

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
COMMENTARY

Barnes' Notes on the Bible
Volume 15 -
1 Timothy
By A. Barnes

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TIMOTHY

INTRODUCTION

SECTION 1. NOTICES OF THE LIFE OF TIMOTHY

Nearly all that can now be known of Timothy is to be learned from the New Testament. He was a native of either Derbe or Lystra, but it is not certainly known which (^{<410>}Acts 16:1). Paul found him there on his visit to those places, and does not appear to have been acquainted with him before. His mother, whose name was Eunice, was a Jewess, and was pious, as was also his grandmother, Lois (^{<500>}2 Timothy 1:3). His father was a Greek, but was evidently not unfriendly to the Jewish religion, because Timothy had been carefully trained in the Scriptures (^{<515>}2 Timothy 3:15). Paul came to Derbe and Lystra, and became acquainted with Timothy, about 51 or 52 A.D., but there is no method now of ascertaining the exact age of Timothy at that time, though there is reason to think that he was then a youth (^{<502>}1 Timothy 4:12). It would seem, also, that he was a youth of uncommon hope and promise, and that there had been some special indications that he would rise to distinction as a religious man, and would exert an extended influence in favor of religion (^{<518>}1 Timothy 1:18). At the time when Paul first met with Timothy, he was a “disciple,” or a Christian convert; but the means which had been used for his conversion are unknown. Timothy’s mother had been before converted to the Christian faith (^{<410>}Acts 16:1), and Timothy was well known to the Christians in the neighboring towns of Lystra and Iconium. The gospel had been preached by Paul and Barnabas, in Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra, some six or seven years before it is said that Paul met with Timothy (^{<410>}Acts 16:1), and it is not improbable that this youth had been converted in the interval.

Several things appear to have combined to induce the apostle to introduce him into the ministry, and to make him a traveling companion. His youth; his acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures; the “prophecies which went before on him;” his talents; his general reputation in the church, and, it

would seem also, his amiableness of manners, adapting himself to be an agreeable companion. attracted the attention of the apostle, and led Paul to desire that he might be a fellow-laborer with him. To satisfy the prejudices of the Jews, and to prevent any possible objection which might be made against his qualifications for the ministerial office, Paul circumcised him (~~446B~~ Acts 16:3), and Timothy was ordained to the office of the ministry by “the laying on of the hands of the presbytery” (~~504B~~ 1 Timothy 4:14). When this ordination occurred is not known, but it is most probable that it was before Timothy went on his travels with Paul, since it is known that Paul was present on the occasion, and took a leading part in the transaction (~~500B~~ 2 Timothy 1:6).

Having joined Paul and Silas, Timothy accompanied them on a visit to the congregations of Phrygia and Galatia, in which they delivered them the decrees to keep which had been ordained at Jerusalem; ~~446B~~ Acts 16:4. following Having done this, they endeavored to go together into Bythnia, a province of Asia Minor, on the northwest, but were prevented; and they then went into Mysia, and to the towns of Troas; ~~446B~~ Acts 16:8. Here Luke appears to have joined them, and from this place, in obedience to a vision which appeared to Paul, they went into Macedonia, and preached the gospel first at Philippi, where they established a church. In this city Paul and Silas were imprisoned; but it is remarkable that nothing is said of Timothy and Luke, and it is not known whether they shared in the sufferings of the persecution there or not. Everything, however, renders it probable that Timothy was with them at Philippi, as he is mentioned as having started with them to go on the journey (~~446B~~ Acts 16:3ff); and, since we find Timothy at Berea, after the apostle had been released from prison, and had preached at Thessalonica and Berea (~~471B~~ Acts 17:14). From this place Paul was conducted to Athens, but left an injunction for Silas and Timothy to join him there as soon as possible. This was done; — but when Timothy had come to Athens, Paul felt it to be important that the church at Thessalonica should be visited and comforted in its afflictions, and being prevented from doing it himself, he sent Timothy, at great personal inconvenience, back to that church. Having discharged the duty there, he rejoined the apostle at Corinth (~~446B~~ Acts 18:5), from which place the First Epistle to the Thessalonians was written; see the introduction to 1 Thessalonians and the notes on ~~500B~~ 1 Thessalonians 1:1, and ~~500B~~ 1 Thessalonians 3:2. These transactions occurred about 52 A.D.

Paul remained at Corinth for a year and a half (^{<4481>}Acts 18:11), and it is probable that Timothy and Silas continued with him; see ^{<5301>}2 Thessalonians 1:1. From Corinth he sailed for Syria, accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila, whom he appears to have left on his way at Ephesus; ^{<4488>}Acts 18:18,19,26. Whether Timothy and Silas accompanied him is not mentioned, but we find Timothy again with him at Ephesus, after he had been to Caesarea and Antioch, and had returned to Ephesus; ^{<4482>}Acts 18:22; 19:1,22. From Ephesus, he sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia (^{<4492>}Acts 19:22), but for what purpose, or how long they remained, is unknown. From ^{<4407>}1 Corinthians 4:17, it appears that Paul expected that on this journey Timothy would stop at Corinth, and would give the church there instructions adapted to its situation. Paul continued in Ephesus until he was compelled to depart by the tumult caused by Demetrius, when he left and went to Macedonia; Acts 20. Whether Timothy, during the interval, had returned to Ephesus from Macedonia, is not expressly mentioned in the history; but such a supposition is not improbable. Paul, during the early part of his residence in Ephesus, appears to have labored quietly (^{<4490>}Acts 19:9,10); and Timothy was sent away before the disturbances caused by Demetrius; ^{<4492>}Acts 19:22. Paul designed to follow him soon, and then to go to Jerusalem, and then to Rome; ^{<4491>}Acts 19:21. Paul (^{<4493>}Acts 20:31) was in Ephesus in all for about three years; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that he remained there after Timothy was sent to Macedonia long enough for him to go and to return to him again. If so, it is possible that when Paul himself went away, he left Timothy there in his place; compare ^{<5403>}1 Timothy 1:3. It has been the general opinion that the First Epistle to Timothy was written at this time, either when the apostle was on his way to Macedonia, or while in Macedonia. But this opinion has not been unquestioned. The departure of Paul for Macedonia occurred about 58 or 59 A.D. In ^{<4494>}Acts 20:4, Timothy is again mentioned as accompanying Paul, after he had remained in Greece three months, on the route to Syria through Macedonia. He went with him, in company with many others, into "Asia." Going before Paul, they waited for him at Troas (^{<4495>}Acts 20:5), and thence doubtless accompanied him on his way to Jerusalem. It was on this occasion that Paul delivered his farewell charge to the elders of the church of Ephesus at Miletus (^{<4497>}Acts 20:17ff). When in Macedonia, Paul wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and Timothy was then with him, for Paul unites in the salutations; ^{<4400>}2 Corinthians 1:1. Timothy was also with the apostle on this journey at Corinth, when from that city he wrote his Epistle to the Romans; ^{<5162>}Romans 16:21.

The subsequent events of the life of Timothy are less known. It does not appear from the Acts of the Apostles, that Timothy was with Paul during his two years' imprisonment at Caesarea, nor during his voyage to Rome. It is certain, however, that he was at Rome with the apostle when he wrote the epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon; ^{<5000>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<5000>}Colossians 1:1; ^{<5000>}Philemon 1:1: From ^{<5833>}Hebrews 13:23 it appears also, that Timothy had been with the apostle there, but that when the Epistle was written he was absent on some important embassy, and that Paul was expecting his speedy return; see notes on that verse. Between the first and second imprisonment of Paul at Rome, no mention is made of Timothy, nor is it known where he was, or whether he accompanied him in his travels or not. When he was imprisoned there the second time, he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which he desires him to come to Rome, and bring with him several things which he had left at Troas; ^{<5009>}2 Timothy 4:9-13,21. If Timothy went to Rome, agreeably to the request of the apostle, it is probable that he was a witness there of his martyrdom.

In regard to the latter part of the life of Timothy, there is nothing which can be depended upon. It has been the current opinion, derived from tradition, that he was "Bishop" of Ephesus; that he died and was buried there; and that his bones were subsequently removed to Constantinople. The belief that he was "Bishop" of Ephesus rests mainly on the "subscription" to the Second Epistle to Timothy — which is no authority whatever (see notes on that subscription). On the question whether he was an episcopal prelate at Ephesus, the reader may consult my "Enquiry into the Organization and Government of the Apostolic Church," pp. 88-107. The supposition that he died at Ephesus, and was subsequently removed to Constantinople, rests on no certain historical basis.

Timothy was long the companion and the friend of the apostle Paul, and is often mentioned by him with affectionate interest. Indeed there seems to have been not one of his fellow-laborers to whom he was so warmly attached; see ^{<5002>}1 Timothy 1:2,18; ^{<5002>}2 Timothy 1:2; 2:1; ^{<4047>}1 Corinthians 4:17, where he calls him "his own son," and "his beloved son" (^{<5004>}2 Timothy 1:4), where he expresses his earnest desire to see him, and makes a reference to the tears which Timothy shed at parting from him; — ^{<6101>}1 Corinthians 16:10,11, where he bespeaks for him a kind reception among the Corinthians; — ^{<6101>}1 Corinthians 16:10; ^{<6102>}Romans 16:21; ^{<5102>}1 Thessalonians 3:2, where he speaks of his fidelity, of his usefulness to him

in his labors, and of the interest which he took in the churches which the apostle had established.

SECTION 2. WHEN AND WHERE THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN

The subscription at the close of the epistle states that it was written from Laodicea. But these subscriptions are of no authority, and many of them are false; see notes at the end of 1 Corinthians. There has been much diversity of opinion in regard to the time when this epistle was written, and of course in regard to the place where it was composed. All that is certain from the epistle itself is, that it was addressed to Timothy at Ephesus, and that it was soon after Paul had left that city to go to Macedonia; ~~<400B>~~1 Timothy 1:3. Paul is mentioned in the Acts as having been at Ephesus twice: ~~<400B>~~Acts 18:19-23; 19:1-41. After his first visit there, he went directly to Jerusalem, and of course it could not have been written at that time. The only question then is, whether it was written when Paul left the city, having been driven away by the excitement caused by Demetrius (~~<400B>~~Acts 20:1), or whether he visited Ephesus again on some occasion after his first imprisonment at Rome, and of course after the narrative of Luke in the Acts of the Apostles closes. If on the former occasion, it was written about the year 58 or 59; if the latter, about the year 64 or 65 A.D. Critics have been divided in reference to this point, and the question is still unsettled, and it may be impossible to determine it with entire certainty.

Those who have maintained the former opinion, among others, are Theodoret, Benson, Zachariae, Michaelis, Schmidt, Koppe, Planck, Grotius, Lightfoot, Witsius, Lardner, Hug, and Prof. Stuart. The latter opinion, that it was written subsequently to the period of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, is maintained by Paley, Pearson, L'Enfant, LeClerc, Cave, Mill, Whitby, Macknight, and others.

An examination of the reasons in favor of each of these opinions in regard to the date of the epistle, may be found in Paley's *Horae Paul.*; Macknight; Hug's *Intro.*, and Koppe, *Prolegomena*.

The theory of Eichhorn, which is unique, and which is supported by some ingenious and plausible, but not conclusive reasoning, may be seen in his *Einleitung in das neue Test.* 3 B. 314-352.

In the diversity of opinion which prevails about the time when the epistle was written, it is impossible to determine the question in such a manner as

to leave no room for doubt. After the most careful examination which I have been able to give to the subject, however, it seems to me that the former opinion is correct, that it was written soon after Paul was driven from Ephesus by the tumult caused by Demetrius, as recorded in Acts 19; ~~401~~ Acts 20:1. The reasons for this opinion are briefly these:

1. This is the only record that occurs in the New Testament of the apostle's having gone from Ephesus to Macedonia; see above. It is natural, therefore, to suppose that this is referred to in ~~500B~~ 1 Timothy 1:3, unless there is some insuperable difficulty in the way.

2. There is no certain evidence that Paul visited the church at Ephesus after his first imprisonment at Rome. It is certainly possible that he did, but there is no record of any such visit in the New Testament, nor any historical record of it elsewhere. If there had been such a visit after his release, and if this epistle was written then, it is remarkable that the apostle does not make any allusion to his imprisonment in this epistle, and that he does not refer at all to his own escape from this danger of death at Rome; compare ~~504G~~ 2 Timothy 4:16,17.

3. The supposition that the epistle was written at the time supposed, agrees better with the character of the epistle, and with the design for which Timothy was left at Ephesus, than the others. It is manifest from the epistle that the church was in some respects in an unsettled condition, and it would seem also that one part of the duty of Timothy there was to see that it was placed under a proper organization. This Paul had evidently proposed to accomplish himself, but it is clear from ~~500B~~ 1 Timothy 1:3, that he left his work unfinished, and that he gave what he had proposed to do into the hands of Timothy to be perfected. After the first imprisonment of Paul at Rome, however, there is every reason to suppose that the church was completely organized. Even when Paul went from Macedonia to Jerusalem (Acts 20), there were "elders" placed over the church at Ephesus, whom Paul assembled at Miletus, and to whom he gave his parting charge, and his final instructions in regard to the church.

4. At the time when Paul wrote this epistle, Timothy was a young man — a youth; ~~504H~~ 1 Timothy 4:12. It is true, that if he was somewhere about twenty years of age when he was introduced into the ministry, as has been commonly supposed, this language would not be entirely inappropriate, even after the imprisonment of Paul, but still the language would more

properly denote one somewhat younger than Timothy would be at that time.

5. To this may be added the declaration of Paul in ^{<4184>}1 Timothy 3:14, that he “hoped to come to him shortly.” This is an expression which agrees well with the supposition that he had himself been driven away before he had intended to leave; that he had left something unfinished there which he desired to complete, and that he hoped that affairs would soon be in such a state that he would be permitted to return. It may he also suggested, as a circumstance of some importance, though not conclusive, that when Paul met the elders of the church of Ephesus at Miletus, he said that he had no expectation of ever seeing them again.

“And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more;”
^{<4125>}Acts 20:25.

I do not think that this is to be understood as an inspired prediction, affirming with absolute certainty that he never would see them again, but that he rather expressed his apprehensions that it would be so from the circumstances which then existed; ^{<4122>}Acts 20:22,23. Still, this passage shows that when he uttered it he did not expect to visit Ephesus again, as he manifestly did when he wrote the epistle to Timothy.

These considerations seem so clear that they would leave no doubt on the mind, were it not for certain things which it seems to many impossible to reconcile with this supposition. The difficulties are the following:

1. That before Paul went to Macedonia, he had sent Timothy with Erastus before him (^{<4122>}Acts 19:22), purposing to follow them at no distant period, and to pass through Macedonia and Achaia, and then to go to Jerusalem, and afterward to visit Rome; ^{<4121>}Acts 19:21. As he had sent Timothy before him but so short a time before he left Ephesus, it is asked how Timothy could be left at Ephesus when Paul went himself to Macedonia? To this objection we may reply, that it is not improbable by any means that Timothy may have accomplished the object of his journey to Macedonia, and may have returned to the apostle at Ephesus before he was driven away. It does not appear, from the narrative, that Timothy was entrusted with any commission which would require a long time to fulfil it, nor that Paul expected that he would remain in Macedonia until he himself came. The purpose for which he sent Timothy and Erastus is not indeed

mentioned, but it seems probable that it was with reference to the collection which he proposed to take up for the poor saints at Jerusalem; see notes on [Acts 19:21,22](#); compare [1 Corinthians 16:1-6](#). If it was the purpose to prepare the churches for such a collection, it could not have required any considerable time, nor was it necessary that Timothy should remain long in a place; and it was natural also that he should return to the apostle at Ephesus and apprise him of what he had done, and what was the prospect in regard to the collection. It has been clearly shown by Hug (Introduction to the New Testamen, sections 104,109), that such a journey could easily have been made during the time which the apostle remained at Ephesus after he had sent Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia.

2. The next objection — and one which is regarded by Paley as decisive against the supposition that the epistle was written on this occasion — is, that from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians ([2 Corinthians 1:1](#)), it is evident that at the time in which this epistle is supposed to have been written, Timothy was with the apostle in Macedonia. The second epistle to the Corinthians was undoubtedly written during this visit of Paul to Macedonia, and at that time Timothy was with him; see the Introduction to 2 Corinthians, section 3. How then can it be supposed that he was at Ephesus? Or how can this fact be reconciled with the supposition that Timothy was left there, and especially with the declaration of Paul to him ([1 Timothy 3:14](#)), that he “hoped to come to him shortly?” That Paul expected that Timothy would remain at Ephesus, at least for some time, is evident from [1 Timothy 3:15](#),

“But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God;”

and from [1 Timothy 4:13](#),

“Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.”

The only solution of this difficulty is, that Timothy had left Ephesus, and had followed the apostle into Macedonia; and the only question here is, whether, since the apostle designed that he should remain at Ephesus, and expected himself to return and meet him there, Timothy would be likely to leave that place and go to Macedonia. It is certain that the history in the Acts does not make this record, but that is no material objection — since it cannot be supposed that every occurrence in the travels of the apostles was

recorded. But there are two or three circumstances which may render the supposition that Timothy, either by the concurrence, or by the direction of Paul, privately communicated to him, may have left Ephesus sooner than was at first contemplated, and may have rejoined him in Macedonia.

(1) One is, that the main business which Timothy was appointed to perform at Ephesus — to give a solemn charge to certain persons there to teach no other doctrine but that which Paul taught (^{<540B>}1 Timothy 1:3) — might have been speedily accomplished. Paul was driven away in haste, and as he had not the opportunity of doing this himself as he wished, he left Timothy in charge of it. But this did not require, of necessity, any considerable time.

(2) Another is, that the business of appointing suitable officers over the church there, might also have been soon accomplished. In fact, the church there is known to have been supplied with proper officers not long after this, for Paul sent from Miletus for the elders to meet him there on his way to Jerusalem. This remark is made in accordance with the opinion that a part of the work which Timothy was expected to perform there was to constitute proper officers over the church. But there is no proof that that was a part of his business. It is not specified in what Paul mentions, in ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 1:3, as the design for which he was left there, and it is hardly probable that the apostle would have spent so long a time as he did in Ephesus nearly three years (^{<40B>}Acts 20:31) — without having organized the church with proper officers. Besides, the address of Paul to the elders at Miletus implies that they had received their appointment before he left them; see ^{<40B>}Acts 20:18-35, particularly ^{<40B>}Acts 20:35. The instructions to Timothy in this Epistle about the proper qualifications of the officers of the church, do not prove that he was then to appoint officers at Ephesus, for they are general instructions, having no particular reference to the church there, and designed to guide him in his work through life. There is, therefore, nothing in the duties which Timothy was to perform at Ephesus which would forbid the supposition that he may have soon followed the apostle into Macedonia.

(3) It appears that though Paul may have intended, if possible, to visit Ephesus on his way to Jerusalem, in accordance with ^{<54B>}1 Timothy 3:14,15; 4:13, yet, if that had been his intention, he subsequently changed his mind, and found it necessary to make other arrangements. Thus it is said (^{<40B>}Acts 20:16), that

“Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia.”

that is, he had resolved to sail past Ephesus without visiting it. It would seem probable also, that this resolution had been formed before he left Macedonia, for it is said that he “had determined” it (ἐκρίνεν ^{<2919>}), and if so, there is no improbability in supposing that he had in some way caused it to be intimated to Timothy that he wished him to leave Ephesus and join him before he left Macedonia.

(4) In fact, and in accordance with this supposition, we find Timothy with Paul when he went on that occasion into “Asia;” ~~<404>~~ Acts 20:4,5. These considerations render it probable that the epistle was written to Timothy soon after Paul left Ephesus to go into Macedonia after the tumult excited by Demetrius. As Paul was driven away unexpectedly, and when he had not completed what he designed to do there, nothing is more natural than the supposition that he would embrace the earliest opportunity to give suitable instructions to Timothy, that he might know how to complete the work.

SECTION 3. THE OCCASION AND DESIGN OF THE EPISTLE

This is specified in ~~<500>~~ 1 Timothy 1:3. Paul had gone into Macedonia, having been suddenly driven away from Ephesus, before he had entirely done what he had designed to do there. He left Timothy there to “charge some that they teach no other doctrine;” that is, no other doctrine than that which he had himself taught when there. It is clear, from this, that there were certain errors prevailing there which Paul thought it of the highest importance to have corrected. In regard to those errors, see the introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Epistle to the Colossians. Some of the circumstances which gave occasion to this epistle can be gathered from the history in the Acts of the Apostles; others can be derived from the epistle itself. From these sources of information we learn the following things in reference to the state of the church in Ephesus, which made it proper that Timothy should be left there, and that these instructions should be given him to regulate his conduct.

(1) There was much opposition to the apostle Paul from the Jews who resided there; ~~<449>~~ Acts 19:8,9.

- (2) There were in the church teachers who endeavored to enforce the maxims of the Jewish law, and to represent that law as binding on Christians; ~~5006~~ 1 Timothy 1:6,7.
- (3) Some of the Jews residing there were addicted to exorcism, and endeavored to make use of Christianity and the name of Jesus to promote their selfish ends; ~~4494~~ Acts 19:14; compare ~~5006~~ 1 Timothy 1:4.
- (4) The Jewish teachers laid great stress on genealogies and traditions. and were much given to debates about various questions connected with the law; ~~5006~~ 1 Timothy 1:4-6.
- (5) There were erroneous views prevailing respecting the rights of women, and the place which they ought to occupy in the church: ~~5408~~ 1 Timothy 2:8-15.
- (6) The organization of the officers of the church had not been effected as Paul wished it to be. It is probable that some of the officers had been appointed, and that some instructions had been given to them in regard to their duties, but the whole arrangement had not been completed; ~~5408~~ 1 Timothy 3:4:
- (7) There were certain questions in regard to the proper treatment of widows which had not yet been determined; 1 Timothy 5.
- (8) The apostle in his preaching had inculcated benevolent principles, and had asserted the natural equality of all men, and it would seem that certain persons had taken occasion from this to excite a spirit of discontent and insubordination among those who were servants. The doctrine seems to have been advanced, that, as all men were equal, and all had been redeemed by the same blood, therefore those who had been held in bondage were free from all obligation to serve their masters. There were those evidently who sought to excite them to insurrection; to break down the distinctions in society, and to produce a state of insubordination and disorder; 1 Timothy 6; compare ~~4005~~ Ephesians 6:5-10; ~~5082~~ Colossians 3:22; 4:2.

