre. No one persuaded me to misbehave, not Moeris in Syria, nor Perilaus in Cilicia, not Psammis or Polyidus in Egypt, not Anchialus in Ethiopia, not my master in Tarentum. No, I am still chaste, since I used every strategem of virtue. (5.14.1-2)

The fourth usage of **δεσπότης** appears only once and refers to a person’s relationship with possessions. In this case, if Habrocomes submits to the plan of Corymbus, he will become “master of all [Corymbus] possesses,” which would have included material possessions and slaves (1.16.4). This occurrence of the term rounds out this review of **δεσπότης** in *Ephesiaca* and completes the hierarchy in ancient thinking: the gods and goddesses are on top; free people come next; then within the realm of people, husbands are masters over wives; and people, whether slave or free can be masters of possessions.

The next term common to 1 Tim 6:1-2a and *Ephesiaca* is **ὄνομα**, “name,” which occurs nineteen times. Most of the time this word simply introduces the names of new characters in the story. There are, however, twice the term emerges referring to honorific benefaction inscriptions.

Meanwhile, Leuco and Rhoda, who were staying in Rhodes, had set up a dedication in the temple of Helios beside the golden panoply that Anthia and Habrocomes had dedicated. They set up a monument inscribed with golden lettering in honor of Habrocomes and Anthia, and also inscribed their own names (**ὀνόματα**), Leuco and Rhoda, as the dedicators. (5.10.6)

Shortly thereafter, Anthia visits the site of the inscription that she and Habrocomes had dedicated and finds Leuco and Rhoda there. Leuco and Rhoda set up their own inscription honoring their masters, Anthia and Habrocomes. After meeting up with her slaves, they reunited her with her lost love, Habrocomes. For Xenophon of Ephesus, etching the names of the gods and the names of earthly masters in an inscription assured their honor in perpetuity.

The next term that comes into view, **θεός**, “god,” occurs forty-two times in

Ephesiaca. Most instances point to the gods or goddesses; however, three times, the word is ascribed to the prominent young leaders, Habrocomes and Anthia, who appear as “gods” in the procession in honor of Artemis and on display before barbarians (1.2.7; 1.2.8; 2.2.4).

In *Ephesiaca*, people serve the gods and offered sacrifices in temples as well as prayers in reverence (1.5.1; 1.8.1), and in response, the gods provide oracles, help and deliverance for those who serve them (1.6.2). The gods also provide people with good things, such as spouses, as depicted in this scene narrated by Aegialeus.

When I was a young man just enrolled in the ephebes, I fell in love with a Spartan girl by the name of Thelxinoe, and Thelxinoe fell in love with me. We met each other during a nightlong festival sponsored by the city, a god (θεοῦ) was guiding both of us, and we consummated what we each desired when we met. (5.1.5)

The gods should be respected, because if not, they could bring schemes upon people as Eros did upon Habrocomes and Anthia at the end of the opening scene.

There they saw each other. Anthia was captivated by Habrocomes, and Habrocomes was bested by Eros. He kept gazing at the girl and though he tried, he could not take his eyes off her: the god (θεός) pressed his attack and held him fast. Anthia too was in a bad way, as with eyes wide open she took in Habrocomes’ handsomeness as it flowed into her, already putting maidenly decorum out of her mind: for what she said was for Habrocomes to hear, and she uncovered what parts of her body she could for Habrocomes to see. He gave himself over to the sight and fell captive to the god (θεοῦ). (1.3.1-2)

Later in the story, Lampo behaves honorably for fear of the gods, and Anthia called out to the gods imploring them to reward him for his good deeds (2.11.8).

Harming the protégés of the gods would also incur judgment in *Ephesiaca*. “So if you violate the goddess’ protégé,” she said, “she will be angry and your punishment harsh” (3.11.5). A person must not dishonor the gods or their servants; those that do will face retribution. Instead, they must honor the gods to receive their favor.

Analysis of the term θεός provides an appropriate transition to look at the term εὐεργέτης, “benefactor,” which occurs only once in *Ephesiaca*, and thematically overlaps with εὐεργεσία, “beneficence,” in 1 Tim 6:2a. Interestingly,

though there are many rich people in the story, the only benefactor in *Ephesiaca* is the god, Eros, as testified by Habrocomes.

“You win, Eros! Here stands your great trophy over Habrocomes the Chaste. He is your suppliant. Now rescue one who takes refuge with you, the master of the universe! Don’t abandon me or punish my rashness any further. It was through inexperience, Eros, that I scorned your powers. But now please give me Anthia! Don’t be only a harsh god toward the gainsayer but also a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) to the vanquished.” (1.4.4-5)

Consistent with our findings from other ancient literary and epigraphic evidence, here in *Ephesiaca*, “benefactor” is a title reserved for the divine. Beneficence in the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus flows from a god.

The final common theme we will examine in light of *Ephesiaca* between masters and slaves is sharing, which relates to the term ἀντιλαμβάνω in 1 Tim 6:1-2a. In the hierarchical thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus, giving or sharing goes *both* directions, downward and upward.

In a downward direction, the gods as masters and benefactors provide both supply and salvation for Anthia and/or Habrocomes in the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus. Additionally, Habrocomes, as master of Anthia, blesses her with love and loyalty throughout the story (5.14.4). Furthermore, Anthia and Habrocomes, as masters of Leuco and Rhoda, share their possessions with their slaves as κοινωνοὶ πάντων, “partners in everything” (5.15.4).

In an upward direction, generous sharing also flows from the slaves to their masters. Near the end of *Ephesiaca*, Leuco and Rhoda, run into their “unlucky” master at the site of their dedication in Rhodes. At that moment, they share all the possessions they had acquired from the death of their subsequent master. The fortune of Habrocomes takes a dramatic turn.

And so Leuco said, “My lad, what do you mean by sitting there groaning and lamenting beside dedications of no concern to you? What is your interest in this? What have you in common with those inscribed here?” Habrocomes replied to him saying, “They are for me, these dedications by Leuco and Rhoda, whom after Anthia I, Habrocomes the unlucky one, am praying to see.” On hearing this Leuco’s party were struck speechless on the spot, but little by little they recovered and recognized him by his appearance, his voice, what he

said, and his evocation of Anthia. They fell at his feet and told their own story: their journey from Tyre to Syria, the wrath of Manto, their being bound over to her, their sale to Lycia, their master's end, their prosperity, their arrival in Rhodes. And so they gathered him up and took him to the house where they were staying, turned their possessions over to him, took care of him, treated him, and tried to bolster his spirit. (5.10.10-12)

In this instance, imitating the goodness of the gods, Leuco and Rhoda represent slaves who illustrate the point of Seneca in his treatise, *On Benefits*, as they share upward the divine benefits they have received and enjoyed. Also, in their marriage, love flows faithfully up from Anthia to Habrocomes despite many opportunities for unchastity (5.14.2).

The upward sharing of people in servitude to Artemis comes into view from the opening procession to the final scene where Anthia and Habrocomes honor the goddess for all she had done for the couple:

The whole city had already heard the news of their salvation. As soon as they disembarked they went just as they were to the temple of Artemis, offered many prayers and made sacrifice, then set up dedications, among them dedicating to the goddess the inscription commemorating all that they had experienced and done. (5.15.2)

In *Ephesiaca*, enjoyment is linked to the giving and receiving of good things that flow both ways between the gods and goddesses who are masters over humans, between masters and slaves, and between husband and wife in reciprocity; however, the only character conferred with the title “benefactor” from whom benefits flow in *Ephesiaca* is a god.

5.2.3. Summary

In reviewing the lexical overlap between 1 Tim 6:1-2a and *Ephesiaca*, Xenophon of Ephesus gives us a fresh glimpse of benefactions and sharing in antiquity. Two insights have emerged in our analysis.

First, Xenophon of Ephesus corroborates the ancient notion that the gods serve as the divine source of beneficence in the ancient mind. Only the god Eros receives the title εὐεργέτης in *Ephesiaca*. Though people can mimic the gods and

demonstrate beneficence toward one another, beneficence originates from divine sources, and the divine sources must always be honored.

Second, as slaves and masters are frequently mentioned by Xenophon of Ephesus, analysis of the usage of these words reveals that they illustrate the hierarchical nature of relationships in ancient thinking, that is, between the gods, people, and material possessions. Within these relationships, giving and receiving of good things goes both ways. Slaves and masters can do virtuous acts of kindness.

These insights suggest that the author of 1 Tim 6:1-2a may have had these ancient ideas in mind. The text calls slaves to demonstrate behavior toward masters that ultimately preserves the honor and name of God. At the same time, the teaching presents the notion that those who believe the teachings of God, that is, humans both slave and free, get to experience and enjoy the beneficence of God, because they are believers and dearly loved by God, the Provider of all beneficence.

Thus far, because both the “Masters as Benefactors” and “Slaves as Benefactors” positions carry weight and simultaneously contradict each other, we chose a third option that harmonizes the ancient usage of these words. Through intertexture analysis this alternative view, the “God as Benefactor” position, also finds support from the perspective of Xenophon of Ephesus.

In light of *Ephesiaca*, 1 Tim 6:1-2a appears to call God’s people to bring Him honor by enjoying and sharing His benefits as fellow partakers of His beneficence. The next phase of this study, ideological texture, will seek to discern the significance of these insights in light of the social and cultural setting.

5.3. Ideological Texture

Ideological texture turns our attention to the people in context of Ephesus to consider how the rich in Ephesus may have heard the teaching of 1 Tim 6:1-2a.

5.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in *Ephesiaca*

Throughout the ancient Mediterranean world, evidence shows that people exalted Artemis as the protector, benefactor, and savior of the sacred city of Ephesus.³⁸⁷

Xenophon of Ephesus portrays the goddess in like fashion from the beginning of the story to the end. However, Artemis was not the only deity worshiped there.

Aurenhammer's exhaustive study of extant Ephesian statues illustrates a myriad of gods and goddesses that were honored there along with Artemis.³⁸⁸ Many are mentioned in *Ephesiaca*. For instance, in the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus, Artemis represents the "savior" of Ephesus, and Eros, one of the "benefactor" gods.

Emperors also received these titles in Ephesus. Earlier in this chapter, four of Danker's five Ephesian documents were explored. The fifth one "Decree by Asians in Honor of Julius Caesar" reinforces this view:

The cities in Asia and the [townships]
and the tribal districts honor Gaius Julius Caesar,
son of Gaius, Pontifex, imperator,
and Consul for the second time,
descendant of Ares and Aphrodite,
our God Manifest and Common Savior
of all human life (*Document 32*).³⁸⁹

This inscription, dated to the second consulship of Caesar (c. 48 BCE), illustrates the widely held belief that benefits flowed from the gods, and from the divine emperors.

Additionally, we can locate other historiographers from the same general timeframe as Xenophon of Ephesus who articulate this view. Consider the statement of Velleius Paterculus (c. 19 BCE - 31 CE) about Caesar Augustus, the benefactor and savior of Rome.

There is nothing that man can desire from the gods, nothing that the gods can grant to a man, nothing that wish can conceive or good fortune bring to pass, which Augustus on his return to the city did not bestow upon the Republic, the Roman people, and the world. (*Roman History 2:89.2*)³⁹⁰

³⁸⁷ Cf. §2.1.1.1.

³⁸⁸ Aurenhammer, "Sculptures of Gods and Heroes from Ephesos," 251-80.

³⁸⁹ Cf. Danker, *Danker, Benefactor*: 213-14, *Document 32*. Editions: SIG 3.760; CIG 2957; *IvE* 251. Cf. Rich leaders with divine ties are also given the title "benefactor" and/or "savior" in *IvE* 713, 1312, 1501.

³⁹⁰ Cf. Danker, *Benefactor*, 256.

This historiographer believed that gods supplied all good things for the people of the ancient world to enjoy, and among mankind, the divine emperor provides such benefits as well. For their beneficence, they received the title, **εὐεργέτης**.³⁹¹

What might the audience and culture of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE have thought regarding **εὐεργασία**? Spicq offers this comment from his research: "For a Greek ear of the first century, **εὐεργασία** evokes a gracious, royal, imperial or divine gift, generosities accorded by superiors, or by patrons."³⁹² In Ephesus, benefactions flowed from rich Ephesians with connections to Rome such as Alcibiades (*IvE* 22).³⁹³ Related to beneficence, the Ephesian audience and culture most likely had thoughts of the divine.

We can sum up the social context of ancient Ephesus and *Ephesiaca* linked slaves and masters with this statement: The rich *owned* slaves who were expected to behave virtuously by giving honor and faithful service to their masters.³⁹⁴ Conflict ensued if slaves did not follow this cultural rule. It was customary for masters to treat slaves harshly with force to gain compliance. Masters often beat their slaves, threatened them, and even separated them from their loved ones by selling them to other owners if they did not cooperate.³⁹⁵ These realities are portrayed in *Ephesiaca*.

In this cultural setting, if the slaves were believers and their masters were not, the virtuous behavior of the slaves would bring honor to God. If both the slaves and their masters were believers, the potential for conflict may have escalated as social distinctions were dissolving in the church.³⁹⁶

³⁹¹ Again, it must be noted that in ancient literary and epigraphic evidence, humans such as the emperors, are lauded with divine honors and often depicted as gods *per se*, whereas, in the canon, those honors only go to God.

³⁹² Spicq, *les Epîtres Pastorales*, 182-84. Cf. 2 Macc. 6:13; Acts 4:9; Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 142.

³⁹³ Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 173: "It was Hadrian's policy to invest in Asia in order to encourage the generosity of local benefactors."

³⁹⁴ Moses I. Finley and Brent D. Shaw, *Ancient Slavery & Modern Ideology* (Princeton: Markus Wiener, 1998) 79-134.

³⁹⁵ Seneca, *Moral Epistles* 47. For ancient examples of this, see: Thomas Wiedemann, *Greek and Roman Slavery*, Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World (New York: Routledge, 1994); Richard Saller, "Slavery and the Roman Family," in *Classical Slavery*, ed. M.I. Finley (London: Frank Cass, 1987) 68-76.

³⁹⁶ For an illustration of this possibility, see: Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1983) 279. Cf. Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997) 151-64.

Analysis of the ideological texture of the text of 1 Tim 6:1-2a seems to convey that slaves must honor and serve their masters because this behavior preserves God's honor. In cases where the masters are also believers, the slaves must not disrespect them, but serve them even better, because they (both the slaves and masters) are believers and fellow partakers of God's beneficence. Those who enjoy God's beneficence should mimic His generosity through their sharing and service.

5.3.2. Slaves, Masters, and Benefaction in the Early Church

How might slaves and masters in the Early Church have heard these behavioral instructions related to the use of the terms *εὐεργεσία* and *ἀντιλαμβάνω* in 1 Tim 6:1-2a? Were divine gifts from God to be shared or benefits they could bestow?

Three of the earliest Christian writings offer insight into these questions:

Didache, 1 Clement and *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Regarding slaves and masters, *Didache* instructs in this way.

Do not give orders to your male slave (*δούλω*) or female servant—who hope in the same God—out of bitterness, lest they stop fearing the God who is over you both. For he does not come to call those of high status, but those whom the Spirit has prepared. And you who are slaves must be subject to your masters as to a replica of God with respect and referential fear. (4:10-11)

Aaron Milavec suggests these instructions outline a whole new way of life based on the social setting. God calls people regardless of their social status to live in a manner that brings Him honor, so masters are not to treat slaves harshly and slaves must obey their masters as representatives of God.³⁹⁷ The *Didache* exhorts both slaves and masters to exhibit God-honoring behavior.

Clement shares a similar perspective. Masters should behave honorably toward their slaves in submission to God. Why? God is over them both, and God determines who receives divine *εὐεργεσία*, which does not originate from people of high status, but from God.

³⁹⁷ Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003) 60.

The humility and obedient lowliness of so many people with such a strong reputation have improved not only us but also the generations that came before us—indeed all those who received the sayings of God in reverential awe and truth. And so, since we have shared in such numerous, great, and glorious deeds, we should forge ahead to the goal of peace that has been delivered to us from the beginning. And we should gaze intently on the Father and Creator of the entire world and cling to his magnificent and superior gifts of peace and acts of kindness (**εὐεργεσίαις**). (*1 Clement* 19.1-2)

Clement further describes God’s **εὐεργεσία** and concludes with this comment:

The great Creator and Master of all appointed all these things to be in peace and harmony, bringing great benefits (**εὐεργεσιῶν**) to all things, but most especially to us, who flee to his compassion through our Lord Jesus Christ. To him be the glory and the majesty forever and ever. Amen. (*1 Clement* 20.11-12)

In contemplating God’s kindnesses, Clement not only calls the reader to awe, but calls the Church to action, having experienced the **εὐεργεσία** of God.

Loved ones, you should take care that his many acts of kindness (**εὐεργεσίαι**) do not lead you to judgment against all of us. For this will happen if we fail to conduct ourselves worthily of him and to do the things that are good and pleasing before him, in harmony. (*1 Clement* 21.1)

Divine blessings should be enjoyed and shared in harmony and community.

In *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, we find help for rendering **ἀντιλαμβάνω** from the Early Church Fathers from the scene in which Polycarp is burned by fire.

For the fire, taking on the appearance of a vaulted room, like a boat’s sail filled with the wind, formed a wall around the martyr’s body. And he was in the center, not like burning flesh but like baking bread or like gold and silver being refined in a furnace. And we perceived (**ἀντελαβόμεθα**) a particularly sweet aroma, like wafting incense or some other precious perfume. (15.2)

In this scene, all that witnessed the death of Polycarp perceived the aroma. This serves as another ancient precedent for reading this verb as something “perceived, experienced, or enjoyed by all,” though this instance is linked to a dreadful act of martyrdom.

5.3.3. Summary

Ideological texture has shifted our attention back to the *context* to determine how the author and audience may have heard the *text*.

Beneficence, from the perspective of the Ephesian audience and culture,

comes from these sources: the gods, emperors, and prominent people tied to divine authorities. Velleius Paterculus, another historiographer from the same general timeframe as Xenophon of Ephesus, ascribes the benefactor title to the emperor and other evidence testifies to this notion that beneficence flowed from divine sources.

Slavery was a social reality in Ephesus and the ancient world and cultural norms dictated appropriate behavior. Early Church writings reveal that though slaves and masters had different ranks before man, they are equal before God; thus, regardless of their status, both slaves and masters were to demonstrate god-honoring behavior toward one another. The text appears instructional for slaves and masters: behave in a God-honoring fashion as fellow recipients of God's beneficence.

5.4. Sacred Texture

In this final phase of analysis, we will focus on the relationship between the divine and mankind. We will also compare our findings with related NT teachings.

5.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text

God appears overtly in this text in the *ἵνα* or purpose clause (v. 1b). This clause is translated, "so that the name of God and the teaching may not be blasphemed." The rich and riches also appear as "masters" with some measure of wealth as owners of slaves (vv. 1-2a).

The text instructs slave and masters to act in a manner that glorifies God and upholds the fame of the teachings of God. In cases where their masters are fellow believers and beloved, they are to serve one another even better, as fellow recipients of God's kindness. That is to say, the motivation for service (whether you are a slave or a master) is not linked to the obligations of role or status, but to bring glory to God, the source of divine beneficence.

5.4.2. Reading the Text in the Context of NT Teaching to Slaves and Masters

The NT reflects a similar message in two letters of the Pauline tradition: the letters written to Christians in Ephesus and Colossae. Ephesians 6:5-9 contains instructions for slaves and masters regarding their behavior and relationship with each other before God.

⁵ Slaves, obey your earthly masters with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as you obey Christ; ⁶ not only while being watched, and in order to please them, but as slaves of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. ⁷ Render service with enthusiasm, as to the Lord and not to men and women, ⁸ knowing that whatever good we do, we will receive the same again from the Lord, whether we are slaves or free. ⁹ And, masters, do the same to them. Stop threatening them, for you know that both of you have the same Master in heaven, and with him there is no partiality.

“According to Paul, both slaves and masters were to conduct themselves with integrity, compelled by their hearts and not by external forces.”³⁹⁸ Heavenly norms now supersede cultural rules and obedience would undoubtedly bring glory to God.

Slaves should serve their masters as if they are serving Christ. Masters must treat their slaves the same way, because before God there are no status distinctions, such as slave or free.³⁹⁹ Clinton Arnold adds “...since God shows no preference for one’s social or economic status, neither should slave owners. Therefore they should treat their slaves the way God treats them.”⁴⁰⁰

Rich masters may have been accustomed to receiving special treatment before men in antiquity; however, they will receive no special treatment before God.⁴⁰¹ Both ought to serve one another in a manner that imitates Christ. Colossians 3:22-4:1 reflects a comparable view:

^{3:22}Slaves, obey your earthly masters in everything, not only while being watched and in order to please them, but wholeheartedly, fearing the Lord. ²³Whatever your task, put yourselves into it, as done for the Lord and not for your masters, ²⁴since you know that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward; you serve the Lord Christ. ²⁵For the wrongdoer

³⁹⁸ Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002) 814.

³⁹⁹ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 698-700.

⁴⁰⁰ Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians*, ZECNT (ed. Clinton E. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010) 427. Cf. Charles J. Ellicott, *A Critical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 2nd ed. (London: John W. Parker & Son, 1859) 146.

⁴⁰¹ Julette M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*, vol. 59, SBLDS (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982) 178.

will be paid back for whatever wrong has been done, and there is no partiality.⁴¹ Masters, treat your slaves justly and fairly, for you know that you also have a Master in heaven.

With God there is no partiality. Masters should to treat slaves fairly, and slaves must serve their masters in a fashion that honors God.⁴⁰² Douglas Moo suggests that these counter-cultural instructions for Christians correspond to the new reality that slaves and masters both answer to a higher master, the Lord Christ.⁴⁰³

Interestingly, neither passage has benefactions flowing from masters to slaves or from slaves to masters. In the canon, divine kindnesses originate and flow from God and human recipients are to enjoy *and* freely share them.

5.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Beneficence in the NT

Does the “God as Benefactor” perspective for interpreting 1 Tim 6:1-2a find support in the context of the NT. Below we will examine *εὐεργεσία* and *ἀντιλαμβάνω* and their related forms as they sparsely occur in NT.⁴⁰⁴

Luke uses the verb *ἀντιλαμβάνω* linked to the ways that God has shown his goodness to His people. In Luke 1:52-55, known as *the Magnificat*, Mary concludes:

⁵² He has brought down the powerful from their thrones, and lifted up the lowly; ⁵³ he has filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich away empty. ⁵⁴ He has helped (*ἀντελάβετο*) his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, according to the promise he made to our ancestors, ⁵⁵ to Abraham and to his descendants for ever.’

Garland describes this help as “God’s merciful intervention and faithfulness.”⁴⁰⁵

The other use of this term, mentioned earlier in this chapter, appears in Acts 20:35 where Paul calls the Ephesian elders “to support the weak.”⁴⁰⁶ On this verse,

Witherington notes:

⁴⁰² Cf. Tit 2:9-10; Stephen Charles Mott, “Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus 2:10-14 and 3:3-7.” *NovT* 20 (1978): 22-48.

⁴⁰³ Douglas J. Moo, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) 317. Cf. Thomas K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897) 180.

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. its lone usage in the OT, Ps 77:11 proclaims this message in the chiasmic center of the Psalm: “I will remember the deeds [*εὐεργεσιῶν*] of the LORD; yes, I will remember your miracles from long ago.”

⁴⁰⁵ Garland, *Luke*, 96. Cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Luke*, IVPNTC (ed. Grant R. Osborne; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994) 47, this reflects “God’s desire to minister to the poor.”

⁴⁰⁶ *BAGD*, 74. As the leader has experienced divine blessings from God, they are to share them with others.

Luke would seem to have in mind those of low social status who tended to be marginalized in the Greco-Roman world, a condition found in the church (see Acts 6:1-6). Luke has also at various points suggested that it was those of somewhat high social status, those with houses large enough for the community to meet in, who tended to assume leadership positions in the church. If this was the case in Ephesus, then Paul would be appealing to others of about the same social status as himself to be willing to “become more vile” and deliberately step down the social ladder by working with their hands and so serve the weak, rather than have them serve the leadership.⁴⁰⁷

Not much can be determined conclusively from these limited occurrences of **ἀντιλαμβάνω**. Based its usage with **εὐεργεσία** in 1 Tim 6:1-2a, it seems most compelling to interpret this difficult phrase as subversively instructing slaves and masters to share the beneficence of God within the community of faith, rather than to consider it as a call to honorably function in accordance with cultural rules.

As for **εὐεργεσία**, the term appears twice in the NT outside 1 Tim 6:2a. It is used exclusively to depict spiritual benefits from God. The first instance comes from the testimony of Peter in Acts 4:9-10 regarding the healing of the lame man.

⁹ If we are being examined today concerning a good deed (**εὐεργεσία**) done to a cripple, by what means this man has been healed, ¹⁰ be it known to you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by him this man is standing before you well.

Peter declares that the means or source of this act of kindness is Jesus Christ of Nazareth.

Later in Acts 10:37-38, Luke recounts the beneficence of Jesus of Nazareth as displayed in His earthly ministry.

³⁷ The word which was proclaimed throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John preached: ³⁸ how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; how he went about doing good (**εὐεργετῶν**) and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.

Jesus is portrayed as the “Benefactor” who broadly shares divine beneficence.⁴⁰⁸

Consequently, the rendering of 1 Tim 6:1-2a that has emerged in this study reads consistently with the way **ἀντιλαμβάνω**, **εὐεργεσία**, and related terms are

⁴⁰⁷ Witherington, *Acts of the Apostles*, 625-26.

⁴⁰⁸ Cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007): 398, “Such activity calls for gratitude from the beneficiaries...Jesus’s good work of healing and ministry was that of one who served and benefited humanity.”

used in the NT: recipients of God's kindness, regardless of their status, should enjoy and share God's beneficence in a manner that brings God glory.

5.4.4. Fresh Rendering of the Disputed Phrase in 1 Tim 6:1-2a

Part of the reason for this review of evidence alongside *Ephesiaca* has been to offer a fresh translation of the disputed phrase. This rendering emerges from our study.

Table #5: Greek Text and Fresh Rendering of the Disputed Phrase in 1 Tim 6:2a

... ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δεουλεύεωσαν, ὅτι πιστοὶ εἰσὶν καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι.	...instead, they should serve <i>one another</i> even better, because they are believers and beloved recipients of <i>God's</i> beneficence.
---	--

Slaves should serve Christian masters for the same reason masters must treat them fairly. Both are members of God's church, and fellow recipients of God's kindness. In this way, both slaves and masters imitate Jesus and bring glory to God.

5.4.5. Summary

In sacred texture analysis, we located the name and teachings of God in the center of this text. Slaves must serve their masters well, and masters must treat their slaves fairly, because both are recipients of God's beneficence. Additionally, their service and sharing brings glory to God and demonstrates obedience to Christ.

The letters to the Ephesians and the Colossians send similar messages to slaves and masters as we see in 1 Tim 6:1-2a. Because both masters and slaves are under a Master in heaven, they are to live their lives in a manner that exceeds cultural norms and brings honor to God. They must do this because God does not play favorites among people. Loving service should typify the lifestyle of all who bear the name of God and have received His kindness.

Furthermore, benefactions do not originate with humans in the canon; thus, it is not compelling to read the text from that perspective. Divine kindness flows from

God to people, so the translation of the text should reflect that reality. As status distinctions were dissolving in God's church, the instructions to both slaves and masters privileged enough to have received God's divine beneficence exhort them to serve one another in a God-honoring manner.

5.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Tim 6:1-2a in light of *Ephesiaca*

In this chapter we have explored a disputed text that contains benefaction language: 1 Tim 6:1-2a. We have examined this text in light of the social and cultural world of Ephesus as presented in ancient sources and *Ephesiaca* to gain new insights.

Inner texture analysis looked at the enigmatic terms, **εὐεργεσία** and **ἀντιλαμβάνω**, in the difficult phrase in 1 Tim 6:2a. Ancient sources testified that beneficence flowed from divine sources that must be honored, and the beneficence was intended for the enjoyment of everyone. In ancient thinking, anyone with the capacity to possess virtue could imitate the gods as a benefactor. Because the "Masters as Benefactors" and the "Slaves as Benefactors" positions both seemed to have valid and yet contradictory evidence, rather than pick one of those lenses, this study identified a third, possible alternative, the "God as Benefactor" view, based on an interpretation that sees God as the implied subject and the source of beneficence.

Intertexture analysis looked at the terms and themes in 1 Tim 6:1-2a and *Ephesiaca* and two insights emerged: (1) Xenophon of Ephesus provided support for the "God as Benefactor" position as beneficence flowed only from the gods who must be honored; and (2) both slaves and masters appeared frequently in *Ephesiaca* in a way that showed the hierarchical nature of relationships in the ancient mind. The gods were on top (and a god is the only character in *Ephesiaca* given the title, **εὐεργέτης**), then free people, then slaves, then material possessions, and within this hierarchy, divine benefits were shared up and down between humans.

Ideological texture appraised the implications of this study for rich Ephesians. They would have considered divine sources, such as the gods, emperors, and people with divine ties as benefactors. In the Early Church, beneficence was also perceived as divine, though not linked to gods *per se* as in the polytheistic mindset, but rather as God's kindnesses for all to enjoy and share. Thus, the "God as Benefactor" position seems to best fit in light of the language in the canon. This text charts a higher course in the social setting where rich masters *owned* slaves who were expected to honor and serve them. Slaves and masters must honor and serve one another because such behavior preserves God's honor.

Sacred texture examined the findings from our study in light of beneficence in the NT. God is the sole source of beneficence in the NT, not people. They simply enjoy and share His divine blessings. In God's church, status distinctions were disappearing, thus putting everyone on an equal plane. As a result, recipients of God's kindness (both slaves and masters) ought to honor the name of God and obey the teachings of God by serving one another, while also enjoying and sharing His kindnesses. This "God as Benefactor" perspective would have been both radically counter-cultural and God-honoring behavior in Ephesus in the first century CE.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER SIX

False Teachers in 1 Timothy 6:2b-10:

Godliness, Greed, and the Sacred Message of *Ephesiaca*

This chapter explores 1 Tim 6:2b-10 in light of ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca*. This text mentions a recurring topic in 1 Tim: false teachers. Their instruction is described as sick wrangling that is contrary to the sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ. The false teachers use religion as a front for **πορισμός**, “a means of gain.”⁴⁰⁹ The section unmasks their motivation: **φιλαργυρία**, “love of money or avarice.”⁴¹⁰

At the core of this polemic, the false teachers have a warped view of **εὐσέβεια**, “piety, godliness, or religion.”⁴¹¹ Rather than consider godliness as a means of gain, the text calls for godliness with **αὐταρκείας**, that is, “contentment, self-sufficiency, or detachment.”⁴¹² Moreover, the text explains the great gain that comes from godliness with contentment using a series of wise sayings.

Greco-Roman historians, Hellenistic moral philosophers, Jewish writers, and Ephesian inscriptions have informed our thinking concerning **εὐσέβεια**, **πορισμός**, **αὐτάρκεια**, and **φιλαργυρία**, and theories abound regarding the false teachers.⁴¹³ After exploring the ancient evidence (6.1.), we will see how *Ephesiaca* sheds light on this text (6.2) and evaluate our findings based on the social setting (6.3.). We will appraise our findings alongside related NT texts (6.4.) and conclude by disclosing what comes into view regarding the identity and message of the false teachers (6.5.).

⁴⁰⁹ BAGD, 693. The term **πορισμός** only appears here in the NT: 1 Tim 6:5, 6. In the LXX it also occurs twice in Wisdom of Solomon as “money-making” in 13:19 and simply “gain” in 14:2 (NRSV).

⁴¹⁰ 1 Tim 6:3, 5, 6. BAGD, 859; **φιλαργυρία** only here in the NT: 1 Tim 6:10; see **φιλαργυρέω** in 2 Macc 10:20; 2 Clement 4:3; and **φιλαργυρος** in Luke 16:14; 2 Tim 3:2; cf. *Didache* 3:5.

⁴¹¹ BAGD, 326. The term **εὐσέβεια** also appears in Acts 3:12; 1 Tim 2:2; 3:16; 4:7, 8; 6:11; 2 Tim 3:5; Tit 1:1; 2 Pet 1:3, 6, 7; 3:1. In the Apostolic Fathers, see: 1 Clement 1:2; 11:1; 15:1; 32:4; 2 Clement 19:2. For the verb **εὐσεβέω**, see: 1 Tim 5:4; and the adjective **εὐσεβής**, see: Acts 10: 2, 7; 2 Pet 2:9. Cf. Robert J. Karris, “The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles.” *JBL* 92 (1973): 549-64.

⁴¹² 1 Tim 6:7-10. BAGD, 122. The term **αὐταρκείας** appears in 1 Tim 6:6 and 2 Cor 9:8. The verb **ἀρκεσθῆσόμεθα** appears in 1 Tim 6:8 and as **αὐτάρκτης** in Phil 4:11 and in the LXX in Sir 40:18. For the definition that **αὐταρκείας** refers to “detachment and freedom from any claims made by possessions of any sort,” see Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 294.

⁴¹³ Cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 171-74, for more on **εὐσέβεια**; and, 41-50, 393 for discussion on the difficulty in locating the identity and message of the greedy false teachers.

6.1. Inner Texture

Inner texture analysis will scrutinize the terms and themes in 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related texts (1:3-7, 19-20; 4:1-10; 6:20-21) in ancient sources and then later in *Ephesiaca*.

6.1.1. Text and Translation

Table #6: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 6:2b-10

<p>^{2b} Ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακαλεῖ. ³ εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ, ⁴ τετύφωται, μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος ἔρις βλασφημίας, ἰπὸνοιαι πονηραί, ⁵ διαπαρτριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας, νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν. ⁶ Ἔστιν δὲ πορισμὸς μέγας ἢ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας·</p> <p>⁷ οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα·</p> <p>⁸ ἔχοντες δὲ διατροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα, τούτοις ἀρκεσθησόμεθα.</p> <p>⁹ οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν ἐπιπίπτουσιν εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ παγίδα καὶ ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς ἀνοήτους καὶ βλαβερὰς, αἵτινες βυθίζουσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν.</p> <p>¹⁰ ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία, ἧς τινες ὀρεγόμενοι ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἑαυτοῦς περιέπειραν ὀδύνας πολλαῖς. (NA²⁷)</p>	<p>^{2b} Teach and urge these duties. ³ Whoever teaches otherwise and does not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching that is in accordance with godliness, ⁴ is conceited, understanding nothing, and has a morbid craving for controversy and for disputes about words. From these come envy, dissension, slander, base suspicions, ⁵ and wrangling among those who are depraved in mind and bereft of the truth, imagining that godliness is a means of gain. ⁶ Of course, there is great gain in godliness combined with contentment;</p> <p>⁷ for we brought nothing into the world, so that we can take nothing out of it;</p> <p>⁸ but if we have food and clothing, we will be content with these.</p> <p>⁹ But those who want to be rich fall into temptation and are trapped by many senseless and harmful desires that plunge people into ruin and destruction.</p> <p>¹⁰ For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, and in their eagerness to be rich some have wandered away from the faith and pierced themselves with many pains. (NRSV)</p>
--	--

6.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources

The polemic language of 1 Tim 6:2b-10 depicts the false teachers as pursuing godliness as a means of gain motivated by greed. Exploration of this passage and related texts in 1 Tim fits within the limits of this study as this polemic unmasks false teaching on riches that was present in this setting. Rare or descriptive terms associated with the false teachers come into view throughout 1 Tim.

Timothy is urged to remain in Ephesus because some are teaching **ἕτεροδιδασκαλεῖν**, “a different doctrine” (1:3).⁴¹⁴ They occupy themselves with **μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις**, “myths or tales, and endless genealogies,” which encourage **ἐκζητήσεις**, “useless speculations” (1:4).⁴¹⁵ Certain unnamed persons have turned to **ματαιολογίαν**, “meaningless talk” (1:6).⁴¹⁶ They desire to be **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**, “teachers of the law,” though are portrayed as clueless about their assertions (1:7). In antiquity, **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** refers to a tutor or teacher of law. In *IvE* 10, the words that make up this compound point to teachers of cultic laws.⁴¹⁷

The false teachers had rejected **πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν**, “faith and good conscience,” so Timothy was commanded to fulfill his prophetic calling and fight against them (1:19). Hymenaeus and Alexander are named as perpetrators guilty of **βλασφημεῖν**, “blaspheming” (1:20).⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁴ This term in 1 Tim 1:3 also appears in 6:3 but is undocumented in antiquity, LXX and NT. Cf. “contrary teachings” in Ignatius, *To Polycarp* 3.1; “teaching other than what his predecessor taught” in Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius, *Church History* 7.7.4); “erroneous teachings” Origen, *In Johannem* 13.50, PG 14.493; cf. Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 62. On the significance of **παρακαλέω** in instructions for Timothy to remain in Ephesus, see: Hermann von Lips, *Glaube – Gemeinde – Amt: Zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralbriefen*, FRLANT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979)130.

⁴¹⁵ On **μύθοις** in 1 Tim 1:4, see also: Tit 1:14. On **γενεαλογίαις** see also: Tit 3:9. The term **ἀπεράντοις** is only here in the NT. On **ἐκζητήσεις** in contrast to **οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ** see: Eph 1:10, 3:2, 9; cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 367, Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 65. Cf. John Reumann, *Stewardship and the Economy of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 18, notes that the divine training in the faith of 1 Tim is set in contrast to the myths, genealogies, and speculations of the opponents, though he (among others) does not link culprits to the Artemis cult, but rather to the Gnostics (cf. 6:20).

⁴¹⁶ No references link **ματαιολογίαν** to the OT law. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 120, notes that this belongs “to the category of things that are pagan.” Cf. Tit 1:10; Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 2.1.

⁴¹⁷ Plutarch, *Marcus Cato* 20.4. The terms that make up this compound **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**, appear in *IvE* 10, that is **νόμου...διδάσκοντες**, referring to instructions linked to cultic laws.

⁴¹⁸ Note: *IvE* 261.5-9 mentions an **Αλέξανδρος** who served under Claudius (c. 41 CE-54 CE) as **γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου**; *IvE* 3865 mentions **Ἰμεναίου καὶ** [...] on a bath wall (undated). Neither person can be tied to 1 Tim 1:20 with certainty though their names are located in *IvE*. It is unclear whether he is the same “Alexander” that is mentioned in Acts 19:33.

The teaching of those who have departed from the faith represents **διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων**, “doctrines of demons,” coming from lying hypocrites with seared consciences (4:1-2). These false teachers call for abstinence from both marriage and foods, which should be freely enjoyed (4:3). The identity of these opponents remains unclear though some of their cultic rules come into view. The text instructs good ministers to instruct followers of Christ Jesus to avoid **βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους**, “godless and silly myths or profane old woman’s tales” (4:7). To do this, they must train themselves in godliness and set their hope on the living God, the **Σωτήρ**, “Savior” (4:10).⁴¹⁹

At the conclusion of the letter, Timothy is charged to pursue **εὐσέβεια** (6:11).⁴²⁰ Simultaneously, he must guard the deposit entrusted to him and avoid **βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως**, “godless chatter or profane sounds and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge” (v. 20). The false teaching has caused some to veer away from the faith (v. 21).

The misguided piety exhibited by the greedy false teachers serving as a means for gain is juxtaposed against sound teaching clarified with this statement: **πορισμὸς μέγας ἡ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας** “godliness with contentment is great gain” (6:2b-6).⁴²¹ The point is explained further with wise sayings (6:7-10).

Consequently, we will examine ancient evidence in three areas below: (1) godliness in antiquity and Ephesus, (2) the wise sayings on contentment in the Ephesian context, and (3) myths, teachings, and the rich in ancient Ephesus.

⁴¹⁹ The use of the term “Savior” linked to the “living God” in 1 Tim 4:10 stands in contrast to the way this term was used in Ephesus on numismatic and inscription evidence linked to Artemis, cf. §2.1.1.1. of this dissertation. Cf. Tom Thatcher, “The Relational Matrix of the Pastoral Epistles.” *JETS* 38 (1995): 41–45. For further explanation on the Christology and divine salvation of the living God, see: Hanna Stettler, *Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe*, vol. 2.105, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 328–34.

⁴²⁰ Wolter, *Paulustradition*, 135–37, notes the **Σὺ δέ**, “but you,” rhetorical shift from the greedy false teachers to Timothy, which highlights the contrast between these nefarious characters and Timothy. His pursuit of **εὐσέβεια** should be distinctively different from them.

⁴²¹ Brian S. Rosner, *Beyond Greed* (Kingsford: Matthias Media, 2004) 89–100. See also: Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 399, “Godliness is not about acquiring better and more material things; it is instead an active life of faith, a living out of covenant faithfulness in relation to God, that finds sufficiency and contentment in Christ alone whatever one’s outward circumstances might be.” Cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 644–45; Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 278–79; Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 334–35; Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 143.

6.1.2.1. Godliness in Antiquity and Ephesus

The term **εὐσέβεια** in antiquity refers to one's response or behavior before the gods as seen by people. Xenophon of Athens (c. 430 BCE–354 BCE) describes Socrates as “so religious (**εὐσεβῆς**) that he did nothing without counsel from the gods”

(*Memorabilia* IV, 8, 11).⁴²² Isocrates (436 BCE–338 BCE) shares a similar opinion.

First of all, then, show devotion (**εὐσέβει**) to the gods, not merely by doing sacrifice, but also by keeping your vows; for the former is but evidence of a material prosperity, whereas the latter is proof of a noble character. Do honour to the divine power (**δαιμόνιον**) at all times, but especially on occasions of public worship; for thus you will have the reputation both of sacrificing to the gods and of abiding by the laws. (*To Demonicus* 13)

For these ancient Greeks, modeling **εὐσέβεια** before the gods and the people includes these types of rituals: making sacrifices, giving gifts, keeping vows, honoring the **δαιμόνιον**, and observing cultic laws.⁴²³

This understanding of **εὐσέβεια** in antiquity was not limited to the ancient Greek world, as it also appears in ancient Judaism. Of the fifty-nine occurrences of **εὐσέβεια** in the LXX, fifty-five appear in the apocrypha or deuterocanonical books and the other four instances surface in OT books.⁴²⁴

In Proverbs 1:7, Isaiah 11:2 and 33:6, **εὐσέβεια** combines the knowledge of God with the appropriate behavioral response. The term is translated as “the fear of the LORD.”⁴²⁵ As this study pertains to riches, it is noteworthy that Proverbs 13:11 describes how a person **μετ' εὐσέβειας** acquires money: “Dishonest money dwindles away, but whoever gathers money little by little makes it grow.”⁴²⁶ In modern terms, this person makes an “honest living.”

In later occurrences in the LXX and Philo, **εὐσέβεια** refers to the behavior of people before God, and **εὐσέβεια** is elevated to the status of a virtue possessed by

⁴²² Cf. *BAGD*, 326. **εὐσέβεια** is defined as “the duty which man owes to God.”

⁴²³ Cf. **δαιμόνιον** also appears in 1 Tim 4:1.

⁴²⁴ The term **εὐσέβεια** occurs 4x the Hebrew Bible: Prov 1:7; Is 11:2; 33:6; 5x in the Apocrypha: 1 Es 1:23; Wis 10:12; Sir 49:3; 2 Macc 3:1; 12:45; 3x in 3 Macc 1:9; 2:31, 32 and 47x in 4 Macc. Cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 172-73.

⁴²⁵ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 141.

⁴²⁶ Witherington, *Jesus and Money*, 29-42.

those committed to the OT Law. This may reflect the influence of Greek thought on Judaism.⁴²⁷ For example, consider 1 Esdras 1:23. “And the deeds of Josiah were upright in the sight of the Lord, for his heart was full of godliness (εὐσέβεια).”

Other deuterocanonical occurrences lean the Greco-Roman direction.⁴²⁸

This virtue, often coupled with wisdom, is of great value as attested in Wisdom of Solomon 10:12.

¹² When his oppressors were covetous, she stood by him and made him rich. She protected him from his enemies, and kept him safe from those who lay in wait for him; in his arduous contest she gave him the victory, so that he might learn that godliness (εὐσέβεια) is more powerful than anything else.

Interestingly, religious leaders are exhorted to possess this virtue in the LXX. For example, in 2 Maccabees 3:1, the high priest, Onias is celebrated for exhibiting godliness. Likewise, Timothy is urged to pursue godliness in 1 Tim 6:11.

In the Greco-Roman period, εὐσέβεια is linked with the Latin equivalent, *pietas*, as attested by Cicero (106 BCE–43 BCE). “Piety (*pietas*) is justice directed toward the gods” (*De Natura Deorum* 1.116). He also uses the term to depict virtuous behavior toward homeland and family. “They refer to what happens in fear and worship of the gods as religion and the tasks which duty tells us to perform towards our native land or to parents or others linked to us by blood relationships as piety” (*In Rhetoric* 2.66).⁴²⁹ For Cicero, *pietas* encompasses respecting the gods, observing cultic laws and treating people appropriately in the greater order of life.

Epictetus, a Stoic born in Hierapolis near Ephesus (55 CE–135 CE), offers a similar perspective on εὐσέβεια.

In piety (εὐσεβείας) towards the gods, I would have you know, the chief element is this, to have the right opinions about them—as existing and as administering the universe well and justly—and to have set yourself to obey them and to submit to everything that happens, and to follow it voluntarily in the belief that it is being fulfilled by the highest intelligence (γνώμης). (*The Enchiridion* 31.1.1-7)⁴³⁰

⁴²⁷ Philo, *Special Laws* 4.135, 147; cf. *TDNT* 7:175-85.

⁴²⁸ Wis 10:12; Sir 49:3; 2 Macc 3:1; 12:45; 3x in 3 Macc 1:9; 2:31, 32 and 47x in 4 Macc.

⁴²⁹ Cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 139.

⁴³⁰ Cf. γνώμης in relation to γνώσεως in 1 Tim 6:20. Cf. Philip H. Towner, “Gnosis and Realized Eschatology in Ephesus (of the Pastoral Epistles) and the Corinthian Enthusiasm.” *JSNT* 31 (1987): 95-124.

For Epictetus, the gods govern the order of the universe; thus, people must exhibit **εὐσέβεια** before them. People are to submit to this ultimate knowledge and demonstrate their submission with deeds such as sacrifices and offerings.

For where a man's interest lies, there is also his piety (**εὐσεβής**). Wherefore, whoever is careful to exercise desire and aversion, as he should, is at the same time careful also about piety (**εὐσεβείας**). But it is always appropriate to make libations, and sacrifices, and to give of the firstfruits after the manner of our fathers, and to do all this with purity, and not in a slovenly or careless fashion, nor, indeed, in a niggardly way, nor yet beyond our means (**δύναμιν**). (*The Enchiridion* 31.4.9-31.5.4)⁴³¹

For Epictetus, showing **εὐσέβεια** included making sacrifices and giving to the gods. This view of **εὐσέβεια** also comes to light in the Ephesian inscriptions.

The **εὐσέβεια** of rich Ephesians ensconced in leadership for generations is linked their service to Artemis and the gods and Ephesus.⁴³² The best example of this may be *IvE* 27, the Gaius Vibius Salutaris inscription of 104 CE. In this prominent inscription located at the entrance to the theatre, **εὐσέβεια** occurs nine times in different forms. Three insights come to our attention in *IvE* 27 linked to **εὐσέβεια**.⁴³³

First, the inscription celebrates the **εὐσέβεια** of Gaius Vibius Salutaris toward the foundress of Ephesus, Artemis, and specifically mentions his giving to the cult. Additionally, his **εὐσέβεια** is not only directed toward the goddess, but also broadly “toward the gods,” including the Roman emperors.⁴³⁴

Second, **εὐσεβής**, “pious,” appears as a virtue of Gaius Vibius Salutaris who is lauded for his financial support of the annual procession. This illustrates the social and cultural expectation that pious people used their wealth to honor Artemis, the gods, and the emperor, while faithfully serving the council and the people.⁴³⁵

⁴³¹ For **δύναμιν** in the NT, note this term related to the giving of the Macedonians in 2 Cor 9:3.

⁴³² For first century CE examples of the **εὐσέβεια** of the *curetes*, see: *IvE* 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1020.

⁴³³ See *IvE* 27.14-19, 84-90, 114-119, 366-369, 384-389, 414-418, 427-430, 431-442. Cf. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, Appendix I, for the Greek text and English translation of *IvE* 27, the largest extant inscription in Ephesus.

⁴³⁴ This usage of **εὐσέβεια** to Artemis and/or the Imperial cult can also be found in: *IvE* 11, 17, 21, 24, 26, 203, 217, 233, 236, 237, 296, 302-4a, 314/5, 666a, 680, 683a, 690, 702, 824, 853, 886, 892, 941/2, 957, 989a, 1001-6, 1008-10, 1012-24, 1028-30, 1032-8, 1040-44, 1047-51/3, 1065-7/8, 1084, 1352, 1380, 1480, 1538, 1565, 1578b, 1579, 1588, 1598, 1859, 2090, 2426, 3041, 3059, 3118, 3263, 3408, 3419, 4336.

⁴³⁵ Cf. Danker, *Benefactor*, 343, echoes this understanding linked to **εὐσέβεια** in his epigraphic research.

Third, rich people receive royal treatment and benefits in return for exhibiting **εὐσέβεια**, and they themselves outline these terms. For establishing this foundation that honors the goddess, other gods, the emperor, and the genealogical heritage of the Ephesians with an annual parade of statues, Gaius Vibius Salutaris awarded himself special seating and other honors in return. It paid to exhibit piety!

In review, **εὐσέβεια** in antiquity reflects respect for the divine demonstrated by public acts. In Greco-Roman thinking, to display **εὐσέβεια** entails sacrifices to the gods and honoring the **δαιμόνιον** in the context of service to homeland, city, and family. Canonical references equate **εὐσέβεια** with “the fear of the LORD,” and Jews who possess this virtue behave in keeping with the OT Law. In Ephesian inscriptions, **εὐσέβεια** embodies the lauded piety of priestesses, priests, and wealthy people who serve Artemis and the gods by supporting the cult, honoring the emperor, and serving the city. This reputation of Artemis and the gods grows thanks to the **εὐσέβεια** of rich Ephesians, who, in return, also benefit richly.

The rhetoric in 1 Tim 6:5-6 portrays the false teachers with a warped view of **εὐσέβεια**: they exhibit piety as a means for gain. This raises a question based on Ephesian evidence: Might rich Ephesians lauded for their service Artemis and the gods be in view? In contrast, the author of 1 Tim declares that there is great gain in godliness with **αὐταρκείας**, “contentment, self-sufficiency, or detachment.” To explain this statement, the conjunction **γὰρ**, “for” (v. 7), leads into a series of wise sayings (vv. 7-10), which we will examine next in light of Ephesian evidence.

6.1.2.2. Wise Sayings on Contentment in the Ephesian Context

To discern how the rich may have heard the wise sayings on contentment in this social and cultural setting we will appraise each saying in light of Ephesian evidence and later alongside *Ephesiaca*.

The rhetoric of the first saying appears often in the OT and antiquity (6:7):

“For we brought nothing into the world, so that (ὅτι) we can take nothing out of it.”

Three OT passages employ similar expressions.

And [Job] said: “Naked I came from my mother’s womb, and naked I will depart. The LORD gave and the LORD has taken away; may the name of the LORD be praised.” (Job 1:21)

¹⁶ Do not be overawed when others grow rich, when the splendor of their houses increases; ¹⁷ for they will take nothing with them when they die, their splendor will not descend with them. (Psalm 49:16-17)

Everyone comes naked from their mother’s womb, and as everyone comes, so they depart. They take nothing from their toil that they can carry in their hands. (Ecclesiastes 5:15)

Since this saying also appears in similar variations in ancient Judaism and Greek and Roman philosophical thought, it is not prudent to argue that the author of 1 Tim was influenced by one tradition or represents a specific school of thought.⁴³⁶

This wise saying instructs people to be detached or free “from any claims made by possessions of any sort” and to quit trying to amass them while alive because people arrive on this earth with nothing and depart with nothing.⁴³⁷ While the scholarly dialogue has focused on the uncertainty of the ὅτι construction of this saying,⁴³⁸ we will explore this saying in light of evidence linked to rich Ephesians.

Spacious burial sites on *Curetes Street* disclose that the rich in Ephesus thought they could take their wealth with them when they died. Scherrer identifies *Curetes Street* as “an ancient burial site with graves lining both sides of the *Via Sacra*.”⁴³⁹ The *Via Sacra* was the sacred path for the annual procession that honored Artemis.⁴⁴⁰ Scherrer and Hilke Thür have labeled at least five prominent burial sites

⁴³⁶ In Hellenistic Judaism, see: Philo, *Special Laws*, 1.294-95; Wis 7:6; Sir 40:1, 18, 41:9-10; *Yoma* 96^b. In Greek thought, see: *Sentences* 110-111; *Anthologia Palatina* 10.59. In Roman writings, see: Horace, *Odes* 2.14.21-24 and Seneca, *Moral Epistles* 102.25. In the Apostolic Fathers, see: Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 4.1.

⁴³⁷ Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 294.

⁴³⁸ M.J.J. Menken, “Ὅτι en 1 Tm 6,7.” *Bib* 58 (1977): 532-41; Homer, *Iliad* 16.34-35; 21.487-88. Cf. Pierre Dornier, *Les Épîtres Pastorales* (Paris: Gabalda, 1958) 102f; Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 504-08; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 399-401; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 85; Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 646-48.

⁴³⁹ Peter Scherrer, “The City of Ephesus: From the Roman Period to Late Antiquity,” in *Ephesus Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 6. Cf. Knibbe, “Via Sacra Ephesiaca,” 141-55.

⁴⁴⁰ For an epigraphic explanation of the procession, see: Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus*, 80-126.

on the *Via Sacra*, in addition to other graves: (1) the Heroon of Androklos, (2) the Heroon of Arsinoë IV, (3) the Tomb of Tiberius Claudius Aristion, (4) the Tomb of C. Sextillius Pollio, and (5) the C. Memmius Memorial.⁴⁴¹

The first site is considered the burial location of the founder of the city, Androklos. The second, known as the Octagon, suggests a linkage between Egypt and Ephesus. This may represent the tomb of Arsinoë IV, the sister of Cleopatra VII, who had been murdered by Julius Caesar in Ephesus despite being granted sanctuary in the Artemisium. The last three correspond to rich Ephesians dated broadly in the first century CE.⁴⁴² The rich erected chambers with space for statues, a sarcophagus, and many other treasures, though few relics remain in the pillaged tombs.

Though the first wise saying reflects Greek moral philosophy and Jewish thinking, when envisioned in ancient Ephesus, it contradicts the sacred values of the city as preserved along the *Via Sacra*. The evidence shows that rich prominent people in Ephesus in the first century CE may have thought they could take their wealth with them when they died.

The language of the second wise saying complements the first explaining the basic provision with which people should be content: “but if we have food and clothing, we will be content with these” (v. 8). This call for a life of simplicity and contentment with basic necessities also surfaces both in ancient Judaism and Greco-Roman thinking. Again, because this saying reflects the view of many groups in antiquity, we cannot with certainty link it to a specific sect such as the Cynics or to one belief system in antiquity.⁴⁴³

⁴⁴¹ Scherrer, “The City of Ephesos,” 6-11; Hilke Thür, “The Processional Way in Ephesos as a Place of Cult and Burial,” in *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, ed. Helmut Koester (Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995) 157-200.

⁴⁴² These rich Ephesians are referred to as “benefactors” as they participated in the cultural institution of benefaction.

⁴⁴³ In the LXX, see: 1 Macc 6:49; 2 Macc 5:14; 4 Macc 6:28. Sir 29:21. In Hellenistic Judaism, see: Philo, *That the Worse is Wont to Attack the Better* 19; Josephus, *Life* 244. In Greek thought, see: Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1043a; Plutarch, *Moralia* 155D. Cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 401. Contra: Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 84-85.

Ancient evidence presents rich people as discontent with basic food and raiment. Numerous inscriptions testify that they themselves assured privileges such as eating the finest foods and wearing purple clothing for their munificence.⁴⁴⁴ In Ephesus, rich benefactors gave money to underwrite feasts that exalted Artemis and the sacred history of their city, and for their generosity, they secured special seats and enjoyed sacred foods during the festivities in return.⁴⁴⁵ Winter thinks that benefactors expected these benefits with each act of beneficence.⁴⁴⁶

While this second wise saying echoes the prevailing views in Jewish writings or the thinking of the moral philosophers, when considered in light of the rich in Ephesus, it appears contrary to the cultural norms. Wealthy Ephesians were simply not content with basic necessities.⁴⁴⁷

The third saying (v. 9) is understood as proclaiming that **οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν**, “those who want to be or remain rich,” will sink themselves.⁴⁴⁸ David Verner believes that those who “want to be rich” comprise a different “group” in the household of God from “those who are rich.”⁴⁴⁹ Other scholars concur,⁴⁵⁰ though Marshall and Towner note that grammar and context may support a different view.⁴⁵¹ Kidd posits that the grammatical construction of the phrase connects it to the false teachers. We find his argument quite convincing. From Kidd’s perspective:

...if **οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν** were aimed at those who are not yet rich, one would expect the infinitive to be in the punctiliar tense, in accordance with **βουλόμενοι**’s preference for a complementary infinitive in the aorist, especially since **πλουτεῖν** itself generally means “become rich” in the punctiliar tense. Since **πλουτεῖν** is in the linear tense, the phrase reads more naturally as “those who are determined to maintain their wealth” than as “those who are determined to become wealthy.”⁴⁵²

⁴⁴⁴ For examples in the Greco-Roman world, see: Hands, *Charities and Social Aid*, 175-209. On eating fine foods or wearing purple for life, see: *Opramoas Inscription* 19, VI, 8-9 in Danker, *Benefactor*, 118.

⁴⁴⁵ On sacred feasting, see Harland, *Associations*, 74-83. Cf. *IvE* 27; Rogers, *Sacred Identity of Ephesus*, 39-72.

⁴⁴⁶ Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26.

⁴⁴⁷ Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists* 543 c-d.

⁴⁴⁸ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 85. Cf. similar usage in: Alciphro 1.16.1; Ditt. *Syll.* 2.730.7. See also: Byington, S.T. “1 Timothy VI,10.” *Expository Times* 56 (1944): 54.

⁴⁴⁹ Verner, *Household of God*, 174.

⁴⁵⁰ Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 498; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 401-02; Johnson, *First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 295.

⁴⁵¹ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 649.

⁴⁵² Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 95-96. Kidd adds: “An instructive parallel is Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics* 1120b16, where he expresses sympathy for liberal people who have difficulty **πλουτεῖν** (staying rich)...”

Additionally, Kidd's translation, "those who are determined to maintain their wealth," may fit better with "the love of money" saying (v. 10), as the two thoughts are connected with γὰρ. Contextually, this may reveal the root of their desire "to remain" rich despite the doom to which it leads them: they love money!⁴⁵³

Though we cannot identify with certainty the identity of those who desire to stay rich, one plausible explanation based on the grammatical construction would be the rich leaders who profited from service to the Artemis cult. Another theory points to the silversmiths who received a good income from their trade (cf. Acts 19:24-27).

The final wise saying (v. 10) unveils the motivation of the false teachers: they are lovers of money. This expression is widely attested in both Greek and Jewish literature.⁴⁵⁴ This malady also appears in Ephesus. Ephesian inscriptions portray the rich demonstrating piety to Artemis and the gods, financially supporting her priesthood, showing respect to the emperor, and conferring benefits to the people in order to receive honor and privileges in return. They reap material gain for this service and, as one mid-first century CE edict reveals, are considered avaricious.

The edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus, the Roman proconsul of Asia (c. 44 CE), called out the inappropriate conduct of priestesses and priests of Artemis. They had used the house of the goddess as a front for activities for personal gain to enrich themselves.⁴⁵⁵ Though the exact circumstances are not disclosed, greed had corrupted the behavior of the leaders who handled the wealth of the Artemisium.

Here *IvE* 27 provides another valuable clue. Rich people in key leadership roles within the Artemis cult received larger percentages of the annual foundation distributions. This illustrates at least one way it *paid* to serve the goddess.

⁴⁵³ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 649, simplify Kidd's reading saying it could refer to those who may have wanted "to stay rich."

⁴⁵⁴ In Greek and Roman antiquity: Hippocrates, *Of the Epidemics* 17.43; Democritus in *De Gnomologio Vaticano inedit* 265; Bion the Sophist in Stobaeus, *Eclog* 10.36-7; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.50; Apollodorus Comicus 4; Diodorus Siculus 21.1; Plutarch, *Moralia* 108A-B, 525C; *Sibylline Oracles* 2.111. In Hellenistic Judaism, see: 4 Macc 1:26; 2:15; Philo, *Special Laws* 4.65; *T. Jud* 18.2; 19.1. In the Apostolic Fathers, see: 2 *Clement* 6:4; Polycarp, *To the Philippians* 2.2; 4:3; 6.1. Cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 651-52.

⁴⁵⁵ *IvE* 18b, 8-18. Cf. Bremmer, "Priestly Personnel," 14.

Rogers' research on *IvE* 27 also shows that the top beneficiaries of the foundation distributions included citizens whose genealogies dated back to the Ionian roots of the city and the teacher of the *Ephebes*: leaders who kept and taught sacred myths of Ephesus.⁴⁵⁶ This may explain why the Ephesian elite vied for prominent positions of service. It also brings to mind another question: Could the rich Ephesians in cultic service to Artemis be the “lovers of money” (6:10) occupied with “myths and endless genealogies” (1:4) envisioned by the author of 1 Tim?

6.1.2.3. Myths, Teachings, and the Rich in Ancient Ephesus

While people in the Greco-Roman world served a pantheon of gods and embraced a myriad of moral philosophies, cities such as Ephesus held tightly to ancient myths and teachings about the origin of their first inhabitants. Evidence shows the rich preserved and propagated these myths and teachings in the first century CE.