Such appears to have been the state of things when the apostle was compelled suddenly to leave Ephesus. He had hitherto directed the affairs of the church there mainly himself, and had endeavored to correct the errors then prevailing, and to establish the church on a right foundation. Matters appear to have been tending to the desired result; religion was

acquiring a strong hold on the members of the church (~~<41918>~~Acts 19:18-20); error was giving way; the community was becoming more and more impressed with the value of Christianity; the influence of idolatry was becoming less and less (~~<41923>~~Acts 19:23ff), and the arrangements for the complete organization of the church were in progress. Such was the promising state of things in these respects that the apostle hoped to be able to leave Ephesus at no very distant period, and had actually made arrangements to do it; ~~<41921>~~Acts 19:21. But his arrangements were not quite finished, and before they were completed, he was compelled to leave by the tumult excited by Demetrius. He left Timothy, therefore, to complete the arrangements, and, in this first epistle, gave him all the instructions which were necessary to guide him in that work.

This view of the state of things in Ephesus at the time when the apostle was constrained to leave it, will enable us to understand the drift of the epistle, and the reasons why the various topics found in it were introduced. At the same time, the instructions are of so general a character that they would be an invaluable guide to Timothy not only at Ephesus, but through his life; and not only to him, but to all the ministers of the gospel in every age and land. A more detailed view of these topics will be furnished in the analysis prefixed to the several chapters of the epistle.

The Epistles to Timothy and Titus occupy a very important place in the New Testament, and without them there would be a manifest and most material defect in the volume of inspiration. Their canonical authority has never been questioned by the great body of the church, and there is no doubt that they are the productions of the apostle Paul. If the various epistles which he wrote, and the various other books of the New Testament; be attentively examined, it will be found that each one is designed to accomplish an important object, and that if anyone were removed a material chasm would be made. Though the removal of anyone of them would not so impair the volume of the New Testament as to obscure any essential doctrine, or prevent our obtaining the knowledge of the way of salvation from the remainder, yet it would mar the beauty and symmetry of the truth, and would render the system of instruction defective and incomplete.

This is true in regard to the epistles to Timothy and Titus, as it is of the other epistles. They fill a department which nothing else in the New Testament would enable us to supply, and without which instructions to

man respecting redemption would be incomplete. They relate mainly “to the office of the ministry;” and though there are important instructions, of the Saviour himself respecting the office (Matthew 10; Mark 16, add elsewhere), and though in the address of Paul to the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20), and in the Epistles to the Corinthians, there are invaluable suggestions respecting it, yet such is its importance in the organization of the church, that more full and complete instructions seem to be imperiously demanded. Those instructions are furnished in these epistles. They are as full and complete as we could desire in regard to the nature of the office, the qualifications for it, and the duties which grow out of it. They are fitted not only to direct Timothy and Titus in the work to which they were specifically appointed, but to counsel the ministry in every age and in every land. It is obvious that the character and welfare of the church depend greatly, if not entirely, on the character of the ministry. The office of the ministry is God’s great appointment for the preservation of pure religion, and for spreading it abroad through the world. The church adheres to the truth; is built up in faith; is distinguished for love, and purity, and zeal, in proportion as the ministry is honored, and shows itself qualified for its work. In every age corruption in the church has commenced in the ministry; and where the gospel has been spread abroad with zeal, and the church has arisen in her strength and beauty, it has been pre-eminently where God has sent down his Spirit in copious measures on those who have filled the sacred office. So important, then, is this office to the welfare of the church and the world, that it was desirable that full instructions should be furnished in the volume of revelation in regard to its nature and design. Such instructions we have in these epistles, and there is scarcely any portion of the New Testament which the church could not better afford to part with than the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Had the ministry always been such as these epistles contemplate; had they who have filled the sacred office always had the character and qualifications here described, we may believe that the church would have been saved from the strifes that have torn it, and that the pure gospel would long before this have been spread through the world.

But it is not to the ministry only that these Epistles are of so much value. They are of scarcely less importance to the church at large. Its vitality; its purity; its freedom from strife; its zeal and love and triumph in spreading the gospel, depend on the character of the ministry. If the church will prosper from age to age, the pulpit must be filled with a pious, learned,

laborious, and devoted ministry, and one of the first cares of the church should be that such a ministry should be secured. This great object cannot better be attained than by keeping the instructions in these Epistles steadily before the minds of the members of the church; and though a large part of them is particularly adapted to the ministers of the gospel, yet the church itself can in no better way promote its own purity and prosperity than by a prayerful and attentive study of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TIMOTHY

NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY 1

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter (1 Timothy 1) comprises the following subjects:

- (1) The salutation to Timothy, in the usual manner in which Paul introduces his epistles; <500>1 Timothy 1:1,2.
- (2) The purpose for which he had left him at Ephesus; <500>1 Timothy 1:3,4. It was that he might correct the false instructions of some of the teachers there, and especially, as it would seem, in regard to the true use of the law. They gave undue importance to somethings in the laws of Moses; they did not understand the true nature and design of his laws; and they mingled in their instructions much that was mere fable.
- (3) The true use and design of the law; <500>1 Timothy 1:5-11. It was to produce love not vain jangling. It was not made to fetter the conscience by vain and troublesome austerities and ceremonies; it was to restrain and bind the wicked. The use of the law, according to these teachers, and according to the prevailing Jewish notions, was to prescribe a great number of formalities, and to secure outward conformity in a great variety of cumbrous rites and ceremonies. Paul instructs Timothy to teach them that love, out of a pure heart and a good conscience, was the elementary principle of religion, and that the “law” was primarily designed to restrain and control the wicked, and that the gospel brought to light and enforced this important truth.
- (4) The mention of the gospel in this connection, leads Paul to express his thanks to God that he had been entrusted with this message of salvation; <500>1 Timothy 1:12-17. Once he had the same views as others. But he had obtained mercy, and he was permitted to publish that glorious gospel

which had shed such light on the law of God, and which had revealed a plan of salvation that was worthy of universal acceleration.

(5) This solemn duty of preaching the gospel he commits now to Timothy, ^{<5018>}1 Timothy 1:18-20. He says that he had been called to the work in accordance with the prophecies which had been uttered of him in anticipation of his future usefulness in the church, and in the expectation that he would not, like some others, make shipwreck of his faith.

^{<5008>}**1 Timothy 1:1.** *Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ;* see the notes on ^{<5008>}Romans 1:1.

By the commandment of God See the notes at ^{<5008>}1 Corinthians 1:1.

Our Saviour The name Saviour is as applicable to God the Father as to the Lord Jesus Christ, since God is the great Author of salvation; see the notes, ^{<5047>}Luke 1:47; compare ^{<5040>}1 Timothy 4:10; ^{<5020>}Titus 2:10; ^{<5025>}Jude 1:25.

And Lord Jesus Christ The apostle Paul had received his commission directly from him; see the notes, ^{<5011>}Galatians 1:11,12.

Which is our hope See the notes at ^{<5027>}Colossians 1:27.

^{<5008>}**1 Timothy 1:2.** *Unto Timothy* For an account of Timothy, see Intro. Section 1.

My own son in the faith Converted to the Christian faith by my instrumentality, and regarded by me with the affection of a father; see notes, ^{<5045>}1 Corinthians 4:15. Paul had no children of his own, and he adopted Timothy as a son, and uniformly regarded and treated him as such. He had the same feeling also toward Titus; ^{<5004>}Titus 1:4; compare notes, ^{<5049>}Galatians 4:19; ^{<5017>}1 Thessalonians 2:7,11; and ^{<5010>}Philemon 1:10.

Grace, mercy, and peace, ... See the notes, ^{<5007>}Romans 1:7.

^{<5008>}**1 Timothy 1:3.** *As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus* It is clear from this, that Paul and Timothy had been laboring together at Ephesus, and the language accords with the supposition that Paul had been compelled to leave before he had completed what he had designed to do there. See the Intro. Section 2.

When I went into Macedonia Having been driven away by the excitement caused by Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen; ^{<400>}Acts 20:1. See the Intro. Section 2,3.

That thou mightest charge some The word charge here — *παραγγελιης* ^{<383>} — seems to mean more than is commonly implied by the word as used by us. If it had been a single direction or command, it might have been given by Paul himself before he left, but it seems rather to refer to that continuous instruction which would convince these various errorists and lead them to inculcate only the true doctrine. As they may have been numerous — as they may have embraced various forms of error, and as they might have had plausible grounds for their belief, this was evidently a work requiring time, and hence Timothy was left to effect this at leisure. It would seem that the wrath which had been excited against Paul had not affected Timothy, but that he was permitted to remain and labor without molestation. It is not certainly known who these teachers were, but they appear to have been of Jewish origin, and to have inculcated the special sentiments of the Jews respecting the law.

That they teach no other doctrine That is, no other doctrine than that taught by the apostles. The Greek word here used is not found in the classic writers, and does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament, except in ^{<503>}1 Timothy 6:3 of this Epistle, where it is rendered “teach otherwise.” We may learn here what was the design for which Timothy was left at Ephesus.

(1) It was for a temporary purpose, and not as a permanent arrangement. It was to correct certain errors prevailing there which Paul would have been able himself soon to correct if he had been suffered to remain. Paul expected soon to return to him again, and then they would proceed unitedly with their work; ^{<503>}1 Timothy 4:13; 3:15.

(2) It was not that he might be the “Bishop” of Ephesus. There is no evidence that he was “ordained” there at all, as the subscription to the Second Epistle declares (see the notes on that subscription), nor were the functions which he was to perform, those of a prelatical bishop. He was not to take the charge of a “diocese,” or to ordain ministers of the “second rank,” or to administer the rite of confirmation, or to perform acts of discipline. He was left there for a purpose which is specified, and that is as far as possible from what are now regarded as the appropriate functions of a prelatical bishop. Perhaps no claim which has ever been set up has had

less semblance of argument than that which asserts that Timothy was the “Bishop of Ephesus.” See this clause examined in my “Inquiry into the Organization and Government of the Apostolic Church,” pp. 84-107.

~~<500>~~ **1 Timothy 1:4.** *Neither give heed to fables* That is, that they should not bestow their attention on fables, or regard such trifles as of importance. The “fables” here referred to were probably the idle and puerile superstitions and conceits of the Jewish rabbies. The word rendered “fable” (*μυθος* ~~<345>~~) means properly “speech” or “discourse,” and then fable or fiction, or a mystic discourse. Such things abounded among the Greeks as well as the Jews, but it is probable that the latter here are particularly intended. These were composed of frivolous and unfounded stories, which they regarded as of great importance, and which they seem to have desired to incorporate with the teachings of Christianity. Paul, who had been brought up amidst these superstitions, saw at once how they would tend to draw off the mind from the truth, and would corrupt the true religion. One of the most successful arts of the adversary of souls has been to mingle fable with truth; and when he cannot overthrow the truth by direct opposition, to neutralize it by mingling with it much that is false and frivolous.

And endless genealogies This also refers to Jewish teaching. The Hebrews kept careful genealogical records, for this was necessary in order that the distinction of their tribes might be kept up. Of course, in the lapse of centuries these tables would become very numerous, complicated, and extended — so that they might without much exaggeration be called “endless.” The Jews attached great importance to them, and insisted on their being carefully preserved. As the Messiah, however, had now come — as the Jewish polity was to cease — as the separation between them and the pagan was no longer necessary, and the distinction of tribes was now useless, there was no propriety that these distinctions should be regarded by Christians. The whole system was, moreover, contrary to the genius of Christianity, for it served to keep up the pride of blood and of birth.

Which minister questions Which afford matter for troublesome and angry debates. It was often difficult to settle or understand them. They became complicated and perplexing. Nothing is more difficult than to unravel an extensive genealogical table. To do this, therefore, would often give rise to contentions, and when settled, would give rise still further to questions about rank and precedence.

Rather than godly edifying which is in faith These inquiries do nothing to promote true religion in the soul. They settle no permanent principle of truth; they determine nothing that is really concerned in the salvation of people. They might be pursued through life, and not one soul be converted by them; they might be settled with the greatest accuracy, and yet not one heart be made better. Is not this still true of many controversies and logomachies in the church? No point of controversy is worth much trouble, which, if it were settled one way or the other, would not tend to convert the soul from sin, or to establish some important principle in promoting true religion. “So do.” These words are supplied by our translators, but they are necessary to the sense. The meaning is, that Timothy was to remain at Ephesus, and faithfully perform the duty which he had been left there to discharge.

~~5005~~ **1 Timothy 1:5.** *Now the end of the commandment* see the notes on ~~5004~~ Romans 10:4. In order that Timothy might fulfil the design of his appointment, it was necessary that he should have a correct view of the design of the law. The teachers to whom he refers insisted much on its obligation and importance; and Paul designs to say that he did not intend to teach that the law was of no consequence, and was not, when properly understood, obligatory. Its nature and use, however, was not correctly understood by them, and hence it was of great importance for Timothy to inculcate correct views of the purpose for which it was given. The word “commandment” here some have understood of the gospel (Doddridge), others of the particular command which the apostle here gives to Timothy (Benson, Clarke, and Macknight); but it seems more naturally to refer to all that God had commanded — his whole law. As the error of these teachers arose from improper views of the nature and design of law, Paul says that that design should be understood. It was not to produce distinctions and angry contentions, and was not to fetter the minds of Christians with minute and burdensome observances, but it was to produce love.

Is charity On the meaning of this word, see notes on ~~660~~ 1 Corinthians 13:1.

Out of a pure heart The love which is genuine must proceed from a holy heart. The commandment was not designed to secure merely the outward expressions of love, but that which had its seat in the heart.

And of a good conscience A conscience free from guilt. Of course there can be no genuine love to God where the dictates of conscience are

constantly violated, or where a man knows that he is continually doing wrong. If a man wishes to have the evidence of love to God, he must keep a good conscience. All pretended love, where a man knows that he is living in sin, is mere hypocrisy.

And of faith unfeigned Undissembled confidence in God. This does seem to be intended specifically of faith in the Lord Jesus, but it means that all true love to God, such as this law would produce, must be based on confidence in him. How can anyone have love to him who has no confidence in him? Can we exercise love to a professed friend in whom we have no confidence? Faith, then, is as necessary under the law as it is under the gospel.

^{<5006>}**1 Timothy 1:6.** *From which some having swerved* Margin, “not aiming at.” The word here used — **αστοχεω** ^{<795>} — means properly, to miss the mark; to err; and then, to swerve from compare ^{<5012>}1 Timothy 6:21; ^{<5018>}2 Timothy 2:18. It does not mean that they had ever had that from which they are said to have swerved — for it does not follow that a man who misses a mark had ever hit it — but merely that they failed of the things referred to, and had turned to vain talk. The word “which” (**ὧν** ^{<3739>}), in the plural, refers not to the law, but to the things enumerated — a pure heart, a good conscience, and unfeigned faith.

Have turned aside unto vain jangling Vain talk, empty declamation, discourses without sense. The word here used does not mean contention or strife, but that kind of discourse which is not founded in good sense. They were discourses on their pretended distinctions in the law; on their traditions and ceremonies; on their useless genealogies, and on the fabulous statements which they had appended to the law of Moses.

^{<5007>}**1 Timothy 1:7.** *Desiring to be teachers of the law* That is, to have the credit and reputation of being well versed in the law of Moses, and qualified to explain it to others. This was a high honor among the Jews, and these teachers laid claim to the same distinction.

Understanding neither what they say That is, they do not understand the true nature and design of that law which they attempt to explain to others. This was true of the Jewish teachers, and equally so of those in the church at Ephesus, who attempted to explain it. They appear to have explained the law on the principles which commonly prevailed among the Jews, and hence their instructions tended greatly to corrupt the faith of the gospel.

They made affirmations of what they knew nothing of, and though they made confident assertions, yet they often pertained to things about which they had no knowledge. One needs only a slight acquaintance with the manner of teaching among Jewish rabbies, or with the things found in their traditions, to see the accuracy of this statement of the apostle. A sufficient illustration of this may be found in Allen's "Modern Judaism."

1 Timothy 1:8. *But we know that the law is good* We admit this; it is that which we all concede. This declaration is evidently made by the apostle to guard against the supposition that he was an enemy of the law. Doubtless this charge would be brought against him, or against anyone who maintained the sentiments which he had just expressed. By speaking thus of what those teachers regarded as so important in the law, it would be natural for them to declare that he was an enemy of the law itself, and would be glad to see all its claims abrogated. Paul says that he designs no such thing. He admitted that the law was good. He was never disposed for one moment to call it in question. He only asked that it should be rightly understood and properly explained. Paul was never disposed to call in question the excellency and the utility of the law, however it might bear on him or on others; compare notes on **Romans 7:12**, and on **Acts 21:21-26**.

If a man use it lawfully In a proper manner; for the purposes for which it was designed. It is intended to occupy a most important place, but it should not be perverted. Paul asked only that it should be used aright, and in order to this, he proceeds to state what is its true design.

1 Timothy 1:9. *Knowing this* That is, "If anyone knows, or admits this, he has the proper view of the design of the law." The apostle does not refer particularly to himself as knowing or conceding this, for then he would have used the plural form of the participle (see the Greek), but he means that anyone who had just views of the law would see that that which he proceeds to specify was its real purpose.

The law is not made for a righteous man There has been great variety in the interpretation of this passage. Some suppose that the law here refers to the ceremonial laws of Moses (Clarke, Rosenmuller, Abbot); others to the denunciatory part of the law (Doddridge and Bloomfield); and others that it means that the chief purpose of the law was to restrain the wicked. It seems clear, however, that the apostle does not refer merely to the

ceremonial law, for he specifies that which condemns the unholy and profane; the murderers of fathers and mothers; liars and perjured persons. It was not the ceremonial law which condemned these things, but the moral law. It cannot be supposed, moreover, that the apostle meant to say that the law was not binding on a righteous man, or that he was under no obligation to obey it — for he everywhere teaches that the moral law is obligatory on all mankind. To suppose also that a righteous man is released from the obligation to obey the law, that is, to do right, is an absurdity. Nor does he seem to mean, as Macknight supposes, that the law was not given for the purpose of justifying a righteous man — for this was originally one of its designs. Had man always obeyed it, he would have been justified by it. The meaning seems to be, that the purpose of the law was not to fetter and perplex those who were righteous, and who aimed to do their duty and to please God. It was not intended to produce a spirit of servitude and bondage. As the Jews interpreted it, it did this, and this interpretation appears to have been adopted by the teachers at Ephesus, to whom Paul refers. The whole tendency of their teaching was to bring the soul into a state of bondage, and to make religion a condition, of servitude. Paul teaches, on the other hand, that religion was a condition of freedom, and that the main purpose of the law was not to fetter the minds of the righteous by numberless observances and minute regulations, but that it was to restrain the wicked from sin. This is the case with all law. No good man feels himself lettered and manacled by wholesome laws, nor does he feel that the purpose of law is to reduce him to a state of servitude. It is only the wicked who have this feeling — and in this sense the law is made for a man who intends to do wrong.

For the lawless To bind and restrain them. The word here used means, properly, those who have no law, and then those who are transgressors — the wicked. It is rendered transgressors in ^{<4158>}Matthew 15:28; ^{<4225>}Luke 22:37, and wicked, ^{<4423>}Acts 2:23; ^{<3118>}2 Thessalonians 2:8.

And disobedient Those who are insubordinate, lawless, refractory. The word properly means those who are under no subjection or authority. It occurs in the New Testament only here, and ^{<3106>}Titus 1:6,10, where it is rendered unruly, and ^{<3118>}Hebrews 2:8, where it is translated not put under; that is, under Christ.

For the ungodly Those who have no religion; who do not worship or honor God. The Greek word occurs in the following places, in all of which

it is rendered ungodly; ^{<6006>}Romans 4:5; 5:6; ^{<5009>}1 Timothy 1:9; ^{<6048>}1 Peter 4:18; ^{<6048>}2 Peter 2:5; 3:7; ^{<6015>}Jude 1:15. The meaning is, that the law is against all who do not worship or honor God.

And for sinners The word used here is the common word to denote sinners. It is general, and includes sins of all kinds.

For unholy “Those who are regardless of duty to God or man,” Robinson, Lexicon. The word occurs in the New Testament only here, and in ^{<5882>}2 Timothy 3:2. It has particular reference to those who fail of their duty toward God, and means those who have no piety; who are irreligious.

And profane This does not necessarily mean that they were profane in the sense that blasphemed the name of God, or were profane swearers — though the word would include that — but it means properly those who are impious, or who are scoffers; notes, ^{<5826>}Hebrews 12:16. The word occurs only in the following places, in all of which it is rendered profane: ^{<5009>}1 Timothy 1:9; 4:7; 6:20; ^{<5826>}2 Timothy 2:16; ^{<5826>}Hebrews 12:16. A man who treats religion with contempt, mockery, or scorn, would correspond with the meaning of the word.

For murderers of fathers The Greek properly means a “smiter of a father” (Robinson), though here it undoubtedly means a parricide. This was expressly forbidden by the law of Moses, and was a crime punishable by death; ^{<0215>}Exodus 21:15. It is said to have been a crime which the Roman law did not contemplate as possible, and hence that there was no enactment against it. It is, indeed, a crime of the highest order; but facts have shown that if the Romans supposed it would never be committed, they did not judge aright of human nature. There is no sin which man will not commit if unrestrained, and there is in fact no conceivable form of crime of which he has not been guilty.

Murderers of mothers A still more atrocious and monstrous crime, if possible, than the former. We can conceive nothing superior to this in atrocity, and yet it has been committed. Nero caused his mother to be murdered, and the annals of crime disclose the names of not a few who have imbrued their own hands in the blood of those who bare them. This was also expressly forbidden by the law of Moses; ^{<0215>}Exodus 21:15.

For manslayers This word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It means a homicide — a murderer. The crime is expressly forbidden by the law; ^{<0213>}Exodus 20:13; ^{<0006>}Genesis 9:6.

1 Timothy 1:10. *For whoremongers* ^{<B92>}Leviticus 19:29; 20:5.

For them that defile themselves with mankind Sodomites. See the evidence that this crime abounded in ancient times, in the notes on ^{<B17>}Romans 1:27. It was forbidden by the law of Moses, and was punishable with death; ^{<B13>}Leviticus 20:13.