Strabo (c. 64 BCE-24 CE) credits the Amazons, a female society, with founding the temple of Artemis (*Geography* 11.5.3-4; 12.3.21).⁴⁵⁷ Pliny adds that statues of the Amazons stood in the Artemisium from the classical age to the Roman period (*Natural History* 34.12.53).⁴⁵⁸ Interestingly, Diodorus Siculus (c. 60 BCE-30 BCE) labels stories about these women as “fictitious tales” (2.46.6),⁴⁵⁹ a skeptical opinion Strabo also shares in the first century CE (*Geography* 12.3.22).

As far back as the fifth century BCE, Pherecydes of Athens ascribes the colonization of the city of Ephesus to Androclus.⁴⁶⁰ Strabo recounts this history.

Androclus, legitimate son of Codrus the king of Athens, was the leader of the Ionian colonization...he became the founder of Ephesus, and for this reason, it is said, the royal seat of the Ionians was established there. And til now the descendants of this family are called kings; and they have certain honours, I mean the privilege of front seats at the games and of wearing purple robes as insignia of royal descent. (*Geography* 14.1.3)⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵⁶ For an explanation of the distributions of *IvE* 27, see: Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 44-72.

⁴⁵⁷ See also: Callimachus, *Hymns* 3.237; Pomonius Mela, *De Chorographia* 1.78.

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 8-9.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. The strikingly parallel expression: “godless and silly myths or profane old woman's tales” in 1 Tim 4:7.

⁴⁶⁰ In numerous other sources the spelling of name of the founder of the city appears as “Androklos.”

⁴⁶¹ *Geography*, 14.1.3.

From the middle of the fifth century BCE to the first century CE, the genealogies of the city founders were carefully traced and honored.

In addition to the stories about the founding of the temple and the city we learn of the legend of the birth of Artemis, as Strabo recounts.

After the Samian strait, near Mt. Mycale, as one sails to Ephesus, one comes, on the right, to the seaboard of the Ephesians; and a part of this seaboard is held by the Samians. First on the seaboard is the Panionium... then comes Neapolis... Marathesium... then comes Pygela... then comes the harbor called Panormus, with a temple of the Ephesian Artemis; and then the city Ephesus. On the same coast, slightly above the sea, is also Ortygia, which is a magnificent grove of all kinds of trees, of the cypress most of all. It is traversed by the Cenchrius River, where Leto is said to have bathed herself after her travail. For here is the mythical (μυθεύουσι) scene of the birth, and of the nurse Ortygia, and of the holy place where the birth took place, and of the olive tree near by, where the goddess is said first to have taken a rest after she was relieved from her travail. Above the grove lies Mt. Solmissus, where, it is said, the Curetes stationed themselves, and with the din of their arms frightened Hera out of her wits when she was jealously spying on Leto, and when they helped Leto to conceal from Hera the birth of her children. There are several temples in the place, some ancient and others built in later times; and in the ancient temples are many ancient wooden images, but in those of later times there are works of Scopas; for example, Leto holding a sceptre and Ortygia standing beside her with a child in each arm. A general festival is held there annually; and by a certain custom the youths vie for honor, particularly in the splendor of their banquets there. At that time, also, a special college of the Curetes holds symposiums and performs certain mystic sacrifices. (*Geography* 14.1.20)

In this record, Strabo identifies the *curetes* as performers of mystic sacrifices.

The *curetes* hosted symposiums, which entailed discussions, drinking, initiations and forms of entertainment. They not only propagated the Artemis myth, they paid for festivities to ensure the people of Ephesus and the world knew it.⁴⁶²

At the annual celebration that honored the birth of the goddess, Rogers notes that the order of the procession was carefully prescribed (*IvE* 27).⁴⁶³ The statues of the parade supremely honored Artemis, then the emperor, followed by the Ionian tribes processing in groups honoring their genealogical heritage. The inscription also outlined the lotteries and distributions for people who performed specific roles. Interestingly, *IvE* 27 was etched in a prominent public location and functioned as law for the people, listing the penalties for anyone who failed to observe it.

⁴⁶² Cf. Table #3 in §4.1.2.3, which features the *curetes* inscriptions in *IvE* in the first century CE.

⁴⁶³ Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 44-72.

Though there was room for other gods and goddesses in Ephesus, ancient historians and inscriptions show that the Artemis myth reigned supreme. Those who could trace their genealogical roots back to the founding of the city had not only revered her there for centuries, they benefited from propagating her myth. Ancient evidence reveals that the rich Ephesians made sure everyone understood these beliefs, which they enforced as law in Ephesus. This last finding raises yet another question for interpreters. Could prominent Ephesians who aspired to positions of leadership be understood as “desiring to be teachers of the law” (cf. 1 Tim 1:7)?

6.1.3. Summary

Inner texture analysis has identified three interpretive issues that remain unclear in understanding 1 Tim 6:2b-10.

First, on **εὐσέβεια**: in the Greek mind, the term represented proper devotion to the gods and the **δαιμόνιον** evidenced by offerings and sacrifices. In Ephesus, those faithful to Artemis and the gods were celebrated for their **εὐσέβεια** in inscriptions and often personally benefited in reciprocity. Since the text criticizes false teachers for considering **εὐσέβεια** as a means of gain, is it right to identify them as greedy leaders in the God’s church or avaricious moral philosophers? Or might the evidence point to rich servants of Artemis who on at least one occasion used religion as a front for gain?

Second, pertaining to the wise sayings: rather than interpret them through the lens of Jewish literature, Greco-Roman moral philosophy, or a blending of those traditions, does the evidence available to us reveal that they may bring to our attention sacred Ephesian values? In other words, can the wise sayings be understood as targeting those who served Artemis and the gods and people whose genealogies marked them as keepers of the sacred identity of the city?

Third, regarding the myths, teachings and the rich in Ephesus: as most commentators link the false teaching to Jewish Gnosticism, Hellenistic moral philosophies, or an amalgam of religious traditions,⁴⁶⁴ might the Ephesian evidence point to prominent proponents of the Artemis cult? If so, what are the implications for interpreting 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related passages on false teaching.

Xenophon of Ephesus has provided helpful clues for reading other texts in 1 Tim; hence, we will explore the themes in *Ephesiaca* next.

6.2. Intertexture

Through inner texture analysis, the terms and themes of 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related texts have references in Greco-Roman literature, Hellenistic moral philosophy, Jewish writings, *and* social realities in Ephesus. In intertexture analysis we will consider how Xenophon of Ephesus may reference these terms and themes.

6.2.1. Terms and Themes in 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and *Ephesiaca*

This phase examines three sets of terms and themes in 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*. First, we will explore **εὐσέβεια** to look for any connections between the rich and Artemis. Second, we will examine the wise sayings in light of the world of *Ephesiaca*. Third, we will consider the myths, tales, and teaching from the perspective of Xenophon of Ephesus to aid us in interpreting 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related passages.

6.2.2. Analysis of Common Terms and Themes

Εὐσέβεια represents a key virtue in Greco-Roman ethical thought. It is not surprising that it appears in *Ephesiaca*.⁴⁶⁵

The two instances of the term **εὐσέβεια** “shine” through Lampo, the humble

⁴⁶⁴ For examples, see: Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 338; Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 66; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 41-50.

⁴⁶⁵ In this chapter, *Ephesiaca* citations follow Henderson’s translation in the LCL unless otherwise noted.

goatherd.⁴⁶⁶ Manto instructed Lampo to kill Anthia after she had become enraged by the rejection of Habrocomes. Manto had banished Anthia to the country only to find that her husband, Moeris, had fallen in love with her. In anger Manto contrived a plan but Lampo could not go along with it. In his thinking, he must behave with **εὐσέβεια** before the gods.⁴⁶⁷

He felt sorry for the girl, but for fear of Manto he went to Anthia and told her what had been decided in her case. She shrieked and began to wail, saying “Oh, how this beauty of ours conspires everywhere against us both! Become of our troublesome good looks Habrocomes is done for in Tyre, and I here. But I ask you, goatherd, Lamp, since you have thus far behaved respectfully (**εὐσέβησας**), if you kill me, give me at least a shallow grave in the ground nearby, put your hands on my eyes, and invoke Habrocomes repeatedly as you bury me: for this would make a happy funeral, in the presence of Habrocomes.” At this, the goatherd was moved to pity, aware that he was about to do an unholy deed by killing a girl who had done no wrong and was so beautiful. Indeed when he seized the girl, the goatherd could not abide a murder, but said this to her: “Anthia, you know that my mistress Manto ordered me to seize and murder you. But I fear heaven (**θεοῦς**) and feel pity at your beauty, so I would rather sell you somewhere far from this country, in case Manto finds out that you are not dead and becomes ill disposed toward me. She clung to his feet in tears, and said, “Please, you gods, and Artemis of my fatherland, reward the goatherd for these good deeds,” and begged to be sold. (2.11.4-8)

Lampo’s **εὐσέβεια** would not allow him to perform the impure deed of murder for fear of the gods. He reiterated this to Habrocomes who came looking for Anthia shortly thereafter: “The goatherd replied that her name was Anthia and told him about the marriage, his respectful behavior (**εὐσέβειαν**) toward her, Moeris’ infatuation, the order to kill her, and the journey to Cilicia” (2.12.3). In *Ephesiaca*, to behave with **εὐσέβεια** is to perform deeds that show reverence of the gods.

The rich also exhibit behavior that is commonly associated with respect toward the gods throughout *Ephesiaca*. For example, the rich honor the gods by making offerings and performing sacrifices in accordance with their **δύναμις**, “power, might, or strength.”⁴⁶⁸ The opening scene introduces the “powerful” parents of Habrocomes.

⁴⁶⁶ Many names of characters can be traced to other works in antiquity or seem to illustrate their role in the story. In this instance, **εὐσέβεια** “shines” through the goatherd, **ἀμπεῶν**, Lampo, meaning shine or lamps.

⁴⁶⁷ This citation and subsequent references in this chapter follow Henderson’s translation, *Anthia and Habrocomes*.

⁴⁶⁸ See Epictetus’ use of **δύναμιν** linked to **εὐσέβεια** in *The Enchiridion* 31.4.9-31.5.4. Cf. *BAGD*, 207.

In Ephesus there was a man named Lycomedes, one of the most powerful (**δυναμένων**) people in the city. This Lycomedes and his wife Themisto, also a local, had a son Habrocomes, a paragon of handsomeness (**κάλλους**) without precedent in Ionia or anywhere else. (1.1.1)

His father's name, Lycomedes, was familiar in Greek thinking as the name of the king of Scyros in the Trojan War. His mother's name, Themisto, means "belonging to the law or the customs." With these names, Xenophon of Ephesus links the power and prominence of Habrocomes' parents to their Greek heritage as well as to the laws and customs of Ephesus.⁴⁶⁹

Anthia's parents also bear aristocratic names: Megamedes and Euippe.

Together, the two leading couples show their devotion to Artemis and the gods and to their city when trying to deliver Habrocomes and Anthia from their lovesick state.

Lycomedes and Themisto were considerably depressed, not knowing what had happened to Habrocomes but frightened by what they saw. Megamedes and Euippe had become equally frightened about Anthia as they saw her beauty fading away without an apparent reason for her affliction. Finally they brought in seers and priests to Anthia to find relief from her terrible state. Upon arrival they sacrificed victims, made various libations, uttered exotic words to placate, so they said, certain divinities (**δαίμονας**), and pretended that her terrible state came from the underworld gods (**θεῶν**). Lycomedes' household also made plenty of sacrifices and prayers for Habrocomes, but there was no relief for either of them from their terrible state, but their love burned even stronger. (1.5.5-8)

Both rich couples make sacrifices, libations, and other offerings to placate the **δαίμονας** in an effort to find relief in their time of crisis.⁴⁷⁰

Shortly thereafter, both sets of parents seek an oracle at the temple of Apollo at Colophon, and receive the same message regarding the future of Anthia and Habrocomes. Though confused by the response from the gods, the two couples find consolation in the belief that the oracle represents both the will and the words of the gods (1.7.2). They host a grand wedding for Anthia and Habrocomes with sacrifices to honor Artemis and the gods, and then send them on their journey bidding them farewell with further libations (1.6.1; 1.8.1; 1.10.7-10).

⁴⁶⁹ Many of the characters in *Ephesiaca* appear with names that have a loaded meaning in the cultural setting.

⁴⁷⁰ The lexical overlap of **δαίμονας** here in *Ephesiaca* and 1 Tim 4:1 is noteworthy. This usage also seems to coincide with the aforementioned testimony of Isocrates, *To Demonicus* 13. A cultural fixture may be in view: it seems that people were expected to honor to the **δαιμόνιον** at all times.

The illustration of εὐσέβεια linked to Lampo and Anthia adds to our knowledge of life in Ephesus in the first century CE. Respect of the gods governed human behavior to conform to social and religious expectations. In *Ephesiaca* we also see rich, prominent Ephesians showing reverence to the gods through sacrifices, offerings, and libations, as well as prayers to Artemis, the gods, and the δαίμονας.

Next we turn to the first wise saying: “For we brought nothing into the world, so that we can take nothing out of it” (v. 7). A burial scene reveals similar clues we located in other Ephesian sources: the customary behavior of the rich seems to show that they thought they could take their wealth out of this world.

Perilaus, “one of the most powerful (δυναμένων) men in Cilicia,” rescued Anthia from Hippothous’ gang and having “no wife or children, and no small amplitude of possessions,” he determined to make Anthia his wife (2.13.3; 2.13.6). To buy time to try to get out of the situation, Anthia delayed the marriage thirty days. In the meantime, she acquired what she thought was poison to end her life. She would rather die than break her vows to Habrocomes. On the eve of her wedding to Perilaus, she took the drug and collapsed. Perilaus believed she was dead.

He decked her out in fine clothing and adorned her with lots of gold. No longer able to bear the sight, he put Anthia on a bier the next day, for she still lay unconscious, and took her to the tombs near the town, where he laid her in a vault after sacrificing many victims and burning much clothing and other apparel. After he had performed the customary ceremonies he was taken back to town by his household... (3.7.4-8.1)

For Xenophon of Ephesus, custom dictated that a burial for a rich person include fine clothing, gold, and even sacrificial victims to join the deceased in the afterlife. This custom envisions the antithesis of this first wise saying. The rich acted as though they could take possessions and people with them when they died.

We turn our attention to the second wise saying: “but if we have food and clothing, we will be content with these” (v. 8). The rich in *Ephesiaca* are not depicted as content with basic provisions. When loading the ship of Anthia and

Habrocomes, their appetite for excess is evident: “So everything was made ready for their departure: there was a large ship with crew ready to sail, provisions were put on board, lots of clothing of various kinds, lots of silver and gold, and an excessive abundance of food” (1.10.4). They have more than basic provision for the journey.

The term **αὐτάρκεια**, “contentment, self-sufficiency, or detachment,” occurs in two senses in *Ephesiaca*. First, Hippothous, the leader of a gang of bandits, was not content with “robbing individuals unless he also attacked villages and cities” (5.2.2). He had an insatiable appetite for pillaging the wealth of others.

Second, Polyidus, the commander who defeated the bandits of Hippothous, was himself overcome by the beauty of Anthia whom he had rescued. When he tried to force himself on her, she fled and found asylum in the temple of Isis.

Polyidus at once respected the goddess, lusted for Anthia, and pitied her misfortune. He went to the temple alone and swore never to force Anthia or do to her any violence but rather to keep her pure as long as she herself wished, for in his affection he considered it enough (**αὐτάρκεις**) simply to look at her and talk to her. (5.4.7)

In this scene, respect for the goddess is coupled with contentment as in 1 Tim 6:6. For fear of the gods, Polyidus “considered it enough” to look at her and was content to set aside his desires. In *Ephesiaca*, maintaining ritual purity before the gods motivated people to choose contentment over strong desires.

Even as the third and fourth wise sayings are connected in 1 Tim 6:9-10, they appear linked together in the mind of Xenophon of Ephesus. The desire to be rich is a trap set by avaricious characters in *Ephesiaca*.

When two pirates, Corymbus and Euxinus, capture Anthia and Habrocomes and become infatuated with them, they try to win over the couple by promising them “lawful marriage, money and prosperity” if they will acquiesce to their lustful demands (1.16.7). The pirates are unsuccessful. Elsewhere Manto promises Habrocomes that he will “be rich (**πλουτήσεις**) and prosperous” if he succumbs to her demands (2.5.2). She too is unsuccessful. Habrocomes does not give in to her

desires and is not tempted by riches. Though he receives a beating for rejecting her advances, when the truth of the situation is discovered, Apsyrtus frees him, gives him charge of his household and rewards his *σωφροσύνης*, “self-control” (2.10.3).⁴⁷¹ In separate situations, self-control saves Anthia from the lure of riches presented by Perilaus and Habrocomes from Cyno.⁴⁷² The self-control of Anthia and Habrocomes mirrors the social expectations of virtuous people related to the love of money.

Five ruinous characters in *Ephesiaca*, however, are depicted as discontent with what they have and desiring wealth. These figures also fail to live with the *σωφροσύνης* that carries Habrocomes and Anthia through their adventures: First, Hippothous is not content to rob people; he pillages cities. His greed leads him to all manner of destructive behavior. Second, Aristomachus is described as “one of the most powerful people [from Byzantium], a man priding himself on his wealth and advantages” (3.2.5). When marveling at the looks of Hypranthes, he conjures a lie to position himself as an expert in rhetoric to lure Hypranthes’ father, “a bad man with a weakness for money,” to give him his son “on the pretext of instruction” (3.2.5-8).⁴⁷³ This “false” teacher lied to fulfill his lusts by deceiving a lover of money. Third, Eudoxus, an Ephesian doctor who lost everything in a shipwreck, resorted to begging from the wealthy to maintain his rich lifestyle.

This Eudoxus made the rounds of the most respectable men in Tarsus, begging clothing from some, money from others, recounting to each his misfortune. He paid a visit to Perilaus too, and told him that he was an Ephesian and a doctor by trade. Perilaus took him to meet Anthia, thinking that she would be glad to see someone from Ephesus. She kindly received Eudoxus and tried to find out if he had anything to tell her about her own family, but he replied that he knew nothing, having been away from Ephesus for so long. Nevertheless Anthia enjoyed his company, since he reminded her of her home town. And so he became a friend of the family and saw Anthia each time he visited, enjoying every amenity and always asking her to send him back to Ephesus, for his wife and children were there. (3.4.2-4)

⁴⁷¹ Cf. Similarly, the prefect of Egypt gave Habrocomes money to compensate him for unjust treatment (4.4.1).

⁴⁷² Anthia was not lured by the riches and possessions of Perilaus (2.13.6-8; 3.5.9). Likewise Habrocomes could not tolerate Cyno’s shamelessness. Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 305, notes that Cyno means “bitch” which suggests “shamelessness.” Others who attempted to seduce either Anthia or Habrocomes often used force or the threat of vengeance rather than overtly promising gain or wealth.

⁴⁷³ Cf. Henderson, *Anthia and Habrocomes*, 281, Aristomachus means: “best in the fight.” With this name, Xenophon of Ephesus may be saying that he was accustomed to winning whatever he wanted. Cf. Tomas Hägg, “The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesus.” *ErJb* 69 (1971): 25-59.

Eudoxus enjoys the hospitality of Anthia. Later he stoops to selling her what she thought was poison in order to get money to return to Ephesus (3.5.11).

The fourth and fifth ruinous characters portrayed as greedy are actually unnamed groups in *Ephesiaca*: pirates and priests. Both appear willing to do anything for money. Pirates, on one occasion, made “a lot of money selling Anthia to merchants” (3.11.1), while the priests simply “pretended” to perform religious libations and sacrifices for the parents of Habrocomes and Anthia who were puzzled by the plight of their children (1.5.7). This latter group, seers and priests, provides an ancient testimony of counterfeit religious leaders in Ephesus, whose descriptions in *Ephesiaca* seem strikingly similar to the false teachers envisioned in 1 Tim.

This leads into the last section of intertexture analysis: the myths, tales, and teaching in *Ephesiaca*. The story begins with the procession at the annual festival that celebrates the birth of the goddess and the Artemis myth. This reinforces what we have seen in other sources and adds to our knowledge about this religious fixture. Furthermore, six terms overlap between *Ephesiaca* and 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related texts in 1 Tim that turn our attention to Ephesian myths, tales, and teaching: **λόγος**, **πνεῦμα**, **πονηρός**, **διδασκαλία**, **γράφω**, and **σωτήρ**.⁴⁷⁴

In 1 Tim 6:2b-10, the **ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις**, “sound words,” of the Lord Jesus Christ are set in contrast to the words of the greedy false teachers. A similar expression appears in *Ephesiaca*. The parents of Anthia and Habrocomes inquire at the temple of Apollo at Colophon for an oracle (1.5.9). Xenophon of Ephesus describes the oracle they each receive as **τοῦ θεοῦ λόγια**, “the god’s utterance or the god’s words” (1.7.1). As it was a common practice to pay money for an oracle in the ancient world,⁴⁷⁵ those who delivered oracles may have been subject to the same sort of derogatory descriptions as the false teachers in view in 1 Tim.

⁴⁷⁴ BAGD, 166; 191; 477; 674-78; 690-91; 800-01.

⁴⁷⁵ For an Ephesian example, see: Strabo, *Geography*, 4.1.4; cf. Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 5-6.

The word, **πνεῦμα**, “spirit or wind,” appears six times in *Ephesiaca*. Twice it favorably guides a ship, on three occasions it adversely affects its course, and once a **πνεῦμα** mystically appears in response to Habrocomes’ prayer to the gods and delivers him from death on a cross.⁴⁷⁶

“Kindest of gods, who hold sway over Egypt, through whom both earth and sky are revealed to all mankind, if Habrocomes has done no wrong, let me perish miserably and receive a worse punishment than this, if any there be, but if I have been betrayed by an evil woman, may the Nile stream never be polluted by the body of one unjustly destroyed, and may you never see such a sight, a person who has done no wrong being destroyed on this your very own land.” This was his prayer and the god took pity on him: a sudden gust of wind (**πνεῦμα**) arose, struck the cross, and blew away the soil on the cliff where the cross had been planted. (4.2.4-6)

Retelling *Ephesiaca* could lead people to trust the gods to send a **πνεῦμα** in time of need, especially as this scene bears a striking resemblance to the crucifixion account of Jesus. This may reflect an ancient example of a “deceiving spirit” (cf. 1 Tim 4:1).

Variations of the term **πονηρός**, “worthless, wicked, or evil,” must be mentioned because the word appears twenty times in *Ephesiaca*, mostly describing the impact the gods have on Anthia, Habrocomes, or others in the story. The sway Eros holds over the couple leaves them “in a bad way,” and on their adventures, the term reflects their “miserable,” and “wretched” state (1.3.2; 1.4.6; 2.4.2; 5.4.11; 5.8.8). In the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus, a person who does not appropriately honor the gods is **πονηρός** because the gods can make one’s life difficult. This may reflect the condition in view in 1 Tim 6:4. The false teachers use **ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί**, “base suspicions,” as a controlling tool to get people to honor the gods and the **δαιμονίων**. As we have already seen from other evidence, honoring the **δαιμονίων** was attested as a religious expectation: Do it, or you too will be “in a bad way!”

The term **διδασκαλία**, “teaching,” occurs only once in *Ephesiaca*, in the scene mentioned above where the lustful Aristomachus disguises himself as a teacher of rhetoric. Instructional intent, however, appears in *Ephesiaca* with another

⁴⁷⁶ The term is used both favorably (1.11.2; 1.12.3) and negatively (2.11.10; 3.2.12; 5.1.1).

term in the larger semantic domain: **γραφή**, “writing or inscription.” At the end of *Ephesiaca*, the couple inscribes their salvation story on the walls of the Artemisium:

The whole city had already heard the news of their salvation. As soon as they disembarked they went just as they were to the temple of Artemis, offered many prayers and made sacrifice, then set up dedications, among them dedicating to the goddess the inscription (**γραφήν**) commemorating all that they had experienced and done. (5.15.2)

The climax of *Ephesiaca* proclaims that salvation has come from Artemis and Isis, who are exalted as “savior” (1.6.2; 5.13.4); in contrast, the choice in 1 Tim to apply the term to God may signify a conscious counter assertion (1:1; 2:3; 4:10).

In 1 Tim 3:14 the same word appears in the verb form, **γράφω**, in the climactic section (3:14-16) that proclaims the mystery of true godliness with a hymn that summarizes the salvation story of Jesus:

Although I hope to come to you soon, I am writing (**γράφω**) you these instructions so that, if I am delayed, you will know how people ought to conduct themselves in God’s household, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth. Beyond all question, the mystery from which true godliness (**εὐσεβείας**) springs is great:

He appeared in the flesh,
was vindicated by the Spirit,
was seen by angels,
was preached among the nations,
was believed on in the world,
was taken up in glory.

The biblical text celebrates the mystery of true godliness; whereas, Xenophon of Ephesus portrays rich Ephesians promoting the salvation linked to Artemis and the gods, which represents a different doctrine than the sound words of Jesus Christ.⁴⁷⁷

6.2.3. Summary

Xenophon of Ephesus continues to illuminate the social and cultural structure of Ephesian life and much of the language he uses to articulate it also appears in 1 Tim.

⁴⁷⁷ The connection between **γραφή** and **γράφω** could draw our attention elsewhere to two topics plumbed by NT scholars and classical scholars outside the bounds of this dissertation, but they must be noted. For example, in 1 Tim scholarship, Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 270-85, reminds us that the situation that motivated the **γραφή** is linked to apostolic travel limitations, nonetheless, he emphasizes the confessional content of the instructions as outlining conduct pertaining to life in God’s household. In classical scholarship, Witt, *Isis in the Ancient World*, 253, believes the instructional purpose for this writing is to “prove the redemptive power of faith.” What comes into view in both 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca* is that they contain writings or confessions that appear to have instructional content that is antithetical or contrary from a doctrinal perspective.

Intertexture analysis reveals three findings for interpreting Tim 6:2b-10 and related texts.

First, **εὐσέβεια** is depicted as ethical behavior in view of the gods in *Ephesiaca*. Xenophon of Ephesus portrays rich Ephesians as committed to Artemis, the gods, and the **δαιμόνιον** from whom they seek consolation in the form of oracles. Priests and seers administering religious rituals as servants of Artemis and other deities are presented as pretenders. Their pious service may have been a front for gain. This may explain why rich people were accused of buying priesthoods in Ephesus in the first century CE.⁴⁷⁸ This may also represent the situation in 1 Tim as the false teachers are identified as pursuing **εὐσέβεια** as a means of gain.

Second, Xenophon of Ephesus adds to our knowledge of social realities that may be in view linked to the wise sayings. Burial customs reveal the rich thought that they could take their possessions with them when they died; rich people are portrayed as discontent with basic food and clothing; and, the desire to remain rich motivated people, including priests, to all manner of evils revealing their love for money. While these wise sayings in 1 Tim 6:2b-10 may be located in Hellenistic moralists, Jewish writers, and the OT Scriptures, when viewing them alongside *Ephesiaca*, they seem to point to sacred values and customs in Ephesus. Again, this may explain their inclusion in the polemic in 1 Tim for an Ephesian audience.

Third, on the myths, teachings, and the rich in Ephesus, clues point to rich servants of Artemis as matching the description of greedy false teachers in 1 Tim. The story begins with the annual celebration of the Artemis myth, a procession ordered in part by the genealogical roots of the participants. Sacrifices are made to Artemis, the gods and the **δαιμόνιον**. Divine words in *Ephesiaca* come in the form of oracles from the gods, and deliverance in difficulty comes from the gods in the form of a **πνεῦμα**. The sway of the gods over people is described as **πονηρός**, so

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. *IvE* 17-19, the edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus (c. 44 CE); Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 11.

retelling this story could foster base suspicions. Lastly, inscribing *Ephesiaca* as a **γραφή**, a sacred writing on the wall of the Artemisium may reveal its didactic purpose: to make known that salvation comes from Artemis and the gods, which represents a **ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν**, “contrary doctrine,” to the message of 1 Tim.

Intertexture analysis demonstrates lexical and thematic overlap between 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*. The story brings to light social and religious realities not previously available to 1 Tim researchers, specifically regarding service of the rich and their relationship to the gods. In *Ephesiaca*, this contrary doctrine or belief system governs the behavior of the rich. They observe it as law and benefit for doing so. Xenophon of Ephesus solidifies our understanding of the connection between the rich and Artemis and offers a fresh perspective on the false teaching in the Ephesian context that seems to mirror that which is envisioned throughout 1 Tim.

6.3. Ideological Texture

Ideological texture shifts our focus from 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and *Ephesiaca* to the people of Ephesus in the first century CE to appraise the implications of our findings.

6.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in *Ephesiaca*

Previously, we noted that Witt and Schmeling suggest that Xenophon of Ephesus is not just a storyteller, but has a “didactic” intent and a “religious aim” with *Ephesiaca*.⁴⁷⁹ They believe Xenophon of Ephesus provides more than instructions for Ephesians, especially the rich who desired to preserve their place in society. The story promotes another doctrine: honor Artemis and the gods (who speak through oracles and save people from difficulty) and live with self-control toward others.⁴⁸⁰

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. The view of R.E. Witt as recounted by Gareth Schmeling, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, 130.

⁴⁸⁰ On **σωφροσύνης** in antiquity, see: Luck, *TDNT* 7:1097-1104; Spicq, *TLNT* 3:359-65; Zeller, *EDNT* 3:29-30; Wibbing, *NIDNTT* 1:501-03; Schwarz, *Bürgerliches Christentum*, 49-51; Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 206-08.

Ephesiaca graphically portrays the ancient Greek mindset: if you fail to understand your place in the order of the world, which is to honor Artemis and the gods and behave appropriately toward others, you will suffer horrible consequences. The “happily ever after” ending in *Ephesiaca* only happens after Anthia and Habrocomes have learned their lessons on their adventures (5.15.3).

Xenophon of Ephesus is not the first ancient testimony to urge people to serve Artemis, worship her supremely, make sacrifices, purchase her idols and honor the gods. Strabo writes of a rich woman, Aristarcha, who could represent the rich audience of *Ephesiaca*.⁴⁸¹

Massilia was founded by the Phocaeans, and it is situated on a rocky place. Its harbour lies at the foot of a theatre-like rock which faces south. And not only is the rock itself well fortified, but also the city as a whole, though it is of considerable size. It is on the headland, however, that the Ephesium and also the temple of the Delphinian Apollo are situated. The latter is shared in common by all Ionians, whereas the Ephesium is a temple dedicated solely to the Ephesian Artemis: for when the Phocaeans were setting sail from their homeland an oracle was delivered to them, it is said, to use for their voyage a guide received from the Ephesian Artemis; accordingly, some of them put in at Ephesus and inquired in what way they might procure from the goddess what had been enjoined in a dream. Now the goddess, in a dream, it is said, had stood beside Aristarcha, one of the women held in very high honour, and commanded her to sail away with the Phocaeans, taking with her a certain reproduction which was among the sacred images; this done and the colony finally settled, they not only established the temple but also did Aristarcha the exceptional honour of appointing her priestess; further, in the colonial cities the people everywhere do this goddess honours of the first rank, and they preserve the artistic design of the "xoanon" the same, and all the other usages precisely the same as is customary in the mother-city. (*Geography* 4.1.4)

In this instance, the Phocaeans receive an oracle from Artemis commanding Aristarcha, one of their prominent women, to sail away with a sacred statue. The religious leaders and idol makers would profit from this oracle, as it would have been made of a fine substance and come at a cost. In this instance, the glory of Artemis spread to another colony, and Aristarcha is appointed priestly service.

As mentioned earlier, the authorship of *Ephesiaca* may have been linked to Ephesians like Gaius Vibius Salutaris, and the audience of *Ephesiaca* may have included rich people like Aristarcha, who, like Anthia and Habrocomes, loved honor

⁴⁸¹ A portion of Strabo's citation is located in §2.1.1.1.

and supported the Artemis cult to receive honor in return. By targeting the rich with oracles such as this one recounted by Strabo, the greatness of Artemis would spread throughout the ancient world: “The priests...were always in quest of persons...worthy of this preferment” (*Geography* 14.1.22-23).

Whether or not *Ephesiaca* had been inscribed on the walls of the Artemisium cannot be determined with certainty.⁴⁸² Regardless, the literary work teaches rich Ephesians and prominent visitors like Artistarcha the religious beliefs and behaviors that the goddess expected people to follow.

6.3.2. The Artemisium Collection, *Ephesiaca*, and 1 Tim 6:2b-10

The pride of Ephesus in the first century CE was the Artemisium, and the pride of the Artemisium was its collection.

In *Guide to Greece*, Pausanias recounts that the precincts of the Artemisium held treasures that celebrated the glory of Artemis, the gods, and their history.

All cities worship Artemis of Ephesus, and individuals hold her in honour above all the gods. The reason, in my view, is the renown of the Amazons, who traditionally dedicated the image, also the extreme antiquity of this sanctuary... (4.31.8)

Another figure of Strife is in the sanctuary of Ephesian Artemis. Calliphon of Samos included it in his picture of the battle at the ships of the Greeks... (5.19.2)

But in the sanctuary of Ephesian Artemis, as you enter the building containing the pictures, there is a stone wall above the altar of Artemis called Goddess of the First Seat. Among the images that stand upon the wall is a statue of the woman at the end, a work of Rhoecus, call by the Ephesians Night. A mere glance shows that this image is older and of rougher workmanship, than the Athena in Amphissa... (6.3.15-16)

Not only have I seen this armor depicted by Polygnotus, but in the temple of Ephesian Artemis Calliphon of Samos has painted women fitting on the *gyala* of the corselet of Patroclus...(10.26.6)

But when the Attic ships were captured at Aegospotami the Samians set up a statue of Lysander at Olympia, and the Ephesians set up in the sanctuary of Artemis not only a statue of Lysander himself, but also statues of Eteonicus, Pharax, and other Spartans quite unknown to the Greek world generally. But

⁴⁸² It seems possible as other large inscription remain today, such as *IvE* 27. For examination of other large displays of writing in antiquity, see Appendix II and II in Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 186-90. Also, the widespread renown of this story can be traced, in part, to its possible influence on writers such as Chariton.

when fortune changed again, and Conon had won the naval action of Cnidus and the mountain called Dorium, the Ionians likewise changed their views, and there are to be seen statues of bronze of Conon and of Timotheus both in the sanctuary of Hera at Samos and also in the sanctuary of the Ephesian goddess... (10.38.6)

Murphy-O'Connor comments that the "temple of Artemis also functioned as a museum for objects of cultural significance."⁴⁸³ Athenaeus (183c) and Strabo (*Geography* 14.1.22-23) cite other gifts to the temple that reinforce this reputation.

If we accept that *Ephesiaca* was part of the Artemisium collection, as attested by Xenophon of Ephesus (5.15.2), it represents a salvation story that proclaimed the glory of the goddess to supplicants and visitors who passed through her precincts. This story appears as an appropriate addition to the murals in the Artemisium that visually honored the glorious acts of Artemis and the gods.

From the perspective of ideological texture, 1 Tim 6:2b-10 pulls back the curtain and shows the greed of the religious leaders. They piously serve Artemis for gain, celebrate their Ionian roots for generations, retell her myths, post inscriptions to ensure her perpetual honor, and manage the collection that honors her renown. Based on what is known in antiquity, the Artemisium collection helps propagate the legends linked to Artemis and the pantheon of gods, so *Ephesiaca* would fit well in her precincts. Whether or not it was inscribed on the walls of the temple, *Ephesiaca* depicts rich Ephesian citizens preserving the sacred identity of the city, promoting conformity to social and cultural rules with respect to the gods and other people, and proclaiming a contrary doctrine to the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ.

6.3.3. Summary

From the opening scene of *Ephesiaca* when Anthia is worshiped as Artemis, to the ending where Artemis is exalted as savior, this tale is more than a love story. It contains a doctrine contrary to 1 Tim. Three points illustrate this.

⁴⁸³ Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 49.

First, Xenophon of Ephesus appears as more than a storyteller or romantic novelist, but rather a teacher with a religious and didactic aim. He outlines the religious and cultural expectations for life in relationship to the gods and people.

Second, the audience of *Ephesiaca* may have been anyone who visited the temple of Artemis, such as Aristarcha. Evidence shows that the Artemis cult recruited rich visitors and appointed them as priests in their homelands to extend the magnificence of Artemis in the ancient world. Xenophon of Ephesus seems to have similar intent, that is, to rally people to respect the goddess by telling this story.

Third, ancient historians and artists tell us that the Ephesian culture prized the Artemisium collection. The temple held treasures that exalted Artemis, honored the gods, and preserved their history. Whether or not *Ephesiaca* was a part of the Artemisium collection cannot be determined conclusively, but clearly *Ephesiaca* promotes a doctrine contrary to the sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ.

6.4. Sacred Texture

Sacred texture is the last phase of analysis between 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and *Ephesiaca*. This step compares the findings from this study with related NT teachings.

6.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text

God's teachings appear in 1 Tim 6:2b-10 with the phrase "the sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ," and are presented as the antithesis of the different doctrine held by the greedy false teachers. Timothy must remain in Ephesus as certain persons are teaching this contrary doctrine (cf. 1:3-10).

The rich also appear in this text as greedy false teachers. In reviewing ancient evidence alongside *Ephesiaca*, a plausible explanation for their identity comes in view. The false teachers may be rich leaders ensconced in religious roles

and serving for gain. They promote a different doctrine rooted in the worship of Artemis supremely, the honoring of the gods and the **δαίμόνιον**, and the celebration of the sacred history of Ephesus. The people who propagate this myth are prominent citizens who can trace their genealogy back to the founding of the city.

Riches also appear in the text. Rich citizens desire to stay wealthy because riches enable them to maintain their place in society. The rich are described as discontent with basic necessities. They secure the richest fare for themselves while living and try to take their riches with them when they die. The edict of Persicus provides evidence that selfish gain motivated the rich to attain positions of priestly service.⁴⁸⁴ The love of money emerges as a pillar of the different doctrine in 1 Tim.

6.4.2. False Teaching in the Context of 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*

Xenophon of Ephesus assists us in deciphering the identity and message of the false teachers in 1 Tim. This study must not be misunderstood as suggesting that *Ephesiaca* offers conclusive proof *per se*, but rather, it offers valuable clues to augment what is known from other ancient evidence.

In 1 Tim 1:4, the “myths and endless genealogies” may refer to the Artemis myth celebrated with the procession led by prominent citizens the opening scene of *Ephesiaca* (1.2.2-1.3.1). Other sources support this view. The Gaius Vibius Salutaris inscription features the genealogical roots of the procession participants that dated back to the origins of the city (*IvE* 27). Strabo says that these genealogies went back for centuries (*Geography* 14.1.3). *IvE* 27 also reveals the financial distributions that were assured to those who propagate the Artemis myth.⁴⁸⁵ When viewed together, the evidence links the Artemis myth with rich leaders who traced their genealogies back to the founding of the city and benefited for promoting her renown.

⁴⁸⁴ *IvE* 17-19; Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 11.

⁴⁸⁵ *IvE* 27; Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 44-72.

In 1 Tim 1:6-7, the text speaks of those who have drifted to **ματαιολογίαν**, “meaningless talk,” and Dibelius and Conzelmann link this term to “idol worship” in Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity.⁴⁸⁶ Such persons desire to be **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**, “teachers of the law.” Plutarch uses this rare term to describe a tutor or teacher of law (*Marcus Cato* 20.4). In *IvE* 10, located in the pavement in the square in front of the theatre, the words that make up this rare compound **νόμου...διδάσκοντες**, refer to instructions associated with cultic laws.⁴⁸⁷ Consequently, we find that it is reasonable to suggest that the author of 1 Tim may envision the cultic laws that false teachers promoted and enforced.⁴⁸⁸ The rich not only paid for festivities such as the annual procession that honored the birth of the goddess. They outlined *as law* the requirements for observance and the harsh penalties for failing to do so.⁴⁸⁹

In *Ephesiaca* we find additional evidence on this point. Lycomedes and Themisto are depicted as a prominent Ephesian couple. Their names present their characters as “owning the law” and “belonging to the city and its customs.” Habrocomes, the son of this leading couple that served Artemis and the gods, could easily be construed as wanting to ascend to the role of “teacher of the law” in Ephesus (cf. 1 Tim 1:7). Xenophon of Ephesus presents him as a young citizen of distinction in Ephesus who anticipated a position of prominent service (1.1.3). It is sensible to envision that in such a role, he would enforce Ephesian customs and laws, which supremely honored Artemis.

⁴⁸⁶ The term **ματαιολογίαν** is a biblical hapax. Cf. *BAGD*, 495, as “empty, fruitless talk” or “fruitless discussion.” Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 21, note “the widespread usage of the catchword, “foolish” (**μάταιος**) in Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity: it is used to characterize idol worship.”

⁴⁸⁷ *IvE* 10 was etched in the pavement in the square in front of the theater. Many 1 Tim scholars have not had this evidence available to them because it was discovered in 1958.

⁴⁸⁸ The literary context provides additional support this reading. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 120-22, notes that 1 Tim 1:8 begins with “a formulaic appeal to accepted tradition.” For support that the false teachers are not Jewish, see: Egbert Schlarb, *Die gesunde Lehre: Häresie und Wahrheit im Spiegel der Pastoralbriefe* (Marburg: Elwert, 1990) 91, 325-26. Contra: Rengstorff, *TDNT* 2:159 and Roloff, *Der Erste Briefe*, 71, think **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** relates to Jewish instructors. Views are mixed regarding **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**. Based on the evidence, it seems most compelling to concur with Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 21, that “idol worship” is in view.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. Again, *IvE* 27, adds insight on this point, describing the penalties for failure to comply with the instructions and observances outlined in the foundation.

In 1 Tim 4:1, views on the references to πνεύμασιν πλάνοις, “deceitful spirits,” and διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, “doctrines of demons,” are mixed.⁴⁹⁰ In *Ephesiaca*, the πνεύμασιν, “spirits,” appear under the control of the gods, miraculously delivering faithful followers from danger, and the δαιμόνιον are among those to whom the rich pay their respect and for whom they perform sacrifices (1.5.6-8, 1.6). With these examples, Xenophon of Ephesus adds to our knowledge of the spirits and demons that may have been in view in this context.

In 1 Tim 4:2, teachers, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, “in hypocrisy will speak falsely.” Towner notes “the phrase shifts from the demonic source of the teaching (v. 1) to the involvement of human minions and their moral condition.”⁴⁹¹ The false teachers are lying hypocrites. Again, it is reasonable to read this as referring to the rich, religious leaders, who promoted the Artemis myth. *Ephesiaca* presents the priests as counterfeits: they act as if to placate the gods, but they merely put on a show with no clue how to deliver the πονηρός from difficulty (1.5.7).

Scholars associate the idea of forbidding marriage in 1 Tim 4:3 with a variety of first century CE ascetic groups and practices.⁴⁹² One ancient source also connects this prohibition with the Artemis/Isis myth. Tertullian reports that supplicants of Isis may have been required to forego marriage due to their vows to the Egyptian goddess (*On an Exhortation to Chastity* 13).⁴⁹³ In *Ephesiaca*, Anthia is presented among the young Ephesian women in the Artemisium offering daily service to

⁴⁹⁰ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 533-35, cite nine views for the background and explanation of the false teachers, the listing of which extends beyond the bounds of this study, though it must be noted that they conclude stating: “Several of these postulated backgrounds are manifestly unconvincing, whether singly or in combination, there is probably a combination of influences here.” We find that *Ephesiaca* sheds light on the way rich Ephesians perceived the πνεύμασιν and δαιμόνιον in Ephesus in the first century CE and adds to our understanding of the religious and cultural realities in the context that preceded the text of 1 Tim.

⁴⁹¹ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 291, notes that Cf. Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 539.

⁴⁹² The explanation for this prohibition, κωλύοντων γαμείν, ranges from practices within Gnostic traditions or Essene sects that can be traced near Ephesus. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 65, note that this view can ascribed to Paul in *Acts of Paul and Thecla* 5, 11. Cf. Richardus Adelbertus Lipsius and Maximilianus Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959) 238-43.

⁴⁹³ Witt, *Isis in the Ancient World*, 246, emphasizes that Artemis/Isis are one in *Ephesiaca*. Cf. Tertullian, *On an Exhortation to Chastity* 13, states: “We know women devoted to African Ceres [*i.e.* Isis], for whom of their own accord they grow old, forgoing marriage.”

Artemis as supplicants who maintained their ritual purity and virginity (1.5.1-4), and she is also described as dedicated to Isis from birth (3.11.4-5). Thus, it is possible that the prohibition in 1 Tim 4:3 may envision followers of the Artemis/Isis myth.

Finally, in 1 Tim 6:20, Timothy is exhorted to avoid τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδοδωδέκωτης γνώσεως, “the profane chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge.” Paul Trebilco and others have noted possible Gnostic and Jewish explanations for this expression, though again, scholars are divided on the meaning of this statement.⁴⁹⁴ Though we can only assemble a theory on this point, 1 Tim 6:20 could be read as a summarization of Ephesian thinking related to Artemis and the gods in contrast to the order of life in accordance with the faith (cf. 1 Tim 1:4). This “knowledge” is antithetical to sound doctrine, though it was widely embraced and propagated in Ephesus.⁴⁹⁵

This review of terms linked to the false teachers in 1 Tim reveals that the findings gained from revisiting 1 Tim 6:2b-10 in light of ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca* can be interpreted consistently throughout the letter. Next these ideas will be examined in light of other NT teachings. The purpose for this exploration as part of sacred texture analysis is to compare the findings with another letter of the Pauline tradition that may reflect a similar *Sitz im Leben* in which the same false teaching may be in view.

6.4.3. Reading the Text and *Ephesiaca* alongside related NT Teachings

Some of the terms linked to handling riches and the false teaching in 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related texts also surface in 2 Tim. For this reason, this section will evaluate our findings alongside related 2 Tim passages.

⁴⁹⁴ Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus*, 218. Cf. Charles K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles in the New English Bible*, NCBC (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963) 109-13; E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (London: Tyndale Press, 1954) 66.

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. Epictetus, *The Enchiridion* 31.1.1-7. People must “submit to everything that happens, and to follow it voluntarily in the belief that it is being fulfilled by the highest intelligence [γνώμης].” The text of 1 Tim can be read as refuting this thinking as γνώμης and γνώσεως can be understood in the same semantic domain.

In 2 Tim, the terms and themes that overlap with 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca* include: savior (1:10), sound words (1:13), disputes about words (2:14), godless chatter (2:15), stupid and senseless controversies (2:23), love of money (3:2), godliness (3:5, 12), sound teaching (4:3), and myths (4:4). Though space does not permit exposition of all these terms and texts, when viewed collectively, the same heresy comes into view.⁴⁹⁶ The sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ are under the attack. Certain persons promote a different doctrine rooted in myths and godless chatter. This fits with the description of the Artemis myth as developed from our exploration of ancient evidence. The way the heresy is framed in 2 Tim is also *consistent* with the trajectory of 1 Tim and perhaps has become more antagonistic toward Christians.

The names of the two opponents mentioned in 1 Tim are also found in 2 Tim: Hymenaeus (2:17) and Alexander (4:14). In 2 Tim, three additional names appear: Phygelus (1:15), Hermogenes (1:15), and Philetus (2:17). If these five opponents have ties to Artemis, the gods and the city, and represent rich leaders as this research suggests, we would expect to find them in Ephesian inscriptions. Interestingly, all these names can be located in *IvE*, though we cannot conclusively connect the names in the inscriptions to the actual people in 1 Tim or 2 Tim with the evidence available to us.⁴⁹⁷ Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that all five appear.

In considering 2 Tim in light of 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*, three insights emerge. First, similar opposition to the sound words of Jesus Christ surfaces in 2 Tim. A clue in 2 Tim that may also connect the false teachers to the Artemis myth is that the

⁴⁹⁶ This dissertation neither takes a position on the dating of 1 Tim in relationship to 2 Tim, nor does this argument hinge on one being written before the other. Of interest to this study is whether or not the findings of this study can be read as *consistent*, *inconsistent*, or *alternating*, in relationship to a related NT text, that is thought to have been addressed to the same social setting.

⁴⁹⁷ For Hymenaeus see: *IvE* 3865; Alexander: *IvE* 9, 17, 41, 47, 257, 261, 597, 613, 614, 688, 719, 898(1), 904a, 905a, 979a, 1001, 1004, 1012, 1015, 1018, 1020, 1021, 1033, 1055b, 1101, 1123, 1153, 1234, 1320, 1419, 1578a, 1590b, 1600, 1602, 1625a, 1633, 1686b, 1687, 1977a, 1987, 2018, 2205b, 2206a/b, 2302, 2306a, 2569, 2900, 2948d, 3022, 3031, 3412, 3414, 3415, 3428, 3429, 3448a, 3801, 3824, 4285; Phygelus: *IvE* 909a; Hermogenes: *IvE* 236, 572, 853, 903, 904b, 905a, 906, 960, 1454, 1600, 3291c, 3272, 3273, 3281, 3115, 3315, 4103; and, Philetus: *IvE* 2440, 2531. It is noteworthy that Hermogenes and Alexander appear in the *ephebenliste* 904a/b, 905a, 906 from the mid-first century CE and Phygelus appears on the *namenliste* from the *Fundplatz*.

opponents specifically prey on **γυναικάριον**, “little women” (3:6).⁴⁹⁸ In ancient thinking, “all” women put their trust in Artemis.⁴⁹⁹ They obeyed her commands for fear of the vengeance of the goddess.⁵⁰⁰ In *Ephesiaca*, all young women “had to march sumptuously adorned” in the annual procession that honored the goddess (1.2.2).⁵⁰¹ Xenophon of Ephesus offers insight not found elsewhere that all young women were expected to participate in the religious rituals in this social setting.

Second, the teachings on riches in 2 Tim appear with the same term related to the false teachers in 1 Tim 6:2b-10, **φιλαργυρία**, and those who possess this “love of money” (3:2) are those who hold “the form of religion (**εὐσεβείας**) but deny the power of it” (3:5)⁵⁰² with a “counterfeit faith” (3:8).⁵⁰³ In Ephesus, epigraphic evidence linked to **εὐσέβεια** has shown that rich advocates of Artemis may be in view.⁵⁰⁴ If accepted, the depiction of the false teachers in 2 Tim sounds similar to the way Xenophon of Ephesus describes the seers and priests of Artemis: they are pretenders unable to offer aid because they lack the power to help (1.5.7).

Third, the **ιερά γράμματα**, “sacred writings” (3:15), that instruct people for salvation through faith in Jesus Christ may represent another theme that is present in

⁴⁹⁸ Burton Scott Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles: Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Word Studies* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947), 63.

⁴⁹⁹ Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists* 15.694D. For the ancient text, see § 3.3.1. of this dissertation.

⁵⁰⁰ *Leucippe and Clitophon* 8.6.11-14.

⁵⁰¹ *Italics* mine. Cf. the riot of Acts 19 suggests that rich, influential people incited opposition to those who abandoned Artemis to embrace the Gospel.

⁵⁰² Towner, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 559, notes: “In his first letter to Timothy, Paul stressed the opponents’ misunderstanding and exploitation of godliness (*eusebeia*). With that linkage of ideas in mind, the occurrence of the concept here creates the transition from the general description to the local setting, in which Paul brings the full weight of the disparaging list to bear on the present oppositional movement: behavior, attitudes, and motives do not correspond to pious claims.”

⁵⁰³ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 116-17, note this as a specific reproach against the “appearance” of the heretics. Though they seem to contradict their own position, 83, as Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 93, notes that Dibelius and Conzelmann see only a superficial connection between the polemic against heresy (6:3-5) and the warning against greed (6:6-10). In this study we read them as connected following the views of Jukka Thurén, “Die Struktur der Schlußparänese 1 Tim 6:3-21.” *TZ* 26 (1970): 241-53, specifically 243: “Just as the heretics sin through false teaching and greed, Timothy and the believers should serve God through unadulterated confession and generosity;” and, Peter Dschulnigg, “Warnung von Reichtum und Ermahnung der Reichen: 1 Tim 6, 6-10. 17-19 im Rahmen des Schlussteils 6, 3-21.” *BZ* 37 (1993): 60-77. The false teaching is set in contrast to the truth in 1 Tim, and it follows that trajectory in 2 Tim as well as in Tit 1:10-16; 3:9-11.

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. *IvE* 27.14-19, 84-90, 114-119, 366-369, 384-389, 414-418, 427-430, 431-442; the “piety” of Gaius Vibius Salutaris is celebrated nine times in the inscription. Cf. Acts 19.

2 Tim as well as 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*.⁵⁰⁵ Xenophon of Ephesus promotes another doctrine, and *Ephesiaca* serves as a sacred writing with instructive intent exalting Artemis and the gods as the providers of salvation for people (5.15.2).

It seems that the same heresy is present in the setting of 2 Tim. The same perpetrators along with other names appear in 2 Tim and can also be found in *IvE*. The behavior of the heretics is depicted in such a manner that continues to point to prominent followers of Artemis. They prey on young women. They exhibit the form of godliness but are really counterfeits. Lastly, the author of 2 Tim portrays the truth as “sacred writings” that instruct people for salvation in Jesus Christ in a setting where *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus represents a “sacred writing” that promotes salvation in Artemis.

6.4.4. Summary

Sacred texture identifies the false teaching as antithetical to the sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ. The false teachers are lovers of money rather than lovers of God.

Ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca* suggests that the rich, religious followers of Artemis are a plausible answer for the identity of the false teachers. Furthermore, we find support for the notion that the Artemis myth, as promoted in part by *Ephesiaca*, may represent the different doctrine in view in 1 Tim.

In comparing the findings from 1 Tim alongside 2 Tim, the teaching follows a *consistent* trajectory and offer further clues. The two opponents from 1 Tim appear and three additional opponents are mentioned. The same heresy comes in view, and the false teachers specifically target little women. Furthermore, the heretics are presented as religious fakes whose different doctrine calls people to trust in Artemis and the gods for salvation, rather than the Lord Jesus Christ.

⁵⁰⁵ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, note this as rare in the LXX and NT. Perhaps this term is used because alternate letters, *Ephesia grammata*, can be linked to the Artemis cult in ancient evidence.

6.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Tim 6:2b-10 in light of *Ephesiaca*

In light of the social and cultural world of Ephesus as set forth in *Ephesiaca*, Xenophon of Ephesus has provided a fresh perspective on the polemic passage on riches in 1 Tim and related texts.

Inner texture analysis, surfaced three interpretive issues: (1) Rather than view the twisted sense of **εὐσέβεια** as depicting avaricious moral philosophers, because inscriptions celebrate the piety of the rich toward Artemis, this study looked to see if prominent followers could be found serving Artemis for gain. (2) Instead of interpreting the wise sayings backward through the lens of the conglomeration of the traditions they seem to echo, we considered them in light inscriptions and *Ephesiaca*; consequently, the wise sayings appear to attack the sacred values of her city. (3) Regarding the rich and the myths and teachings in ancient Ephesus, extant evidence and Xenophon of Ephesus suggest together that leading advocates of Artemis may be envisioned in 1 Tim.

Intertexture analysis looked at common terms and themes and offered three findings: (1) *Ephesiaca* presents rich people exhibiting pious behavior toward Artemis, the gods, and the **δαιμόνιον**, and those who serve the goddess in priestly roles are presented in one instance as counterfeits. (2) The wise sayings of 1 Tim 6:7-10 alongside *Ephesiaca* and other evidence appear to target sacred values in Ephesus. Tombs reveal the rich were trying to take wealth with them. The rich are portrayed as discontent with basic necessities. Also, the rich served the goddess for gain as well as to maintain their secure place in society. (3) As the Artemis myth is the thread throughout *Ephesiaca*, when considered alongside 1 Tim 6:2b-10 and related passages on false teachers, advocates of her cult, come into view.

Ideological texture showed that Xenophon of Ephesus moved beyond the role of a storyteller. He appears to have a didactic agenda: to exhort people to honor

Artemis and the gods and exhibit self-control toward others. Whether or not *Ephesiaca* was etched in the walls of the Artemisium, it fits with the other treasures known to have been held there, and can be understood as promoting a contrary doctrine for the salvation of people.

Sacred texture revealed the sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only source of salvation, stand in stark contrast to the counterfeit faith of the greedy false teachers. This understanding of the terms and themes of the polemic in 1 Tim follow a similar trajectory in 2 Tim. Rather than serve for gain and riches, followers were to embrace Christ with contentment.

IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Rich in 1 Timothy 6:17-19:

Hope in God, Enjoy and Share all God Richly Provides, and Grasp Life

The last passage we will appraise in light of *Ephesiaca* is 1 Tim 6:17-19.⁵⁰⁶ Scholars agree that the text contains a command to τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰωνί, “those who in the present age are rich,” regarding the handling of the riches they possess.⁵⁰⁷ Views are mixed, however, on interpreting this passage.

Some scholars contend that this charge exhorts rich people in God’s church to serve as generous benefactors.⁵⁰⁸ Others argue that it calls for divestiture of riches to prevent further conflict associated with socioeconomic diversity in the church.⁵⁰⁹ Some view it as commanding the rich to a different lifestyle than the one to which they would have been accustomed as Ephesian benefactors.⁵¹⁰ Still others say that it appears to have a softened Pauline tone.⁵¹¹

To offer insight into this debate, we will scrutinize ancient evidence linked to the aspects of this charge (7.1.), assess how *Ephesiaca* may aid us in interpreting it (7.2), and consider the findings that emerge in light of the social and cultural setting (7.3.). We will compare the results of this research with key NT teachings directed to the wealthy on handling riches (7.4.), and conclude by assessing the interpretive implications of reading this charge in light of *Ephesiaca* (7.5).

⁵⁰⁶ Opinions are mixed on the placement of this passage, the discussion of which moves beyond the scope of this study. On this section as the climax of the paraenesis, see: Thurén, “Die Struktur der Schlußparaenese 1 Tim 6:3-21,” 241-53; Dschulnigg, “Warnung von Reichtum und Ermahnung der Reichen,” 60-77; G. Olingdahl, “Den Kristne og Jordisk Rikedom: En Formell och Innehållslig Analys av 1 Tim 6:17-19” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Uppsala, 1968). For reading it as a “brutal” digression, see: E. Käsemann, *Essays Exegetiques* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1972) 112. As a later addition, see: Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 170; Spicq, *les Epîtres Pastorales*, 575. On the link between this paranesis and the *Sitz im Leben*: Robert J. Karris, “The Function and Sitz im Leben of the Parenetic Elements in the Pastoral Epistles” (PhD Diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1971).

⁵⁰⁷ Philip H. Towner, “The Present Age in the Eschatology of the Pastoral Epistles.” *NTS* 32 (1986): 427-48.

⁵⁰⁸ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 91; Verner, *Household of God*, 175.

⁵⁰⁹ For more on this position in the Early Church, see: Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (trans. John A. Schütz; Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1982) 124-40.

⁵¹⁰ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 423-29; Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 550-55.

⁵¹¹ Hanson, *Studies*, 114; Hasler, *Die Briefe*, 52; cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 424.

7.1. Inner Texture of 1 Tim 6:17-19

This charge sends a strong message to the rich using rare terms and rhetorical devices. We will explore these lexical and socio-rhetorical features as they appear in the Greek text in light of ancient evidence and later alongside *Ephesiaca*.

7.1.1. Text and Translation

Table #7: Greek Text and English Translation of 1 Tim 6:17-19

<p>¹⁷ Τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι παράγγελλε μη ὑψηλοφρονεῖν μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλοῦτου ἀδηλότητι ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θεῷ τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ¹⁸ ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς, ¹⁹ ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς. (NA²⁷)</p>
<p>¹⁷ As for those who in the present age are rich, command them not to be haughty, or to set their hopes on the uncertainty of riches, but rather on God who richly provides us with everything for our enjoyment.¹⁸ They are to do good, to be rich in good works, generous, ready to share, ¹⁹ thus storing up for themselves the treasure of a good foundation for the future, so that they may take hold of the life that really is life. (NRSV)</p>

7.1.2. Analysis in Relationship to Ancient Sources

This charge is located in the literary context of 1 Tim 6:2b-21.⁵¹² It exposes the greedy teachers who have a false view of piety and desire “to be or to remain” rich (vv. 2b-10), instructs Timothy to avoid such beliefs and behavior (vv. 11-16), issues this command to the rich (vv. 17-19),⁵¹³ and reminds Timothy to guard the deposit entrusted to him while avoiding godless chatter called “knowledge” (vv. 20-21).

⁵¹² See: Thurén, “Die Struktur der Schlußparänese 1 Tim 6:3-21,” 241-243. Cf. Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, 1st ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986) 103, for an example of a similar letter in antiquity: *Pliny to Maximus*.

⁵¹³ Adolf von Schlatter, *Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus: eine Auslegung seiner Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1936) 159. In a context where some were pursuing εὐσέβεια for profit, he persuasively interprets 1 Tim 6:2b-21 as instructions on “the exclusion of business from the worship of God.”

The instructions to the rich come in what Craig Smith has categorized as the literary form of the charge.⁵¹⁴ The teaching is bracketed by the *νῦν*, “now,” and the *μέλλον*, “future,” statements that direct the rich to use their earthly wealth for eternal purposes. Within those brackets, prohibitions and expectations are set forth. The charge concludes with a *ἵνα* clause that defines the purpose for the command.⁵¹⁵

The rich are prohibited from being proud or haughty,⁵¹⁶ and they are not to set their hopes on the uncertain riches.⁵¹⁷ Instead, they are to hope in God who richly provides all things for enjoyment *and* sharing. Rhetorically, the shift is emphasized with the *πλουτ-* wordplay: rather than hoping in uncertain *πλούτου*, “riches,” *τοῖς πλουσίους*, “the rich,” are to hope in God who *πλουσίως*, “richly,” provides.⁵¹⁸

The rich are instructed to share God’s provision with a series of infinitives that are rare in antiquity.⁵¹⁹ They are *ἀγαθοεργεῖν*, “to do good,”⁵²⁰ *πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς*, “to be rich in good works,”⁵²¹ *εὐμεταδότους εἶναι*, “to be generous,”⁵²² *κοινωνικούς*, and “ready to share”⁵²³ or “sharers of possessions.”⁵²⁴ In so doing, the rich are *ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς*, “storing up or laying up for themselves,”⁵²⁵ a firm or noble foundation or treasure for the future or coming age.⁵²⁶

⁵¹⁴ See: Smith, *Timothy’s Task, Paul’s Prospect*, 26-66, for more on the charge form in antiquity. Cf. Teresa Morgan, *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 25.