For menstealers The word here used— *ανδραποδιστης* ^{<405>} — occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It properly means one who steals another for the purpose of making him a slave — a kidnapper. This is the common way in which people are made slaves. Some, indeed, are taken in war and sold as slaves, but the mass of those who have been reduced to servitude have become slaves by being kidnapped. Children are stolen from their parents, or wives from their husbands, or husbands from their wives, or parents from their children, or whole families are stolen together. None become slaves voluntarily, and consequently the whole process of making slaves partakes of the nature of theft of the worst kind. What theft is like that of stealing a man's children, or his wife, or his father or mother? The guilt of manstealing is incurred essentially by those who purchase those who are thus stolen — as the purchaser of a stolen horse, knowing it to be so, participates in the crime. A measure of that criminality also adheres to all who own slaves, and who thus maintain the system — for it is a system known to have been originated by theft. This crime was expressly forbidden by the law of God, and was made punishable with death; ^{<B16>}Exodus 21:16; ^{<B47>}Deuteronomy 24:7.

For liars ^{<B12>}Leviticus 6:2-4; 19:11.

For perjured persons Those who swear falsely; ^{<B12>}Leviticus 19:12; 6:3; ^{<B17>}Exodus 20:7.

And if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine To sound or correct teaching — for so the word doctrine means. The meaning is, if there is anything else that is opposed to the instruction which the law of God gives.

1 Timothy 1:11. *According to the glorious gospel* The gospel is a system of divine revelation. It makes known the will of God. It states what is duty, and accords in its great principles with the law, or is in harmony with it. The law, in principle, forbids all which the gospel forbids, and in publishing the requirements of the gospel, therefore, Paul says that the law

really forbade all which was prohibited in the gospel, and was designed to restrain all who would act contrary to that gospel. There is no contradiction between the law and the gospel. They forbid the same things, and in regard to morals and true piety, the clearer revelations of the gospel are but carrying out the principles stated in the law. They who preach the gospel, then, should not be regarded as arrayed against the law, and Paul says that they who preached the gospel aright really stated the true principles of the law. This he evidently intends should bear against the false teachers who professed to explain the law of Moses. He means here that if a man wished to explain the law, the best explanation would be found in that gospel which it was his office to publish; compare ^{<4931>}Romans 3:31.

Of the blessed God Revealed by the blessed God — the same God who was the Author of the law.

Which was committed to my trust Not to him alone, but to him in common with others. He had received it directly from the Lord; ^{<4917>}1 Corinthians 9:17; notes, ^{<4901>}Galatians 1:1.

^{<5012>}**1 Timothy 1:12.** *And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord* The mention of the gospel (^{<5011>}1 Timothy 1:11), and of the fact that it was committed to him, leads the apostle to express his gratitude to him who had called him to the work of preaching it. The Lord Jesus had called him when he was a blasphemer and a persecutor. He had constrained him to leave his career of persecution and blasphemy, and to consecrate himself to the defense and the propagation of the gospel. For all this, though it had required him to give up his favorite projects in life, and all the flattering schemes of ambition, he now felt that praise was due to the Redeemer. If there is anything for which a good man will be thankful, and should be thankful, it is that he has been so directed by the Spirit and providence of God as to be put into the ministry. It is indeed a work of toil, and of self-denial, and demanding many sacrifices of personal ease and comfort. It requires a man to give up his splendid prospects of worldly distinction, and of wealth and ease. It is often identified with want, and poverty, and neglect, and persecution. But it is an office so honorable, so excellent, so noble, and ennobling; it is attended with so many precious comforts here, and is so useful to the world, and it has such promises of blessedness and happiness in the world to come, that no matter what a man is required to give up in order to become a minister of the gospel, he should be thankful to Christ for putting him into the office. A minister, when he comes to die, feels that

the highest favor which Heaven has conferred on him has been in turning his feet away from the paths of ambition, and the pursuits of ease or gain, and leading him to that holy work to which he has been enabled to consecrate his life.

Who hath enabled me Who has given me ability or strength for this service. The apostle traced to the Lord Jesus the fact that he was in the ministry at all, and all the ability which he had to perform the duties of that holy office. It is not necessary here to suppose, as many have done, that he refers to miraculous power conferred on him, but he makes the acknowledgment which any faithful minister would do, that all the strength which he has to perform the duties of his office is derived from Christ; compare notes, ~~<B157>~~John 15:5; ~~<4510>~~1 Corinthians 15:10.

For that he counted me faithful This is equivalent to saying that he reposed confidence in me. It means that there was something in the character of Paul, and in his attachment to the Saviour, on which reliance could be placed, or that there was that which gave the assurance that he would be faithful. A sovereign, when he sends an ambassador to a foreign court, reposes confidence in him, and would not commission him unless he had reason to believe that he would be faithful. So it is in reference to all who are called by the Redeemer into the ministry. They are his ambassadors to a lost world. His putting them into the ministry is an act expressive of great confidence in them — for he commits to them great and important interests. Hence, learn:

(1) that no one ought to regard himself as called to the ministry who will not be “faithful” to his Master; and

(2) that the office of the ministry is most honorable and responsible. Nowhere else are there so great interests entrusted to man.

~~<5013>~~**1 Timothy 1:13.** *Who was before a blasphemer* This does not mean that Paul before his conversion was what would now be regarded as an open blasphemer — that he was one who abused and reviled sacred things, or one who was in the habit of profane swearing. His character appears to have been just the reverse of this, for he was remarkable for treating what he regarded as sacred with the utmost respect; see the notes on ~~<5014>~~Philippians 3:4-6. The meaning is, that he had reviled the name of Christ, and opposed him and his cause — not believing that he was the Messiah; and in thus opposing he had really been guilty of blasphemy. The

true Messiah he had in fact treated with contempt and reproaches, and he now looked back upon that fact with the deepest mortification, and with wonder that one who had been so treated by him should have been willing to put him into the ministry. On the meaning of the word blaspheme, see the notes on ^{<408>}Matthew 9:3; compare ^{<4051>}Acts 26:11. In his conduct here referred to, Paul elsewhere says, that he thought at the time that he was doing what he ought to do (^{<409>}Acts 26:9); here he says that he now regarded it as blasphemy. Hence, learn that people may have very different views of their conduct when they come to look at it in subsequent life. What they now regard as harmless, or even as right and proper, may hereafter overwhelm them with shame and remorse. The sinner will yet feel the deepest self-reproaches for that which now gives us no uneasiness.

And a persecutor ^{<400>}Acts 9:1ff; 22:4; 26:11; ^{<659>}1 Corinthians 15:9; ^{<803>}Galatians 1:13,23.

And injurious The word here used (^{<597>}ὄβριστης), occurs only in one other place in the New Testament, ^{<610>}Romans 1:30, where it is rendered “despiteful.” The word injurious does not quite express its force. It does not mean merely doing injury, but refers rather to the manner or spirit in which it is done. It is a word of intenser signification than either the word “blasphemer,” or “persecutor,” and means that what he did was done with a proud, haughty, insolent spirit. There was wicked and malicious violence, an arrogance and spirit of tyranny in what he did, which greatly aggravated the wrong that was done; compare the Greek in ^{<426>}Matthew 22:6; ^{<216>}Luke 11:45; 18:32; ^{<446>}Acts 14:5; ^{<510>}1 Thessalonians 2:2; ^{<720>}2 Corinthians 12:10, for illustrations of the meaning of the word. Tyndale and Coverdale render it here “tyrant.”

But I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief compare notes on ^{<234>}Luke 23:34. The ignorance and unbelief of Paul were not such excuses for what he did that they would wholly free him from blame, nor did he regard them as such — for what he did was with a violent and wicked spirit — but they were mitigating circumstances. They served to modify his guilt, and were among the reasons why God had mercy on him. What is said here, therefore, accords with what the Saviour said in his prayer for his murderers; “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” It is undoubtedly true that persons who sin ignorantly, and who regard themselves as right in what they do, are much more likely to obtain mercy than those who do wrong designedly.⁷

~~5014~~ **1 Timothy 1:14.** *And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant*

That is, in his conversion under these circumstances and in the aid which was afterward imparted to him in his work.

With faith and love which is in Christ Jesus Accompanied with the exercise of faith and love; or producing faith and love. The grace which was imparted to him was seen in the faith and love which it produced; see the notes, ~~6150~~ 1 Corinthians 15:10.

~~5015~~ **1 Timothy 1:15.** *This is a faithful saying* Greek, “Faithful is the word,” or doctrine — ὁ ~~3588~~ λογος ~~3056~~. This verse has somewhat the character of a parenthesis, and seems to have been thrown into the midst of the narrative because the mind of the apostle was full of the subject. He had said that he, a great sinner, had obtained mercy. This naturally led him to think of the purpose for which Christ came into the world — to save sinners — and to think how strikingly that truth had been illustrated in his own case, and how that case had shown that it was worthy the attention of all. The word rendered “saying,” means in this place doctrine, position, or declaration. The word “faithful,” means assuredly true; it was that which might be depended on, or on which reliance might be placed. The meaning is, that the doctrine that Christ came to save sinners might be depended on as certainly true; compare ~~5011~~ 2 Timothy 2:11; ~~5008~~ Titus 3:8.

And worthy of all acceptance Worthy to be embraced or believed by all. This is so, because:

- (1) all are sinners and need a Saviour. All, therefore ought to welcome a doctrine which shows them how they may be saved.
- (2) Because Christ died for all. If he had died for only a part of the race, and could save only a part, it could not be said with any propriety that the doctrine was worthy of the acceptance of all. If that were so, what had it to do with all? How could all be interested in it or benefited by it? If medicine had been provided for only a part of the patients in a hospital, it could not be said that the announcement of such a fact was worthy the attention of all. It would be highly worthy the attention of those for whom it was designed, but there would be a part who would have nothing to do with it; and why should they concern themselves about it? But if it was provided for each one, then each one would have the highest interest in it. So, if salvation has been provided for me, it is a matter claiming my profoundest

attention; and the same is true of every human being. If not provided for me, I have nothing to do with it. It does not concern me at all.

(See this subject discussed at length in the supplementary note on ~~4:14~~ 2 Corinthians 5:14.)

(3) The manner in which the provision of salvation has been made in the gospel is such as to make it worthy of universal acceptance. It provides for the complete pardon of sin, and the restoration of the soul to God. This is done in a way that is honorable to God — maintaining his law and his justice; and, at the same time, it is in a way that is honorable to man. He is treated afterward as a friend of God and an heir of life. He is raised up from his degradation, and restored to the favor of his Maker. If man were himself to suggest a way of salvation, he could think of none that would be more honorable to God and to himself; none that would do so much to maintain the law and to elevate him from all that now degrades him. What higher honor can be conferred on man than to have his salvation sought as an object of intense and earnest desire by one so great and glorious as the Son of God?

(4) It is worthy of all acceptance, from the nature of the salvation itself. Heaven is offered, with all its everlasting glories, through the blood of Christ — and is not this worthy of universal acceptance? People would accept of a coronet or crown; a splendid mansion, or a rich estate; a present of jewels and gold, if freely tendered to them — but what trifles are these compared with heaven! If there is anything that is worthy of universal acceptance, it is heaven — for all will be miserable unless they enter there.

That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners The great and unique doctrine of the gospel. He “came into the world.” He therefore had a previous existence. He came. He had, therefore, an object in coming. It makes his gospel more worthy of acceptance that he had an intention, a plan, a wish, in thus coming into the world. He CAME when he was under no necessity of coming; he came to save, not to destroy; to reveal mercy, not to denounce judgment; to save sinners — the poor, the lost, the wandering, not to condemn them; he came to restore them to the favor of God, to raise them up from their degradation, and to bring them to heaven.

Of whom I am chief Greek, “first.” The word is used to denote eminence — and it means that he occupied the first rank among sinners. There were none who surpassed him. This does not mean that he had been the greatest

of sinners in all respects, but that in some respects he had been so great a sinner, that on the whole there were none who had surpassed him. That to which he particularly refers was doubtless the part which he had taken in putting the saints to death; but in connection with this, he felt, undoubtedly, that he had by nature a heart eminently prone to sin; see Romans 7. Except in the matter of persecuting the saints, the youthful Saul of Tarsus appears to have been eminently moral, and his outward conduct was framed in accordance with the strictest rules of the law; ^{<5086>}Philippians 3:6; ^{<4206>}Acts 26:4,5. After his conversion, he never attempted to extenuate his conduct, or excuse himself. He was always ready, in all circles, and in all places, to admit to its fullest extent the fact that he was a sinner. So deeply convinced was he of the truth of this, that he bore about with him the constant impression that he was eminently unworthy; and hence he does not say merely that he had been a sinner of most aggravated character, but he speaks of it as something that always pertained to him — “of whom I am chief.” We may remark:

- (1) that a true Christian will always be ready to admit that his past life has been evil;
- (2) that this will become the abiding and steady conviction of the soul; and
- (3) that an acknowledgment that we are sinners is not inconsistent with evidence of piety, and with high attainments in it. The most eminent Christian has the deepest sense of the depravity of his own heart and of the evil of his past life.

^{<5016>}**1 Timothy 1:16.** *Howbeit for this cause* That is, this was one of the causes, or this was a leading reason. We are not to suppose that this was the only one. God had other ends to answer by his conversion than this, but this was one of the designs why he was pardoned — that there might be for all ages a permanent proof that sins of the deepest dye might be forgiven. It was well to have one such example at the outset, that a doubt might never arise about the possibility of forgiving great transgressors. The question thus would be settled for ever.

That in me first Not first in the order of time, as our translation would seem to imply, but that in me the first or chief of sinners (^{<1722>}εν ^{<01698>}εμοι ^{<4413>}πρωτω) he might show an example. The idea is, that he sustained the first rank as a sinner, and that Jesus Christ designed to show mercy to him as such, in order that the possibility of pardoning the greatest sinners might

be evinced, and that no one might afterward despair of salvation on account of the greatness of his crimes.

Might shew forth all long-suffering The highest possible degree of forbearance, in order that a case might never occur about which there could be any doubt. It was shown by his example that the Lord Jesus could evince any possible degree of patience, and could have mercy on the greatest imaginable offenders.

For a pattern ὑποτυπωσιν ^{<296>}. This word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, except in ^{<3013>}2 Timothy 1:13, where it is rendered “form.” It properly means a form, sketch, or imperfect delineation. Then it denotes a pattern or example, and here it means that the case of Paul was an example for the encouragement of sinners in all subsequent times. It was that to which they might look when they desired forgiveness and salvation. It furnished all the illustration and argument which they would need to show that they might be forgiven. It settled the question forever that the greatest sinners might be pardoned; for as he was “the chief of sinners,” it proved that a case could not occur which was beyond the possibility of mercy.

Which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting All might learn from the mercy shown to him that salvation could be obtained. From this verse we may learn:

(1) that no sinner should despair of mercy. No one should say that he is so great a sinner that he cannot be forgiven. One who regarded himself as the “chief” of sinners was pardoned, and pardoned for the very purpose of illustrating this truth, that any sinner might be saved. His example stands as the illustration of this to all ages; and were there no other, any sinner might now come and hope for mercy. But there are other examples. Sinners of all ranks and descriptions have been pardoned. Indeed, there is no form of depravity of which people can be guilty, in respect to which there are not instances where just such offenders have been forgiven. The persecutor may reflect that great enemies of the cross like him have been pardoned; the profane man and the blasphemer, that many such have been forgiven; the murderer, the thief, the sensualist, that many of the same character have found mercy, and have been admitted to heaven.

(2) The fact that great sinners have been pardoned, is a proof that others of the same description may be also. The same mercy that saved them can

save us — for mercy is not exhausted by being frequently exercised. The blood of atonement which has cleansed so many can cleanse us — for its efficacy is not destroyed by being once applied to the guilty soul. Let no one then despair of obtaining mercy because he feels that his sins are too great to be forgiven. Let him look to the past, and remember what God has done. Let him remember the case of Saul of Tarsus; let him think of David and Peter; let him recall the names of Augustine, and Colonel Gardiner, and the Earl of Rochester, and John Newton, and John Bunyan — and thousands like them, who have found mercy; and in their examples let him see a full proof that God is willing to save any sinner, no matter how vile, provided he is penitent and believing.

^{<5017>}**1 Timothy 1:17** *Now unto the king eternal* This ascription of praise is offered to God in view of the mercy which he had shown to so great a sinner. It is the outbreak of that grateful emotion which swelled his bosom, and which would not be denied expression, when Paul recalled his former life and the mercy of God to his soul. It somewhat interrupts indeed the train of his remarks, but the heart was so full that it demanded utterance. It is just an instance of the joy and gratitude which fill the soul of a Christian when he is led along in a train of reflections which conduct him to the recollections of his former sin and danger, and to the fact that he has obtained mercy and has now the hope of heaven. The apostle Paul not unfrequently, in accordance with a mode of writing that was common among the Hebrews, interposes an expression of praise in the midst of his reasonings; compare ^{<5015>}Romans 1:25; ^{<7113>}2 Corinthians 11:31. God is called King here, as he is often in the Scriptures, to denote that he rules over the universe. A literal translation of the passage would be, “To the King of ages, who is immortal,” etc. The meaning of this expression — “the King of ages” — βασιλει ^{<935>}των ^{<588>}αιωνων ^{<165>} — is, that he is a king who rules throughout all ages. This does not mean that he himself lives for ever, but that his dominion extends over all ages or generations. The rule of earthly monarchs does not extend into successive ages; his does. Their reign is temporary; his is enduring, and continues as one generation after another passes on, and thus embraces them all.

Immortal This refers to God himself, not to his reign. It means that he does not die, and it is given to him to distinguish him from other sovereigns. All other monarchs but God expire — and are just as liable to die at any moment as any other people.

Invisible ^{<5066>}1 Timothy 6:16; see the notes on ^{<6118>}John 1:18.

The only wise God notes, ^{<5672>}Romans 16:27. The word “wise” is missing in many MSS., and in some editions of the New Testament. It is omitted by Griesbach; marked as doubtful by Tittman, and rejected in the valuable edition of Hahn. Erasmus conjectures that it was added against the Arians, who maintained that the Father only was God, and that as he is here mentioned as such, the word wise was interpolated to denote merely that the attribute of perfect wisdom belonged only to him. Wetstein regards the reading as genuine, and suspects that in some of the early manuscripts where it is missing it was omitted by the transcriber, because it was regarded as inelegant for two adjectives to be united in this manner. It is not easy to determine as to the genuineness of the reading. The sense is not materially affected, whichever view be adopted. It is true that Yahweh is the only God; it is also true that he is the only wise God. The gods of the pagan are “vanity and a lie,” and they are wholly destitute of wisdom; see ^{<4878>}Psalms 115:3-8; 135:15-18; ^{<2308>}Isaiah 40:18-20; 44:10-17.

Be honour Let there be all the respect and veneration shown to him which is his due.

And glory Praise. Let him be praised by all for ever.

Amen So be it; an expression of strong affirmation; ^{<4878>}John 3:3. Here it is used to denote the solemn assent of the heart to the sentiment conveyed by the words used; see the notes on ^{<4163>}Matthew 6:13; ^{<6446>}1 Corinthians 14:16.

^{<5018>}**1 Timothy 1:18.** *This charge* This command or injunction. It does not refer to any “charge,” or “cure,” which he had as bishop or minister, as the word is sometimes used now, but to the commands or injunctions which he was delivering to him. The command particularly referred to is that in ^{<5008>}1 Timothy 1:8.

According to the prophecies which went before on thee The general meaning of this is plain. It is, that Paul was committing to him an important trust, and one that required great wisdom and fidelity; and that in doing it he was acting in conformity with the hopes which had been cherished respecting Timothy, and with certain expressed anticipations about his influence in the church. From early life the hope had been entertained that he would be a man to whom important trusts might be committed; and it

had been predicted that he would be distinguished as a friend of religion. These hopes seem to have been cherished in consequence of the careful training in religion which he had had (~~2~~ Timothy 2:1; 3:15), and probably from the early indications of seriousness, prudence, and piety, which he manifested. It was natural to entertain such hopes, and it seems, from this place, that such hopes had even assumed the form of predictions. It is not absolutely necessary to suppose that these predictions referred to by the word prophecies were inspired, for the word may be used in a popular sense, as it is often now. We speak now familiarly of predicting or foretelling the future usefulness of a serious, prudent, studious, and pious youth. We argue from what he is, to what he will be, and we do not deem it unsafe or improper to hazard the prediction that, if he lives, he will be a man to whom important interests may be entrusted. As there were, however, prophets in the Christian church (notes, ~~4117~~ Acts 11:27; 1 Corinthians 14), and as it is possible that in some cases they were inspired to foretell future events, it cannot be regarded as improper to suppose that some of them had foretold the future usefulness of this religiously educated youth. Whatever may be meant by the expression, this general observation may be made, that when a young man enters on the active duties of life, and when great interests are entrusted to him, it is not improper to remind him of the hopes which had been cherished of him; of the anticipations which had been formed of his future usefulness; and of the expressions which have been used by the pious and the discerning respecting his future character. This is a kind of reminiscence which will rather increase his sense of responsibility than flatter his vanity; and it may be made a means of exciting him to diligence and fidelity. A virtuous young man will not willingly disappoint the long-cherished hopes of his friends. He will be likely to be made more diligent by the remembrance of all their fond anticipations of his future success.

That thou by them By those prophecies. That is, that being stimulated and excited by those predictions and hopes, you might be led to fidelity and usefulness.

Mightest war a good warfare The Christian life is often compared to a warfare or struggle for victory (compare ~~6000~~ Ephesians 6:10-17; ~~4007~~ 1 Corinthians 9:7; ~~4000~~ 2 Corinthians 4:4), and the services of the Christian ministry especially are likened to those of a soldier; ~~4000~~ 2 Timothy 2:3,4; 4:7. The meaning here is, that he should contend with earnestness as a Christian and a minister in that holy service in which he was engaged, and

endeavor to secure the victory. He “wars a good warfare” who is engaged in a righteous cause; who is faithful to his commander and to his post; who is unslumbering in observing the motions of the enemy, and fearless in courage in meeting them; who never forsakes his standard, and who continues thus faithful until the period of his enlistment has expired, or until death. Such a soldier the Christian minister should be.