⁵¹⁵ On the role of the *ἵνα* clause in the form of benefaction inscriptions, see: Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26-40. Cf. Alan S. Henry, *Honors and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1983).

⁵¹⁶ Some translate the hapax legomenon, *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*, “to be arrogant;” *BAGD*, 850, renders it as proud or haughty. For the variant, *ὑψηλά φρόνειν*, “high-minded;” see: Rom 11:20. Plato, *Republic* 550B re: those who love honor. Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich*, 38, says the rich are literally “commanded to be humble.”

⁵¹⁷ On the hapax legomenon, *ἀδηλότητι*, “uncertain;” see: *BAGD*, 16.

⁵¹⁸ On the *πλουτ-* wordplay, see: Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 309; cf. *τοῖς πλοῦσιος*, “the rich;” *πλούτου*, “riches;” and, *πλουσίως*, “richly;” in *BAGD*, 673-74.

⁵¹⁹ *BAGD*, 94. Cf. Philo, *Noah’s Work as a Planter* 132.3. For further exploration of *ἀπόλαυσιν* in antiquity and its function in these instructions, see: Abraham J. Malherbe, “Godliness, Self-Sufficiency, Greed, and the Enjoyment of Wealth: 1 Timothy 6:3-19, Part 1.” *NovT* 52 (2010): 376-405; and, “Godliness, Self-Sufficiency, Greed, and the Enjoyment of Wealth: 1 Timothy 6:3-19, Part 2.” *NovT* 53 (2011): 73-96.

⁵²⁰ A similar term, *ἀγαθοουργῶν*, refers to God’s benefits in Acts 14:17. Cf. *BAGD*, 2.

⁵²¹ The idea of abounding in good deeds may link this passage back to the lifestyle called for in 1 Tim 2:9-10.

⁵²² This hapax legomenon is rare in antiquity and is not found in *IvE*. Cf. *BAGD*, 323.

⁵²³ On this rendering of *κοινωνικούς*, see Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 310.

⁵²⁴ This term is also a hapax legomenon and again, does not appear *IvE*, though it is common in *IvE* to see instances of gifts to a common funds, *κοινός*, cf. *IvE* 4, 8, 11, 17, 26, 27, 215, 232-5, 237-42, 251, 614c, 802, 1024, 1382, 1409, 1412-13, 1440-41, 1447, 1449, 1454, 1457, 1463, 1481, 1498, 2003, 2005, 2037, 2048, 2061-63, 2923, 3217. In *IvE*, benefactors are never exhorted to be sharers of their possessions. Cf. *BAGD*, 438-39.

⁵²⁵ On *ἀποθησαυρίζοντας*, see: *BAGD*, 91. The idea of the rich storing up a deposit would have made sense in Ephesus: the rich stored their riches on deposit with Artemis; Dio Chrysostom, *Orations* 31.54. Cf. the related verb *θησαυρίζω* in Matt 6:19-20; Luke 12:21; James 5:3; *BAGD*, 361.

Why should the rich enjoy *and* share all God provides? The answer is found in the *ἵνα* clause: so that they may take hold of τῆς ὀντως ζωῆς, “real or certain life.”⁵²⁷ The use of ὀντως with the hapax legomenon ἀδηλότητι, “uncertain,” strengthens the rhetorical contrast by explaining the rationale: to grasp what is *certain*, the rich must stop placing their hope in *uncertain* riches and demonstrate their hope is in God through enjoying *and* sharing His provision.

This phase of analysis will revisit the features of this command as they appear in the Greek text of 1 Tim 6:17-19 in six sections: (1) the rich in ancient Ephesus; (2) two prohibitions; (3) God, the Benefactor; (4) expectations regarding sharing; (5) storing up treasure in Ephesus; and, (6) the *ἵνα* clause in benefaction inscriptions. In each section, the terms and themes will be viewed in light of ancient sources and Ephesian evidence.

7.1.2.1. The Rich in the Present World of Ancient Ephesus

τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι

The πλουσίοις refers to people who have “an abundance of earthly possessions that exceeds normal experience;” thus, they are categorized as “rich.”⁵²⁸ Furfey posits that the rich do not have to work for a living *per se*, as they possess material resources from noble birth or inheritance, from trade as merchants, from the work of others on their land, or from nefarious activities ranging from exorbitant tax collection to thievery.⁵²⁹ People of different social ranks may be rich.⁵³⁰

⁵²⁶ The term θεμέλιον occurs in Ephesian benefaction inscriptions: *JvE* 438, 448, 455, 491, 1073, 2260 linked to a fund in the present time. Cf. *BAGD*, 356: “treasure” or “reserve.” The text connotes a reserve in a future one.

⁵²⁷ On ὀντως as “real or certain,” cf. its use in 1 Tim 5; *BAGD*, 574. Rhetorically, this term serves as a fitting and dramatic contrast to ἀδηλότητι, “uncertain,” in 1 Tim 6:17.

⁵²⁸ Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus*, 405; cf. *BAGD*, 673; *TDNT* 3.114-117; *TDNT* 6.318-332; Bruce J. Malina, “Wealth and Poverty in the New Testament and Its World.” *Int* 41 (1987): 354-67. In the OT, see: Jer 9:22; 38:2; Hos 2:5-7. In the NT, see: Matt 19:23f; 27:57; Mark 10:25; Luke 6:24; 12:16; 16:1,19; 14:12; 18:25; 21:1; Jam 1:10f; 2:6; 5:1; Rev 6:15; 13:16. In the Early Church, see: *1 Clement* 13:1; 16:10.

⁵²⁹ Furfey, “ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ and Cognates in the New Testament,” 241-63.

⁵³⁰ Countryman, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Empire*, 33.

The rich in Ephesus in the first century CE are citizens who ascend to positions of civic and religious leadership for years and pass their posts on to their progeny. They serve Artemis, honor the emperor, support the city and its culture, and enjoy the best of the emporium. They are religiously Greek and respectfully Roman, which enables them to maintain their prominence in society. Some rich Ephesians may have gained their wealth through other avenues from theft or commerce. Merchants and association leaders such as Demetrius, mentioned in Acts 19:23-41, may be among the well-to-do in this ancient setting.⁵³¹

Acts 19 presents Demetrius and fellow silversmiths (who had made a good income from their occupation) inciting the crowds to stand up for Artemis *and* to protect their trade (vv. 24-27). The ministry of Paul had apparently drawn many away from Artemis and magic to Christ. Trebilco offers this assessment:

The incident suggests two points about the on-going life of the church in Ephesus. Firstly, the value of the magic books was 50,000 silver drachmae. Since a drachma was a day's wage, this was a considerable amount of money. Of course they were much poorer after they had burnt the books! But, if the sum is reliable, the possession of this amount of disposable income to spend on magic books suggests that at least some of the Ephesian Christians were well off. Secondly, these people had come into the Ephesian Christian community with a worldview shaped by the contemporary magical arts. Such a pronounced background might have continued to influence their thinking as Christians.⁵³²

Consequently, it is reasonable to envision that wealthy Greek converts formerly associated with Artemis and magic may be among the rich in view in 1 Tim 6:17-19. Rick Strelan believes the church in Ephesus may also have included some wealthy Jews, as the word of the Lord had spread among Jews and Greeks (Acts 19:10).⁵³³

⁵³¹ Witherington, *Acts of the Apostles*, 591, notes that their "prosperity/high standard of living" is uppermost on his mind. Cf. John R. W. Stott, *The Message of Acts*, BST (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990) 308-09.

⁵³² Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus*, 151-52; Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 551, connect Acts 19:25 with rich Ephesians in 1 Tim 6:17-19 as follows (though their view may be influenced by prior assumptions about the relationship between Acts and the PE, it is worth noting): "Thus Acts 19:25 with its frank admission of the economic motive for the agitation against believers could be read as an illustration of 1 Tim 6:9-10, whereas 1 Tim 6:17-19 reads like advice for persons like those Ephesian magicians who became believers and destroyed books of magic worth 50,000 silver pieces (Acts 19:19), i.e. 50,000 days' wages. The point at issue here is neither whether the incident happened in 54 CE nor the price of magic books on the Big Board that day in Ephesus. Rather one sees that the author of Acts thought it quite reasonable to usher rich Ephesians onto the stage of his narrative to make his point, and that the author of the Pastorals thought that Christian Ephesus was a suitable *Sitz im Leben* for admonitions about the use and abuse of wealth." Cf. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971) 567.

⁵³³ Rick Strelan, *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*, BZNW (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996) 197.

As we have seen in this study, rich Ephesians in the first century CE regardless of their ethnicity function and interact in accordance with the prevailing cultural rules linked to the institution of benefaction. Social norms dictated that they serve as generous benefactors toward the people of the city while exhibiting piety to Artemis, the gods, and the emperor. Considering that rich Ephesians would have been under tremendous social pressure to follow cultural expectations linked to their status, it is fitting that the instructions for the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19 employ strong language.⁵³⁴ The teaching comes not in the form of a suggestion; the use of the charge verb, **παράγγελλε**, “command,” suggests these orders *must* be followed.⁵³⁵

7.1.2.2. Two Prohibitions

μη ὑψηλοφρονεῖν μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι ἐπι πλούτου ἀδηλόγητι

The charge contains two prohibitions for the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE. Each of these is explored below.

First, the term **ὑψηλοφρονεῖν**, meaning “proud, high-minded, haughty, or arrogant,” is rare in antiquity. Euripides (c. 480–408 BCE) employing the word poetically has Achilles say: “My proud spirit (**ὑψηλόφρων**) is stirred to range aloft, but I have learned to grieve in misfortune and rejoice in high prosperity with equal moderation” (*Iphigenia in Aulis* 919–20).

In *Republic*, Plato (c. 423–347 BCE) uses this term to refer to prominent people who are ambitious, high-spirited, lovers of honor.

Men who mind their own affairs in the city are spoken of as simpletons and are held in slight esteem, while meddlers who mind other people's affairs are honored and praised. Then it is that the youth, hearing and seeing such things, and on the other hand listening to the words of his father, and with a near view of his pursuits contrasted with those of other men, is solicited by both, his father watering and fostering the growth of the rational principle in his soul and the others the appetitive and the passionate; and as he is not by nature of a bad disposition but has fallen into evil communications, under

⁵³⁴ Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 297.

⁵³⁵ On the charge verb, **παράγγελλε**, in antiquity, see: Craig Smith, *Timothy's Task. Paul's Prospect*, 27–38. Cf. Cicero, *Letters to Atticus* 11.2.2; Pseudo-Ignatius, *Epistola ad Heronem* 1.

these two solicitations he comes to a compromise and turns over the government in his soul to the intermediate principle of ambition and high spirit and becomes a man haughty of soul (*ὑψηλόφρων*) and covetous of honor (*φιλότιμος*).” (*Republic* 550A-B)

Danker provides further examples from the semantic domain of benefaction that connect *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν* to *φιλοτιμία*, “love of honor.” In his thinking, the rich are driven by *φιλοτιμία*: “the competitive spirit, ambition, or aspiration of benefactors who receive adulation for munificent outlays or for exceptional service in various capacities.”⁵³⁶ This first prohibition, “not to be high-minded,” steers rich Ephesians away from behaviors and attitudes associated by some ancient writers with the negative assessment of self-seeking benefactors.⁵³⁷

For an Ephesian example, consider *IvE 27*, which exhibits variations of *φιλοτιμία* nine times.⁵³⁸ Two uses appear in this excerpt in which Gaius Vibius Salutaris is exalted by proconsul Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus.⁵³⁹

[Gaius Vibius Salutaris] had previously furnished numerous and extraordinary examples of his munificence (*φιλοτειμίας*), I [proconsul Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus] held him among my most intimate friends, as was proper. And now, since he has decided to adorn the city magnificently with the greatest and most remarkable gifts for the honor of the most manifest and greatest goddess Artemis, and of the house of the emperors, and of your city, and has dedicated 20,000 denarii to the citizens for distributions and now announces, you are right to give, in return for his munificence (*φιλοτειμία*) and goodwill, the things you have voted in his honor. (*IvE 27.338-50*)

The benefactor gave gifts in honor of Artemis and the emperors, and did so in a manner that positioned his close friend, the proconsul, to glorify him in return.

Knibbe argues that the significance of *IvE 27* is not linked to underwriting festivities that honor Artemis but as an avenue for Gaius Vibius Salutaris to make his reputation “immortal.”⁵⁴⁰ While it may be a stretch to try to pinpoint his motives for making this gift, it accomplishes both purposes as it is written. *IvE 27* institutes and prescribes *as law* community activities to preserve the sacred identity of

⁵³⁶ Danker, *Benefactor*, 328. Cf. Herodotus 1.199; Menander, *Fragment* 587.

⁵³⁷ For a lengthy example of this in Asia Minor dated 152 CE, see Danker, *Benefactor, Document* 19.

⁵³⁸ *IvE 27*. 8, 19, 85, 125, 312, 340, 349, 386, 552.

⁵³⁹ See: *IvE 27.340, 349* for Greek; Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 173, for English translation.

⁵⁴⁰ Knibbe, “Via Sacra Ephesiaca,” 154. In the larger context of 1 Tim 6, the Lord Jesus Christ is labeled “the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who alone has immortality” (vv. 14b-16a). For the author of 1 Tim, Jesus Christ, not rich benefactors, is the only One who should receive unending glory.

Ephesus linked to Artemis, *and* it set in motion the perpetual celebration of the piety and munificence of Gaius Vibius Salutaris.⁵⁴¹ This rich man was not the only Ephesian to love honor. In *IvE* there are fifty-four more examples of the φιλοτιμία of rich people whose reputations betray their proclivity to ὑψηλοφρονεῖν.⁵⁴²

The second prohibition in 1 Tim 6:17 urges the rich to refrain from “setting their hope on uncertain riches.” Scholars by and large concur with Dibelius and Conzelmann who note the “intended paradox” that the rich had been placing their hope in the uncertain and undependable.⁵⁴³ A review of ancient Ephesian testimonies related to the security of money may reveal the social perception to which this intended paradox may point.

Ephesus is acclaimed as *the* depository for wealth in the ancient world in the first century CE. Dio Chrysostom testifies that the wealth of “persons from all parts of the world” was stored in the Artemisium (*Oration* 31.54). Aelius Aristides refers to the temple of Artemis as the “general bank of Asia” (*Orations* 23.24). “It was thought that the power of the goddess protected money deposited there.”⁵⁴⁴ As riches are depicted as safe and secure in her precincts,⁵⁴⁵ it is reasonable to suggest the paradoxical statement in 1 Tim 6:17 may be an affront to prevailing notions regarding the perceived security and certainty linked to riches in the care of Artemis.

We must add a rhetorical note linked to this second prohibition. As the hapax legomenon, ἀδηλότητι, “uncertainty,”⁵⁴⁶ is rare, when coupled with ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ θεῷ, “but in God,” it represents a stark contrast. Consequently, the rich are commanded to

⁵⁴¹ Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, 136-49.,

⁵⁴² See *IvE* Teil VIII, 1, 73. Cf. The Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudes* 8.9.1, riches and honor lead to haughtiness. Cf. Ramsay, Boniface. *Beginning to Read the Fathers* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985) 182-96.

⁵⁴³ Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 91 are silent about the “intent” of this “intended paradox.” Cf. Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 297-98, suggests that Menander, *Dyskolos* 797-816, may be envisioned. Menander (fourth century BC) describes money as ἀβεβαίον, “unstable.”

⁵⁴⁴ Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Ephesus*, 52. Cf. Coins portray Artemis holding the temple in her hand, see: *The Coinage of Ephesus*, Kenneth Sheedy, Curator. Cf. G. Kenneth Jenkins, *Ancient Greek Coins, The World of Numismatics* (New York: Putnam, 1972).

⁵⁴⁵ On Scipio’s attempts to rob the Artemisium thwarted by Caesar, see: Julius Caesar, *Civil Wars* 3.33; 3.105.

⁵⁴⁶ Polybius, *Histories* 5.2.3; Philo, *On the Virtues* 152, *On the Change of Names* 10. Menander, *Dyskolos* 797-816; Lucian, *Navigium* 26-27, 41; though considered secure in Ephesus.

shift from being glory-seeking benefactors whose hope and riches are linked to Artemis to become generous sharers who place their hope in God, the Benefactor.

7.1.2.3 God, the Benefactor

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θεῷ τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν

God is emphatically presented as the supreme Benefactor in four ways: (1) God provides *all things*; (2) God provides *richly*; (3) God provides *for enjoyment*; and, (4) God provides for *generous sharing*. Rich Ephesians would have been accustomed to hearing such things about Artemis, the emperors, and themselves.

Danker cites two inscriptions that echo the language of 1 Tim 6:17. Rather than acknowledging God as the source of *all beneficence*, *these inscriptions attribute* that acclaim to the emperors. Emperor Claudius (41-54 CE) is pronounced: “Savior and Benefactor of all humanity” in *Document 34*: “Dedication by Eratophanes of Rhodes to Tiberius Claudius Caesar Germanicus.”⁵⁴⁷ Elsewhere Emperor Nero (54-68 CE) is lauded as “the Good Divinity of the world” who has given “all the good benefits” and should be thanked for the condition that “Egypt is teeming with all good things” that have been “enjoyed” in *Document 35*: “Decree by the Inhabitants of Busiris, Egypt in Honor of Prefect Tiberius Claudius Balbillus.”⁵⁴⁸

The rich in Ephesus are lauded in similar fashion for their beneficence in the first century CE. People such as Stertinius Orpex and his daughter, are honored for providing the statues of Asklepois, Hygieia, and Hypnos in the gymnasium during the reign of Nero (*IvE* 2113).⁵⁴⁹ In 54-59 CE, L. Fabricius Vitalius and others along with him are lauded for giving to the construction of the fishery and customs house (*IvE* 20). Later, C. Laecanius Bassus is celebrated for building a beautiful fountain (*IvE* 695), and T. Claudius Aristion is honored in multiple places for financing the

⁵⁴⁷ Editions: BCH 11 (1887): 306-08; Danker, *Benefactor*, *Document* 34.21-22. Cf. *IvE* 713, 1312, 1501; Julius Caesar is “God manifest and Common Savior of all human life” in Danker, *Benefactor*, *Document* 32.

⁵⁴⁸ Editions: OGIS 666; BMEA 2.376-379; CIG 4699; IGR I, 1110; Danker, *Benefactor*, *Document* 35.1-3, 9, 20.

⁵⁴⁹ Cf. Aurenhammer, “Sculptures of Gods and Heroes from Ephesos,” 266.

water pipe to Ephesus (*IvE* 424, 3217).⁵⁵⁰ In return for their beneficence, these and other benefactors received public honors from the council and the people.

In Ephesus, the emperors and rich people with divine connections are categorized as “benefactors” and are exalted for supplying “all good things” for the people to enjoy. Alternatively in 1 Tim 6:17-19, God is depicted as *the* Benefactor supplying all good things for our enjoyment (v. 17) and sharing (v. 18).⁵⁵¹ The purpose of God’s rich provision is not for self-indulgence (cf. 1 Tim 5:3-8), but for enjoyment and sharing.⁵⁵² Seneca shares a similar sentiment on the universal purpose of divine beneficence: “...the gods do not cease to heap their benefits upon those who are doubtful about the source of benefits, but distribute their blessings among the nations and peoples with unbroken uniformity” (*On Benefits* 7.31.5).

If we consider this evidence as reflecting ancient thinking, we conclude that the language of 1 Tim 6:17 would have sounded familiar to the rich. Further review this charge, however, reveals a counter-cultural message in this *Sitz im Leben*: God provides all things richly, *not* the gods, the emperors, or benefactors with divine ties. Furthermore, the intended purpose of His beneficence is for enjoyment *and* sharing.

7.1.2.4. Expectations regarding Sharing

ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς

Most scholars interpret the four expectations regarding sharing as calling the rich to serve as generous benefactors,⁵⁵³ in part, because the first two infinitives sound like benefaction language: **ἀγαθοεργεῖν**, “to do good or confer benefits,” and **πλουτεῖν**

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. Scherrer, “The City of Ephesus,” 9-10.

⁵⁵¹ On **ἀπόλαυσιν** in antiquity, see: Abraham J. Malherbe, “Godliness, Self-Sufficiency, Greed, and the Enjoyment of Wealth: 1 Timothy 6:3-19, Part 1.” 376-405; “Godliness, Self-Sufficiency, Greed, and the Enjoyment of Wealth: 1 Timothy 6:3-19, Part 2.” 73-96. In the larger literary context of 1 Tim, this idea of God as the Provider of all things appears to contradict the message of 1 Tim 5:8: “And whoever does not provide (**προνοεῖ**) for relatives, and especially for family members, has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.” A closer look, however, reveals that **προνοεῖ** may be better rendered “think about” or “have regard for.” For the author of 1 Tim, people must be thoughtful to attend to the needs of their relatives, though not consider themselves providers *per se* as that is God’s role (1 Tim 6:17).

⁵⁵² On moderate **ἀπόλαυσιν** “enjoyment” of riches in antiquity, see cf. Isocrates, *To Demonicus* 27-28. Cf. The community sharing in Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37.

⁵⁵³ Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 298; Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, 212; *et al.*

ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, “to be rich in good works or noble deeds.” The latter two, εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, “to be generous,” and κοινωνικούς, “ready to share,” are linked grammatically and yet difficult to interpret because they are rare in antiquity. We will explore these four expectations along with related terms in biblical passages and other ancient evidence to attempt to locate their function and meaning here.

The first infinitive, ἀγαθοεργεῖν, does not appear in *IvE*. Though good works such as making monetary gifts and rendering service to Artemis and the city are realities that are present in Ephesian evidence, this term is not. While it may sound like instructions for benefactors, there is no evidence that links this rare compound to the cultural fixture of benefaction in antiquity. The closest parallel may be 1 Tim 2:10, which contains similar instructions with two words ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, “good deeds,” that exhibit θεοσέβειαν, “piety toward God.”⁵⁵⁴ With this first infinite calling for good works by way of a fresh expression, it seems that the force of this command may be interpreted as calling rich Ephesians to a new kind of generosity.

This first infinitive finds its two closest biblical comparisons in Luke-Acts. In Luke 6:35, ἀγαθοποιεῖτε, “to do good to someone,” envisions good deeds with financial ramifications toward others: “But love your enemies, do good (ἀγαθοποιεῖτε) to them, and lend to them without expecting to get anything back. Then your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High, because he is kind to the ungrateful and wicked.”⁵⁵⁵ In Acts 14:17, another related term, ἀγαθουργῶν, “to do good or confer benefits,” is used of God’s kindness toward man. “Yet he has not left himself without testimony: He has shown kindness (ἀγαθουργῶν) by giving you rain from heaven and crops in their seasons; he provides you with plenty of food and fills your hearts with joy.”⁵⁵⁶ The sharing

⁵⁵⁴ For ἀγαθὸν ἔργον in the PE, see also: 1 Tim 5:10; 2 Tim 2:21; 3:17; Tit 1:16; 3:1.

⁵⁵⁵ BAGD, 2, ἀγαθοποιέω in Mark 3:4; Lk 6:9. The idea that divine beneficence is extended to all people, even the ungrateful and wicked, can also be traced to Seneca, *On Benefits* 7.31.5.

⁵⁵⁶ BAGD, 2, notes that ἀγαθοεργέω is quite rare and may be linked to ἀγαθουργός in ἀγαθουργίη in Pythagoras and Herodotus.

portrayed in these related terms is directed to all people and described as divine kindness. This differs from what we know about sharing in antiquity. Hands and Bassler note that instructions for the rich regarding sharing limited distributions to those who could offer honor or service in return.⁵⁵⁷ It seems that the Christian sharing in view here might differ in comparison to cultural patterns.

The second infinitive phrase, *πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς*, emphatically completes the *πλουτ*- play on words in the paraenesis.⁵⁵⁸ Johnson aptly sums up the message to rich Ephesians in this way: “The rich are not to rely on riches but on God, who gives richly, and they are to be rich in good deeds.”⁵⁵⁹ In a social world where riches helped rich people preserve their place and relationship to the gods, the emperor, and other people, this instruction seems to present an alternative cultural rule; however, not all scholars understand it this way.

Verner interprets this phrase as reflecting a moderate attitude to handling wealth, saying that the rich “are not instructed to divest themselves of their possessions.”⁵⁶⁰ Any divesting that is envisioned in this language perhaps should not be understood as referring to actions that would leave the rich Ephesians empty, and thus, unable to follow the command to *enjoy* God’s provision (v. 16). The strength of the rhetoric and the action required to follow it instead reflects a content posture of enjoyment and sharing that leads to *equality* (cf. 2 Corinthians 8:13-14).⁵⁶¹ This ancient idea of *equality* can also be traced to Seneca’s thinking that divine beneficence was distributed with “unbroken uniformity” (*On Benefits* 7.31.5).

The third expectation, *εὐμεταδότους εἶναι*, further explains the command to the rich with regard to their sharing: they are to “be generous!” This term does not

⁵⁵⁷ Hands, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*, 30-31, 118-20; Bassler, *God & Mammon*, 17f.

⁵⁵⁸ Marshall and Towner, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 672, note “Constant the use of *πλουτεῖν* in 6.9, where it means ‘to become rich’ rather than ‘to abound in’ . Cf. Roloff, *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*, 369, note 194, who adds that this phrase may echo Luke 12:21.

⁵⁵⁹ Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 309.

⁵⁶⁰ Verner, *Household of God*, 174-75. Verner sees Matt 6:19-21 and Luke 12:33 as inconsistent with 1 Tim 6:18, though these teachings use synonymous language and to obey them would require the same behavior.

⁵⁶¹ In other words “godliness with contentment” (6:6) may be exhibited through enjoyment and sharing.

appear in the NT, LXX, Apostolic Fathers, *IvE*, or elsewhere in antiquity until the second century CE.⁵⁶² Quinn and Wacker believe the generosity called for reflects “the same idealism that painted the picture of Acts 4:32-37.”⁵⁶³

To attempt to locate the function and meaning of this third expectation, we will explore a related term **μεταδίδωμι**, “to give (a part of), impart, share,” which occurs five times in the NT and not at all in *IvE*.⁵⁶⁴ Luke 3:11 reads: “Anyone who has two shirts should share (**μεταδώτω**) with the one who has none, and anyone who has food should do the same.” This verb urges sharing between persons that meets basic needs, and again, *equality* comes into view. Ephesians 4:28 adds: “Anyone who has been stealing must steal no longer, but must work, doing something useful with their own hands, that they may have something to share (**μεταδιδόναι**) with those in need.” The sharing of resources flows from those who have received more than enough from God to those who lack necessities (cf. 2 Corinthians 8:13-14).⁵⁶⁵

The root word of **εὐμεταδότους** and **μεταδίδωμι** is **δίδωμι**, “give.”⁵⁶⁶ This term appears in *IvE* in at least one hundred and twenty-nine inscriptions (Teil, VIII, 1, 20-21). The standard form of the benefaction inscriptions depicts a reciprocal transaction in which the giving of the benefactor anticipates a return of honor.⁵⁶⁷ The rich in view in 1 Tim 6:17-19, however, are subject to a different motivation: rather than anticipating earthly honors, they are to consider the sharing of their wealth as a heavenly investment to which is linked the possibility of obtaining (eternal) life.

The fourth expectation of the wealthy, **κοινωνικούς**, does not appear in the NT, LXX, or *IvE*. In antiquity it refers to one who “shares all around” (Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric* 1401A; *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1119b-23a; Lucian, *Timon* 56;

⁵⁶² Cf. Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* 1.14.4; 6.48.1; LSJ notes Vettius Valens, a second century CE philosopher.

⁵⁶³ Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 554, also note that “the unusual term highlights the unusual generosity that is being urged here upon the wealthy.”

⁵⁶⁴ Luke 3:11; Rom 1:11, 12:8; Eph 4:28; and 1 Thess 2:8.

⁵⁶⁵ In the three remaining uses, this term portrays the sharing of one’s resources (Rom 12:8); the imparting of a spiritual gift (Rom 1:11); and the sharing the gospel and even one’s own self (1 Thess 2:8).

⁵⁶⁶ BAGD, 192-93.

⁵⁶⁷ Cf. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26-27. Cf. Ephesian examples: *IvE* 27, 49, 681, and 989.

Polybius, *Histories* 2.44.1). For Josephus, it entails the sharing of “a community of goods” with equality (*Jewish War* 2.122).⁵⁶⁸ In the charge to the rich, this term seems to extend parameters: the rich must share “all around” and “in community.”⁵⁶⁹

Taken together, these four expectations call rich Christians to a new way of living based on the enjoyment and sharing of God’s provision with the goal of equality in community. Scholars, however, do not all interpret the text in this way. Hanson considers the charge as giving “no suggestion that the rich should share their wealth.”⁵⁷⁰ Considering the language of the charge, this conclusion is problematic. Mark Harding takes a middle view that these teachings “both share and do not share some quite fundamental assumptions about wealth and civic obligation in the Greco-Roman world.”⁵⁷¹ It is unclear, however, how these expectations share assumptions about wealth from the culture, especially considering the evidence we have explored linked to the institution of benefaction in this *Sitz im Leben*. Towner sees this charge more radically: “to encourage equality and the meeting of community needs.”⁵⁷² This last view, which sounds quite compelling, will be tested in light of *Ephesiaca*.

7.1.2.5. Storing up Treasure in Ephesus

ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον

In the ancient Mediterranean world, Ephesus is *the* city and the Artemisium is *the* location where rich people stored up treasures for themselves. Dio Chrysostom says:

“You know about the Ephesians, of course, and that large sums of money are in their hands, some of them belonging to private citizens and deposited in the temple of Artemis, not alone money of the Ephesians, but also of aliens and of persons from all parts of the world, and in some cases of commonwealths and kings... Well, that the money is deposited on state property is indeed evident, but it is also evident, as the lists show, that it is the custom of the Ephesians to have these deposits officially recorded” (*Oration* 31.54-55)

⁵⁶⁸ Cf. Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 554.

⁵⁶⁹ Cf. “All people” and “the family of believers” in Gal 6:10. Related to *κοινωνικός*, the root word, *κοινός*, “common,” appears frequently in Ephesus related to a common temple or common fund (*IvE*, Teil, VIII, 1). Aelius Aristides portrays the Artemisium as “the general treasury (*κοινόν*) of Asia” (*Oration* 23.24). The related term *κοινωνός*, “partner,” appears twice (*IvE* 1480; 2245). It is not surprising that *κοινωνία*, “fellowship,” occurs once linked to the Christian community in a later inscription in St. John’s Church (*IvE* 4311).

⁵⁷⁰ Hanson, *Studies*, 114. Cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 427.

⁵⁷¹ Harding, *What Are They Saying?* 59. Cf. Kidd, *Wealth and Beneficence*, 112.

⁵⁷² Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 427. Cf. 2 Cor 8:13-15.

Customs dictated that temple attendants kept the records of the deposits of the rich. Murphy-O'Connor adds: "The temple had no authority to do anything more unless it was explicitly authorized by the depositor, who then retained full responsibility."⁵⁷³

Such accounts are labeled with terms like **θεμέλιος**, "treasury or reserve," and **κοινός**, "common fund." The former term appears in 1 Tim 6:19 and six times in *IvE* linked to accounts for projects such as gymnasiums, kitchens or latrines (*IvE* 438, 448, 455, 491, 1073, 2260). The latter term occurs in inscriptions linked to various funds established at the Artemisium for defined purposes (*IvE*, Teil, VIII, 1). For example, Gaius Vibius Salutaris established a **κοινός** in the temple and outlined instructions for the usage of the financial resources in perpetuity (*IvE* 27).

The call to store up treasure *through sharing* subverts social and cultural rules in Ephesus where they were accustomed to storing up treasure for personal use or other purposes. In order to share resources generously, the wealthy would have to remove earthly riches from the temple and distribute them. Obedience to this charge turns the cultural practice of storing up treasure on its head (cf. Matthew 6:19-20).⁵⁷⁴

7.1.2.6. The **ἵνα** clause in Benefaction Inscriptions

ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς

To consider how the rich may have understood this **ἵνα** clause, we must see how phrases like this functioned in antiquity. Alan Henry suggests that benefaction inscriptions followed a consistent form from the fifth century BCE to the second century CE.⁵⁷⁵ Winter summarizes this form as having an *announcement*, an actual *resolution*, and a *final clause*, starting with **ἵνα** or **ὅπως**.⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷³ Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 65.

⁵⁷⁴ Cf. Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudes* 1.8. "Instead of fields, buy souls that are in trouble according to your ability."

⁵⁷⁵ Henry, *Honors and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, 64.

⁵⁷⁶ Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City*, 26-27.

The command to the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19 loosely follows this form though it appears to have an alternative function. The charge starts with an *announcement* to the rich in this present world, contains a *resolution* regarding the enjoyment and sharing of the rich provision of our Benefactor God, and concludes with a *final clause* explaining what the wealthy gain when they follow these instructions.⁵⁷⁷

The alternative function emerges in the *ἵνα* or purpose clause. The reason that rich Ephesians should not set their hope on uncertain riches, but rather enjoy all that God richly provides *and* share generously His provision, is so that they may *ἐπιλάβωνται*, “grasp or lay claim to,”⁵⁷⁸ real life. Why embark on lifestyle that would have radical implications in light of the social setting and cultural rules? It seems the focus of rhetoric in the command emphasizes that *life* depends on it.

Views are mixed, however, on the function and meaning of this command. Opinions range from considering it an interpolation⁵⁷⁹ to understanding it as the climax of the paraenesis.⁵⁸⁰ Peter Dschulnigg offers a compelling assessment that finds support in the evidence we have considered. He argues that this command leads the rich to obtain true life in a manner that “strikingly agrees with claims of the Jesus tradition, which urges the rich to give away their possessions to the poor.”⁵⁸¹

7.1.3. Summary

Inner texture analysis reveals three interpretive issues in reading the charge to the rich alongside ancient evidence.

First, regarding the prohibitions: Is the text calling the rich to serve as benefactors who assure the welfare of God’s church and the city? Is it calling the

⁵⁷⁷ Cf. Thurén, “Die Struktur der Schlußparänese 1 Tim 6:3-21,” 246-47, who does not necessarily identify the benefaction form but points out that Timothy takes hold of life by the good confession (v. 12) and the rich take hold of life through obedience to the command (vv. 17-19).

⁵⁷⁸ For the usage of *ἐπιλάβωνται* in antiquity, see: Herodotus, *Persian Wars* 6:114; Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4.7.12; Plato, *Laws* 954C.

⁵⁷⁹ Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. 2, *Die Chronologie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1958) 482.

⁵⁸⁰ Thurén, “Die Struktur der Schlußparänese 1 Tim 6:3-21,” 241-53.

⁵⁸¹ Peter Dschulnigg, “Warnung von Reichtum und Ermahnung der Reichen,” 68.

rich to redefine the benefactor model? Or should 1 Tim 6:17-19 be understood as a counter-cultural command urging the rich to abandon the cultural fixture of benefaction characterized by arrogance and love of honor and instead consider God as Benefactor?

Second, we find that views are mixed regarding the expectations for sharing. Do the four terms or expressions provide no suggestion that rich Christians share their possessions? Should these expectations for sharing be understood as sharing some of the fundamental assumptions about wealth and civic obligation in the Greco-Roman world? Or do the expectations represent counter-cultural instructions for rich Christians to enjoy and share their resources with equality in view?

Third, on the purpose clause: Is the purpose of enjoyment and sharing to eliminate socioeconomic diversity in the body? Is this behavior prescribed so that Christians will have a generous reputation as benefactors? Or could the text be saying that only way for the rich to grasp *certain* life is to demonstrate that they have stopped setting their hope on *uncertain* riches through generous sharing?

Analysis of 1 Tim 6:17-19 alongside *Ephesiaca* may provide clues for answering these interpretive questions.

7.2. Intertexture

This phase of analysis examines the key terms and themes present in the charge to the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19 in light of *Ephesiaca*.⁵⁸²

7.2.1. Terms Common to 1 Tim 6:17-19 and *Ephesiaca*

Following our methodology, terms and themes in 1 Tim 6:17-19 will be examined as they appear: πλουσίοις, νῦν, ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, ἐλπίδος, πλοῦτος, θεός, πλουσίως, ἀπόλαυσιν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, ἔργον, κοινωνικούς, and μέλλον.

⁵⁸² In this chapter, *Ephesiaca* citations follow Henderson's translation in the LCL unless otherwise noted.

7.2.2. Analysis of Common Terminology

The plural noun, **πλουσίοις**, “rich,” occurs once in a verb form in *Ephesiaca*. It appears in Manto’s note to Habrocomes to abandon Anthia for her. “For if you say yes...you will be rich (**πλουτήσεις**) and prosperous” (2.5.2). Manto was the rich daughter of pirate chief, Apsyrtus, who promised Habrocomes that he would be rich if he agreed to her request. While Manto’s efforts fell short, her use of this term connotes, in ancient thinking, a condition of comfortable existence.

Next, **νῦν**, “now,” is common in *Ephesiaca*, appearing twenty-five times. In the same sentence mentioned above, this term occurs as an adjective referring to a current reality. “For if you say yes, I will convince my father Apsyrtus to betroth me to you, we will get rid of your present (**νῦν**) wife, and you will be rich (**πλουτήσεις**) and prosperous” (2.5.2). Both in 1 Tim 6:17 and *Ephesiaca*, a person’s current, earthly situation is described using the adjective, **νῦν**.⁵⁸³

The rare compound, **ὑψηλοφρονεῖν**, “proud, arrogant, or high minded,” is built upon the verb **φρονέω**, meaning “to think, form, or hold an opinion.”⁵⁸⁴ While **ὑψηλοφρονεῖν** does not appear in *Ephesiaca*, terms in the semantic domain do. Rich characters are portrayed as arrogant and holding high opinions of themselves.

[Habrocomes] held a high opinion of himself (**ἐφρόνει δὲ τὸ μειράκιον ἐφ’ ἑαυτῷ μεγάλα**), glorying both in his spiritual accomplishments and even more so in his physical beauty. Everything generally reckoned fine he despised as inferior, and nothing seen or heard seemed worthy to him worthy of Habrocomes. (1.1.4)

Habrocomes’ arrogance as depicted by Xenophon of Ephesus is evident to all, including Anthia.

“What is wrong with me?” she said, “I am an underage maiden in love, and I hurt in ways strange and inappropriate for a girl. I’m crazy for Habrocomes, who is handsome and arrogant. Where is the limit of my desire, and where is the end of my suffering? The one I love is haughty...” (1.4.6-7; cf. 1.9.7)

⁵⁸³ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 425, notes that **νῦν** is also eschatologically-charged in the thinking of the author of 1 Tim, as the command to the rich is bracketed with “the present (**νῦν**) world” and “the coming age” statements. Notwithstanding, **νῦν** appears in 1 Tim 6:17 and *Ephesiaca* to refer to a current state or condition as well, which is to imply that the command to the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19 is directed to people who are presently rich and who possess resources for enjoyment and sharing.

⁵⁸⁴ BAGD, 866.

Another character presented in the story as rich and arrogant is Aristomachus.

“Someone came to town from Byzantium, Byzantium being close to Perinthus, one of the most powerful (**δυναμένων**) people there, a man priding himself (**μέγα φρονῶν**) on his wealth (**πλούτῳ**) and advantages, whose name was Aristomachus” (3.2.5). In the characterization of haughty people, Xenophon of Ephesus offers fresh ancient illustrations of the behavior that may be envisioned with the rare compound in 1 Tim 6:17.

The term, **ἐλπίδος**, “hope,” is a thread through *Ephesiaca*. The story begins with the theme of hope for the future embodied in young *Ephebes* like Habrocomes.

[Habrocomes] was much sought after by all the Ephesians and by the inhabitants of the rest of Asia as well, and they had high hopes (**μεγάλας ἐλπίδας**) that he would be a citizen of distinction. They treated the young man like a god, and there were some who at the sight of him even bowed and offered prayers. (1.1.3)

Conversely the loss of hope appears in the story when Habrocomes is separated from Anthia. He is poor, lonely, and forced to do manual labor to survive.

The work was hard on him: he was not in the least accustomed to subjecting his body to strenuous or punishing tasks but fared poorly and frequently bemoaned his own bad luck. “Here, Anthia,” he said, “behold your Habrocomes, a laborer in a low job, who have submitted my body to servitude. If I had any hope (**ἐλπίδα**) of finding you and spending the rest of our lives together, that would console me better than anything.” (5.8.3-4)

Interestingly, Xenophon of Ephesus provides for us an ancient testimony that links hope to the way in which riches helped a person to maintain their place in society as well as their outlook on the future. With this perspective brought to light by *Ephesiaca*, the command to the rich in 1 Tim appears to exhort the rich to set their present and eschatological hope on God rather than riches.

The term, **πλούτος**, “riches or wealth,” occurs four times as a noun in *Ephesiaca*. First, when Apsyrtus offers to compensate Habrocomes for unfair punishment, wealth is described as meaningless compared to what really mattered to him: Anthia (2.10.3). The second instance presents Aristomachus priding himself in his riches (3.2.5), and the last two uses relate to the inherited wealth of Hippothous.

Meanwhile Hippothous of Perinthus spent the first part of his sojourn in Tauromenium in poor condition through lack of means, but as time passed an old woman fell in love with him, and under compulsion of his poverty he married the old woman. He had lived with her a short time when she died, and he inherited great wealth (πλοῦτόν) and prosperity: a large retinue of servants, a large amount of clothing, and an extravagant array of belongings. (5.9.1; cf. 5.9.9)

Riches in *Ephesiaca* take forms beyond gold and silver. The term broadly includes jewelry, servants, clothes, food, and other possessions. People of different ranks possessed them through noble birth, inheritance, or thievery. These examples of riches add to our knowledge of the term in 1 Tim and antiquity.

The next word, θεός, “God,” appears in *Ephesiaca* some seventy-three times, in reference to Habrocomes, Anthia, Artemis, Apollo, Helios, Isis, Eros, Ares, Apis, Aphrodite, the two gods: Love and Death, the Nile god, unnamed gods, the underworld gods, the gods of Egypt, a sacred disease, and in a generic plural term: the gods, also translated, “heaven.”⁵⁸⁵ Prominent rich people are deified alongside the pantheon of gods in *Ephesiaca*, though lower in the perceived hierarchy of power. In cataloging these occurrences alongside the charge to the rich, it shows how radically counter-cultural 1 Tim 6:17 may have sounded: The rich are no longer to place their hope in themselves, their own δύναμις, their πλούτος, their ancestral θεός, the pantheon of θεοὺς, but instead, in the one, true God.

The adverb in the πλουτ- wordplay, πλουσίως, translated “richly,” appears once in *Ephesiaca* in describing the customary burial of a rich female (3.8.3). This usage envisions a richly adorned corpse. This usage adds to our perception of the term chosen to describe the lavish nature of God’s provision in 1 Tim 6:17. While the term εὐεργέτης, “benefactor,” is not used in 1 Tim 6:17-19, it is implied in the

⁵⁸⁵ In *Ephesiaca*, θεός refers to: Habrocomes in 1.1.3; 1.1.5; 1.2.8; 2.2.4; Anthia in 1.2.7; 2.2.4; Artemis in 1.2.7; 1.2.7; 1.5.1; 1.5.3; 1.5.4; 1.5.9; 1.8.1; 1.11.5; 5.15.2; Apollo in 1.6.1; 1.6.2; 1.7.1; 1.7.2; 1.10.2; 1.10.3; Helios in 5.10.7; 5.10.9; 5.11.6; Isis in 1.7.1; 3.11.5; 3.11.5; 5.4.7; 5.13.3; Eros in 1.1.5; 1.2.1; 1.2.1; 1.3.1; 1.4.1; 1.4.1; 1.4.2; 1.4.4; 1.4.5; 1.11.5; 2.1.2; Ares in 2.13.2; Apis in 5.4.8; 5.4.9; the Cyprian’s ancestral goddess, Aphrodite in 5.10.3; the two gods, “Love and Death,” in 3.8.5; the Nile god in 4.2.6; an unnamed god in 3.2.6; 5.1.5; 5.1.6; and a sacred disease in 5.7.4. The plural form, θεοὺς, refers to Anthia and Habrocomes in 1.12.1; the gods, in 2.11.8; 3.5.8; 4.2.10; 5.4.11; 5.8.9; the underworld gods in 1.5.7; “your own native gods” in 3.8.5; “the gods of Egypt” in 4.2.4; 5.2.5; Isis, greatest of goddesses in 4.3.3; Apis, “most humane of gods” in 5.4.10; and θεοὺς is translated as “heaven” in 2.11.7.

rhetoric that proclaims that God provides all things “richly.” Also noteworthy, in *Ephesiaca*, the term **εὐεργέτης** occurs once linked to the god, Eros (1.4.5).⁵⁸⁶ This strengthens our understanding that the benefactor title connects to the divine.

The word, **ἀπόλαυσιν**, “enjoyment,” occurs six times in *Ephesiaca*. It appears in a pure light in three scenes, such as the wedding night of Anthia and Habrocomes, when they “enjoyed” the intimacy they had long desired (1.10.1; 3.4.4; 5.1.8). It also occurs in an impure manner three times with characters that desire to use another person against their will to “indulge” their sexual desires (1.15.5; 2.1.5; 3.12.3). Based on diverse examples in *Ephesiaca*, this term consistently reflects deep desires. The declaration in 1 Tim 6:17 that God’s rich provision is for our enjoyment may envision the satisfaction of deep longings.

The final expression in the **πλουτ-** play on words, **πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς**, “to be rich in good works,” is not found in *Ephesiaca* or *IvE*. The term **ἔργον**, “work or deed,” is used of the unholy act of murder that Manto calls Lampo to do. He refuses to do this deed before the gods. In response, Anthia invokes Artemis and the gods to “reward the goatherd for these good deeds” (2.11.6-8). In addition to a good or noble act before the gods, elsewhere **ἔργον** is used in *Ephesiaca* to illustrate physical labor. “The work (**ἔργον**) was hard on him: he was not in the least accustomed to subjecting his body to strenuous or punishing tasks but fared poorly and frequently bemoaned his own bad luck” (3.8.3). For Xenophon of Ephesus, the rich were not accustomed to working with their hands. Conversely, 1 Tim 6:18 may be instructing the rich to exhibit a lifestyle of good deeds requiring physical service.

⁵⁸⁶ Though it may not represent a key term or them, the verb **παρέχω**, “to cause or bring about for someone or to supply,” (*BAGD*, 626) occurs in 1 Tim 6:17 and once in *Ephesiaca* before Anthia attempts suicide to avoid marrying Perilaus. “Soul of dearest Habrocomes, look: I am keeping my promises and coming to you, a journey sad but necessary. Welcome me with gladness, and make (**πάρεχε**) my life there with you a happy one” (3.6.5). Here Xenophon of Ephesus reveals a fresh ancient example in which the term is used to describe someone making something happen for another. It is possible that the term was included in the command to the rich to emphasize that God richly makes our lives filled with all good things.

The word, **καλοῖς**, “good or noble,” appears once in the plural form in *Ephesiaca*, when Habrocomes is lauded for his **σώματος καλοῖς**, “physical excellences” (1.1.2). In the singular form, **καλός**, occurs twenty-seven times, mostly describing Anthia as “beautiful,” Habrocomes as “handsome,” families as “good,” serving as “well,” and things as “fine.”⁵⁸⁷ With these numerous occurrences, Xenophon of Ephesus adds to our knowledge of the kind of deeds the rich are commanded to exhibit in 1 Tim 6:18.

Though the NT hapax legomenon, **κοινωνικούς**, “ready to share or sharers of possessions,” does not appear in *Ephesiaca*, many terms in the same word group do. The term **κοινωνήματα** describes the “special relationship” that Leuco and Rhoda had with each other (2.3.6). When Habrocomes asks Hippothous to sojourn with him, **κοινῶνον**, portrays how he wanted to “share” the journey with him (2.14.2).⁵⁸⁸ Likewise, when Habrocomes worked alongside Aegialeus, he **κοινωνῶν**, “took part” in his trade (5.2.1). The practice of sharing is further portrayed in this excerpt. “But [Hippothous] was always thinking of Habrocomes and prayed that he would find him, putting great value in sharing (**κοινωνήσαι**) with him his whole way of life and his possessions” (5.9.2).

Lastly, Leuco and Rhoda went beyond sharing their possessions after inheriting great wealth. They turned them over to their master upon being reunited with him in the story.

And so they gathered [Habrocomes] up and took him to the house where they were staying, turned (**παραδιδόασι**) their possessions over to him, took care of him, treated him, and tried to bolster his spirit. But for him nothing had as much value as Anthia, and at every turn he mourned for her. (5.10.12)

⁵⁸⁷ In *Ephesiaca*, **καλός** or **καλῶ** refers to: “handsome” in 1.1.5; 1.1.5; 1.1.6; 1.2.8; 1.2.8; 1.4.6; 2.4.2; 2.5.1; 2.12.1; 2.14.2; 2.2.2; 5.13.6; “beautiful or lovely” in 1.2.8; 2.8.1; 5.8.5; 5.13.3; “good” in 5.9.3; “fine” in 3.10.1; 5.9.5; Eros in 1.4.1; “serving well,” “guiding well,” or to “be well” in 1.9.7; 1.9.7; 2.3.6; 5.4.11; connotes being happily made by the gods as perfect for each other in 1.11.5; the “right” course in 5.8.9; and in 1.10.1; **καλῶν** appears in a textual variant.

⁵⁸⁸ A similar construct occurs in 5.12.5 as Leuco and Rhoda **κοινωνήσαντες** “shared” the voyage with Anthia. Cf. 5.10.4 where **κοινωνόν** refers to a “partner” in one’s experiences, and 5.10.10 where **κοινωνεῖ** refers to having something “in common” with something else.

The compound, **παραδίδομι**, appears frequently in the NT to connote “handing over or giving back something.”⁵⁸⁹ This depicts the voluntary surrendering of resources that does not leave them empty but portrays them as experiencing harmonious equality in community. Later Xenophon of Ephesus adds this statement regarding their condition: “Leuco and Rhoda were their companions’ partners in everything (**κοινωνοί πάντων**)” (5.15.4). From the **κοινωνικούς** word group and related terms, *Ephesiaca* provides fresh examples of people sharing possessions resulting not in emptiness but as “partners in everything,” experiencing the kind of equality that may be envisioned in this rare term in 1 Tim 6:18 (cf. Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37).

The timeframe referred to as **μέλλον**, “the future,” appears seven times in varied forms in *Ephesiaca* primarily speaking of instances in the near future such as a victim to be sacrificed and an impending marriage.⁵⁹⁰ It is also linked to emotions.

They recognized each other as soon as their eyes met, for this is what their hearts desired, and joining in an embrace they fell to the ground. Many emotions seized them at once: joy, pain, fear (**φόβος**), memory of the past, fear about the future (**τὸ τῶν μελλόντων δέος**). (5.13.3)

That Xenophon of Ephesus includes “fear about the future” in this way gives insight into the mindset of rich citizens in antiquity. In their thinking, they must exhibit piety to the gods and live respectfully toward others because life is uncertain. Failure to do so could put them in great danger. Alongside 1 Tim 6:17-19 the contrast is striking: rather than live in fear of the gods following cultural rules to try to maintain your place in an uncertain world, the rich are commanded to put their present and eschatological hope in God, and follow His commands in order to grasp certain life.

7.2.3. Summary

Intertexture analysis reveals that *Ephesiaca* illuminates the kind of alternative commitments that the author of 1 Tim 6:17-19 envisions in three areas.

⁵⁸⁹ See: *BAGD*, 614-15, for a list of references.

⁵⁹⁰ *Ephesiaca* 1.10.3; 1.10.5; 1.11.6; 1.14.3; 2.13.2; 3.5.7.

First, the lexical overlap between 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca* adds to our understanding of the way riches shaped peoples lives and perceptions in the ancient world. Riches lead characters such as Habrocomes and Artistomachus to become haughty and arrogant with a sense of pride and entitlement, whereas the lack of financial resources left Habrocomes with little hope for the future. For Xenophon of Ephesus, the rich honor the hierarchy of gods, and are even deified as gods, while being lauded for richly supplying benefits, however, the only character in the story portrayed with the title, benefactor, is a god.

Second, this analysis provides examples from Xenophon of Ephesus that add to our knowledge about good deeds and the practice of sharing. We see that good deeds may require effort or service beyond what is customary behavior in a cultural setting. We also find that the practice of sharing possessions with others in community results not in emptiness but a harmonious state of equality as “partners in everything” that seems to reflect the condition of sharing in view in 1 Tim 6:18.

Third, Xenophon of Ephesus portrays life in an uncertain world and his characters live in fear about the future. This adds to our knowledge of the ancient mindset: life for the rich entails honoring the gods, showing respect to people in accordance with cultural rules, and possessing riches. These illustrations aid modern readers in understanding the force of the alternatives presented by the author of 1 Tim to the wealthy in the Christian community. In this light, the charge contains more than instructions for handling riches: it offers the rich both hope and life!

7.3. Ideological Texture

Ideological texture moves from 1 Tim 6:17-19 and *Ephesiaca* to look at people in Ephesus in the first century CE to discern how they may have understood the implications of this charge.

7.3.1. The Author, Audience, and Culture in *Ephesiaca*

As an ancient historiographer, Xenophon of Ephesus augments our knowledge regarding how rich Ephesians handled their riches in at least three ways.⁵⁹¹

First, Anthia and Habrocomes honor the pantheon of gods by making offerings and prayers to gods such as Artemis, Isis, and Helios. The couple expects honor in return for their beneficence, which they received both in Ephesus and in Rhodes. Second, they live luxuriously, evidenced by the description of their wedding night and the supplies on their ship. Third, the rich couple expends their riches in accordance with cultural rules to ensure a harmonious life.

To gain further insight into the audience and culture of *Ephesiaca*, we must consider the testimony of another historian, Athenaeus (c. 200 CE). He was born in Egypt and travelled the world of *Ephesiaca*. He connects the rich to Artemis and offers examples of their luxurious lifestyle and their φιλοτιμία.

In *The Deipnosophists*, Athenaeus (c. 200 CE) mentions Ephesus twenty-five times. In one instance, he cites a prominent citizen who demonstrates his commitment to the goddess, Artemis, by making a gift in her temple.⁵⁹²

Alexander of Cythera, as Juba says, perfected the psaltery with a large number of strings, and since in his old age he lived in the city of Ephesus, he dedicated the invention, as the most ingenious product of his skill, in the temple of Artemis. (183c)

Athenaeus also presents famous rich Ephesians like Parrhasius as indulging in luxury, delighting in honor, and celebrating his own virtue.

To such an extent were the delights of luxury and sumptuous expense cultivated among the ancients that even the Ephesian painter, Parrhasius dressed himself in purple and wore a gold crown on his head, as Clearchus records in his *Lives*. For he indulged in luxury in a way offensive to good taste and beyond his station as a painter, and yet in talk claimed the possession of virtue, inscribing on the words of art wrought by him the following verse: “A man who lives in dainty style and at the same time honors virtue, has written these words.” (543c-d; cf. 525c)

⁵⁹¹ Cf. §1.1.1. Hesychius of Miletus, a fifth/sixth century CE historian, categorizes Xenophon of Ephesus as a “historiographer” in the *Suda* reference to his authorship of *Ephesiaca*.

⁵⁹² Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Ephesus*, 49, dates Juba in the last half of the first century BCE.

Athanaeus offers a similar picture of rich and their world as we find in the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus. Rich Ephesians love Artemis; they revel in the reciprocal benefits of their beneficence, and indulge luxuriously while always endeavoring to maintain their virtue reputation (and because of their *φιλοτιμία* they let others know about it).

When we compare the expectations linked to the rich in the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus and Athanaeus alongside 1 Tim 6:17-19, they appear as opposites. In the thinking of Xenophon of Ephesus and Athanaeus the rich see themselves and each other as benefactors who love glory, show reverence to a pantheon of gods, and live luxuriously, while behaving respectfully toward others in accordance with cultural rules. In return for this behavior, they anticipate a life of harmony. Conversely, 1 Tim 6:17-19 exhorts the rich to humbly put their hope in their Benefactor God who provides them with all things for enjoyment and sharing. Obedience to the charge in this *Sitz im Leben*, which expected conformity to social and cultural rules, would put the rich at risk in relationship to the gods and cause them to lose their place among people.

7.3.2. The Riches of the Rich in Ephesus

The Acts 19 account reveals further clues about the rich and nature of their riches in Ephesus in the first century CE. The author of Acts notes that magic books, worth some 50,000 pieces of silver, appear among the assets of rich Ephesians who had converted to Christianity.

Magic in Ephesus can be linked to Artemis and the Artemisium as far back as the middle of the sixth century BCE. Croesus, the rich and generous King of Lydia, donated “oxen of gold and the greater part of the pillars” for the Artemisium

(Herodotus, *History* 1.92), and elsewhere is reported to have “saved himself from the funeral pyre by using the *Ephesia grammata*.”⁵⁹³

The *Ephesia grammata* are renowned in antiquity for assistance ranging from warding off evil demons to giving victory to athletes in competition. Pausanias connects these magical letters to Artemis stating that the letters “seem to have been written indistinctly and obscurely on the feet, girdle and crown of Artemis” (Eustathius, *Comm ad Hom* 19.247).

The Acts 19 account also connects Ephesians with some measure of wealth to both magic (vv. 18-20) and Artemis (vv. 23-41).⁵⁹⁴ Rich Ephesians make public confessions, destroy valuable magic books, and the spread of Christianity contributes to the decline of the idol making industry and the reputation of Artemis.

In *Ephesiaca*, the rich are presented as seeking help from the seers and priests of Artemis, who “uttered exotic words to placate, so they said, certain divinities (δαίμονας)” (1.5.7). Xenophon of Ephesus depicts the prominent families as putting their hope in the incantations recited on their behalf. They purchase oracles and perform magical rituals to seek aid or deliverance from difficulty. Later, Leuco and Rhoda “set up a monument inscribed with golden lettering (γράμμασι) in honor of Habrocomes and Anthia” (5.15.2). While it is unclear whether or not the *Ephesia grammata* are in view, their actions show that they trusted in forms of magic and prayers to the gods and other divinities in times of need.

7.3.3. Summary

Ideological texture looked at the author, audience and culture with assistance from Athenaeus, an ancient historian who frequently mentioned Ephesus. Additionally,

⁵⁹³ Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 15, 22-28. Beyond the bounds of this study it would be interesting to see we can locate evidence that shows whether Croesus deemed his gift “a return” to Artemis for the deliverance he experienced from the goddess who had a reputation for watching over those who were loyal to her.

⁵⁹⁴ Stott, *The Message of Acts*, 294.

Ephesia grammata stories and the Acts 19 account provide clues that add to our knowledge of the ways that riches in Ephesus are linked to Artemis and magic.

Athenaeus and Xenophon of Ephesus offer similar descriptions of rich Ephesians. The rich supremely honor the gods and expect honor in return for their beneficence. They enjoy living in luxury, and when they share their resources, they follow cultural rules to exhibit a virtuous persona in order to maintain their place in society. In this setting, the charge to the rich in 1 Tim envisions a new way of life.

Research on magic and the *Ephesia grammata* shows that rich people in the history of Ephesus relied on sorcery linked to Artemis. We see fresh examples of this type of behavior associated with prominent Ephesians in *Ephesiaca*. For the rich, obedience to the charge in 1 Tim 6:17-19 would impact their use of wealth in relation to the gods and other people, especially in situations where they needed to experience deliverance or salvation.

The Acts 19 account illuminates the nature of riches associated with magic and Artemis and presents Ephesian converts to Christianity burning valuable magic books and making public confessions of faith that adversely impact the silversmith industry and the reputation of the goddess. Compared to the portraits of rich Ephesians in the thinking of Athenaeus and Xenophon of Ephesus, the behavior of these converts is radically counter-cultural and would put their lives and futures at risk. Through their actions, these converts appear to have shifted from setting their hope on their valuable magic books *and* Artemis to placing their hope in Christ.

7.4. Sacred Texture

With the aid of *Ephesiaca* we have scrutinized the rare terms and themes in charge to the rich 1 Tim 6:17-19. We have determined that this text appears to command the rich to a whole new way of life in light of the social setting and cultural rules.

In this final phase of analysis these radically counter-cultural findings will be examined alongside two key texts where the rich are given instructions on handling riches. We will turn our attention first to a pivotal passage in the Gospels, Mark 10:13-31. After that, we will consider our findings alongside a significant text from the Pauline tradition, 2 Corinthians 8-9.

7.4.1. God, the Rich, and Riches in the Text

God is central to the charge to the rich. God is the object of hope, not uncertain riches. God is the source of all benefits, not rich benefactors. In sharing uncertain riches, the rich grasp life in God.

The rich are the audience of this charge. In the present world of Ephesus in the first century CE many who possessed riches had current or former ties to magic and the Artemis cult. Whether wealthy worshipers of Artemis had taken up residence in God's church or the different doctrine in view in 1 Tim represents a syncretism of beliefs linked to God and Artemis cannot be determined conclusively. What is clear is that the evidence links the heresy to the rich and the Artemis cult.