1 Timothy 1:19. *Holding faith* Fidelity to the cause in which you are enlisted — as a good soldier should do. This does not mean, as it seems to me, that Timothy should hold to the system of doctrines revealed in the gospel, but that he should have that fidelity which a good soldier should have. He should not betray his trust. He should adhere to the cause of his master with unwavering steadfastness. This would include, of course, a belief of the truth, but this is not the leading idea in the phrase.

And a good conscience see the notes, ^{<420>}Acts 23:1. A good conscience, as well as fidelity, is necessary in the service of the Redeemer. A good conscience is that which is well informed in regard to what is right, and where its dictates are honestly followed.

Which some having put away That is, which good conscience some have put from them, or in other words, have not followed its dictates. The truth thus taught is, that people make shipwreck of their faith by not keeping a good conscience. They love sin. They follow the leadings of passion. They choose to indulge in carnal propensities. As a matter of course, they must, if they will do this, reject and renounce the gospel. People become infidels because they wish to indulge in sin. No man can be a sensualist, and yet love that gospel which enjoins purity of life. If people would keep a good conscience, the way to a steady belief in the gospel would be easy. If people will not, they must expect sooner or later to be landed in infidelity.

Concerning faith In respect to the whole subject of faith. They are unfaithful to God, and they reject the whole system of the gospel. “Faith” is sometimes used to denote the gospel — as faith is the principal thing in the gospel.

Have made shipwreck There is an entire destruction of faith — as a ship is wholly ruined that strikes on a rock and sinks.

1 Timothy 1:20. *Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander* Hymeneus is nowhere else mentioned in the New Testament, except in ^{<507>}2 Timothy

2:17, where he is mentioned in connection with Philetus as a very dangerous man. An Alexander is mentioned in ^{<HERB>}Acts 19:33, which some have supposed to be the same as the one referred to here. It is not certain, however, that the same person is intended; see the notes on that verse. In ^{<SMH4>}2 Timothy 4:14, Alexander the coppersmith is mentioned as one who had done the apostle “much evil,” and there can be little doubt that he is the same person who is referred to here. One of the doctrines which Hymeneus held was, that the “resurrection was past already” (^{<SDS>}2 Timothy 2:18); but what doctrine Alexander held is unknown, It is not improbable, as he is mentioned here in connection with Hymeneus, that he maintained the same opinion, and in addition to that he appears to have been guilty of some personal injury to the apostle. Both also were guilty of blasphemy.

Whom I have delivered unto Satan On the meaning of this expression, see the notes on ^{<KRE>}1 Corinthians 5:5.

That they may learn not to blaspheme It cannot be supposed that Satan would undertake to teach them not to blaspheme, or that Paul put them under him as an instructor on that subject. The instructions of Satan tend rather to teach his followers to blaspheme, and none in his school fail to be apt scholars. The meaning here is, that Paul excommunicated them, and not improbably brought upon them, by giving them over to Satan, some physical maladies, that they might be reformed; compare notes on ^{<KRE>}1 Corinthians 5:5. It is not entirely clear what is meant by blaspheme in this place; compare notes on ^{<SOIB>}1 Timothy 1:13. It cannot be supposed that they were open and bold blasphemers, for such could not have maintained a place in the church, but rather that they held doctrines which the apostle regarded as amounting to blasphemy; that is, doctrines which were in fact a reproach on the divine character. There are many doctrines held by people which are in fact a reflection on the divine character, and which amount to the same thing as blasphemy. A blasphemer openly expresses views of the divine character which are a reproach to God; an errorist expresses the same thing in another way — by teaching as true about God that which represents him in a false light, and, to suppose which, in fact, is a reproach. The spirit with which this is done in the two cases may be different; the thing itself may be the same. Let us be careful that we hold no views about God which are reproachful to him, and which, though we do not express it in words, may lead us to blaspheme him in our hearts.

NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY 2

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter (1 Timothy 2) is occupied mainly in directions about the mode of conducting public worship. Timothy had been left at Ephesus to complete the plans which the apostle had commenced in reference to the church there, but from completing which he had been unexpectedly prevented (see the Intro.), and it was important to state the views which he entertained on this subject to Timothy. It was important also that general directions on these subjects should be given, which would be useful to the church at large. The directions in this chapter relate to the following subjects:

I. Public prayer; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:1-8.

(1) It was to be offered for all classes of people, without distinction of rank, sect, party, country, or name, especially for all that were in authority; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:1,2. The reasons for this were:

(a) That God desired all people to be saved, and it was acceptable to him that prayer should be offered for all; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:3,4.

(b) There is but one God over all the human race, and all are alike his children; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:5.

(c) There is one and the same Mediator between God and all people; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:5.

(d) The same atonement has been made for all; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:6,7.

(2) The way in which prayer should be offered. It should be with holy hands, and without the intermingling of any bad passion; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:8.

II. The duties of women; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:9-15.

(1) Modesty in their demeanor and apparel; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:9.

(2) Good works — the chief ornament of women professing piety; ^{<5111>}1 Timothy 2:10.

(3) The duty of learning from others with a gentle and quiet spirit; ^{<421>}1 Timothy 2:11.

(4) The duty of a proper subordination and submission to man; ^{<422>}1 Timothy 2:12.

(5) The reasons for this subordination and submission are then stated. They are:

(a) That Adam was first formed; ^{<423>}1 Timothy 2:13.

(b) That the woman had been deceived, and should be willing to occupy a subordinate place, as she was first in the transgression and was the means of leading him into sin; ^{<424>}1 Timothy 2:14.

(6) Yet, as if to make a kind remark in favor of woman — to show that he did not intend to teach that she was degraded and abandoned of God — the apostle says that she would be under the divine protection, and that in the special sorrow and peril which had been brought upon her for her transgression, God would sustain her if she continued in faith, and evinced the spirit of a Christian in her life; ^{<425>}1 Timothy 2:15.

^{<426>}**1 Timothy 2:1.** *I exhort, therefore* Margin, “desire.” The word exhort, however, better expresses the sense of the original. The exhortation here is not addressed particularly to Timothy, but relates to all who were called to lead in public prayer; ^{<427>}1 Timothy 2:8. This exhortation, it may be observed, is inconsistent with the supposition that a liturgy was then in use, or with the supposition that there ever would be a liturgy — since, in that case, the objects to be prayed for would be prescribed. How singular would it be now for an Episcopal bishop to “exhort” his presbyters to pray “for the President of the United States and for all who are in authority.” When the prayer is prescribed, do they not do this as a matter of course?

First of all That is, as the first duty to be enjoined; the thing that is to be regarded with primary concern; compare ^{<428>}Luke 12:1; ^{<601>}2 Peter 1:20. It does not mean that this was to be the first thing in public worship in the order of time, but that it was to be regarded as a duty of primary importance. The duty of praying for the salvation of the whole world was not to be regarded as a subordinate and secondary thing.

Supplications It is not entirely easy to mark the difference in the meaning of the words used here, and it is not essential. They all relate to prayer, and

refer only to the different parts of prayer, or to distinct classes of thought and desire which come before the mind in pleading for others. On the difference between the words supplications and prayers, see notes on ^{<8187>}Hebrews 5:7.

Intercessions The noun used occurs only in this place and in ^{<5015>}1 Timothy 4:5, of this Epistle. The verb, however (^{<1793>}εὐτυγχάνω), occurs in ^{<4214>}Acts 25:4; ^{<4187>}Romans 8:27,34; 11:2; ^{<3075>}Hebrews 7:25. See the meaning explained in the notes on ^{<4186>}Romans 8:26; ^{<3075>}Hebrews 7:25. There is one great Intercessor between God and man, who pleads for our salvation on the ground of what he himself has done, but we are permitted to intercede for others, not on the ground of any merit which they or we possess, but on the ground of the merit of the great Advocate and Intercessor. It is an inestimable privilege to be permitted to plead for the salvation of our fellow-men.

Giving of thanks That is, in behalf of others. We ought to give thanks for the mercy of God to ourselves; it is right and proper also that we should give thanks for the goodness of God to others. We should render praise that there is a way of salvation provided; that no one is excluded from the offer of mercy; and that God is using so many means to call lost sinners to himself.

For all men Prayers should be made for all people — for all need the grace and mercy of God; thanks should be rendered for all, for all may be saved. Does not this direction imply that Christ died for all mankind? How could we give thanks in their behalf if there were no mercy for them, and no way had been provided by which they could be saved? It may be observed here, that the direction to pray and to give thanks for all people, showed the large and catholic nature of Christianity. It was opposed entirely to the narrow and bigoted feelings of the Jews, who regarded the whole Gentile world as excluded from covenant mercies, and as having no offer of life. Christianity threw down all these barriers, and all people are on a level; and since Christ has died for all, there is ample ground for thanksgiving and praise in behalf of the whole human race.

See Supplementary note, ^{<4154>}2 Corinthians 5:14.

^{<5011>}**1 Timothy 2:2.** *For kings* On the respect due to rulers, see the notes on ^{<4311>}Romans 13:1-7. The meaning here is, that while all people should be the subjects of prayer, those should be particularly remembered before the

throne of grace who are in authority. The reason is, that so much depends on their character and plans; that the security of life, liberty, and property, depends so much on them. God has power to influence their hearts, and to incline them to what is just and equal; and hence we should pray that a divine influence may descend upon them. The salvation of a king is of itself of no more importance than that of a peasant or a slave; but the welfare of thousands may depend on him, and hence he should be made the special subject of prayer.

All that are in authority Margin, or, “eminent place.” This does not necessarily mean those who hold office, but refers to any of elevated rank. The happiness of all who are under their control depends greatly on them, and hence we should pray for them that they may be converted people, and inclined to do that which is right.

That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life That their hearts may be so inclined to what is right that they may protect us in the enjoyment of religion, and that we may not be opposed or harassed by persecution. This does not mean that their protection would dispose us to lead quiet and peaceful lives, but that under their protection we may be saved from oppression on account of our religion. Christians are disposed of themselves to be peaceful and orderly; they ask of their rulers only that they may not be harassed in the enjoyment of their rights.

In all godliness and honesty In the practice of all our duties toward God, and of all the duties which we owe to people. The word godliness here denotes piety — or the duty which we owe to God; the word honesty refers to our duties to our fellow-men. The Christian asks from civil rulers such protection that; he maybe enabled quietly to perform both these classes of duties.

1 Timothy 2:3. *For this is good and acceptable* That is, it is good and acceptable to God that we should pray for all people. The reason is, that he desires their salvation, and hence it is agreeable to him that we should pray for it. If there were no provision made for their salvation, or if he was unwilling that they should be saved, it could not be agreeable to him that we should offer prayer for them.

1 Timothy 2:4. *Who will have all men to be saved* That is, it is in accordance with his nature, his feelings, his desires. The word “will” cannot be taken here in the absolute sense, denoting a decree like that by

which he willed the creation of the world, for then it would certainly be done. But the word is often used to denote a desire, wish, or what is in accordance with the nature of anyone. Thus it may be said of God that he “wills” that his creatures may be happy — because it is in accordance with his nature, and because he has made abundant provision for their happiness — though it is not true that he wills it in the sense that he exerts his absolute power to make them happy. God wills that sickness should be relieved, and sorrow mitigated, and that the oppressed should go free, because it is agreeable to his nature; though it is not true that he wills it in the sense that he exerts his absolute power to produce it. A parent wills the welfare of his child. It is in accordance with his nature, his feelings, his desires; and he makes every needful arrangement for it. If the child is not virtuous and happy, it is his own fault. So God wills that all people should be saved. It would be in accordance with his benevolent nature. He has made ample provision for it. He uses all proper means to secure their salvation. He uses no positive means to prevent it, and if they are not saved it will be their own fault. For places in the New Testament where the word here translated “will” (θελω ^{<230>}), means to desire or wish, see ^{<181>}Luke 8:20; 23:8; ^{<186>}John 16:19; ^{<184>}Galatians 4:20; Mark 17:24; ^{<180>}1 Corinthians 7:7; 11:3; 14:5; ^{<153>}Matthew 15:28. This passage cannot mean, as many have supposed, that God wills that all kinds of people should be saved, or that some sinners of every rank and class may be saved, because:

- (1) the natural and obvious interpretation of the language is opposed to such a sense. The language expresses the desire that “all men” should be saved, and we should not depart from the obvious sense of a passage unless necessity requires it.
- (2) Prayer and thanksgiving (^{<511>}1 Timothy 2:1) are directed to be offered, not for some of all ranks and conditions, but for all mankind. No exception is made, and no direction is given that we should exclude any of the race from the expressions of our sympathy, and from an interest in our supplications. The reason given here for that prayer is, that God desires that all people should be saved. But how could this be a reason for praying for all, if it means that God desired only the salvation of some of all ranks?
- (3) In ^{<515>}1 Timothy 2:5,6 the apostle gives reasons showing that God wished the salvation of all people, and those reasons are such as to prove that the language here is to be taken in the most unlimited sense. Those reasons are:

(a) that there is one God over all, and one Mediator between God and people — showing that God is the Father of all, and has the same interest in all; and

(b) that Christ gave himself a ransom for all — showing that God desired their salvation. This verse proves:

(1) that salvation is provided for all — for if God wished all people to be saved, he would undoubtedly make provision for their salvation; and if he had not made such provision, it could not be said that he desired their salvation, since no one can doubt that he has power to provide for the salvation of all;

(2) that salvation should be offered to all people — for if God desires it, it is right for his ministers to announce that desire, and if he desires it, it is not proper for them to announce anything contrary to this;

(3) that people are to blame if they are not saved. If God did not wish their salvation, and if he had made no provision for it, they could not be to blame if they rejected the gospel. If God wishes it, and has made provision for it, and they are not saved, the sin must be their own — and it is a great sin, for there is no greater crime which a man can commit than to destroy his own soul, and to make himself the eternal enemy of his Maker.

And to come unto the knowledge of the truth The truth which God has revealed; the “truth as it is in Jesus.” notes, ^{<402>}Ephesians 4:21.

^{<405>}**1 Timothy 2:5.** *For there is one God* This is a reason for offering prayer for all people, and for the declaration (^{<404>}1 Timothy 2:4) that God desires that all people should be saved. The reason is founded in the fact that he is the common Father of all the race, and that he must have the same desire for the welfare of all his children, He has made them of one blood (^{<406>}Acts 17:26), and he must have the same interest in the happiness of all; compare notes, ^{<406>}Ephesians 4:6; ^{<403>}Romans 3:30.

And one Mediator between God and men see notes on ^{<409>}Galatians 3:19,20; ^{<309>}Hebrews 9:15. This also is given as a reason why prayer should be offered for all, and a proof that God desires their salvation. The argument is, that there is the same Mediator between God and all people. He is not the Mediator between God and a part of the human race, but between “God and men,” implying that He desired the salvation of the race. Whatever love there was in giving the Mediator at all, was love for all

the race; whatever can be argued from that about the interest which God has in man, is proof of his interest in the race at large. It is proper, therefore, to pray for all. It may be remarked here that there is but one Mediator. There is not one for kings and another for their subjects; one for the rich and another for the poor; one for the master and another for the slave. All are on the same level, and the servant may feel that, in the gift of a Mediator, God regarded him with the same interest that he did his master. It may be added also that the doctrine of the Papists that the saints or the Virgin Mary may act as mediators to procure blessings for us, is false. There is but “one Mediator;” and but one is necessary. Prayer offered to the “saints,” or to the “Virgin,” is idolatry, and at the same time removes the one great Mediator from the office which he alone holds, of making intercession with God.

The man Christ Jesus Jesus was truly and properly a man, having a perfect human body and soul, and is often called a man in the New Testament. But this does not prove that he was not also divine — anymore than his being called God (^{<B00>}John 1:1; 20:28; ^{<B05>}Romans 9:5; ^{<A50>}1 John 5:20; ^{<B08>}Hebrews 1:8), proves that he was not also a man. The use of the word man here was probably designed to intimate that though he was divine, it was in his human nature that we are to consider him as discharging the office. Doddridge.

^{<B06>}**1 Timothy 2:6.** *Who gave himself a ransom for all* This also is stated as a reason why prayer should be offered for all, and a proof that God desires the salvation of all. The argument is, that as Christ died for all, it is proper to pray for all, and that the fact that he died for all is proof that God desired the salvation of all. Whatever proof of his desire for their salvation can be derived from this in relation to any of the race, is proof in relation to all. On the meaning of the phrase “he gave himself a ransom,” see the notes on ^{<A08>}Matthew 20:28; ^{<B05>}Romans 3:25; on the fact that it was for “all,” see the notes on ^{<A54>}2 Corinthians 5:14.

To be testified in due time Margin, “a testimony.” The Greek is, “the testimony in its own times,” or in proper times — το ^{<358>}μαρτυριον ^{<314>}καιροισ ^{<254>}ιδιοις ^{<238>}. There have been very different explanations of this phrase. The common interpretation, and that which seems to me to be correct, is, that “the testimony of this will be furnished in the proper time; that is, in the proper time it shall be made known through all the world;” see Rosenmuller. Paul affirms it as a great and important truth that Christ

gave himself a ransom for all mankind — for Jews and Gentiles; for all classes and conditions of people alike. This truth had not always been understood. The Jews had supposed that salvation was designed exclusively for their nation, and denied that it could be extended to others, unless they became Jews. According to them, salvation was not provided for, or offered to pagans as such, but only on condition that they became Jews. In opposition to this, Paul says that it was a doctrine of revelation that redemption was to be provided for all people, and that it was intended that the testimony to this should be afforded at the proper time. It was not fully made known under the ancient dispensation, but now the period had come when it should be communicated to all; compare notes on ^{<816>}Romans 5:6, and ^{<804>}Galatians 4:4.

^{<807>}**1 Timothy 2:7.** *Whereunto* Greek, “Unto which;” that is, to the bearing of which testimony I am appointed.

I am ordained Greek, “I am placed or constituted” — *ετεθην* ^{<5087>}. The word “ordain” has now acquired a technical signification, meaning to set apart solemnly to a sacred office by the imposition of hands; but it has not that meaning here. It does not refer to the manner in which he was set apart, or to any act of others in consecrating him to this work, but merely to the fact that he had been placed in this office, or appointed to it. He refers doubtless to the fact that the Lord Jesus had designated him to this work.

A preacher and an apostle see the notes on ^{<801>}1 Corinthians 9:1-6; ^{<801>}Galatians 1:11,12.

I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not That is, by Christ; or I solemnly appeal to Christ — a form of an oath; notes, ^{<800>}Romans 9:1. Paul makes a solemn declaration similar to this in regard to his call to the apostleship, in ^{<802>}Galatians 1:20. For the reasons why he did it, see the notes on that verse. It is probable that there were those in Ephesus who denied that he could be an apostle, and hence his solemn declaration affirming it.

A teacher of the Gentiles Specially appointed to carry the gospel to the Gentiles or the pagan; see the notes on ^{<5113>}Romans 11:13; ^{<807>}Galatians 2:7.

In faith and verity These words mean that he was appointed to instruct the Gentiles in faith and the knowledge of the truth.

1 Timothy 2:8. *I will therefore* The Greek word here (βουλομαι <1014>) is different from the word rendered “will” — θελω <2309> — in <5414>1 Timothy 2:4. The distinction is, that the word there used — θελω <2309> — denotes an active volition or purpose; the word here used — βουλομαι <1014> — a mere passive desire, propensity, willingness. Robinson’s Lexicon The meaning here is, “it is my will” — expressing his wish in the case, or giving direction — though using a milder word than that which is commonly employed to denote an act of will.

That men pray everywhere Not merely in the temple, or in other sacred places, but in all places. The Jews supposed that there was special efficacy in prayers offered at the temple in Jerusalem; the pagan also had the same view in regard to their temples — for both seemed to suppose that they came nearer to God by approaching his sacred abode. Christianity teaches that God may be worshipped in any place, and that we are at all times equally near him; see the notes on <6040>John 4:20-24; <4475>Acts 17:25. The direction here given that men should pray, in contradistinction from the duties of women, specified in the next verse, may be intended to imply that men should conduct the exercises of public worship. The duties of women pertain to a different sphere; compare <5421>1 Timothy 2:11,12.

Lifting up holy hands To lift up the hands denotes supplication, as it was a common attitude of prayer to spread abroad the hands toward heaven; compare Ps 68:31; <1292>Exodus 19:29,33; <1182>1 Kings 8:22; <4462>2 Chronicles 6:12,13; <2315>Isaiah 1:15; see also Horace Odes, iii. 23. 1; Ovid, M. 9:701; Livy, v. 21; Seneca, Ephesians 21. “Holy hands” here, mean hands that are not defiled by sin, and that have not been employed for any purpose of iniquity. The idea is, that when men approach God they should do it in a pure and holy manner.

Without wrath That is, without the intermingling of any evil passion; with a calm, peaceful, benevolent mind. There should be nothing of the spirit of contention; there should be no anger toward others; the suppliant should be at peace with all people. It is impossible for a man to pray with comfort, or to suppose that his prayers will be heard, if he cherishes anger. The following exquisite and oft-quoted passage from Jeremy Taylor, is a more beautiful and striking illustration of the effect of anger in causing our prayers to return unanswered than was probably ever penned by anyone else. Nothing could be more true, beautiful, and graphic.

“Anger sets the house on fire, and all the spirits are busy upon trouble, and intend propulsion, defense, displeasure, or revenge. It is a short madness, and an eternal enemy to discourse and a fair conversation; it intends its own object with all the earnestness of perception or activity of design, and a quicker motion of a too warm and distempered blood; it is a fever in the heart, and a calenture in the head, and a fire in the face, and a sword in the band, and a fury all over; and therefore can never suffer a man to be in a disposition to pray. For prayer is the peace of our spirit, the stillness of our thoughts, the evenness of recollection, the seat of meditation, the rest of our cares, and the calm of our tempest; prayer is the issue of a quiet mind, of untroubled thoughts; it is the daughter of charity and the sister of meekness; and he that prays to God with an angry, that is, with a troubled and discomposed spirit, is like him that retires into a battle to meditate, and sets up his closet in the out-quarters of an army, and chooses a frontier garrison to be wise in. Anger is a perfect alienation of the mind from prayer, and therefore is contrary to that attention which presents our prayers in a right line to God. For so have I seen a lark rising from his bed of grass, and soaring upward, and singing as he rises, and hopes to get to heaven, and rise above the clouds; but the poor bird was beaten back with the loud sighings of an eastern wind, and his motion made irregular and inconsistent, descending more at every breath of the tempest than it could recover by the libration and frequent weighing of his wings, until the little creature was forced to sit down and pant, and stay till the storm was over; and then it made a prosperous flight, and did rise and sing, as if it had learned music and motion from an angel.” “The Return of Prayers,” Works, vol. i. 638. Ed. Lond. 1835.

And doubting This word, as used here, does not mean, as our translation would seem to imply, that we are to come before God without any doubts of our own piety, or in the exercise of perfect faith. The word used (*διαλογισμος* ^{<1261>}) means, properly, computation, adjustment of accounts; then reflection, thought; then reasoning, opinion; then debate, contention, strife; ^{<1096>}Luke 9:46; ^{<1093>}Mark 9:33,34; ^{<10414>}Philippians 2:14. This is the sense evidently in this place. They were not to approach God in prayer in the midst of clamorous disputings and angry contentions. They were not to come when the mind was heated with debate, and irritated by

strife for victory. Prayer was to be offered in a calm, serious, sober state of mind, and they who engaged in polemical strife, or in warm contention of any kind, are little fitted to unite in the solemn act of addressing God. How often are theologians, when assembled together, so heated by debate, and so anxious for party victory, that they are in no suitable state of mind to pray! How often do even good people, holding different views on the disputed points of religious doctrine, suffer their minds to become so excited, and their temper so ruffled, that they are conscious they are in an unfit state of mind to approach the throne of grace together! That theological debate has gone too far; that strife for victory has become too warm, when the disputants are in such a state of mind that they cannot unite in prayer; when they could not cease their contentions, and with a calm and proper spirit, bow together before the throne of grace.

418-1 Timothy 2:9. *In like manner also* That is, with the same propriety; with the same regard to what religion demands. The apostle had stated particularly the duty of men in public worship (418-1 Timothy 2:8), and he now proceeds to state the duty of women. All the directions here evidently refer to the proper manner of conducting public worship, and not to private duties; and the object here is to state the way in which he would have the different sexes appear. He had said that he would have prayers offered for all people (418-1 Timothy 2:1ff), and that in offering such petitions he would have the men on whom devolved the duty of conducting public devotion, do it with holy hands, and without any intermingling of passion, and with entire freedom from the spirit of contention. In reference to the duty of females in attendance on public worship, he says that he would have them appear in apparel suitable to the place and the occasion — adorned not after the manner of the world, but with the zeal and love in the cause of the Redeemer which became Christians. He would not have a woman become a public teacher (412-1 Timothy 2:12), but would wish her ever to occupy the place in society for which she was designed (421-1 Timothy 2:11), and to which she had shown that she was adapted; 423-1 Timothy 2:13,14. The direction in 419-1 Timothy 2:9-12, therefore, is to be understood particularly of the proper deportment of females in the duties of public worship. At the same time, the principles laid down are doubtless such as were intended to apply to them in the other situations in life, for if modest apparel is appropriate in the sanctuary, it is appropriate everywhere. If what is here prohibited in dress is wrong there, it would be difficult to show that it is right elsewhere.

That women adorn themselves The words “I will” are to be understood here as repeated from ^{<5118>}1 Timothy 2:8. The apostle by the use of the word “adorn” (**κοσμεῖν** ^{<2885>}), shows that he is not opposed to ornament or adorning, provided it be of the right kind. The world, as God has made it, is full of beauty, and he has shown in each flower that he is not opposed to true ornament. There are multitudes of things which, so far as we can see, appear to be designed for mere ornament, or are made merely because they are beautiful. Religion does not forbid true adorning. It differs from the world only on the question what “is” true ornament, or what it becomes us, all things considered, to do in the situation in which we are placed, the character which we sustain, the duties which we have to perform, and the profession which we make. It may be that there are ornaments in heaven which would be anything but appropriate for the condition of a poor, lost, dying sinner on earth.

In modest apparel The word here rendered “modest” (**κοσμιος** ^{<2887>}), properly relates to ornament, or decoration, and means that which is “well-ordered, decorous, becoming.” It does not, properly, mean modest in the sense of being opposed to that which is immodest, or which tends to excite improper passions and desires, but that which is becoming or appropriate. The apostle does not positively specify what this would be, but he mentions somethings which are to be excluded from it, and which, in his view, are inconsistent with the true adorning of Christian females — “broidered hair, gold, pearls, costly array.” The sense here is, that the apparel of females should be such as becomes them, or is appropriate to them. The word here used (**κοσμιος** ^{<2887>}), shows that there should be due attention that it may be truly neat, fit, decorous. There is no religion in a negligent mode of apparel, or in inattention to personal appearance — anymore than there is in wearing gold and pearls; and a female may as truly violate the precepts of her religion by neglecting her personal appearance as by excessive attention to it. The true idea here is, that her attention to her appearance should be such that she will be offensive to no class of persons; such as to show that her mind is supremely fixed on higher and more important things, and such as to interfere with no duty which she owes, and no good which she can do, either by spending her time needlessly in personal adorning, or by lavishing that money for dress which might do good to others, or by neglecting the proprieties of her station, and making herself offensive to others.

With shamefacedness With modesty of appearance and manner — an eminent female virtue, whether in the sanctuary or at home.

And sobriety The word here used means, properly, “sanity;” then sober-mindedness, moderation of the desires and passions. It is opposed to all that is frivolous, and to all undue excitement of the passions. The idea is, that in their apparel and deportment they should not entrench on the strictest decorum. Doddridge.

Not with broided hair Margin, “plaited.” Females in the East pay much more attention to the hair than is commonly done with us. It is plaited with great care, and arranged in various forms, according to the prevailing fashion, and often ornamented with spangles or with silver wire or tissue interwoven; see the notes on ~~2081~~ Isaiah 3:24. The sense here is, that Christian females are not to imitate those of the world in their careful attention to the ornaments of the head. It cannot be supposed that the mere braiding of the hair is forbidden, but only that careful attention to the manner of doing it, and to the ornaments usually worn in it, which characterized worldly females.

Or gold, or pearls It is not to be supposed that all use of gold or pearls as articles of dress is here forbidden; but the idea is, that the Christian female is not to seek these as the adorning which she desires, or is not to imitate the world in these personal decorations. It may be a difficult question to settle how much ornament is allowable, and when the true line is passed. But though this cannot be settled by any exact rules, since much must depend on age, and on the relative rank in life, and the means which one may possess, yet there is one general rule which is applicable to all, and which might regulate all. It is, that the true line is passed when more is thought of this external adorning, than of the ornament of the heart. Any external decoration which occupies the mind more than the virtues of the heart, and which engrosses the time and attention more, we may be certain is wrong. The apparel should be such as not to attract attention; such as becomes our situation; such as will not be particularly singular; such as shall leave the impression that the heart is not fixed on it. It is a poor ambition to decorate a dying body with gold and pearls. It should not be forgotten that the body thus adorned will soon need other habiliments, and will occupy a position where gold and pearls would be a mockery. When the heart is right; when there is true and supreme love for religion, it is usually not difficult to regulate the subject of dress.

Costly array Expensive dress. This is forbidden — for it is foolish, and the money thus employed may be much more profitably used in doing good. “Costly array” includes that which can be ill afforded, and that which is inconsistent with the feeling that the principle ornament is that of the heart.

1 Timothy 2:10. *But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works* That is, it is not appropriate for women who profess to be the followers of the Saviour, to seek to be distinguished for personal, external decorations. If they are Christians, they have seen the vanity of these things, and have fixed the heart on more substantial realities. They are professed followers of Him “who went about doing good,” and the performance of good works especially becomes them. They profess to have fixed the affections on God their Saviour, and to be living for heaven; and it is not becoming in them to seek such ornaments as would indicate that the heart is supremely attached to worldly things. There is great beauty in this direction. Good works, or deeds of benevolence, eminently become a Christian female. The nature of woman seems to be adapted to the performance of all deeds demanding kindness, tenderness, and gentleness of feeling; of all that proceeds from pity, sympathy, and affection; and we feel instinctively that while acts of hardy enterprise and daring in a good cause especially become a Christian man, there is something exquisitely appropriate to the female character in deeds of humble and unobtrusive sympathy and benevolence. God seems to have formed her mind for just such things, and in such things it occupies its appropriate sphere rather than in seeking external adorning.

1 Timothy 2:11. *Let the woman learn in silence* Listen attentively to instruction, without attempting to teach in public; see the notes on **1 Corinthians 14:35**.

With all subjection With due subjection to those who are in authority, and who are appointed to minister in holy things; notes, **1 Corinthians 14:34**.

1 Timothy 2:12. *But I suffer not a woman to teach* see the notes on **1 Corinthians 14:34**.

Nor to usurp authority over the man notes, **1 Corinthians 11:3**.

1 Timothy 2:13. *For Adam was first formed, then Eve* The apostle, in this verse, and the following, gives reasons why a woman should occupy

a subordinate situation, and not usurp authority. The first is, that she was second in the act of creation, or was made subsequent to man. The reason here assigned cannot be understood to be merely that of priority of existence — for then it would give every old person authority over a younger one; but it must refer to the circumstances of the case as detailed in the history of the creation; Genesis 1—2. Man was made as the lord of this lower creation and placed in the garden, and then the woman was made of a rib taken from his side, and given to him, not as a lord, but as a companion. All the circumstances combine to show the subordinate nature of her rank, and to prove that she was not designed to exert authority over the man; compare notes on ~~6108~~ 1 Corinthians 11:8,9.

~~5024~~ **1 Timothy 2:14.** *And Adam was not deceived* This is the second reason why the woman should occupy a subordinate rank in all things. It is, that in the most important situation in which she was ever placed she had shown that she was not qualified to take the lead. She had evinced a readiness to yield to temptation; a feebleness of resistance; a pliancy of character, which showed that she was not adapted to the situation of headship, and which made it proper that she should ever afterward occupy a subordinate situation. It is not meant here that Adam did not sin, nor even that he was not deceived by the tempter, but that the woman opposed a feebler resistance to the temptation than he would have done, and that the temptation as actually applied to her would have been ineffectual on him. To tempt and seduce him to fall, there were needed all the soft persuasions, the entreaties, and example of his wife. Satan understood this, and approached man not with the specious argument of the serpent, but through the allurements of his wife. It is undoubtedly implied here that man in general has a power of resisting certain kinds of temptation superior to that possessed by woman, and hence that the headship properly belongs to him. This is, undoubtedly, the general truth, though there may be many exceptions, and many noble cases to the honor of the female sex, in which they evince a power of resistance to temptation superior to man. In many traits of character, and among them those which are most lovely, woman is superior to man; yet it is undoubtedly true that, as a general thing, temptation will make a stronger impression on her than on him. When it is said that “Adam was not deceived,” it is not meant that when he partook actually of the fruit he was under no deception, but that he was not deceived by the serpent; he was not first deceived, or first in the transgression. The woman should remember that sin began with her, and

she should therefore be willing to occupy an humble and subordinate situation.

But the woman being deceived She was made to suppose that the fruit would not injure her, but would make her wise, and that God would not fulfil his threatening of death. Sin, from the beginning, has been a process of delusion. Every man or woman who violates the law of God is deceived as to the happiness which is expected from the violation, and as to the consequences which will follow it.

~~4025~~ **1 Timothy 2:15.** *Notwithstanding she shall be saved* The promise in this verse is designed to alleviate the apparent severity of the remarks just made about the condition of woman, and of the allusion to the painful facts of her early history. What the apostle had just said would carry the mind back to the period in which woman introduced sin into the world, and by an obvious and easy association, to the sentence which had been passed on her in consequence of her transgression, and to the burden of sorrows which she was doomed to bear. By the remark in this verse, however, Paul shows that it was not his intention to overwhelm her with anguish. He did not design to harrow up her feelings by an unkind allusion to a melancholy fact in her history. It was necessary for him to state, and for her to know, that her place was secondary and subordinate, and he wished this truth ever to be kept in memory among Christians. It was not unkind or improper also to state the reasons for this opinion, and to show that her own history had demonstrated that she was not designed for headship. But she was not to be regarded as degraded and abandoned. She was not to be overwhelmed by the recollection of what “the mother of all living” had done. There were consolations in her case. There was a special divine interposition which she might look for, evincing tender care on the part of God in those deep sorrows which had come upon her in consequence of her transgression; and instead of being crushed and broken-hearted on account of her condition, she should remember that the everlasting arms of God would sustain her in her condition of sorrow and pain. Paul, then, would speak to her the language of consolation, and while he would have her occupy her proper place, he would have her feel that “God was her Friend.” In regard to the nature of the consolation referred to here, there has been a considerable variety of opinion. Some have held, that by the expression “she shall be saved in child-bearing,” the apostle designs to include all the duties of the maternal relation, meaning that she should be saved through the faithful performance of her duties as a mother. Robinson, Lexicon.

Rosenmuller regards the words rendered “child-bearing” (τεκνογονία ^{<5042>}), as synonymous with education, and supposes that the meaning is, that a woman, by the proper training of her children, can obtain salvation as well as her husband, and that her appropriate duty is not public teaching, but the training of her family. Wetstein supposes that it means “she shall be saved from the arts of impostors, and from the luxury and vice of the age, if, instead of wandering about, she remains at home, cultivates modesty, is subject to her husband, and engages carefully in the training of her children.” This sense agrees well with the connection. Calvin supposes that the apostle designs to console the woman by the assurance that, if she bears the trials of her condition of sorrow with a proper spirit, abiding in faith and holiness, she will be saved. She is not to regard herself as cut off from the hope of heaven. Doddridge, Macknight, Clarke, and others suppose that it refers to the promise in ^{<0815>}Genesis 3:15, and means that the woman shall be saved through, or by means of bearing a child, to wit, the Messiah; and that the apostle means to sustain the woman in her sorrows, and in her state of subordination and inferiority, by referring to the honor which has been put upon her by the fact that a woman gave birth to the Messiah. It is supposed also that he means to say that special honor is thus conferred on her over the man, inasmuch as the Messiah had no human father. Doddridge. The objections to this interpretation, however, though it is sustained by most respectable names, seem to me to be insuperable. They are such as these:

(1) The interpretation is too refined and abstruse. It is not that which is obvious. It depends for its point on the fact that the Messiah had no human father, and in the apostle had intended to refer to that, and to build an argument on it it may be doubted whether he would have done it in so obscure a manner. But it may reasonably be questioned whether he would have made that fact a point on which his argument would turn. There would be a species of refinement about such an argument, such as we should not look for in the writings of Paul.

(2) It is not the obvious meaning of the word “child-bearing.” There is nothing in the word which requires that it should have any reference to the birth of the Messiah. The word is of a general character, and properly refers to child-bearing in general.

(3) It is not true that woman would be “saved” merely by having given birth to the Messiah. She will be saved, as man will be, as a consequence of

his having been born; but there is no evidence that the mere fact that woman gave birth to him, and that he had no human father, did anything to save Mary herself, or any one else of her sex. If, therefore, the word refers to the “bearing” of the Messiah, or to the fact that he was born, it would be no more proper to say that this was connected with the salvation of woman than that of man. The true meaning, it seems to me, has been suggested by Calvin, and may be seen by the following remarks:

- (1) The apostle designed to comfort woman, or to alleviate the sadness of the picture which he had drawn respecting her condition.
- (2) He had referred, incidentally, as a proof of the subordinate character of her station, to the first apostasy. This naturally suggested the sentence which was passed on her, and the condition of sorrow to which she was doomed, particularly in child-birth. That was the standing demonstration of her guilt; that the condition in which she suffered most; that the situation in which she was in greatest peril.
- (3) Paul assures her, therefore, that though she must thus suffer, yet that she ought not to regard herself in her deep sorrows and dangers, though on account of sin, as necessarily under the divine displeasure, or as excluded from the hope of heaven. The way of salvation was open to her as well as to men, and was to be entered in the same manner. If she had faith and holiness, even in her condition of sorrow brought on by guilt, she might as well hope for eternal life as man. The object of the apostle seems to be to guard against a possible construction which might be put on his words, that he did not regard the woman as in circumstances as favorable for salvation as those of man, or as if he thought that salvation for her was more difficult, or perhaps that she could not be saved at all. The general sentiments of the Jews in regard to the salvation of the female sex, and their exclusion from the religious privileges which men enjoy; the views of the Muslims in reference to the inferiority of the sex; and the prevalent feelings in the pagan world, degrading the sex and making their condition, in regard to salvation, far inferior to that of man, show the propriety of what the apostle here says, and the fitness that he should so guard himself that his language could not possibly be construed so as to give countenance to such a sentiment. According to the interpretation of the passage here proposed, the apostle does not mean to teach that a Christian female would be certainly saved from death in child-birth — for this would not be true, and the proper construction of the passage does not require us

to understand him as affirming this. Religion is not designed to make any immediate and direct change in the laws of our physical being. It does not of itself guard us from the pestilence; it does not arrest the progress of disease; it does not save us from death; and, as a matter of fact, woman, by the highest degree of piety, is not necessarily saved from the perils of that condition to which she has been subjected in consequence of the apostasy. The apostle means to show this — that in all her pain and sorrow; amidst all the evidence of apostasy, and all that reminds her that she was “first” in the transgression, she may look up to God as her Friend and strength, and may hope for acceptance and salvation.

If they continue If woman continues — it being not uncommon to change the singular form to the plural, especially if the subject spoken of have the character of a noun of multitude. Many have understood this of children, as teaching that if the mother were faithful, so that her children continued in faith, she would be saved. But this is not a necessary or probable interpretation. The apostle says nothing of children, and it is not reasonable to suppose that he would make the prospect of her salvation depend on their being pious. This would be to add a hard condition of salvation, and one nowhere else suggested in the New Testament. The object of the apostle evidently is, to show that woman must continue in the faithful service of God if she would be saved — a doctrine everywhere insisted on in the New Testament in reference to all persons. She must not imitate the example of the mother of mankind, but she must faithfully yield obedience to the laws of God until death.

Faith Faith in the Redeemer and in divine truth, or a life of fidelity in the service of God.

Charity Love to all; compare notes on 1 Corinthians 13.

Holiness She must be truly righteous.

With sobriety All these things must be united with a becoming soberness or seriousness of deportment; notes, ⁴⁰⁰1 Timothy 2:9. In such a life, woman may look to a world where she will be forever free from all the sadnesses and sorrows of her condition here; where, by unequalled pain, she will be no more reminded of the time when

— *“her rash hand in evil hour
Forth reaching to the fruit, she pluck’d, she ate;”*

and when before the throne she shall be admitted to full equality with all the redeemed of the Lord. Religion meets all the sadnesses of her condition here; pours consolation into the cup of her many woes; speaks kindly to her in her distresses; utters the language of forgiveness to her heart when crushed with the remembrance of sin — for “she loves much” (~~41757~~ Luke 7:37-48); and conducts her to immortal glory in that world where all sorrow shall be unknown.

NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY 3

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER

The object of this chapter (1 Timothy 3) is to give directions respecting the qualifications and duties of the officers of the Christian church. As it is evident that Timothy was to be partly employed in the appointment of suitable officers for the church at Ephesus, and as the kinds of officers here referred to were to be permanent in the church, it was important that a full statement should be put on record, under the influence of inspiration, respecting their qualifications and duties. The chapter embraces the following subjects:

I. The qualifications of a bishop; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:1-7. The enumeration of his qualifications is preceded by a general statement that the office was an honorable one, and that he who aspired to it sought an employment that was, in itself, to be regarded as desirable; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:1. The qualifications specified for this office, are the following:

(1) He must be a man of good private character; possessing and illustrating the Christian virtues, or, as we would say now, an upright man, and a Christian gentleman; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:2,3.

(2) He must be a man who ruled his own house well, and who thus showed that he was qualified to preside as the first officer in the church of God; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:4,5.

(3) He must be a man of suitable age and experience — one who would not be likely to fall into the temptations that are laid for the young; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:6.

(4) He must have a fair reputation among those who were not Christians — as it is intended that the influence of his ministry shall reach them, and as it is impossible to do them good unless he is believed to be a man of integrity; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:7.

II. The qualifications of deacons; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:8-10,12,13. They must be:

(1) Men of fair character — serious, temperate, candid; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:8.

(2) Men who hold to the doctrines of the gospel with a pure conscience; ^{<5489>}1 Timothy 3:9.

(3) Men who have been proved, and who have shown that they are qualified to serve the church: ^{<5480>}1 Timothy 3:10.

(4) Men whose wives are of such a character that their example will contribute to the promotion of the common cause; ^{<5481>}1 Timothy 3:11.

(5) Men not living in polygamy, and who exercise exemplary family government; ^{<5482>}1 Timothy 3:12,13.

III. The reason why Paul gave these instructions to Timothy; ^{<5484>}1 Timothy 3:14,15. It was, that he might know how he ought to demean himself in the important station which he was called to occupy. Paul hoped to be able to come to him before long, and to complete the work which he had commenced at Ephesus, but, in the meantime, he gave him these written councils, that he might understand particularly the duty which was required of him.

IV. The chapter closes with a statement which seems to have been intended to impress the mind of Timothy with the importance of the duties in which he was engaged; ^{<5485>}1 Timothy 3:15,16. The statement is, that the church is the great defender of the truth in the world (^{<5485>}1 Timothy 3:15), and that the truth which the church is to maintain is of the greatest importance. It relates to the incarnation of the Son of God, and to the work which he accomplished on earth a work which excited the deepest interest in heaven, and the true doctrine respecting which it was of the utmost importance to keep up among people; ^{<5486>}1 Timothy 3:16. This reason is further urged in the following chapter, by showing that the time would come when, under the influence of Satan, these great doctrines would be denied, and the truth be corrupted and perverted.

^{<5488>}**1 Timothy 3:1.** *This is a trite saying* Greek, “Faithful is the word” — the very phrase which is used in ^{<5485>}1 Timothy 1:15; see the notes on that verse. The idea here is, that it was worthy of credence; it was not to be doubted.