Riches are the topic of the charge, which comes as a command. The rich are to abandon a high-minded perception of themselves and stop serving a pantheon of gods. Instead, they are to set their hope humbly and securely on their Benefactor God. They must adopt a new lifestyle of enjoying and sharing God's provision. In so doing, they will grasp life now and store up treasure for the future.

7.4.2. Reading the Text in light of a Pivotal Passage in the Gospels

The Gospels contains many teachings on riches. One pivotal passage, Mark 10:17-31 (cf. Matthew 19:16-30; Luke 18-18-30), will be examined here because scholars find it most difficult to harmonize with 1 Tim 6:17-19. Blomberg notes the tension.

Paul may not issue any of Jesus' wide-ranging or radical calls to abandon everything, although we have already argued that none of those calls was intended to be normative for all believers in the first place. But he does insist that Hellenistic Christians be equally counter-cultural in rejecting the systems of patronage and reciprocity so endemic to their culture. And he calls all believers to act as generous benefactors regardless of their net worth and with no thought of any material reward in this life.⁵⁹⁵

Was the "radical call" only for the rich man or does it apply to everyone? Likewise, does the command to the rich pertain only to rich Ephesians or does it have implications for everyone? Should Christians reject the systems of reciprocity and benefaction and adopt a whole new way of life in God's church? Here we will consider how might Mark 10:17-31 may aid us in answering these questions.

Andrew Clarke notes that scholars dating back to the third century CE have posited that because the rich man trusted in his riches, Jesus called *him* to sell them.⁵⁹⁶ The text, however, does not say that. Also, the prevailing view assumes that the rich man missed the kingdom. Again, the text does not say that. Consequently, our difficulty in interpreting this text may be clouded by our own perceptions. With the aid of Clement of Alexandria, Clarke suggests scholars have mistaken the rich man's *sorrow* for *rejection*, and in so doing, they have missed the point of the text: sharing riches is simply the way the rich demonstrate that they no longer hope in riches and that they have found life in God (cf. 1 Tim 6:17-19).⁵⁹⁷

In Mark 10:17, the rich man approaches Jesus seeking ζωής, "life" (cf. 1 Tim 6:19). After the two exchange comments, Mark 10:21-23 states:

²¹Jesus, looking at him, loved him and said, 'You lack one thing; go, sell what you own, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me.' ²²When he heard this, he was shocked and went away grieving, for he had many possessions. ²³Then Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, 'How hard it will be for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God!'

⁵⁹⁵ Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, 212.

⁵⁹⁶ Andrew D. Clarke, "Do not judge who is worthy and unworthy: Clement's warning not to speculate about the Rich Young Man's response." *JSNT* 31. 4 (2009): 447-68. *Italics* mine for emphasis of Clarke's point.

⁵⁹⁷ G.W. Butterworth, ed. and trans. *The Rich Man's Salvation by Clement of Alexandria*, 265-367. Cf. With the help of Clement, Clarke, "Do not judge who is worthy and unworthy," 447-68. argues convincingly that we must not confuse the "sorrow" with rejection of Jesus' invitation to the possibility of life. While it cannot be argued conclusively whether or not the rich man obeyed the commands of Jesus, to go, sell, give, come, and follow, we will find that the evidence is compelling *not* to assume the traditional position that favors rejection. We should not be to quick to judge the rich man who is being saved.

Jesus instructs the rich man to *go, sell, give, come, and follow*.⁵⁹⁸ Jesus further announces that for his obedience the rich man will have treasure in heaven. In response, the rich man went away grieving.

The key to locating the meaning of this text may be found in exploring the function of *λυπούμενος*, translated “grief, pain, sadness, or sorrow,”⁵⁹⁹ in other characters in the Markan narrative. Interestingly, sorrowful people in Mark’s Gospel persevere through the difficult work ahead of them. Grief does not hinder Herod, who was *περίλυπος*, “deeply grieved or exceedingly sorry,” from beheading John the Baptist (6:26). Sorrow does not stop Jesus, who was *περίλυπος*, “deeply grieved or very sorrowful,” from going to the cross (14:34). Consequently, we should not assume the rich man who went away *λυπούμενος*, “grieving or sorrowful,” did not follow the instructions of Jesus. That the rich man “went away” in response to Jesus’ command to go may actually represent the first indication of obedience (10:22).⁶⁰⁰

After the rich man’s departure, Jesus does not condemn him but sounds sympathetic in his response (v. 23): “How hard it will be for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God!” Jesus seems to understand precisely how difficult it will be for the rich man (cf. 2 Corinthians 8:9). Shortly thereafter, the text states that Peter testifies that the disciples had left everything (v. 28). In saying that they had “left everything,” the disciples should not be understood as left empty or with nothing *per se*, but rather should be envisioned as enjoying and sharing possessions out of a common purse (cf. John 13:29). At this point in the narrative, Jesus proclaims the reward for those who all who follow the same course (vv. 29-31).

²⁹Jesus said, ‘Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, ³⁰who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age—houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields, with persecutions—and in the age to come eternal life. ³¹But many who are first will be last, and the last will be first.’

⁵⁹⁸ Cf. George W. Buchanan, “Jesus and the Upper Class.” *NovT* 7 (1964/1965): 195-209.

⁵⁹⁹ *BAGD*, 481-82.

⁶⁰⁰ Clarke, “Do not judge who is worthy and unworthy,” 462-65, notes obedient responses in Matt 8:32; 28:10.

In ancient thinking, leaving family members or selling houses or fields may represent abandoning that which shaped a rich person's identity and gave them security. C.E.B. Cranfield notes, "what is gained will far outweigh what is lost."⁶⁰¹

We must note three points of comparison between Clarke's reading of Mark 10:17-31 and our assessment of 1 Tim 6:17-19 that aid us in interpreting this charge. First, the rich man comes to Jesus seeking life. Jesus instructs him to go, sell his possessions, and give the money to the poor. Clarke's interpretation reveals that it is plausible to interpret his sad departure as leaving with hard work to do. Alongside 1 Tim 6:17-19 the same difficult work may be envisioned: the rich are commanded to exhibit an alternative lifestyle of generosity and sharing. In both passages, the outcome of obedience is the same: the rich are offered the possibility of ζῶης.

Second, the call for the rich to share possessions comes with a purpose. When those with more than enough (the rich) share with who have less than enough (the poor) the sharing results not in emptiness but rather equality and enjoyment in community. We see this in Mark 10:31. Jesus subverts the cultural privileges associated with wealth and announces: "the first will be last and the last first."⁶⁰² This view of equality mirrors the sharing all around and in community expected of rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19.⁶⁰³

Third, obeying the imperatives set forth by Jesus would impact the rich man's relationships in the ancient world. It would change everything during life on earth and for eternity.⁶⁰⁴ Jesus promised the rich man a hundredfold provision now

⁶⁰¹ C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, CGTC (ed. C.F.D. Moule; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 333-34. Cf. the sale of property by Barnabas in Acts 4:32-37.

⁶⁰² In the Gospels, see also: Matt 19:30; 20:16; Luke 13:30. Cf. *Barnabas* 6:13; *Gospel of Thomas* 4. Cf. James R. Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 317, notes, "God topples our cherished priorities and demands of disciples new ones. It takes from those who follow Jesus things they would keep, and gives to them things they could not imagine."

⁶⁰³ Philip H. Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus*, IVPNTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994) 146-49, notes the parallels between this teaching and the Jesus tradition in Matt 6:24 and the Pauline tradition in 2 Cor 8-9.

⁶⁰⁴ Sondra Ely Wheeler, *Wealth as Peril and Obligation: the New Testament on Possessions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 39-56, notes on 47: "Three things are especially noteworthy. First, is that the form obedience takes explicitly includes both leaving and following. Second, the leaving referred to is not some kind of inner detachment of the soul from objects still in possession, but a perfect literal departure from literal objects, places, and people. It is the concrete abandonment of one life for the sake of another. Finally, it is of more than passing

(10:30) as well as treasure in heaven and eternal life (10:21, 30). Likewise, those who obey the command to the rich in 1 Tim 6:19 grasp life now and are promised a treasure of a sure foundation for the future.⁶⁰⁵ The language of these two sets of instructions sounds synonymous, as the promises of life and reward are linked to the present life as well as life eternal.⁶⁰⁶ The command to the rich in both texts is clear: to demonstrate faith and hope in God through sharing.⁶⁰⁷

If accepted, these points of comparison reveal how Mark 10:17-31 relates to all who are rich. This analysis also shows how the command to the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19 can be interpreted as *consistent* with this pivotal passage in the Gospels.

7.4.3. Reading the Text in light of Teaching from the Pauline Tradition

We must also determine if 1 Tim 6:17-19 can be interpreted as *consistent* with the primary passage that contains teachings on riches within the Pauline tradition, 2 Corinthians 8-9. Interestingly, the same three themes surface in this text.

First, the objective of equality is clearly presented. In urging the Corinthians to participate in the Jerusalem collection, 2 Corinthians 8:13-15 states:

¹³I do not mean that there should be relief for others and pressure on you, but it is a question of a fair balance between ¹⁴your present abundance and their need, so that their abundance may be for your need, in order that there may be a fair balance. ¹⁵As it is written, 'The one who had much did not have too much, and the one who had little did not have too little.'

Gerald Bray cites the view of Ambrosiaster to suggest that this text outlines the reason for sharing between the churches: voluntary sharing between those with abundance and those who lack resources moves toward the goal of equality.⁶⁰⁸

importance that Peter speaks in the first person plural as part of the group of disciples. While the one who refuses goes his way alone, to heed the call is to become one of the community of followers."

⁶⁰⁵ David Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 239-40, makes the connection between the charge to the rich and Jesus' radical call to give away ones goods.

⁶⁰⁶ Cf. Warren W. Wiersbe, *Be Rich: Are You Losing the Things that Money Can't Buy? An Expository Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1976). Cf. Matt 6:19-20.

⁶⁰⁷ For ancient voices that echo this perspective, see: Thomas C. Oden and Christopher A. Hall, ed., *Mark*. ACCS, vol. II (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998) 137-39.

⁶⁰⁸ Gerald Bray, ed., *1-2 Corinthians*. ACCS, vol. VII (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999) 271; cf. Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Paul's Epistles* (CSEL 81.3:261): "The saints, with their hope in the world to

Second, the source of the provision intended for sharing is not rich human benefactors but God. 2 Corinthians 9:8 states: "And God is able to provide you with every blessing in abundance, so that by always having enough of everything, you may share abundantly in every good work." As in 1 Tim 6:17, God is depicted as the Provider. The rationale for the rich to share generously in both texts is not based on their human capability but God's unlimited ability.⁶⁰⁹

Third, in both texts, when those who possess an excess of financial resources demonstrate obedience to these instructions and a lifestyle of enjoyment and sharing, they show they have taken hold of life in God. On this final note, the climactic language of 2 Corinthians 9:13-15 seems to echo the message of 1 Tim 6:17-19.

¹³Through the testing of this ministry you glorify God by your obedience to the confession of the gospel of Christ and by the generosity of your sharing with them and with all others, ¹⁴while they long for you and pray for you because of the surpassing grace of God that he has given you. ¹⁵Thanks be to God for his indescribable gift!

Those who exhibit obedience and generosity show that they have experienced the surpassing grace of God. What is God's indescribable gift (v. 15)? It is an synonymous expression for that which the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19 grasp for their obedience: life in God.⁶¹⁰

As parallel themes emerge in both texts, we can conclude that 1 Tim 6:17-19 though much shorter than the teaching in 2 Corinthians 8-9, can be interpreted as *consistent* with this related text from the Pauline tradition.

7.4.4. Reading the Text in light of the Early Church in Ephesus

The Early Church in the NT and the Apostolic Fathers presents followers of Jesus living out their faith through generosity that is similar to the behavior envisioned in

come, have more than those who appear to be rich in this world. But both will be made equal, because those who give of their wealth to help the saints now will be helped by them at some future time, when they are in need."

⁶⁰⁹ R. Kent Hughes, *2 Corinthians: Power in Weakness*, Preaching the Word (Wheaton: Crossway, 2006) 175, notes: "The challenge for us is not our wealth or lack of it, but belief and obedience. The generous, giving heart will live in this grace... There will always be enough to be generous."

⁶¹⁰ Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1997) 448-49.

1 Tim 6:17-19 in light of *Ephesiaca*.⁶¹¹ Of interest to this study is whether or not there is evidence that such deeds were practiced in the Early Church in Ephesus.

In Revelation 2:2, the letter to the church in Ephesus announces: “I know your works (ἔργα), your toil and your patient endurance...” This testimony states that Ephesian Christians had been known for their deeds. Revelation 2:5a, however, continues: “repent, and do the works (ἔργα) you did at first.” As cultural forces may have adversely influenced their behavior, the letter exhorts them to return to works that maintain the testimony of Christ either to the point of death or the eschaton.⁶¹²

A similar exhortation surfaces in the Apostolic Fathers. In his letter to the church in Ephesus, Ignatius of Antioch also emphasizes deeds (cf. 1 Tim 6:18).⁶¹³ “Constantly pray for others; for there is still hope that they may repent so as to attain to God. And so, allow them to learn from you, at least by your deeds (ἔργων)” (*To the Ephesians* 10). This echoes the generosity called for in 1 Tim 6:17-19, and interestingly, obedience assists others in attaining to God.⁶¹⁴

7.4.5. Summary

Sacred texture reveals God as our Benefactor and Hope who provides all things richly. The rich are commanded to humbly enjoy and share God’s provision. In so doing, they take hold of life now and store up treasure for themselves for the future.

⁶¹¹ In Acts 2:42-45, the picture of sharing all things in common in the early Jewish Christian community mirrors the sharing at the end of *Ephesiaca*; again, voluntary divestiture results not in emptiness but harmonious equality. Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977); Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia Fortress Press, 1980). Sharing appears again in Acts 4:32-37 with the example of Barnabas, as Peterson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 207, notes: “When he humbly places the proceeds at the apostles’ feet, he forgoes the usual social benefit of praise and public honor. In effect, his donation is a private contribution to the common purse. With this narrative, Luke encourages others with wealth and status in the church to cross social barriers and benefit those in need.” Barnabas is not portrayed as functioning as benefactor *per se* but seems to take the posture of a servant, and his generosity demonstrates his faith in God. Cf. Richard A. Horsley, *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All*, 1st ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009) 141-43. Though this behavior may also find parallels in communal living in Hebrew, Jewish, or Hellenistic-Jewish settings, it reflects the language and behavior called for by Jesus in the Gospels and echoed in 1 Tim.

⁶¹² Stephen Finamore, *God, Order, and Chaos: René Girard and the Apocalypse*, PBM (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009) 146.

⁶¹³ Ignatius of Antioch was arrested under Trajan (98-117 CE) and taken from Syria to Rome where he would eventually be martyred. En route, he visited Christians and wrote letters to encourage their perseverance.

⁶¹⁴ Cf. Peter Gorday, ed., *Colossians, 1-2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*. ACCS, vol. IX (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000) 223-26.

We compared our findings from 1 Tim 6:17-19 with a pivotal passage in the Gospels, Mark 10:17-31, because scholars have found it difficult to reconcile these texts. With the aid of Clarke and Clement of Alexandria, we determined that perhaps the difficulty has been linked to mistaking the rich man's *sorrow* for *rejection*. We found that three parallel insights came into view in the analysis. Both texts suggest that the rich demonstrate their hope in God through sharing. Additionally, these passages envision equality as the objective of sharing. Lastly, both texts promise the possibility of life now as well as eternal reward. In the end, we concluded that these texts apply to all who are rich and can be interpreted consistently.

In turning our attention to the Pauline tradition, we considered 2 Corinthians 8-9 alongside the charge to the rich, and the same three insights emerged. The rich must voluntarily share with a view toward equality. They must exhibit good deeds not as benefactors *per se*, but as distributors of God's generous provision. Lastly, the generous lifestyle demonstrates the obedience of the rich and shows they have taken hold of the indescribable gift of life in Jesus. We concluded that 2 Corinthians 8-9 and 1 Tim 6:17-19 can also be interpreted consistently. Though they reflect different NT contexts and situations, they contain synonymous messages.

Did rich Ephesians obey this charge? Letters linked to Early Church in Ephesus (Revelation 2:1-7 and Ignatius of Antioch, *To the Ephesians*) attest to their deeds. Additionally, these letters exhort the Ephesians to persist in doing them as a witness until martyrdom or the *parousia*, in order that others too may attain to God.

The rich cannot ignore this charge. Johnson believes that sharing possessions is what faith demands.⁶¹⁵ Rodney Stark has shown that Christian sharing was a key factor that caused the gospel to become influential throughout the ancient world.⁶¹⁶

⁶¹⁵ Johnson, *Sharing Possessions*, 73-107.

⁶¹⁶ Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997) 3-27.

7.5. Conclusion: Reading 1 Tim 6:17-19 in light of *Ephesiaca*

The aim of this chapter has been to scrutinize 1 Tim 6:17-19 alongside ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca* to gain fresh insight for NT interpretation.

Inner texture analysis revealed three interpretive issues: (1) On prohibitions: Are Christians to serve as generous benefactors? Are they to abandon the institution of benefaction altogether seeing God as Benefactor and freely share *His* benefits? Or should they function somewhere in between? (2) Regarding expectations: What is envisioned in the enjoyment and sharing of resources? How do these expectations compare to fundamental assumptions about wealth and civic obligation in the Greco-Roman world? Might this charge represent counter-cultural instructions for rich Christians to enjoy and share God's provision with equality in view? (3) On the charge: Is this command intended to eliminate socioeconomic diversity or is that merely a byproduct that results from obedience? Is this charge essentially exhorting the rich to shift from setting their hope on uncertain riches to trusting in God and demonstrating that faith through generous sharing?

Intertexture analysis explored terms common to 1 Tim 6:17-19 and *Ephesiaca*. Three points emerged for addressing the interpretive challenges: (1) Handling riches by way of the benefactor model causes characters in *Ephesiaca* to exhibit haughtiness and their hope can be traced to the gods and their financial condition. Thus, the charge in 1 Tim 6:17-19 seems to call the rich out of the cultural institution of benefaction attested by some ancient sources as contributing to haughtiness and to set their hope on God. (2) The sharing of possessions in *Ephesiaca* results in characters portrayed as "partners in everything." Those who shared their riches are not left empty but are found enjoying harmonious equality. From this perspective, the sharing called for in 1 Tim 6:17-19 seems to instruct the rich to share with a view to equality. (3) In *Ephesiaca*, the main characters, though

rich, are depicted as fearful of the future living in a world of *uncertainty*.

Alternatively, the charge invites them to experience life in God that is *certain*.

Ideological texture considered the implications of our findings for the author, audience, and culture. Athenaeus, an ancient historian, provides a view of the rich in Ephesus that mirrors the perspective of Xenophon of Ephesus. In Athenaeus' thinking: rich benefactors love honor and often display haughtiness; they love living in luxury; and, they desire a virtuous reputation, in order to preserve their social location. Alongside on these testimonies, the charge in 1 Tim 6:17-19 represents a call to a radically different lifestyle. Also, the *Ephesia grammata* and Acts 19 provide further evidence that links the rich to Artemis and magic in this historical setting. Despite the costs and implications of such commitments, converts who find life in Christ sever their ties with Artemis and magic.

Sacred texture located God centrally within this charge as our Benefactor and Hope. Rich Ephesians are the recipients of this counter-cultural message to enjoy and share God's provision. In so doing they demonstrate that they have fixed their hope in God, and taken hold of life. We tested this interpretation first alongside a pivotal passage in the Gospels, Mark 10:17-31. We found that both messages can be understood consistently based on Clarke's interpretation of Mark 10:17-31, which reveals that the prevailing view of this text may be misinterpreting the rich man's *sorrow for rejection*. If accepted, we found that Jesus' instructions to the rich man pertain to all who are rich. In both texts, sharing that envisions equality comes into view, the function of good deeds is to demonstrate faith and obedience, and the outcome for the rich is the possibility of life now as well as eternal reward. We also determined that 2 Corinthians 8-9 can be understood as *consistent* with 1 Tim 6:17-19. In both texts, the sharing in view leads to equality, it is fueled by our Benefactor God, and those who exhibit such generosity demonstrate that they have taken hold

of life. To determine if rich Ephesians may have responded to this command, we viewed two letters linked to Early Church in Ephesus. We discovered that Ephesians had become known for their deeds and were exhorted to return to them as a witness and to help others attain to God. All who are rich must humbly follow the instructions set forth in this charge because life depends on it, and obedience may lead others to find life in God.

IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has demonstrated that the teachings on riches in 1 Tim can be interpreted as *consistent* with the trajectory of other NT teachings on riches when examined in light of ancient material in general and *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus in particular. This task was accomplished through research guided by a socio-rhetorical methodology. This section summarizes the contribution of this study to 1 Tim scholarship and suggests areas for further research.

Chapter One introduced *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus and the methodology for examining it alongside 1 Tim. *Ephesiaca* has received little attention in NT scholarship because for about two centuries it was considered a second or third century CE document. Recent scholarship has dated it to the mid-first century CE. With a provenance of Ephesus, this locates *Ephesiaca* in broadly the same timeframe and setting as Luke places the ministry of the Apostle Paul in Acts of the Apostles.

Part of the debate on interpreting the teachings on riches in 1 Tim has centered on language that is rare or difficult to interpret. Thus, this study employed a model that has proved useful for discerning how terms and themes in *texts* may have been understood in ancient *contexts*: a socio-rhetorical methodology developed by Vernon K. Robbins. Simultaneously, this project avoided the issue of the authorship of 1 Tim, which cannot be determined conclusively.

The socio-rhetorical methodology is comprised of five textures or parts: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture, and sacred texture. Following the suggestion of Robbins for studies like this, the order of the textures was altered. Analysis of social and cultural texture came first, mapping the *context* of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE that preceded the *texts* of 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca* (chapter two). From there, we applied the four remaining textures to

five passages: 1 Tim 2:9-10 (chapter three); 3:1-13 (chapter four); 6:1-2a (chapter five); 6:2b-10 (chapter six); and 6:17-19 (chapter seven).

Chapter Two sketched the social and cultural texture. This phase of analysis located the *Sitz im Leben* of the rich in Ephesus in the first century CE based on ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca*. The testimony of Xenophon of Ephesus brought to life what is known from other ancient sources and added much to our knowledge.

Ephesiaca demonstrates the centrality of Artemis in the life of rich Ephesians with vivid detail. It features their participation in social realities such as leading processions and seeking oracles. The story depicts the expectations and obligations of rich Ephesians in service to the gods. It also presents prominent youth being trained as *Ephebes* and highlights the roles they expected to attain as a result of their wealth and status. Xenophon of Ephesus portrays how the rich belonged to the city and the city belonged to them.

Additionally, *Ephesiaca* illustrates the social rules and cultural fixtures of the ancient world found in numerous other sources. Using literary devices such as repetition, Xenophon of Ephesus urges conformity to those rules for maintaining honor, preserving identity, and securing social status in society. The story also presents prominent citizens extending beneficence and expecting honor in return, while avoiding envy and staying pure by performing rituals dictated by the culture, especially those that honor Artemis and the gods.

Chapter Three scrutinized 1 Tim 2:9-10 as women with wealth are in view. Scholars have been divided on interpreting the meaning of the prohibitions and expectations in this text due to limited ancient evidence. These questions surfaced: Is the text instructing women to follow prevailing norms for modesty? Are they to avoid dressing like “new Roman women” or prostitutes? Or may this teaching refer to other social realities in Ephesus?

In *Ephesiaca*, Anthia, the daughter of wealthy citizens, leads the annual procession dressed sumptuously *as Artemis* wearing a hairstyle employing the rare term, **πλέγμασιν**, translated as “plaits or braids.” This word also appears as a prohibited hairstyle in 1 Tim 2:9-10 linked to the social expectation of Ephesian women linked to Artemis. Based on this and other evidence, 1 Tim 2:9-10 can be understood as instructing rich Christian women to radically counter-cultural behavior. Instead of following the social expectations to honor Artemis, they are to exhibit modest decorum and good deeds to demonstrate their piety to God. Interestingly, the piety and deeds called for in 1 Tim 2:9-10 are illustrated by three leading Christian women in Luke’s Acts: Dorcas, Lydia, and Priscilla.

Chapter Four examined the themes of *greed* and *stewardship* that surface in the leadership qualifications lists of 1 Tim 3:1-13. Because the terms in this text are also found in leadership qualifications and virtue/vice lists in antiquity, many have posited that God’s church was adopting the thinking of the moral philosophers and conforming to societal norms for appointing religious leaders. In reviewing ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca*, we came to a different conclusion.

Rich Ephesians expected to ascend to religious leadership roles *not* based on character qualifications but related to noble birth. Pious service to the Artemis cult *and* Rome assured they would retain those roles. Also, ancient Ephesian evidence and *Ephesiaca* revealed that religious leaders functioning by way of the benefactor model were motivated by shameful gain. Leadership appointments and the model for service in God’s church were to follow a new pattern.

The fresh perspective on 1 Tim 3:1-13 we discovered would have had radically counter-cultural and subversive implications in Ephesus where the rich nobility owned the religious leadership roles, and the religious leadership roles owned the rich nobility. This fresh interpretation would also have been antithetical

to the message of *Ephesiaca*, which appears as a sacred writing, a *hieros logos*, seeking to preserve the sacred identity and cultural rules of Ephesus.

Elsewhere in the NT, leaders of God's church are called to avoid greed and exchange the benefactor model for a new fixture characterized by humble service. Religious leadership appointments in God's church will not be linked to noble birth but godly character. Their service is not for personal gain but for God's glory, and they may retain their roles not by being pious benefactors, but rather, by exhibiting faithful stewardship.

Chapter Five focused on a disputed phrase in 1 Tim 6:1-2a, which contains benefaction language that has been viewed from two perspectives: "Masters as Benefactors" or "Slaves as Benefactors." As both positions have valid and yet contradictory evidence in antiquity, rather than pick one of those positions for reading the text, we determined that a third alternative, the "God as Benefactor" view, seemed more compelling based on ancient evidence and *Ephesiaca*.

We discovered that, in ancient thinking, beneficence flowed from divine sources, and the honor of the divine benefactor must always be preserved. Thus, 1 Tim 6:1-2a can be interpreted as calling slaves to serve their masters, not because the masters will benefit from their beneficence, and not because the slaves benefit from the beneficence of their masters, but because they are fellow partakers of God's beneficence. Such behavior preserves the honor of God, the Benefactor.

This interpretation of these instructions would have been understood as counter-cultural in a social setting where the gods, the emperor, and leading citizens with divine ties were accustomed to receiving all glory and honor. It also sounds *consistent* with other NT teachings on slaves and masters. In God's church, status distinctions had been erased. People were now on an equal plane. Recipients of

God's kindness must honor the name of God and obey the teachings of God by enjoying and sharing His kindnesses in a manner that brings Him glory.

Chapter Six scrutinized 1 Tim 6:2b-10 in three sections: εὐσεβεία, the wise sayings, and the role of the rich in propagating myths in ancient Ephesus. Rather than merely read this section through the lens of the moral philosophers or the conglomeration of religious traditions they seem to echo, we found that Ephesian evidence revealed that the polemic might be targeting the thinking and behavior of the rich who sought to preserve their roles and the religious reputation of Ephesus.

In 1 Tim 6:2b-10, false teachers are presented as lovers of money who desire to stay rich. Ephesian evidence and *Ephesiaca* presents greedy religious leaders linked to Artemis and the gods as pious pretenders serving for shameful gain. We determined that they might represent the false teachers in view in 1 Tim 6:2b-10. They gained by serving the Artemis cult, and the Artemis cult gained from their service. Furthermore, in looking at terms throughout 1 Tim and *Ephesiaca*, a plausible explanation for the message of the false teachers also came to light.

Xenophon of Ephesus promotes a different doctrine than the gospel of Jesus Christ that exalts Artemis and the gods as the source of salvation. Rich Ephesians hearing 1 Tim would lose their profitable perch if they ceased serving the goddess and stopped promoting her myths. The sound words of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only source of salvation in the NT, stand in stark contrast to the counterfeit faith of the greedy false teachers. Rather than serve for gain and riches, which may have led some to abandon the faith due to social pressures linked to cultural expectations, Christians must be content with basic provisions as noted in other NT texts.

Chapter Seven looked at the charge to the rich in 1 Tim 6:17-19. The rich in the present world of Ephesus were commanded to abandon haughtiness, behavior often associated with benefactors in antiquity. They must also stop setting their hope

on uncertain riches, which likely would have been stored up in the Artemisium.

Instead they are to put their hope in God.

Similar to the structure and sound of an Ephesian benefaction inscription, the charge exalts God as the One who richly provides everything for universal enjoyment, not human benefactors. Then, with a series of infinitives, the rich are instructed to enjoy *and* share God's provision. Ironically in *Ephesiaca* and other examples in antiquity, the sharing of resources does not leave the characters empty but experiencing harmonious equality. Also, the rhetoric in the purpose clause in the charge to the rich appears to explain why they must obey this command: it is the only way to grasp real or certain life.

Alongside other NT instructions to the rich regarding sharing, we determined that the findings can be interpreted consistently. God is the sole Benefactor and Hope for everyone, including the wealthy. Rich Christians must enjoy and share all God provides, which is expressed in language that reflects a Pauline trajectory with equality as a goal. Demonstrating faith through good deeds and generous sharing with the goal of equality is what the Gospels and the Pauline tradition command. For the rich, life depends on it.