If a man desire Implying that there would be those who would wish to be put into the ministry. The Lord, undoubtedly, by his Spirit, often excites an earnest and irrepressible desire to preach the gospel — a desire so strong,

that he in whom it exists can be satisfied in no other calling. In such a case, it should be regarded as one evidence of a call to this work. The apostle, however, by the statements which follow, intimates that wherever this desire exists, it is of the utmost importance to have just views of the nature of the office, and that there should be other qualifications for the ministry than a mere desire to preach the gospel. He proceeds, therefore, to state those qualifications, and no one who “desires” the office of the ministry should conclude that he is called to it, unless these qualifications substantially are found in him. The word rendered “desire” here **ορεγω** ^{<3713>}, denotes properly, “to reach” or “stretch out” — and hence to reach after anything, to long after, to try to obtain; ^{<3116>}Hebrews 11:16.

The office of a bishop The Greek here is a single word — **επισκοπης** ^{<1984>}. The word **επισκοπη** ^{<1984>} — “Episcope” — whence the word “Episcopal” is derived — occurs but four times in the New Testament. It is translated “visitation” in ^{<2944>}Luke 19:44, and in ^{<4021>}1 Peter 2:12; “bishoprick,” Acts. 1:20; and in this place “office of a bishop.” The verb from which it is derived **επισκοπεω** ^{<1983>}, occurs but twice, In ^{<3825>}Hebrews 12:15, it is rendered “looking diligently,” and in ^{<4021>}1 Peter 5:2, “taking the oversight.” The noun rendered bishop occurs in ^{<4025>}Acts 20:28; ^{<3001>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<5421>}1 Timothy 3:2; ^{<3001>}Titus 1:7; ^{<4025>}1 Peter 2:25. The verb means, properly, to look upon, behold; to inspect, to look after, see to, take care of; and the noun denotes the office of overseeing, inspecting, or looking to. It is used to denote the care of the sick, Xen. Oec. 15,9; compare “Passow;” and is of so general a character that it may denote any office of overseeing, or attending to. There is nothing in the word itself which would limit it to any class or grade of the ministry, and it is, in fact, applied to nearly all the officers of the church in the New Testament, and, indeed, to Christians who did not sustain “any” office. Thus it is applied:

- (a) to believers in general, directing them to “look diligently, lest anyone should fail of the grace of God,” ^{<3825>}Hebrews 12:15;
- (b) to the elders of the church at Ephesus, “over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers,” ^{<4025>}Acts 20:28;
- (c) to the elders or presbyters of the church in ^{<4021>}1 Peter 5:2, “Feed the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof;

(d) to the officers of the church in Philippi, mentioned in connection with deacons as the only officers of the church there, “to the saints at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons,” ~~<400>~~Philippians 1:1;

(e) to Judas, the apostate. ~~<402>~~Acts 1:20; and

(f) to the great Head of the church, the Lord Jesus Christ, ~~<402>~~1 Peter 2:25, “the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.” From this use of the term it follows:

(1) That the word is never used to designate the “uniqueness” of the apostolic office, or so as to have any special applicability to the apostles. Indeed, the term “bishop” is “never” applied to any of them in the New Testament; nor is the word in any of its forms ever used with reference to them, except in the single case of “Judas,” ~~<402>~~Acts 1:20.

(2) It is never employed in the New Testament to designate an order of men superior to presbyters, regarded as having any other functions than presbyters, or being in any sense “successors” to the apostles. It is so used now by the advocates of prelacy; but this is a use wholly unknown to the New Testament. It is so undeniable that the name is never given in the New Testament to those who are now called “bishops,” that even Episcopalians concede it. Thus, Dr. Onderdonk (Tract on Episcopacy, p. 12) says,

“All that we read in the New Testament concerning ‘bishops’ is to be regarded as pertaining to the ‘middle grade;’ that is, to those who are now regarded as ‘priests.’”

This is not strictly correct, as is clear from the remarks above respecting what is called the “middle grade;” but it is strictly correct, so far as it affirms that it is “never” applied to prelates.

(3) It is used in the New Testament to denote ministers of the gospel who had the care or oversight of the churches, without any regard to grade or rank.

(4) It has now, as used by Episcopalians, a sense which is wholly unauthorized by the New Testament, and which, indeed, is entirely at variance with the usage there. To apply the term to a pretended superior order of clergy, as designating their special office, is wholly to depart from the use of the word as it occurs in the Bible.

(5) As it is never used in the Scriptures with reference to “prelates,” it “should” be used with reference to the pastors, or other officers of the church; and to be a “pastor,” or “overseer” of the flock of Christ, should be regarded as being a scriptural bishop.

He desireth a good work An honorable office; an office which it is right for a man to desire. There are some stations in life which ought never to be desired; it is proper for anyone to desire the office of a bishop who has the proper qualifications; compare notes on ^{<5113>}Romans 11:13.

^{<5102>}**1 Timothy 3:2.** *A bishop* A minister of religion, according to the foregoing remarks, who has the charge or oversight of any Christian church. The reference here is doubtless to one who had the government of the church entrusted to him (^{<5104>}1 Timothy 3:4,5), and who was also a preacher of the gospel.

Must be blameless This is a different word ($\alpha\nu\epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\eta\mu\pi\tau\omicron\nu$ ^{<423>}) from that rendered “blameless” in ^{<4106>}Luke 1:6; ^{<5145>}Philippians 2:15; 3:6 ($\alpha\mu\epsilon\mu\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ^{<273>}); compare however, notes on ^{<4106>}Luke 1:6; ^{<5106>}Philippians 3:6. The word here used does not mean that, as a necessary qualification for office, a bishop should be “perfect;” but that he should be a man against whom no charge of immorality, or of holding false doctrine, is alleged. His conduct should be irreprehensible or irreproachable. Undoubtedly it means that if “any” charge could be brought against him implying moral obliquity, he is not fit for the office. He should be a man of irreproachable character for truth, honesty, chastity, and general uprightness.

The husband of one wife This need not be understood as requiring that a bishop “should be” a married man, as Vigilantius, a presbyter in the church at Barcelona in the fourth century, supposed, however desirable in general it may be that a minister of the gospel should be married. But, while this interpretation is manifestly to be excluded as false, there has been much difference of opinion on the question whether the passage means that a minister should not have more than one wife at the same time, or whether it prohibits the marriage of a second wife after the death of the first. On this question, the notes of Bloomfield, Doddridge, and Macknight, may be consulted. That the former is the correct opinion, seems to me to be evident from the following considerations:

(1) It is the most obvious meaning of the language, and it would doubtless be thus understood by those to whom it was addressed. At a time when

polygamy was not uncommon, to say that a man should “have but one wife” would be naturally understood as prohibiting polygamy.

(2) The marriage of a second wife, after the death of the first, is nowhere spoken of in the Scriptures as wrong. The marriage of a widow to a second husband is expressly declared to be proper (^{<4073>}1 Corinthians 7:39); and it is not unfair to infer from that permission that it is equally lawful and proper for man to marry the second time. But if it is lawful for any man it is right for a minister of the gospel. No reason can be assigned against such marriages in his case, which would not be equally valid in any other. Marriage is as honorable for a minister of the gospel as for any other man (compare notes on ^{<3104>}Hebrews 13:4); and, as Doddridge has well remarked, “Circumstances may be so adjusted that there may be as much reason for a second marriage as for the first, and as little inconvenience of any kind may attend it.”

(3) There was a special propriety in the prohibition, if understood as prohibiting polygamy. It is known that it was extensively practiced, and was not regarded as unlawful. Yet one design of the gospel was to restore the marriage relation to its primitive condition; and though it might not have seemed absolutely necessary to require of every man who came into the church to divorce his wives, if he had more than one, yet, in order to fix a brand on this irregular practice, it might have been deemed desirable to require of the ministers of the gospel that they should have but one wife. Thus the practice of polygamy would gradually come to be regarded as dishonorable and improper, and the example and influence of the ministry would tend to introduce correct views in regard to the nature of this relation. One thing is clear from this passage, that the views of the Papists in regard to the celibacy of the clergy are directly at variance with the Bible. The declaration of Paul in ^{<3104>}Hebrews 13:4, is, that “marriage is honorable in all;” and here it is implied that it was proper that a minister should be married. If it were not, why did not Paul prohibit it altogether? Instead of saying that it was improper that a bishop should have more than one wife, why did he not say that it was improper that he should be married at all? Would not a Romanist say so now?

Vigilant This word (*νηφαλεος* ^{<3524>}) occurs only here and in ^{<3481>}1 Timothy 3:11; ^{<3482>}Titus 2:2. It means, properly, “sober, temperate, abstinent,” especially in respect to wine; then “sober-minded, watchful, circumspect.

Robinson.” A minister should have a watchful care over his own conduct. He should be on his guard against sin in any form.

Sober σωφρονα ^{<498>} Properly, a man of “a sound mind;” one who follows sound reason, and who is not under the control of passion. The idea is, that he should have his desires and passions well regulated. Perhaps the word “prudent” would come nearer to the meaning of the apostle than any single word which we have.

Of good behaviour Margin, “modest.” Coverdale renders it, “mannerly.” The most correct rendering, according to the modern use of language, would be, that he should be “a gentleman.” He should not be slovenly in his appearance, or rough and boorish in his manners. He should not do violence to the usages of refined conversation, nor be unfit to appear respectable in the most refined circles of society. Inattention to personal neatness, and to the rules which regulate refined contact, is indicative neither of talent, learning, nor religion; and though they are occasionally — not often — connected with talent, learning, and religion, yet they are never the fruit of either, and are always a disgrace to those who exhibit such incivility and boorishness, for such men “ought” to know better. A minister of the gospel should be a finished gentleman in his manners, and there is no excuse for him if he is not. His religion, if he has any, is adapted to make him such. He has usually received such an education as ought to make him such, and in all cases “ought” to have had such a training. He is admitted into the best society, and has an opportunity of becoming familiar with the laws of refined conversation. He should be an example and a pattern in all that goes to promote the welfare of mankind, and there are few things so easily acquired that are suited to do this, as refinement and gentility of manners. No man can do good, on the whole, or in the “long run,” by disregarding the rules of refined contact; and, other things being equal, the refined, courteous, polite gentleman in the ministry, will always do more good than he who neglects the rules of goodbreeding.

Given to hospitality This is often enjoined on all Christians as a duty of religion. For the reasons of this, and the nature of the duty, see the notes on ^{<523>}Romans 12:13; ^{<813>}Hebrews 13:2. It was a special duty of the ministers of religion, as they were to be examples of every Christian virtue.

Apt to teach Greek, “Didactic;” that is, capable of instructing, or qualified for the office of a teacher of religion. As the principal business of a preacher of the gospel is to “teach,” or to communicate to his fellow-men

the knowledge of the truth, the necessity of this qualification is obvious. No one should be allowed to enter the ministry who is not qualified to impart "instruction" to others on the doctrines and duties of religion; and no one should feel that he ought to continue in the ministry, who has not industry, and self-denial, and the love of study enough to lead him constantly to endeavor to "increase" in knowledge, that he may be qualified to teach others. A man who would "teach" a people, must himself keep in ADVANCE of them on the subjects on which he would instruct them.

1 Timothy 3:3. *Not given to wine* Margin, "Not ready to quarrel and offer wrong, as one in wine." The Greek word (*παροινος*) occurs in the New Testament only here and in Titus 1:7. It means, properly, "by wine;" i.e., spoken of what takes place "by" or "over" wine, as revelry, drinking songs, etc. Then it denotes, as it does here, one who sits "by" wine; that is, who is in the habit of drinking it. It cannot be inferred, from the use of the word here, that wine was absolutely and entirely prohibited; for the word does not properly express that idea. It means that one who is in the HABIT of drinking wine, or who is accustomed to sit with those who indulge in it, should not be admitted to the ministry. The way in which the apostle mentions the subject here would lead us fairly to suppose that he did not mean to commend its use in any sense; that he regarded its use as dangerous, and that he would wish the ministers of religion to avoid it altogether. In regard to its use at all, except at the communion or as a medicine, it may be remarked, that a minister will do no injury to himself or others by letting it entirely alone; he MAY do injury by indulging in it. No man is under any "obligation" of courtesy or Christian duty to use it; thousands of ministers of the gospel have brought ruin on themselves, and disgrace on the ministry, by its use; compare notes on Matthew 11:9, and 1 Timothy 5:23.

No striker He must be a peaceable, not a quarrelsome man. This is connected with the caution about the use of wine, probably, because that is commonly found to produce a spirit of contention and strife.

Not greedy of filthy lucre Not contentious or avaricious. Greek, Not desirous of base gain. The desire of this is condemned everywhere in the New Testament; but it is especially the duty of a minister of the gospel to be free from it. He has a right to a support (see the notes on 1 Corinthians 9); but there is nothing that more certainly paralyzes the usefulness of a

minister of the gospel than the love of money. There is an instinctive feeling in the human bosom that such a man ought to be actuated by a nobler and a purer principle. As avarice, moreover, is the great sin of the world — the sin that sways more hearts, and does more to hinder the progress of the gospel, than all others combined — it is important in the highest degree that the minister of religion should be an example of what men “should” be, and that he, by his whole life, should set his face against that which is the main obstruction to the progress of that gospel which he is appointed to preach.

But patient Modest, mild, gentle. See the word (Greek) in ^{<5045>}Philippians 4:5; ^{<5046>}Titus 3:2; ^{<5047>}James 3:17, and ^{<5048>}1 Peter 2:18, where it is rendered “gentle.” The word means that the minister of the gospel should be a man of mild and kind demeanor, such as his Master was.

Not a brawler compare ^{<5024>}2 Timothy 2:24. That is, he should not be a man given to contention, or apt to take up a quarrel. The Greek is, literally, “Not disposed to fight.”

Not covetous Greek, “Not a lover of silver;” that is, of money. A man should not be put into the ministry who is characteristically a lover of money. Such a one, no matter what his talents may be, has no proper qualification for the office, and will do more harm than good.

^{<5044>}**1 Timothy 3:4.** *One that ruleth well his own house* This implies that a minister of the gospel would be, and ought to be, a married man. It is everywhere in the New Testament supposed that he would be a man who could be an example in all the relations of life. The position which he occupies in the church has a strong resemblance to the relation which a father sustains to his household; and a qualification to govern a family well, would be an evidence of a qualification to preside properly in the church. It is probable that, in the early Christian church, ministers were not unfrequently taken from those of mature life, and who were, at the time, at the head of families; and, of course, such would be men who had had an opportunity of showing that they had this qualification for the office. Though, however, this cannot be insisted on now as a “previous” qualification for the office, yet it is still true that, if he has a family, it is a necessary qualification, and that a man in the ministry “should be” one who governs his own house well. A want of this will always be a hindrance to extensive usefulness.

Having his children in subjection with all gravity This does not mean that his “children” should evince gravity, whatever may be true on that point; but it refers “to the father.” He should be a grave or serious man in his family; a man free from levity of character, and from frivolity and fickleness, in his conversation with his children. It does not mean that he should be severe, stern, morose — which are traits that are often mistaken for gravity, and which are as inconsistent with the proper spirit of a father as frivolity of manner — but that he should be a serious and sober-minded man. He should maintain proper “dignity” (σεμνοτης ^{<4587>}); he should maintain self-respect, and his deportment should be such as to inspire others with respect for him.

^{<4875>} **1 Timothy 3:5.** *For if a man know not how to rule* This is a beautiful and striking argument. A church resembles a family. It is, indeed, larger, and there is a greater variety of dispositions in it than there is in a family. The authority of a minister of the gospel in a church is also less absolute than that of a father. But still there is a striking resemblance. The church is made up of an assemblage of brothers and sisters. They are banded together for the same purposes, and have a common object to aim at. They have common feelings and common needs. They have sympathy, like a family, with each other in their distresses and afflictions. The government of the church also is designed to be “paternal.” It should be felt that he who presides over it has the feelings of a father; that he loves all the members of the great family; that he has no prejudices, no partialities, no selfish aims to gratify. Now, if a man cannot govern his own family well; if he is severe, partial, neglectful, or tyrannical at home, how can he be expected to take charge of the more numerous “household of faith” with proper views and feelings? If, with all the natural and strong ties of affection which bind a father to his own children; if, when they are few comparatively in number, and where his eye is constantly upon them, he is unable to govern them aright, how can he be expected to preside in a proper manner over the larger household where he will be bound with comparatively feebler ties, and where he will be exposed more to the influence of passion, and where he will have a much less constant opportunity of supervision? Confucius, as quoted by Doddridge, has a sentiment strikingly resembling that before us: “It is impossible that he who knows not how to govern and reform his own family, should rightly govern and reform a people.” We may remark, also, in this verse, a delicate and beautiful use of words by the apostle to prevent the possibility of

misapprehension. While he institutes a comparison between the government of a family and that of the church, he guards against the possibility of its being supposed that he would countenance “arbitrary” authority in the church, even such authority as a father must of necessity employ in his own family. Hence, he uses different words. He speaks of the father as “ruling” over his own family, or “presiding over it” — **προσθηναί** ^{<4291>}; he describes the minister of religion as “having a tender care for the church” — **επιμελησεται** ^{<1959>}.

^{<5486>} **1 Timothy 3:6.** *Not a novice* Margin, “one newly come to the faith.” The Greek word, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, means, properly, that which is “newly planted.” Thus it would mean a plant that was not strong, or not fitted to bear the severity of storms; that had not as yet struck its roots deep, and could not resist the fierceness of a cold blast. Then the word comes to mean a new convert; one who has had little opportunity to test his own faith, or to give evidence to others that he would be faithful to the trust committed to him. The word does not refer so much to one who is young “in years,” as one who is young “in faith.” Still, all the reasons which apply against introducing a very recent convert into the ministry, will apply commonly with equal force against introducing one young in years.

Lest being lifted up with pride We are not to suppose that this is the only reason against introducing a recent convert into the ministry, but it is a SUFFICIENT reason. He would be likely to be elated by being entrusted at once with the highest office in the church, and by the commendations and flattery which he might receive. No condition is WHOLLY proof against this; but he is much less likely to be injured who has had much experience of the depravity of his own heart, and whose mind has been deeply imbued with the spirit of the gospel.

He fall into the condemnation of the devil That is, the same kind of condemnation which the devil fell into; to wit, condemnation on account of pride. It is here intimated that the cause of the apostasy of Satan was pride — a cause which is as likely to have been the true one as any other. Who can tell but it may have been produced by some new honor which was conferred on him in heaven, and that his virtue was not found sufficient for the untried circumstances in which he was placed? Much of the apostasy from eminent virtue in this world, arises from this cause; and possibly the case of Satan may have been the most signal instance of this kind which has

occurred in the universe. The idea of Paul is, that a young convert should not suddenly be raised to an exalted station in the church. Who can doubt the wisdom of this direction? The word rendered “lifted up” (τυφωθεις ^{<S187>}), is from a verb which means to smoke, to fume, to surround with smoke; then to “inflate” — as a bladder is with air; and then to be conceited or proud; that is, to be “like” a bladder filled, not with a solid substance, but with air.

^{<S48>}**1 Timothy 3:7.** *Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without* Who are without the church; that is, of those who are not Christians. This includes, of course, “all” classes of those who are not Christians — pagans, infidels, Jews, moral people, and scoffers. The idea is, that he must have a fair reputation with them for integrity of character. His life must be in their view upright. He must not be addicted to anything which they regard as inconsistent with good morals. His deportment must be such that they shall regard it as not inconsistent with his profession. He must be true and just and honest in his dealings with his fellow-men, and so live that they cannot say that he has wronged them. He must not give occasion for scandal or reproach in his contact with the other sex, but must be regarded as a man of a pure life and of a holy walk. The “reason” for this injunction is obvious. It is his business to endeavor to do such people good, and to persuade them to become Christians. “But no minister of the gospel can possibly do such people good, unless they regard him as an upright and honest man.” No matter how he preaches or prays; no matter how orthodox, learned, or apparently devout he may be, all his efforts will be in vain unless THEY regard him as a man of incorruptible integrity. If they hate religion themselves, they insist justly that since HE has professed it he shall be governed by its principles; or if they feel its importance, they will not be influenced to embrace it by a man that they regard as hypocritical and impure. Go to a man whom you have defrauded, or who regards you as having done or attempted wrong to any other one, and talk to him about the necessity of religion, and he will instinctively say that he does not “want” a religion which will not make its professor true, honest, and pure. It is impossible, therefore, for a minister to over-estimate the importance of having a fair character in the view of the world, and no man should be introduced into the ministry, or sustained in it, who has not a fair reputation; compare notes on ^{<S104>}Colossians 4:5; ^{<S142>}1 Thessalonians 4:12. *Lest he fall into reproach* That is, in such a way as to bring dishonor on

the ministerial character. His life will be such as to give people occasion to reproach the cause of religion.

And the snare of the devil The snare which the devil lays to entrap and ruin the ministers of the gospel and all good people. The snare to which reference is here made, is that of “blasting the character and influence of the minister of the gospel.” The idea is, that Satan lays this snare so to entangle him as to secure this object, and the means which he uses is the vigilance and suspicion of those who are out of the church. If there is anything of this kind in the life of a minister which they can make use of, they will be ready to do it. Hence, the necessity on his part of an upright and blameless life. Satan is constantly aiming at this thing; the world is watching for it, and if the minister has any “propensity” which is not in entire accordance with honesty, Satan will take advantage of it and lead him into the snare.

^{<508>}**1 Timothy 3:8.** *Likewise must the deacons* On the meaning of the word “deacons,” see the notes on ^{<500>}Philippians 1:1. On their appointment, see the notes, ^{<400>}Acts 6:1. The word here evidently denotes those who had charge of the temporal affairs of the church, the poor, etc. No qualifications are mentioned, implying that they were to be preachers of the gospel. In most respects, except in regard to preaching, their qualifications were to be the same as those of the “bishops.”

Be grave Serious, sober-minded men. In ^{<446>}Acts 6:3, it is said that they should be men “of honest report.” On the meaning of the word “grave,” see the notes on ^{<504>}1 Timothy 3:4. They should be men who by their serious deportment will inspire respect.

Not double-tongued The word here used **διλογος** ^{<1351>} — does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. It means, properly, uttering the same thing twice (from **δις** ^{<1364>} and **λεγω** ^{<3004>}), and then deceitful, or speaking one thing and meaning another. They should be men who can be relied on for the exact truth of what they say, and for the exact fulfillment of their promises.