NT researchers have much to learn by studying *Ephesiaca* further. Others hopefully will revisit Xenophon of Ephesus to shed light on other NT terms or themes that are rare in antiquity. As *Ephesiaca* shaped other Greek writings such as *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, new insight may be gained by scrutinizing this story alongside Luke-Acts, the PE, or other NT books. The salvation scenes and miraculous stories of deliverance in *Ephesiaca* bear striking resemblance to the miracles, adventures, crucifixion, and resurrection accounts in NT writings, though of course, Xenophon of Ephesus calls for faith in opposing deities. What could be uncovered by such study? We will leave that question for others to research.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

Ancient Literary Sources and Epigraphic Collections

Ancient Literary Sources

Achilles Tattius, <i>Leucippe and Clitophon</i>	-----, <i>To You Has the Poor Man Abandoned Himself, You Will Be Guardian for the Orphan</i>
Acts of Paul and Thecla	Barnabas
Aelius Aristides, <i>Oration</i> s	Callimachus, <i>Hymns</i>
Alciphro	Chrysostom, <i>Homily 18 on First Timothy</i>
Anacharsis, <i>To Croesus</i>	Cicero, <i>De Inventione</i>
Antipater of Sidon, <i>Greek Anthology</i>	-----, <i>De Natura Deorum</i>
Apollodorus Comicus	-----, <i>In Rhetoric</i>
Apollonius of Tyre	-----, <i>Letters to Atticus</i>
Apollonius of Tyana, <i>Letter</i>	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Paedagogus</i>
Aristophanes, <i>Fragment</i>	-----, <i>The Rich Man's Salvation</i>
Aristotle, <i>The Art of Rhetoric</i>	-----, <i>Stromata</i>
-----, <i>Metaphysics</i>	Clement of Rome, <i>1 Clement</i>
-----, <i>Nichomachean Ethics</i>	-----, <i>2 Clement</i>
-----, <i>Politics</i>	<i>De Gnomologio Vaticano inedito</i>
Athenaeus, <i>The Diepnosophists</i>	Dead Sea Scrolls, <i>1QS</i>
Augustine, <i>Do Not Delay to Turn to the Lord, nor Put It Off from Day to Day</i>	Didache
-----, <i>Eight Beatitudes in the Gospel</i>	Dio Chrysostom, <i>On Kingship</i>
-----, <i>On the Birthday of the Holy Scillitan Martyrs</i>	-----, <i>Oration</i>
-----, <i>On the Words of the Apostle, Galatians 6:2-5: Bear Your Burdens for Each Other</i>	Diodorus Siculus
-----, <i>On the Words of the Gospel of Matthew 7:7-11: Ask and You Will Be Given</i>	Diogenes Laertius, <i>Lives</i>
	Epictetus, <i>Discourses</i>
	-----, <i>The Enchiridion</i>
	-----, <i>Fragment</i>
	Euripides, <i>Ion</i>

----- . <i>Iphigenia in Aulis</i>	----- . <i>Timon</i>
----- . <i>Orestes</i>	Marcus Aurelius, <i>Meditations</i>
Eusebius, <i>Church History</i>	Martyrdom of Polycarp
Eustathius, <i>Commentarii Ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem Codicis Laurentiani editi</i>	Menander, <i>Dyskolos</i>
Heliodorus, <i>Aethiopica</i>	----- . <i>Fragment</i>
Herodotus, <i>Persian Wars</i>	Æcumenius of Tricca, <i>Pauli Apostoli Ad Timotheum Prior Epistola</i>
Hesiod, <i>Theogony of Hesiod</i>	Onasander, <i>De Imperatoris Officio</i>
----- . <i>Works and Days</i>	Origen, <i>In Johannem</i>
Himerios, <i>Oration</i>	Pausanias, <i>Guide to Greece</i>
Hippocrates, <i>Of the Epidemics</i>	Persius
Homer, <i>Iliad</i>	Philo, <i>Dreams</i>
----- . <i>The Odyssey</i>	----- . <i>Drunkeness</i>
Horace, <i>Odes</i>	----- . <i>Embassy to Gaius</i>
----- . <i>Satires</i>	----- . <i>Every Good Man Is Free</i>
Ignatius of Antioch, <i>To Polycarp</i>	----- . <i>Life of Moses</i>
----- . <i>To the Ephesians</i>	----- . <i>Noah's Work as a Planter</i>
Isocrates, <i>To Demonicus</i>	----- . <i>On Rewards and Punishments</i>
Josephus, <i>Antiquities</i>	----- . <i>On the Change of Names</i>
----- . <i>Jewish War</i>	----- . <i>On the Virtues</i>
----- . <i>Life</i>	----- . <i>The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain</i>
Julius Caesar, <i>Civil Wars</i>	----- . <i>Special Laws</i>
Juvenal, <i>Satires</i>	----- . <i>That the Worse Is Wont to Attack the Better</i>
Libanius, <i>Progymnasmata</i>	Plato, <i>Cratylus</i>
Lucian, <i>De Saltatione</i>	----- . <i>Greek Anthology</i>
----- . <i>Navigium</i>	

----- . *Laws*

----- . *Protagoras*

----- . *Republic*

----- . *Timaeus*

Pliny, *Letters*

----- . *Natural History*

Plotina, *Letter*

Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom*

----- . *Alexander*

----- . *Listening to Lectures*

----- . *Marcus Cato*

----- . *Moralia*

----- . *On Envy and Hate*

----- . *Talkativeness*

Polybius, *Histories*

Polycarp, *To the Philippians*

Pomponius Mela, *De Chorographia*

Pseudo-Clement, *Homilies*

Pseudo-Ignatius, *Epistola ad Heronem*

Pseudo-Phocylides, *Sentences*

Sallust, *De Coniuratione Catilinae*

Seneca, *Ad Helviam*

----- . *On Benefits*

----- . *Letters*

----- . *Moral Epistles*

----- . *Quaestiones Naturales*

----- . *On the Virtues*

Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudes*

Sibylline Oracles

Stobaeus, *Eclog*

Strabo, *Geography*

Suda

Suetonius, *Augustus*

----- . *Tiberius*

Tacitus, *Annals*

Tertullian, *On an Exhortation to Chastity*

The Testament of Judah

The Testament of Reuben

Xenophon of Ephesus, *Ephesiaca*

----- . *The City of the Ephesians*

Yoma

Epigraphic Collections

BMEA

CIG

GIBM

IGR

IvE

OGIS

SIG



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

Bibliography

- Abbott, Frank Frost, and Allan Chester Johnson. *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1926.
- Abbott, Thomas K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897.
- Akerman, John Yonge. *Numismatic Illustrations of the Narrative Portions of the New Testament*. Argonaut Library of Antiquities. Chicago: Argonaut, 1966.
- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality: The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Anderson, Graham. "Xenophon of Ephesus: An Ephesian Tale." In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, edited by B.P. Reardon. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Ando, Clifford. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Arichea, Daniel C., and Howard A. Hatton. *A Handbook on Paul's Letters to Timothy and to Titus*. United Bible Society Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies, 1995.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Ephesians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Clinton E. Arnold. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- , *Ephesians: Power and Magic – The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of its Historical Setting*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- Aurenhammer, Maria. "Sculptures of Gods and Heroes from Ephesos." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1997.
- Barrett, Charles K. *The Pastoral Epistles in the New English Bible, with Introduction and Commentary*. New Clarendon Bible Commentary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Bartchy, S. Scott. *First Century Slavery and 1 Corinthians 7:21*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Bartsch, Hans W. *Die Anfänge Urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen: Studien Zu Den Pastoralbriefen*. Hamburg: Reich, 1965.
- Basore, John W., ed. and trans. *Seneca: Moral Essays III*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 310, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

- Bassler, Jouette M. "Book Review: *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* by Vernon K. Robbins." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 341.
- . *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 59. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
- . *God & Mammon: Asking for Money in the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- Baugh, Steven M. "Cult Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42, 3 (1999).
- . "A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century." In *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Die Sogenannten Pastoralbriefe Des Apostels Paulus*. Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1835.
- Baxter, Richard. *The Reformed Pastor*. Edited by William Brown. 5th ed. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1862.
- Best, Ernest. *Ephesians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Material Possessions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Blomberg, Craig L., and Mariam J. Kamell. *James*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Clinton E. Arnold. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- . *Luke*. The IVP New Testament Commentary Series, edited by Grant R. Osborne. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994.
- Boeckh, Augustine, ed. *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*. 4 vols. Berlin: Reimer, 1828-77.
- Bowie, Ewen. "The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B. E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions." *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002): 47-63.
- Bray, Gerald, ed. *1-2 Corinthians*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, edited by Thomas C. Oden, vol. VII. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999.

- Bremmer, Jan N. "Priestly Personnel of the Ephesian Artemision: Anatolian, Persian, Greek and Roman Aspects." (2008). Published electronically 30 March 2009. http://theol.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/FILES/root/2008/Priestly_1/Bremmer-Priests.pdf
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2004.
- Broughton, T. Robert S. "Roman Asia." In *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, edited by Tenney Frank. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938.
- Brox, Norbert. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1969.
- Buchanan, George W. "Jesus and the Upper Class." *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1964/1965): 195-209.
- Bürger, Gottfried. "Zu Xenophon Von Ephesus." *Hermes* 27 (1892): 36-67.
- Burrell, Barbara. *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Butterworth, G.W., ed. and trans. *The Rich Man's Salvation by Clement of Alexandria*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 92, Cambridge. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Byington, Steven T. "I Timothy VI,10." *Expository Times* 56 (1944): 54.
- Cagnat, René, ed. *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes avctoritate et impensis Adademiae inscriptionvm et litterarvm hvmaniorvm collectae et editae*. 4 vols. Paris: E. Leroux. 1852-1937.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1846.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. "Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe." In *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1963.
- Chang, Steven S. H. *Fundraising in Corinth: A Socio-Economic Study of the Corinthian Church, the Pauline Collection and 2 Corinthians*. Department of Divinity and Religious Studies. Unpublished PhD: University of Aberdeen, 2000.
- Charles, J. Daryl. "Vice and Virtue Lists." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, edited by S. E. Porter and C.A. Evans. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Chow, John K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

- . "Patronage in Roman Corinth." In *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1997.
- Clarke, Andrew D. "Do Not Judge Who Is Worthy and Unworthy: Clement's Warning Not to Speculate About the Rich Young Man's Response." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31, 4 (2009): 447-68.
- . *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Classen, Carl Joachim. *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, vol. 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, edited by Harold W. Attridge. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, Raymond F. *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- . "Marriage (NT)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 4 (1992): 569-72.
- Countryman, L. William. *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations*. New York: E. Mellen Press, 1980.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary, edited by C.F.D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Curnow, Trevor. *The Oracles of the Ancient World: A Comprehensive Guide*. London: Duckworth Archaeology, 2004.
- Daley, Brian E. "Position and Patronage in the Early Church." *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1993): 529-53.
- Dalmeyda, Georges, ed. *Xénophon D'ephèse: Les Ephésiaques*. Paris: Budé, 1924.
- . *Xénophon D'éphèse. Les Éphésiaques ou le Roman d'Habrocomès et d'Anthia*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton, 1982.
- Davids, Peter H. *The Epistle of James*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . *The First Epistle of Peter*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

- de Sales, Francis. *Introduction to the Devout Life*. Edited by Allan Ross. Mineola: Dover, 2009.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927.
- deSilva, David Arthur. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 152. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Urchristentum Und Kultur*. Heidelberg: C. Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928.
- Dibelius, Martin, and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. Translated by Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, edited by Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae. Supplementum sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1903-05.
- . *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Vol 2. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1883.
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm, Hiller von Gaetringen, and Friedrich Freiherr, eds. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1915.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Donelson, Lewis R. *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Dornier, Pierre. *Les Épîtres Pastorales*. Paris: Gabalda, 1958.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Dschulnigg, Peter. "Warnung von Reichtum und Ermahnung der Reichen: 1 Tim 6, 6-10. 17-19 m Rahmen des Schlussteils 6, 3-21." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 37 (1993): 60-77.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dutch, Robert S. *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians: Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman Context*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

- Easton, Burton Scott. *The Pastoral Epistles: Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Word Studies*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.
- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel According to Mark*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Ehrman, Bart D., ed. and trans. *Apostolic Fathers I*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Eichhorn, Johann G. *Einleitung in Das Neue Testament*. Vol. 3 Leipzig: Weidmanischen Buchhandlung, 1812.
- Ellicott, Charles J. *A Critical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. 2nd ed. London: John W. Parker & Son, 1859.
- Elliott, John H. "Patronage and Clientage." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- . "Patronage and Clientism in Early Christian Society: A Short Reading Guide." *Forum* 3/4 (1987): 39-48.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Fee, Gordon D. *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*. New International Biblical Commentary. 2nd ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Finamore, Stephen. *God, Order, and Chaos: René Girard and the Apocalypse*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.
- Finley, Moses I., and Brent D. Shaw. *Ancient Slavery & Modern Ideology*. Princeton: Markus Wiener, 1998.
- Fiore, Benjamin. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- . *The Pastoral Epistles*. Sacra Pagina, edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Vol. 12, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Flavel, John. "Mystery of Providence." In *The Whole Works of the Rev. Mr. John Flavel, Late Minister of the Gospel at Dartmouth, Devon*. London: W. Baynes and Son, 1820.
- Frank, Tenney, ed. *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. Vol. IV. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938.
- Friesen, Steven. "The Cult of the Roman Emperors in Ephesos: Temple Wardens, City Titles and the Interpretation of the Revelation of John." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.

- . *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia, and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Furfey, Paul H. "ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ and Cognates in the New Testament." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 5 (1943): 241-63.
- Gaebelein, A.C. *The Gospel of Matthew: An Exposition*. New York: Our Hope Publication Office, 1910.
- Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975.
- Garland, David E. *Luke*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Clinton E. Arnold. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Garnsey, Peter. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Garnsey, Peter, and Richard Saller. "Patronal Power Relations." In *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1997.
- Gärtner, Hans. "Xenophon of Ephesos." *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* IX, A2 (1967): 2055-89.
- Gilfillan Upton, Bridget. *Hearing Mark's Endings: Listening to Ancient Popular Texts through Speech Act Theory*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Gnanavaram, M. *Treasure in Heaven and Treasure on Earth*. ISPCK: The India Club, Inc., 2008.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *A Commentary on 1 Peter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Gorday, Peter, ed., *Colossians, 1-2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, edited by Thomas C. Oden, vol. IX. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Gülzow, Henneke. *Christentum und Sklaverei in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Bonn: Habelt, 1969.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1930.
- Guthrie, Donald. *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Vol. 14, Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2007.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.

- Hägg, Tomas. "Die Ephesiaka des Xenophon of Ephesus: Original or Epitome?" *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966): 118-61.
- . "The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesus." *Eranos Jahrbuch* 69 (1971): 25-59.
- . *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesus, and Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm: Svenska institutet i Athen, 1971.
- . *The Novel in Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Haight, Elizabeth Hazelton. *Essays on the Greek Romances*. New York: Longmans & Company, 1943.
- Hands, A. R. *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1968.
- Hanson, A. T. *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles*. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Hanson, Kenneth C. "BTB Reader's Guide: Kinship." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24 (1994): 183-94.
- . "Kinship." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Harding, Mark. *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*. New York: Peter Lang, 1998.
- . *What Are They Saying About the Pastoral Epistles?* New York: Paulist Press, 2001.
- Harland, Philip A. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- . *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities*. New York: T & T Clark, 2009.
- . "Honours and Worship: Emperors, Imperial Cults and Associations at Ephesus (First to Third Centuries CE)." *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* 25 (1996): 319-34.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Die Chronologie, Vol. 2. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1958.
- Hasler, Victor. *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1978.
- Head, Barclay Vincent. *On the Chronological Sequence of the Coins of Ephesus*. London: Rollin & Feuardent, 1880.

- Henderson, Jeffrey, ed. and trans. *Daphnis and Chloe by Longus; Anthia and Habrocomes by Xenophon of Ephesus*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 69, Cambridge. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Hengel, Martin. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia Fortress Press, 1980.
- . *Property and Riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Henry, Alan S. *Honors and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1983.
- Hering, James P. *The Colossian and Ephesian Haustafeln in Theological Context: an Analysis of their Origins, Relationship, and Message*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Hickman, Edward, ed. *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*. London: Ball, Arnold, and Company, 1840.
- Hicks, E.L., ed. *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1874-1916.
- Hock, Ronald F. "Paul's Tentmaking and the Problem of His Social Class." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 555-64.
- . *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Hodgin Gritz, Sharon. *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1991.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich J. *Die Pastoralbriefe, Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1880.
- Holzberg, Niklas. *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Horsley, G. H. R. "The Inscriptions of Ephesos and the New Testament." *Novum Testamentum* 34 (1992): 105-68.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Covenant Economics: A Biblical Vision of Justice for All*. 1st ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.
- Hughes, R. Kent. *2 Corinthians: Power in Weakness*. Preaching the Word. Wheaton: Crossway, 2006.
- Irvin, Dorothy. "The Ministry of Women in the Early Church: The Archaeological Evidence." *Duke Divinity Review* 45 (1980): 76-86.

- Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (FGRH) #419*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Jenkins, G. Kenneth. *Ancient Greek Coins. The World of Numismatics*. New York: Putnam, 1972.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Texte Zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 9, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Jeremias, Joachim, Freda Helen Cave, and Cyril Hayward Cave. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. 3rd ed. London: S.C.M. Press, 1969.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles. Sacra Pagina*. edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Vol. 5, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- , *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation and Introduction*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Vol. 35, New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- , *Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*. Ntic. Valley Forge: Trinity Press 1996.
- , *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- , *Sharing Possessions: What Faith Demands*. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2011.
- Johnson, Sarah Iles, ed. *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Jones, Rick. "Backwards and Forwards in Roman Burial." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 6 (1993): 427-32.
- Judge, E. A. "Rank and Status in the World of the Caesars and St. Paul." In *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays by E.A. Judge*, edited by David M. Scholer. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.
- , "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." *Journal of Religious History* 11 (1980): 201-17.
- , *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation*. 1st ed. London: Tyndale Press, 1960.
- Judge, E. A., and James R. Harrison. "Ethical Terms in St. Paul and the Inscriptions of Ephesus." In *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, vol. 229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Karris, Robert J. "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 549-64.

- . "The Function and *Sitz im Leben* of the Parenetic Elements in the Pastoral Epistles." PhD Diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1971.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Essias Exégétiques*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1972.
- Keil, Josef. "Die Erste Kaiserneokorie von Ephesos." *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 12 (1919): 115-20.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1963.
- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kennedy, George A., and Duane F. Watson. *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Kidd, Reggie M. *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A "Bourgeois" Form of Early Christianity?* Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 122. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Kirk, J. Andrew. "Did 'Officials' in the New Testament Church Receive a Salary?" *Expository Times* 84 (1972-73): 105-08.
- Knibbe, Dieter. "Der Staatsmarkt: Die Inschriften des Prytaneions." *Forschungen in Ephesos* 9.1 (1981).
- . "Via Sacra Ephesiaca." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- Knight, George W. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Koester, Helmut, ed. *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, Harvard Theological Studies, vol. 41. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- . *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*. Introduction to the New Testament. 2 vols. Vol. 1, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Konstan, David. "Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and Narrative in the Novel." In *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, edited by J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin. *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of I Timothy 2:9-15*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Kreitzer, Larry Joseph. "A Numismatic Clue to Acts 19.23-41." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 59-70.

- . *Striking New Images: Roman Imperial Coinage and the New Testament World*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series 134. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Kroeger, Richard Clark, and Catherine Clark Kroeger. *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
- Lake, Kirsopp, ed. and trans. *Apostolic Fathers II*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 25, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 42, Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Lips, Hermann von. "Die Haustafel als 'Topos' im Rahmen der Urchristlichen Paränese: Beobachtungen an Hand des 1 Petrusbriefes und des Titusbriefes." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 261-80.
- . *Glaube—Gemeinde—Amt: Zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralbriefen*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 122. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Lipsius, Richardus Adelbertus, and Maximilianus Bonnet. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.
- Llewelyn, S. R., and G. H. R. Horsley, eds. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Linguistic Essays, with Cumulative Indexes to Vols. 1-5*. Vol. 5. North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1989.
- Llewelyn, S.R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of Greek Inscriptions and Papyri*. Vol. 3. North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1978.
- Lock, Walter. *The Pastoral Epistles*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1952.
- Long, George, ed. *The British Museum: Egyptian Antiquities*. 2 vols. London: Charles Knight. 1832-36.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Lull, David J. "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness [Luke 22:24-30]." *Novum Testamentum* (1986): 289-305.
- Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. 65 vols. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883-1966.

- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Colossians and Ephesians*. Sacra Pagina, edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Vol. 17, Collegeville: Liturgical, 2000.
- . *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- . "Women in Public in the Roman Empire." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 29 (1980): 208-18.
- Magie, David. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*. Roman History. 2 Vols. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study, edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Vol. 12, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- . "Godliness, Self-Sufficiency, Greed, and the Enjoyment of Wealth: 1 Timothy 6:3-19, Part 1." *Novum Testamentum* 52 (2010): 376-405.
- . "Godliness, Self-Sufficiency, Greed, and the Enjoyment of Wealth: 1 Timothy 6:3-19, Part 2." *Novum Testamentum* 53 (2011): 73-96.
- . "Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles." In *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers.*, edited by Eugene W. March. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.
- . *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Library of Early Christianity, edited by Wayne A. Meeks. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- . *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- . *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . "Personal Meeting with Abraham J. Malherbe on 5 October 2007."
- Malina, Bruce J. "Limited Good and the Social World of Early Christianity." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 8 (1979): 162-76.
- . *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. 3rd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- . *The Social World of Jesus and the Gospels*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

- , "Wealth and Poverty in the New Testament and Its World." *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 354-67.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey. *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*. 1st ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Markus, Robert A. *Christianity in the Roman World*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1974.
- Marshall, A. J. "Roman Women and the Provinces." *Ancient Society* 6 (1975): 108-27.
- Marshall, I. Howard, and Philip H. Towner. *The Pastoral Epistles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- McEleney, N. J. "The Vice Lists in the Pastoral Epistles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 203-19.
- McGinn, Thomas A. J. *Prostitution, Sexuality and the Law in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- , *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Menken, M.J.J. "Οτι εν 1 Τμ 6,7." *Biblica* 58 (1977): 532-41.
- Merz, Annette. *Die Fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*. *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus/Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*. Vol. 52, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Morgan, Thaïs. "Is There an Intertext in This Text?: Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality." *American Journal of Semiotics* 3 (1985): 1-40.
- Mott, Stephen Charles. "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus 2:10-14 and 3:3-7." *Novum Testamentum* 20 (1978): 22-48.

- . "The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney*, edited by G.F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Mounce, William D. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 46, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
- Moxnes, Halvor, ed. *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2004.
- . "Honor and Shame." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- . "Honor and Shame: A Reader's Guide." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 23 (1993).
- . "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. *St. Paul's Ephesus: Texts and Archaeology*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2008.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and the System of Purity." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- . *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- O'Sullivan, James N. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Herausgegeben von Winfried Bühler, Peter Herrmann, und Otto Zwierlein. Band 44. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Oakman, Douglas E. "The Ancient Economy." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Oberlinner, Lorenz. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.
- Oden, Thomas C., and Christopher A. Hall, eds. *Mark*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, edited by Thomas C. Oden, vol. II. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998.

- Oldfather, William, ed. *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodutus, Onasander*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 156, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923.
- Olingdahl, G. "Den Kristne og Jordisk Rikedom: En Formell och Innehållslig Analys av 1 Tim 6:17-19." Ph.D. Diss., University of Uppsala, 1968.
- Outler, Albert C., and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds. *John Wesley's Sermons: An Anthology*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- Osiek, Carolyn, and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. 1st ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Oster, Richard. *A Bibliography of Ancient Ephesus*. Atla. Vol. 19, Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1987.
- . "The Ephesian Artemis as an Opponent of Early Christianity." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 19 (1976): 24-44.
- . "Ephesus." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2 (1992): 543.
- Padgett, Alan. "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Tim 2:8-15 in Social Context." *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 19-31.
- Papanikolaou, A. D., ed. *Xenophon Ephesius: Ephesiacorum Libri V*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1978.
- Peterson, David G. *Acts of the Apostles*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Pilch, John J., and Bruce J. Malina. *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "Honour and Social Status." In *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, edited by John G. Peristiany. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965.
- Polhill, John P. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- . "Prejudice, Partiality, and Faith: James 2." *Review and Expositor* 83 (1986): 395-404.
- Quinn, Jerome D., and William C. Wacker. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Raditsa, Leo. "The Appearance of Women and Contact: Tertullian's *De Habitu Feminarum*." *Athenaeum* 63 (1985): 305.
- Ramsay, Boniface, ed. *Essential Sermons: The Works of Saint Augustine*. A Translation for the 21st Century. Translated by Edmund Hill. Hyde Park: New City Press, 2007.

- . *Beginning to Read the Fathers*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.
- Ramsay, William Mitchell. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895.
- Reardon, B.P., ed. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Reumann, John. "Stewards of God": Pre-Christian Religious Application of Oikonomos in Greek." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 339-49.
- . *Stewardship and the Economy of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Rhee, Helen. *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty and Early Christian Formation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "The Dialectical Nature of Early Christian Discourse." *Scriptura: International Journal of Bible, Religion, and Theology in Southern Africa* 59 (1996): 353-62.
- . *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996.
- . *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Rogers, Guy M. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Rohde, Erwin. *Der Griechische Roman und Seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1876.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "The Preindustrial City." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Der Erste Brief an Timotheus*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament. Zürich: Benziger, 1988.
- Rosner, Brian S. *Beyond Greed*. Kingsford: Matthias Media, 2004.
- . *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Saller, Richard. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . "Slavery and the Roman Family." In *Classical Slavery*, edited by M.I. Finley. London: Frank Cass, 1987.

- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 2-13.
- Schaps, David. "The Women Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names." *Church Quarterly* 27 (1987): 323-30.
- Scherrer, Peter. "The City of Ephesos: From the Roman Period to Late Antiquity." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- . *Ephesus: The New Guide*. Turkey: Austrian Archaeological Institute, 2000.
- Schlarb, Egbert. *Die Gesunde Lehre: Häresie und Wahrheit im Spiegel der Pastoralbriefe*. Marburg: Elwert, 1990.
- Schlatter, Adolf von. *Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus: eine Auslegung Seiner Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1936.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Über den Sogennanten Ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus: Ein Kritisches Sendschreiben an J.C. Gass*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1807.
- Schmeling, Gareth L. *Xenophon of Ephesus*. Twayne's World Authors Series 613: Greece. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980.
- Schmidt, Thomas E. *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Supplement Series for Journal for the Study of New Testament* 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Schnackenberg, Rudolf. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Commentary*. Translated by H. Heron. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Scholer, David M., ed. *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century: Pivotal Essays by E.A. Judge*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Schwarz, Roland. *Bürgerliches Christentum Im Neuen Testament?* Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.
- Selwyn, Edward G. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Sheedy, Kenneth. "The Coinage of Ephesus." Macquarie University. http://www.mq.edu.au/research/centres_and_groups/acans/
- Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Simpson, E. K. *The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. London: Tyndale Press, 1954.

- Smith, Craig A. *Timothy's Task, Paul's Prospect*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.
- Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales*. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1969.
- Stambaugh, John E., and David L. Balch. *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997.
- Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. The New American Commentary. Vol. 24, Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1992.
- Stettler, Hanna. *Die Christologie Der Pastoralbriefe*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, vol. 2.105. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Stevens, Marty E. *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Stoa Consortium. "Suda." www.stoa.org/sol/ Keyword: Ephesiaca.
- Stone, Jon R., ed. *The Routledge Dictionary of Latin Quotations*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Stott, John R. W. . *The Message of Acts*. Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Strelan, Rick. *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
- Strobel, August. "Der Begriff des 'Hauses' im griechischen und Römischen Privatrecht." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 56 (1965): 91-100.
- Strocka, Volker Michael. *The Celsus Library in Ephesus*. Freiburg: Sonderdrucke aus der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, 2003.
- Thatcher, Tom. "The Relational Matrix of the Pastoral Epistles." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 38 (1995): 41-45.

- Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John A. Schütz. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1982.
- . "Soziale Schichtung in der Korinthischen Gemeinde: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des Hellenistischen Urchristentums." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 65 (1974): 155-72.
- Thielman, Frank. *Ephesians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Thiessen, Werner. *Christen in Ephesus: Die Historische und Theologische Situation in Vorpaulinischer und Paulinischer Zeit und zur Zeit der Apostelgeschichte und der Pastoralbriefe*. Texte Und Arbeiten Zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Vol. 12, Tübingen: Francke, 1995.
- Thomas, Christine M. "At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesus in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Thür, Hilke. "The Processional Way in Ephesus as a Place of Cult and Burial." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.
- Thurén, Jukka. "Die Struktur Der Schlußparänese 1 Tim 6:3-21." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 26 (1970): 241-53.
- Towner, Philip H. *1-2 Timothy & Titus*. The IVP New Testament Commentary Series, edited by Grant R. Osborne. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994.
- . "Can Slaves Be Their Masters' Benefactors? 1 Timothy 6:1-2a in Literary, Cultural, and Theological Context." *Current Trends in Scripture Translation* 182/183 (1997): 43-50.
- . "Gnosis and Realized Eschatology in Ephesus (of the Pastoral Epistles) and the Corinthian Enthusiasm." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (1987): 95-124.
- . *The Goal of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . "The Present Age in the Eschatology of the Pastoral Epistles." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 427-48.
- Trebilco, Paul R. *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

- . *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- van Unnik, Willem C. "Die Rücksicht Auf Die Reaktion Der Nicht-Christen Als Motiv In Der Altchristlichen Paränese." In *Sparsa Collecta*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Verner, David. *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 71. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Vögtle, Anton. "Die Tugend Und Lasterkataloge Im Neuen Testament." *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen* 16, 4-5 (1936).
- Wankel, H., R. Merkelbach, and H. Engelmann, eds. *Die Inschriften Von Ephesos: Inschriften Griechischen Städte Aus Kleinasien*. 10 vols. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1979-84.
- Watson, Duane F., and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*. Biblical Interpretation Series. edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Rolf Rendtorff. Vol. 4, New York: Brill, 1994.
- Weaver, Rebecca H. "Wealth and Poverty in the Early Church." *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 368-81.
- Welch, Bill. "Forum Ancient Coins: Diana the Huntress, Bringer of Light." http://www.forumancientcoins.com/moonmoth/reverse_diana.html
- Welles, C. Bradford. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven, Prague: Kondakov Institute, 1934.
- Wenham, David. *The Parables of Jesus*. The Jesus Library, edited by Michael Green. Downers Grove: IVP, 1989.
- . *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Wheeler, Sondra Ely. *Wealth as Peril and Obligation: The New Testament on Possessions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- White, N. J. D. *The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus*. Expositor's Greek Testament. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. "The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre." *American Journal of Philology* 126 (2005): 587-611.
- Wiedemann, Thomas. *Greek and Roman Slavery*. Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Wiersbe, Warren W. *Be Rich: Are You Losing the Things That Money Can't Buy? An Expository Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Wheaton: Victor, 1976.

Winter, Bruce W. "The Public Honoring of Christian Benefactors: Romans 13.3-4 and 1 Peter 2.14-15." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 34 (1988): 87-103.

-----, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

-----, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Wiseman, James. "A Distinguished Macedonian Family of the Roman Imperial Period." *American Journal of Archaeology* 88 (1984): 567-82.

Witherington III, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

-----, *Jesus and Money: A Guide for Times of Financial Crisis*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2010.

-----, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2 Timothy and 1-3 John*. Vol. 1, Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.

-----, *What's in the Word: Rethinking the Socio-Rhetorical Character of the New Testament*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.

-----, *Women in the Earliest Churches*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Witt, R. E. *Isis in the Ancient World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Wolter, Michael. *Die Pastoralbriefe Als Paulustradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

Wood, Susan E. *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 69*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Woolf, Greg. "Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire." *Journal of Roman Studies* 86 (1996): 22-39.

Wright, David P., and Hans Hübner. "Unclean and Clean." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 6 (1992): 729-741.

Wright, N.T. *Luke for Everyone*. London: SPCK, 2001.

Young, Frances Margaret. *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Zabehlicky, Heinrich. "Preliminary Views of the Ephesian Harbor." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.

Zabehlicky-Scheffenegger, Susanne. "Subsidiary Factories of Italian Sigillata Potters." In *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Its Archaeology, Religion and Culture*, edited by Helmut Koester. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1995.

Zanker, P. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988.