Not given to much wine see ^{<508>}1 Timothy 3:3. The word “much” is added here to what is said (^{<508>}1 Timothy 3:2) of the qualification of a bishop. It is not affirmed that it would be proper for the deacon, anymore than the bishop, to indulge in the use of wine in small quantities, but it “is” affirmed that a man who is much given to the use of wine ought not, on any

consideration, to be a deacon. It may be remarked here, that this qualification was everywhere regarded as necessary for a minister of religion. Even the pagan priests, on entering a temple, did not drink wine. “Bloomfield.” The use of wine, and of strong drinks of all kinds, was absolutely prohibited to the Jewish ministers of every rank when they were about to engage in the service of God; ^{<SRB>}Leviticus 10:9. Why should it then be anymore proper for a Christian minister to drink wine than for a Jewish or a pagan priest? Shall a minister of the gospel be less holy than they? Shall he have a feebler sense of the purity of his vocation? Shall he be less careful lest he expose himself to the possibility of conducting the services of religion in an irreverent and silly manner? Shall he venture to approach the altar of God under the influence of intoxicating drinks, when a sense of propriety restrained the pagan priest, and a solemn statue of Yahweh restrained the Jewish priest from doing it?

Not greedy of filthy lucre notes, ^{<SRB>}1 Timothy 3:3. The special reason why this qualification was important in the deacon was, that he would be entrusted with the funds of the church, and might be tempted to appropriate them to his own use instead of the charitable purposes for which they were designed; see this illustrated in the case of Judas, ^{<SRB>}John 12:6.

^{<SRB>}**1 Timothy 3:9.** *Holding the mystery of the faith* On the word “mystery,” see notes on ^{<SRB>}1 Corinthians 2:7. It means that which had been concealed, or hidden, but which was now revealed. The word “faith” here, is synonymous with “the gospel;” and the sense is, that he should hold firmly the great doctrines of the Christian religion which had been so long concealed from people, but which were now revealed. The reason is obvious. Though not a preacher, yet his influence and example would be great, and a man who held material error ought not to be in office.

In a pure conscience A mere orthodox faith was not all that was necessary, for it was possible that a man might be professedly firm in the belief of the truths of revelation, and yet be corrupt at heart.

^{<SRB>}**1 Timothy 3:10.** *And let these also first be proved* That is, tried or tested in regard to the things which were the proper qualifications for the office. This does not mean that they were to be employed as “preachers,” but that they were to undergo a proper trial in regard to their fitness for the office which they were to fill. They were not to be put into it without any

opportunity of knowing what they were. It should be ascertained that they were grave, serious, temperate, trustworthy men; men who were sound in the faith, and who would not dishonor the office. It is not said here that there should be a “formal” trial, as if they were candidates for this office; but the meaning is, that they should have had an opportunity of making their character known, and should have gained such respect for their piety, and their other qualifications, that there would be reason to believe that they would perform the functions of the office well. Thus, in ^{<44B>}Acts 6:3, when deacons were first appointed, the church was directed to “look out seven men of honest report,” who might be appointed to the office.

Then let them use the office of a deacon Let them be appointed to this office, and fulfil its duties.

Being found blameless If nothing can be alleged against their character see the notes on ^{<44B>}1 Timothy 3:2.

^{<44B>}**1 Timothy 3:11.** *Even so must their wives be grave* Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius, Bloomfield, and many others, suppose that by the word “wives,” here, (γυναῖκας ^{<135>}), the apostle means “deaconesses.” Clarke supposes that it refers to women in general. The reason assigned for supposing that it does not refer to the wives of deacons, as such, is, that nothing is said of the qualifications of the wives of bishops — a matter of as much importance as that of the character of the wife of a deacon; and that it cannot be supposed that the apostle would specify the one without some allusion to the other. But that the common interpretation, which makes it refer to the wives of deacons, as such, is to be adhered to, seems to me to be clear. Because:

- (1) it is the obvious and natural interpretation.
- (2) The word here used — “wives” — is never used of itself to denote deaconesses.
- (3) If the apostle had meant deaconesses, it would have been easy to express it without ambiguity; compare notes, ^{<54D>}Romans 16:1.
- (4) What is here mentioned is important, whether the same thing is mentioned of bishops or not.
- (5) In the qualifications of bishops, the apostle had made a statement respecting his family, which made any specification about the particular

members of the family unnecessary. He was to be one who presided in a proper manner over his own house, or who had a well-regulated family; ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:4,5. By a comparison of this passage, also, with ^{<540B>}Titus 2:3,4, which bears a strong resemblance to this, it would seem that it was supposed that the deacons would be taken from those who were advanced in life, and that their wives would have some superintendence over the younger females of the church. It was, therefore, especially important that they should be persons whose influence would be known to be decidedly favorable to piety. No one can doubt that the character of a woman may be such, that it is not desirable that her husband should be an officer in the church. A bad woman ought not to be entrusted with any additional power or influence.

Grave notes, ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:4.

Not slanderers compare ^{<540B>}Titus 2:3, “Not false accusers.” The Greek word is **δίαβολος** ^{<1228>} — “devils.” It is used here in its original and proper sense, to denote a “calumniator,” “slanderer,” or “accuser.” It occurs in the same sense in ^{<540B>}2 Timothy 3:3, and ^{<540B>}Titus 2:3. Elsewhere in the New Testament, it is uniformly rendered “devil” (compare notes, ^{<400B>}Matthew 4:1), and is given to Satan, the prince of the fallen angels (^{<400B>}Matthew 9:34), by way of eminence, as “the accuser;” compare notes on ^{<3006>}Job 1:6-11, and ^{<620>}Revelation 12:10. Here it means that they should not be women who were in the habit of calumniating others, or aspersing their character. Mingling as they would with the church, and having an opportunity to claim acquaintance with many, it would be in their power, if they chose, to do great injury to the character of others.

Sober notes, ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:2.

Faithful in all things To their husbands, to their families, to the church, to the Saviour.

^{<540B>}**1 Timothy 3:12.** *Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife* notes, ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:2.

Ruling their children and their own houses well notes, ^{<540B>}1 Timothy 3:4,5.

^{<540B>}**1 Timothy 3:13.** *For they that have used the office of a deacon well* Margin, “ministered.” The Greek word is the same as deacon, meaning ministering, or serving in this office. The sense would be well expressed by

the phrase, “deaconizing well.” The “word” implies nothing as to the exact nature of the office.

Purchase to themselves Procure for themselves; see this word explained in the notes on ^{<44B>}Acts 20:28.

A good degree The word here used (^{<398>}βαθμος) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It means, properly, “a step,” as of a stair; and the fair meaning is that of going up higher, or taking an additional step of dignity, honor, or standing. So far as the “word” is concerned, it may mean either an advance in office, in dignity, in respectability, or in influence. It cannot certainly be inferred that the apostle referred to a higher grade of “office;” for all that the word essentially conveys is, that, by exercising this office well, a deacon would secure additional respectability and influence in the church. Still, it is possible that those who had performed the duties of this office well were appointed to be preachers. They may have shown so much piety, prudence, good sense, and ability to preside over the church, that it was judged proper that they should be advanced to the office of bishops or pastors of the churches. Such a course would not be unnatural. This is, however, far from teaching that the office of a deacon is a subordinate office, “with a view” to an ascent to a higher grade.

And great boldness in the faith The word here rendered “boldness” properly refers to boldness “in speaking;” see it explained in the notes on ^{<44B>}Acts 4:13; ^{<48B>}2 Corinthians 3:12; ^{<50B>}Philippians 1:20. But the word is commonly used to denote boldness of any kind — openness, frankness, confidence, assurance; ^{<48B>}John 8:13,26; ^{<40B>}Mark 8:32; ^{<50B>}2 Corinthians 7:4. As it is here connected with “faith” — “boldness in the faith” — it means, evidently, not so much public speaking, as a manly and independent exercise of faith in Christ. The sense is, that by the faithful performance of the duties of the office of a deacon, and by the kind of experience which a man would have in that office, he would establish a character of firmness in the faith, which would show that he was a decided Christian. This passage, therefore, cannot be fairly used to prove that the deacon was “a preacher,” or that he belonged to a grade of ministerial office from which he was regularly to rise to that of a presbyter.

^{<48B>}**1 Timothy 3:14.** *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly* That is, he hoped to come there to give instructions personally, or to finish, himself, the work which he had commenced in Ephesus, and which had been interrupted by his being driven so

unexpectedly away. This verse PROVES that the apostle Paul did not regard Timothy as the permanent diocesan bishop of Ephesus. Would any Episcopal bishop write this to another bishop? If Timothy were the permanent prelate of Ephesus, would Paul have intimated that he expected soon to come and take the work of completing the arrangements there into his own hands? In regard to his expectation of going soon to Ephesus, see the notes on ^{<40B>}1 Timothy 1:3; compare the Introduction to the Epistle.

^{<40B>}**1 Timothy 3:15.** *But if I tarry long* Paul appears to have been uncertain how long circumstances would require him to be absent. He expected to return, but it was possible that his hope of returning soon would be disappointed.

That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself That is, that he might have just views about settling the affairs of the church.

In the house of God This does not mean in a place of public worship, nor does it refer to propriety of deportment there. It refers rather to the church as a body of believers, and to converse with them. The church is called the “house of God,” because it is that in which he dwells. Formerly, his unique residence was in the temple at Jerusalem; now that the temple is destroyed, it is the church of Christ, among his people.

Which is the church of the living God This seems to have been added to impress the mind of Timothy with the solemn nature of the duty which he was to perform. What he did pertained to the honor and welfare of the church of the living God, and hence he should feel the importance of a correct deportment, and of a right administration of its affairs.

The pillar and ground of the truth There has been no little diversity of opinion among critics whether this phrase is to be taken in connection with the preceding, meaning that “the church” is the pillar and ground of the truth; or whether it is to be taken in connection with what follows, meaning that the principal support of the truth was the doctrine there referred to — that God was manifest in the flesh. Bloomfield remarks on this:

“It is surprising that any who have any knowledge or experience in Greek literature could tolerate so harsh a construction as that which arises from the latter method.”

The more natural interpretation certainly is, to refer it to the former; and this is supported by the consideration that it would then fall in with the

object of the apostle. His design here seems to be, to impress Timothy with a deep sense of the importance of correct conduct in relation to the church; of the responsibility of those who presided over it; and of the necessity of care and caution in the selection of proper officers. To do this, he reminded him that the truth of God — that revealed truth which he had given to save the world — was entrusted to the church; that it was designed to preserve it pure, to defend it, and to transmit it to future times; and that, therefore, every one to whom the administration of the affairs of the church was entrusted, should engage in this duty with a deep conviction of his responsibility. On the construction of the passage, Bloomfield, Rosenmuller, and Clarke, may be consulted. The word “pillar” means a column, such as that by which a building is supported, and then any firm prop or support; ^{<4119>}Galatians 2:9; ^{<4182>}Revelation 3:12. If it refers to the church here, it means that that is the support of the truth, as a pillar is of a building. It sustains it amidst the war of elements, the natural tendency to fall, and the assaults which may be made on it, and preserves it when it would otherwise tumble into ruin. Thus it is with the church. It is entrusted with the business of maintaining the truth, of defending it from the assaults of error, and of transmitting it to future times. The truth is, in fact, upheld in the world by the church. The people of the world feel no interest in defending it, and it is to the church of Christ that it is owing that it is preserved and transmitted from age to age. The word rendered “ground” — **ἔδραιωμα** ^{<4477>} — means, properly, a basis, or foundation. The figure here is evidently taken from architecture, as the use of the word pillar is. The proper meaning of the one expression would be, that truth is supported by the church, as an edifice is by a pillar; of the other, that the truth rests “on” the church, as a house does on its foundation. It is that which makes it fixed, stable, permanent; that on which it securely stands amidst storms and tempests; that which renders it firm when systems of error are swept away as a house that is built on the sand; compare notes on ^{<4024>}Matthew 7:24-27. The meaning then is, that the stability of the truth on earth is dependent on the church. It is owing to the fact that the church is itself founded on a rock, that the gates of hell cannot prevail against it, that no storms of persecution can overthrow it, that the truth is preserved from age to age. Other systems of religion are swept away; other opinions change; other forms of doctrine vanish; but the knowledge of the great system of redemption is preserved on earth unshaken, because the church is preserved, and because its foundations cannot be moved. This does not refer, I suppose, to creeds and confessions, or to the decisions of synods

and councils; but to the living spirit of truth and piety “in” the church itself. As certainly as the church continues to live, so certain it will be that the truth of God will be perpetuated among people.

^{<4816>}**1 Timothy 3:16.** *And, without controversy* Undeniably, certainly. The object of the apostle is to say that the truth which he was about to state admitted of no dispute.

Great is the mystery On the meaning of the word “mystery,” see the notes on ^{<4817>}1 Corinthians 2:7. The word means that which had been hidden or concealed. The meaning here is not that the proposition which he affirms was mysterious in the sense that it was unintelligible, or impossible to be understood; but that the doctrine respecting the incarnation and the work of the Messiah, which had been so long “kept hidden” from the world, was a subject of the deepest importance. This passage, therefore, should not be used to prove that there is anything unintelligible, or anything that surpasses human comprehension, in that doctrine, whatever may be the truth on that point; but that the doctrine which he now proceeds to state, and which had been so long concealed from mankind, was of the utmost consequence.

Of godliness The word “godliness” means, properly, piety, reverence, or religiousness. It is used here, however, for the gospel scheme, to wit, that which the apostle proceeds to state. This “mystery,” which had “been hidden from ages and from generations, and which was now manifest” (^{<5015>}Colossians 1:26), was the great doctrine on which depended “religion” everywhere, or was that which constituted the Christian scheme.

God Probably there is no passage in the New Testament which has excited so much discussion among critics as this, and none in reference to which it is so difficult to determine the true reading. It is the only one, it is believed, in which the microscope has been employed to determine the lines of the letters used in a manuscript; and, after all that has been done to ascertain the exact truth in regard to it, still the question remains undecided. It is not the object of these notes to enter into the examination of questions of this nature. A full investigation may be found in Wetstein. The question which has excited so much controversy is, whether the original Greek word was **Θεός** ^{<2316>}, “God,” or whether it was **ὅς** ^{<3739>}, “who,” or **ὃ** ^{<3739>}, “which.” The controversy has turned, to a considerable degree, on the reading in the “Codex Alexandrinus;” and a remark or two on the method in which the manuscripts in the New Testament were written, will show the true nature

of the controversy. Greek manuscripts were formerly written entirely in capital letters, and without breaks or intervals between the words, and without accents; see a full description of the methods of writing the New Testament, in an article by Prof. Stuart in Dr. Robinson's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, No. 2, pp. 254ff The small, cursive Greek letters which are now used, were not commonly employed in transcribing the New Testament, if at all, until the ninth or tenth centuries. It was a common thing to abridge or contract words in the manuscript. Thus, $\pi\text{-}\rho$ would be used for $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho$ ^{<396>}, "father;" $\kappa\text{-}\varsigma$ for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ^{<296>}, "Lord;" $\Theta\text{-}\varsigma$ for $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ^{<2316>}, "God," etc. The words thus contracted were designated by a faint line or dash over them. In this place, therefore, if the original uncials (capitals) were ΘC , standing for $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ^{<2316>}, "God," and the line in the Θ , and the faint line over it, were obliterated from any cause, it would easily be mistaken for OC — $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ^{<3739>} — "who." To ascertain which of these is the true reading, has been the great question; and it is with reference to this that the microscope has been resorted to in the examination of the Alexandrian manuscript. It is now generally admitted that the faint line "over" the word has been added by some later hand, though not improbably by one who found that the line was nearly obliterated, and who meant merely to restore it. Whether the letter O was originally written with a line within it, making the reading "God," it is now said to be impossible to determine, in consequence of the manuscript at this place having become so much worn by frequent examination. The Vulgate and the Syriac read it: "who," or "which." The Vulgate is, "Great is the sacrament of piety which was manifested in the flesh." The Syriac, "Great is the mystery of godliness, that he was manifested in the flesh." The "probability" in regard to the correct reading here, as it seems to me, is, that the word, as originally written, was $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ^{<2316>} — "God." At the same time, however, the evidence is not so clear that it can be properly used in an argument. But the passage is not "necessary" to prove the doctrine which is affirmed, on the supposition that that is the correct reading. The same truth is abundantly taught elsewhere; compare ^{<1023>}Matthew 1:23; ^{<1014>}John 1:14.

Was manifest Margin, "Manifested." The meaning is, "appeared" in the flesh.

In the flesh In human nature; see this explained in the notes on ^{<1003>}Romans 1:3. The expression here looks as though the true reading of the much-disputed word was "God." It could not have been, it would seem evident, $\acute{\omicron}$ ^{<3739>}, "which," referring to "mystery;" for how could a mystery "be

manifested in the flesh?" Nor could it be $\delta\varsigma$ ^{<3739>}, "who," unless that should refer to one who was more than a man; for how absurd would it be to say that "a man was manifested, or appeared in the flesh!" How else could a man appear? The phrase here means that God appeared in human form, or with human nature; and this is declared to be the "great" truth so long concealed from human view, but now revealed as constituting the fundamental doctrine of the gospel. The expressions which follow in this verse refer to God "as" thus manifested in the flesh; to the Saviour as he appeared on earth, regarded as a divine and human being. It was the fact that he thus appeared and sustained this character, which made the things which are immediately specified so remarkable, and so worthy of attention.

Justified in the Spirit That is, the incarnate person above referred to; the Redeemer, regarded as God and man. The word "Spirit," here, it is evident, refers to the Holy Spirit, because:

- (1) it is not possible to attach any intelligible idea to the phrase, "he was justified by his own spirit, or soul;"
- (2) as the Holy Spirit performed so important a part in the work of Christ, it is natural to suppose there would be some allusion here to him; and
- (3) as the "angels" are mentioned here as having been with him, and as the Holy Spirit is often mentioned in connection with him, it is natural to suppose that there would be some allusion to Him here. The word "justified," here, is not used in the sense in which it is when applied to Christians, but in its more common signification. It means to "vindicate," and the sense is, that he was shown to be the Son of God by the agency of the Holy Spirit; he was thus vindicated from the charges alleged against him. The Holy Spirit furnished the evidence that he was the Son of God, or "justified" his claims. Thus he descended on him at his baptism, ^{<4086>}Matthew 3:16; he was sent to convince the world of sin because it did not believe on him, ^{<5168>}John 16:8,9; the Saviour cast out devils by him, ^{<4028>}Matthew 12:28; the Spirit was given to him without measure, ^{<4034>}John 3:34, and the Spirit was sent down in accordance with his promise, to convert the hearts of people; ^{<4423>}Acts 2:33. All the manifestations of God to him; all the power of working miracles by his agency; all the influences imparted to the man Christ Jesus, endowing him with such wisdom as man never had before, may be regarded as an attestation of the Holy Spirit to the divine mission of the Lord Jesus, and of course as a vindication from all the charges against him. In like manner, the descent of the Holy Spirit on

the day of Pentecost, and his agency in the conversion of every sinner, prove the same thing, and furnish the grand argument in vindication of the Redeemer that he was sent from God. To this the apostle refers as a part of the glorious truth of the Christian scheme now revealed — the “mystery of religion;” as a portion of the amazing records, the memory of which the church was to preserve as connected with the redemption of the world.

Seen of angels They were attendants on his ministry, and came to him in times of distress, peril, and want; compare ^{<4119>}Luke 2:9-13; 22:43; 24:4; ^{<3006>}Hebrews 1:6; ^{<4041>}Matthew 4:11. They felt an interest in him and his work, and they gladly came to him in his sorrows and troubles. The design of the apostle is to give an impressive view of the grandeur and glory of that work which attracted the attention of the heavenly hosts, and which drew them from the skies that they might proclaim his advent, sustain him in his temptations, witness his crucifixion, and watch over him in the tomb. The work of Christ, though despised by people, excited the deepest interest in heaven; compare notes on ^{<4012>}1 Peter 1:12.

Preached unto the Gentiles This is placed by the apostle among the “great” things which constituted the “mystery” of religion. The meaning is, that it was a glorious truth that salvation might be, and should be, proclaimed to all mankind, and that this was a part of the important truths made known in the gospel. Elsewhere this is called, by way of eminence, “the mystery of the gospel;” that is, the grand truth which had not been known until the coming of the Saviour; see the notes on ^{<4069>}Ephesians 6:19; ^{<5103>}Colossians 1:26,27; 4:3. Before his coming, a wall of partition had divided the Jewish and Gentile world. The Jews regarded the rest of mankind as excluded from the covenant mercies of God, and it was one of the principal stumblingblocks in their way, in regard to the gospel, that it proclaimed that all the race was on a level, that that middle wall of partition was broken down, and that salvation might now be published to all people; compare ^{<4022>}Acts 22:21; ^{<4124>}Ephesians 2:14,15; ^{<4182>}Romans 3:22; 10:11-20. The Jew had no special advantage for salvation by being a Jew; the Gentile was not excluded from the hope of salvation. The plan of redemption was adapted “to man” as such — without regard to his complexion, country, customs, or laws. The blood of Christ was shed for all, and wherever a human being could be found, salvation might be freely offered him. This “is” a glorious truth; and taken in all its bearings, and in reference to the views which then prevailed, and which have always more or less prevailed about the distinctions made among people by caste and

rank, there is scarcely anymore glorious truth connected with the Christian revelation, or one which will exert a wider influence in promoting the welfare of man. It is a great privilege to be permitted to proclaim that all people, in one respect — and that the most important — are on a level; that they are all equally the objects of the divine compassion; that Christ died for one as really as for another; that birth, wealth, elevated rank, or beauty of complexion, contribute nothing to the salvation of one man; and that poverty, a darker skin, slavery, or a meaner rank, do nothing to exclude another from the favor of his Maker.

Believed on in the world This also is mentioned among the “great” things which constitute the mystery of revealed religion. But why is this regarded as so remarkable as to be mentioned thus? In point of importance, how can it be mentioned in connection with the fact that God was manifest in the flesh; that he was vindicated by the Holy Spirit; that he was an object of intense interest to angelic hosts, and that his coming had broken down the walls which had separated the world, and placed them now on a level? I answer, perhaps the following circumstances may have induced the apostle to place this among the remarkable things evincing the greatness of this truth:

(1) The strong “improbability” arising from the greatness of the “mystery,” that the doctrines respecting the incarnate Deity WOULD BE believed. Such is the incomprehensible nature of many of the truths connected with the incarnation; so strange does it seem that God WOULD become incarnate; so amazing that he should appear in human flesh and blood, and that the incarnate Son of God should die, that it might be regarded as a wonderful thing that such a doctrine had in fact obtained credence in the world. But it was a glorious truth that all the natural improbabilities in the case had been overcome, and that people had accredited the announcement.

(2) The strong improbability that his message would be believed, arising from the “wickedness of the human heart.” Man, in all his history, had shown a strong reluctance to believe ANY message from God, or ANY truth whatever revealed by him. The Jews had rejected his prophets and put them to death (Matthew 23; Acts 7); and had at last put his own Son — their Messiah — to death. Man everywhere had shown his strong inclination to unbelief. There is in the human soul no elementary principle or germ of faith in God. Every man is an unbeliever by nature — an infidel first; a Christian afterward; an infidel as he comes into the world; a believer

only as he is made so by grace. The apostle, therefore, regarded it as a glorious fact that the message respecting the Saviour “had been” believed in the world. It overcame such a strong and universal reluctance to confide in God, that it showed that there was more than human power in operation to overcome this reluctance.

(3) The EXTENT to which this had been done may have been a reason why he thought it worthy of the place which he gives it here. It had been embraced, not by a few, but by thousands in all lands where the gospel had been published; and it was proof of the truth of the doctrine, and of the great power of God, that such high mysteries as those relating to redemption, and so much opposed to the natural feelings of the human heart, should have been embraced by so many. The same thing occurs now. The gospel makes its way against the native incredulity of the world, and every new convert is an additional demonstration that it is from God, and a new illustration of the greatness of this mystery.

Received up into glory To heaven; compare ~~400B~~ John 17:5; see the notes on ~~400B~~ Acts 1:9. This is mentioned as among the “great” or remarkable things pertaining to “godliness,” or the Christian revelation, because it was an event which had not elsewhere occurred, and was the crowning grandeur of the work of Christ. It was an event that was fitted to excite the deepest interest in heaven itself. No event of more importance has ever occurred in the universe, of which we have any knowledge, than the re-ascension of the triumphant Son of God to glory after having accomplished the redemption of a world.

In view of the instructions of this chapter, we may make the following remarks.

1. The word “bishop” in the New Testament never means what is now commonly understood by it — “a Prelate.” It does not denote here, or anywhere else in the New Testament, one who has charge over a “diocese” composed of a certain district of country, embracing a number of churches with their clergy.

2. There are not “three orders” of clergy in the New Testament. The apostle Paul in this chapter expressly designates the characteristics of those who should have charge of the church, but mentions only two, “bishops” and “deacons.” The former are ministers of the word, having charge of the spiritual interests of the church; the other are deacons, of whom there is no

evidence that they were appointed to preach. There is no “third” order. There is no allusion to anyone who was to be “superior” to the “bishops” and “deacons.” As the apostle Paul was expressly giving instructions in regard to the organization of the church, such an omission is unaccountable if he supposed there was to be an order of “prelates” in the church. Why is there no allusion to them? Why is there no mention of their qualifications? If Timothy was himself a prelate, was he to have nothing to do in transmitting the office to others? Were there no special qualifications required in such an order of people which it would be proper to mention? Would it not be “respectful,” at least, in Paul to have made some allusion to such an office, if Timothy himself held it?

3. There is only one order of preachers in the church. The qualifications of that order are specified with great minuteness and particularity, as well as beauty; ^{<SARE>}1 Timothy 3:2-7. No man really needs to know more of the qualifications for this office than could be learned from a prayerful study of this passage.

4. A man who enters the ministry “ought” to have high qualifications; ^{<SARE>}1 Timothy 3:2-7. No man “ought,” under any pretence, to be put into the ministry who has not the qualifications here specified. Nothing is gained in any department of human labor, by appointing incompetent persons to fill it. A farmer gains nothing by employing a man on his farm who has no proper qualifications for his business; a carpenter, a shoemaker, or a blacksmith, gains nothing by employing a man who knows nothing about his trade; and a neighborhood gains nothing by employing a man as a teacher of a school who has no qualifications to teach, or who has a bad character. Such a man would do more mischief on a farm, or in a workshop, or in a school, than all the good which he could do would compensate. And so it is in the ministry. The true object is not to increase the “number” of ministers, it is to increase the number of those who are “qualified” for their work, and if a man has not the qualifications laid down by the inspired apostle, he had better seek some other calling.

5. The church is the guardian of the truth; ^{<SARIS>}1 Timothy 3:15. It is appointed to preserve it pure, and to transmit it to future ages. The world is dependent on it for any just views of truth. The church has the power, and is entrusted with the duty, of preserving on earth a just knowledge of God and of eternal things; of the way of salvation; of the requirements of pure morality: to keep up the knowledge of that truth which tends to

elevate society and to save man. It is entrusted with the Bible, to preserve uncorrupted, and to transmit to distant ages and lands. It is bound to maintain and assert the truth in its creeds and confessions of faith. And it is to preserve the truth by the holy lives of its members, and to show in their walk what is the appropriate influence of truth on the soul. Whatever religious truth there is now on the earth, has been thus preserved and transmitted, and it still devolves on the church to bear the truth of God on to future times, and to diffuse it abroad to distant lands.

6. The closing verse of this chapter (~~5016~~ 1 Timothy 3:16) gives us a most elevated view of the plan of salvation, and of its grandeur and glory. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to condense more interesting and sublime thought into so narrow a compass as this. The great mystery of the incarnation; the interest of angelic beings in the events of redemption; the effect of the gospel on the pagan world; the tendency of the Christian religion to break down every barrier among people, and to place all the race on a level; its power in overcoming the unbelief of mankind; and the re-ascension of the Son of God to heaven, present a series of most wonderful facts to our contemplation. These things are found in no other system of religion, and these are worthy of the profound attention of every human being. The manifestation of God in the flesh! What a thought! It was worthy of the deepest interest among the angels, and it “claims” the attention of people, for it was FOR human beings and not for angels that he thus appeared in human form; compare notes on ~~4012~~ 1 Peter 1:12.

7. How strange it is that “man” feels no more interest in these things! God was manifest in the flesh for his salvation, but he does not regard it Angels looked upon it with wonder: but man, for whom he came, feels little interest in his advent or his work! The Christian religion has broken down the barrier among nations, and has proclaimed that all people may be saved; yet the mass of people look on this with entire unconcern. The Redeemer ascended to heaven, having finished his great work; but how little interest do the mass of mankind feel in this! He will come again to judge the world; but the race moves on, regardless of this truth; unalarmed at the prospect of meeting him; feeling no interest in the assurance that he “has” come and died for sinners, and no apprehension in view of the fact that he WILL come again, and that they must stand at his bar. All heaven was moved with his first advent, and will be with his second; but the earth regards it with unconcern. Angelic beings look upon this with the deepest anxiety, though they have no personal interest in it; man, though all his

great interests are concentrated on it, regards it as a fable, disbelieves it all, and treats it with contempt and scorn. Such is the difference between heaven and earth — angels and human beings!

NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY 4

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER

There is, in many respects, a strong resemblance between the first part of this chapter (1 Timothy 4) and 2 Thessalonians 2; compare notes on that chapter. The leading object of this chapter is to state to Timothy certain things of which he was constantly to remind the church; and having done this, the apostle gives him some directions about his personal deportment. The chapter may be conveniently divided into three parts:

I. Timothy was to put the church constantly in remembrance of the great apostasy which was to occur, and to guard them against the doctrines which would be inculcated under that apostasy; <500>1 Timothy 4:1-6.

(a) There was to be, in the latter days, a great departing from the faith; <500>1 Timothy 4:1.

(b) Some of the characteristics of that apostasy were these; there would be a giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; <500>1 Timothy 4:1. Those who taught would hypocritically speak what they knew to be falsehood, having their own consciences seared; <500>1 Timothy 4:2. They would forbid to marry, and forbid the use of certain articles of food which God had appointed for man; <500>1 Timothy 4:3-5.

II. Timothy was to warn the churches against trifling and superstitious views, such as the apostle calls “old wives” fables; <500>1 Timothy 4:7-11.

(a) He was not to allow himself to be influenced by such fables, but at once to reject them; <500>1 Timothy 4:7.

(b) The bodily exercise which the friends of such “fables” recommended was of no advantage to the soul, and no stress ought to be laid on it, as if it were important; <500>1 Timothy 4:8.

(c) That which was truly profitable, and which ought to be regarded as important was godliness; for “that” had promise of the present life, and of the life to come; <500>1 Timothy 4:8.

(d) Timothy must expect, in giving these instructions, to endure labor and to suffer reproach; nevertheless, he was faithfully to inculcate these important truths; ^{<5040>}1 Timothy 4:10,11.

III. Various admonitions respecting his personal deportment; ^{<5042>}1 Timothy 4:12-16.

(a) He was so to live that no one would despise him or his ministry because he was young; ^{<5042>}1 Timothy 4:12.

(b) He was to give a constant attention to his duties until the apostle should himself return to him; ^{<5043>}1 Timothy 4:13.

(c) He was carefully to cultivate the gift which has been conferred by his education, and by his ordination to the work of the ministry; ^{<5044>}1 Timothy 4:14.

(d) He was to meditate on these things, and to give himself wholly to the work, so that his profiting might appear to all; ^{<5045>}1 Timothy 4:15.

(e) He was to take good heed to himself, and to the manner and matter of his teaching, that he might save himself and those who heard him; ^{<5046>}1 Timothy 4:16.

^{<5048>}**1 Timothy 4:1.** *Now the Spirit* Evidently the Holy Spirit; the Spirit of inspiration. It is not quite certain, from this passage, whether the apostle means to say that this was a revelation “then” made to him, or whether it was a well-understood thing as taught by the Holy Spirit. He himself elsewhere refers to this same prophecy, and John also more than once mentions it; compare 2 Thessalonians 2; ^{<5048>}1 John 2:18; Revelation 20. From ^{<5046>}2 Thessalonians 2:5, it would seem that this was a truth which had before been communicated to the apostle Paul, and that he had dwelt on it when he preached the gospel in Thessalonica. There is no improbability, however, in the supposition that so important a subject was communicated directly by the Holy Spirit to others of the apostles.

Speaketh expressly In express words, **ρητως** ^{<4490>}. It was not by mere hints, and symbols, and shadowy images of the future; it was in an open and plain manner — in so many words. The object of this statement seems to be to call the attention of Timothy to it in an emphatic manner, and to show the importance of attending to it.

That in the latter times Under the last dispensation, during which the affairs of the world would close; see the notes on ^{<800>}Hebrews 1:2. It does not mean that this would occur “just before” the end of the world, but that it would take place during “that last dispensation,” and that the end of the world would not happen UNTIL this should take place; see the notes on ^{<800>}2 Thessalonians 2:3.

Some shall depart from the faith The Greek word here — **αποστησονται** ^{<868>} — is that from which we have derived the word “apostatize,” and would be properly so rendered here. The meaning is, that they would “apostatize” from the belief of the truths of the gospel. It does not mean that, as individuals, they would have been true Christians; but that there would be a departure from the great doctrines which constitute the Christian faith. The WAYS in which they would do this are immediately specified, showing what the apostle meant here by departing from the faith. They would give heed to seducing spirits, to the doctrines of devils, etc. The use of the word “some,” here **τινες** ^{<5100>} — does not imply that the number would be small. The meaning is, that “certain persons” would thus depart, or that “there would be” an apostasy of the kind here mentioned, in the last days. From the parallel passage in ^{<800>}2 Thessalonians 2:3, it would seem that this was to be an extensive apostasy.

Giving heed to seducing spirits Rather than to the Spirit of God. It would be a part of their system to yield to those spirits that led astray. The spirits here referred to are any that cause to err, and the most obvious and natural construction is to refer it to the agency of fallen spirits. Though it “may” apply to false teachers, yet, if so, it is rather to them as under the influence of evil spirits. This may be applied, so far as the phraseology is concerned, to “any” false teaching; but it is evident that the apostle had a specific apostasy in view — some great “system” that would greatly corrupt the Christian faith; and the words here should be interpreted with reference to that. It is true that people in all ages are prone to give heed to seducing spirits; but the thing referred to here is some grand apostasy, in which the characteristics would be manifested, and the doctrines held, which the apostle proceeds immediately to specify; compare ^{<600>}1 John 4:1.

And doctrines of devils Greek, “Teachings of demons — **διδασκαλιας** ^{<1319>} **δαμωνιον** ^{<1140>}. This may either mean teachings “respecting” demons, or teachings “by” demons. The particular sense must be determined by the connection. Ambiguity of this kind in the construction of

words, where one is in the genitive case, is not uncommon; compare ^{<619>}John 15:9,10; 21:15. Instances of the construction where the genitive denotes the “object,” and should be translated “concerning,” occur in ^{<1025>}Matthew 9:25; “The gospel of the kingdom,” i.e., concerning the kingdom; ^{<1001>}Matthew 10:1; “Power of unclean spirits,” i.e., over or concerning unclean spirits; so, also, ^{<440>}Acts 4:9; ^{<6165>}Romans 16:15; ^{<1005>}2 Corinthians 1:5; ^{<1001>}Ephesians 3:1; ^{<1023>}Revelation 2:13. Instances of construction where the genitive denotes the “agent,” occur in the following places: ^{<1016>}Luke 1:69, “A horn of salvation,” i.e., a horn which produces or causes salvation; ^{<1013>}John 6:28; ^{<1012>}Romans 3:22; ^{<1010>}2 Corinthians 4:10; ^{<1018>}Ephesians 4:18; ^{<1021>}Colossians 2:11. Whether the phrase here means that, in the apostasy, they would give heed to doctrines “respecting” demons, or to doctrines which demons “taught,” cannot, it seems to me, be determined with certainty. If the previous phrase, however, means that they would embrace doctrines taught by evil spirits, it can hardly be supposed that the apostle would immediately repeat the same idea in another form; and then the sense would be, that one characteristic of the time referred to would be the prevalent teaching “respecting” demons. They would “give heed to,” or embrace, some special views respecting demons. The word here rendered “devils” is **δαίμονια** ^{<1140>} — “demons.” This word, among the Greeks, denoted the following things:

- (1) A god or goddess, spoken of the pagan gods; compare in New Testament, ^{<44718>}Acts 17:18.
- (2) A divine being, where no particular one was specified, the agent or author of good or evil fortune; of death, fate, etc. In this sense it is often used in Homer.
- (3) The souls of people of the golden age, which dwelt unobserved upon the earth to regard the actions of men, and to defend them — tutelary divinities, or geniuses — like that which Socrates regarded as his constant attendant. Xen. Mem. 4. 8. 1. 5; Apol. Soc. 4. See “Passow.”
- (4) To this may be added the common use in the New Testament, where the word denotes a demon in the Jewish sense — a bad spirit, subject to Satan, and under his control; one of the host of fallen angels — commonly, but not very properly rendered “devil” or “devils.” These spirits were supposed to wander in desolate places, ^{<1026>}Matthew 12:43; compare ^{<1021>}Isaiah 13:21; 34:14; or they dwell in the air, ^{<1011>}Ephesians 2:2. They were regarded as hostile to mankind, ^{<1084>}John 8:44; as able to utter pagan

oracles, ^{<4167>}Acts 16:17; as lurking in the idols of the pagan, ^{<4500>}1 Corinthians 10:20; ^{<6090>}Revelation 9:20. They are spoken of as the authors of evil, ^{<4029>}James 2:19; compare ^{<4062>}Ephesians 6:12, and as having the power of taking “possession” of a person, of producing diseases, or of causing mania, as in the case of the demoniacs, ^{<4063>}Luke 4:33; 8:27; ^{<4078>}Matthew 17:18; ^{<4079>}Mark 7:29,30; and often elsewhere. The doctrine, therefore, which the apostle predicted would prevail, might, “so far as the word used is concerned,” be either of the following:

- (1) Accordance with the prevalent notions of the pagan respecting false gods; or a falling into idolatry similar to that taught in the Grecian mythology. It can hardly be supposed, however, that he designed to say that the common notions of the pagan would prevail in the Christian church, or that the worship of the pagan gods “as such” would be set up there.
- (2) An accordance with the Jewish views respecting demoniacal possessions and the power of exorcising them. If this view should extensively prevail in the Christian church, it would be in accordance with the language of the prediction.
- (3) Accordance with the prevalent pagan notions respecting the departed spirits of the good and the great, who were exalted to the rank of demi-gods, and who, though invisible, were supposed still to exert an important influence in favor of mankind. To these beings, the pagan rendered extraordinary homage. They regarded them as demi-gods. They supposed that they took a deep interest in human affairs. They invoked their aid. They set apart days in honor of them. They offered sacrifices, and performed rites and ceremonies to propitiate their favor. They were regarded as a sort of mediators or intercessors between man and the superior divinities. If these things are found anywhere in the Christian church, they may be regarded as a fulfillment of this prediction, for they were not of a nature to be foreseen by any human sagacity. Now it so happens, that they are in fact found in the Papal communion, and in a way that corresponds fairly to the meaning of the phrase, as it would have been understood in the time of the apostle. There is, “first,” the worship of the virgin and of the saints, or the extraordinary honors rendered to them — corresponding almost entirely with the reverence paid by the pagan to the spirits of heroes or to demi-gods. The saints are supposed to have extraordinary power with God, and their aid is implored as intercessors.

The virgin Mary is invoked as “the mother of God,” and as having power still to command her Son. The Papists do not, indeed, offer the same homage to the saints which they do to God, but they ask their aid; they offer prayer to them. The following extracts from the catechism of Dr. James Butler, approved and recommended by Dr. Kenrick, “Bishop of Philadelphia,” expresses the general views of Roman Catholics on this subject.

“Question: How do Catholics distinguish between the honor they give to God, and the honor they give to the saints, when they pray to God and the saints? Answer: Of God alone they beg grace and mercy; and of the saints they only ask the assistance of their prayers? Question Is it lawful to recommend ourselves to the saints, and ask their prayers. Answer: Yes; as it is lawful and a very pious practice to ask the prayers of our fellow-creatures on earth, and to pray for them.”

In the “Prayer to be said before mass,” the following language occurs: “In union with the holy church and its minister, and invoking the blessed virgin Mary, Mother of God, and all the angels and saints, we now offer the adorable sacrifice of the mass,” etc. In the General Confession, it is said —

“I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly.”

So also, the council of Trent declared, Sess. 25, “Concerning the invocation of the saints,” “that it is good and useful to supplicate them, and to fly to their prayers, power, and aid; but that they who deny that the saints are to be invoked, or who assert that they do not pray for people, or that their invocation of them is idolatry, hold an impious opinion. See also Peter Den’s Moral Theology, translated by the Revelation John F. Berg, pp. 342-356. “Secondly,” in the Papal communion the doctrine of “exorcism” is still held — implying a belief that evil spirits or demons have power over the human frame — a doctrine which comes fairly under the meaning of the phrase here — “the doctrine respecting demons.” Thus, in Dr. Butler’s Catechism:

“Question: What do you mean by exorcism? Answer: The rites and prayers instituted by the church for the casting out devils, or

restraining them from hurting persons, disquieting places, or abusing any of God’s creatures to our harm. Question: Has Christ given his church any such power over devils? Answer: Yes, he has; see ~~<400>~~ Matthew 10:1; ~~<405>~~ Mark 3:15; ~~<400>~~ Luke 9:1. And that this power was not to die with the apostles, nor to cease after the apostolic age, we learn from the perpetual practice of the church, and the experience of all ages.”

The characteristic here referred to by the apostle, therefore, is one that applies precisely to the Roman Catholic communion, and cannot be applied with the same fitness to any other association calling itself Christian on earth. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the Holy Spirit designed to designate that apostate church.

~~<500>~~ **1 Timothy 4:2.** *Speaking lies in hypocrisy* εν ^{<172>} ὑποκρισει ^{<572>} ψευδολογων ^{<573>}. Or rather, “by, or through the hypocrisy of those speaking lies. So it is rendered by Whitby, Benson, Macknight, and others. Our translators have rendered it as if the word translated “speaking lies” — ψευδολογων ^{<573>} — referred to “demons,” or, “devils,” δαιμονιων ^{<140>} — in the previous verse. But there are two objections to this. One is, that then, as Koppe observes, the words would have been inverted — ψευδολογων ^{<573>} εν ^{<172>} ὑποκρισει ^{<572>}. The other is, that if that construction is adopted, it must be carried through the sentence, and then all the phrases “speaking lies,” “having their conscience seared,” “forbidding to marry,” etc., must be referred to demons. The preposition εν ^{<172>}, “in” may denote “by” or “through,” and is often so used. If this be the true construction, then it will mean that those who departed from the faith did it “by” or “through” the hypocritical teachings of those who spoke lies, or who knew that they were inculcating falsehoods; of those whose conscience was seared; of those who forbade to marry, etc. The meaning then will be, “In the last days certain persons will depart from the faith of the gospel. This apostasy will essentially consist in their giving heed to spirits that lead to error, and in embracing corrupt and erroneous views on demonology, or in reference to invisible beings between us and God. This they will do through the hypocritical teaching of those who inculcate falsehood; whose consciences are seared,” etc. The series of characteristics, therefore, which follow, are those of the “teachers,” not of “the taught;” of the ministers of the church, not of the great body of the people. The apostle meant to say that this grand apostasy would occur under the influence of a hypocritical, hardened, and arbitrary ministry,

teaching their own doctrines instead of the divine commands, and forbidding that which God had declared to be lawful. In the clause before us — “speaking lies in hypocrisy” — two things are implied, “first,” that the characteristic of those referred to would be that they would “speak lies;” “second,” that this would be done “hypocritically.” In regard to the first, there can be no doubt among Protestants of its applicability to the papal communion. The entire series of doctrines respecting the authority of the Pope, purgatory, the mass, the invocation of the saints, the veneration of relics, the seven sacraments, the authority of tradition, the doctrine of merit, etc., is regarded as false. Indeed, the system could not be better characterized than by saying that it is a system “speaking lies.” The entire scheme attempts to palm falsehood upon the world, in the place of the simple teaching of the New Testament. The only question is, whether this is done “in hypocrisy,” or hypocritically. In regard to this, it is not necessary to maintain that there is “no” sincerity among the ministers of that communion, or that “all” are hypocritical in their belief and their teaching. The sense is, that this is the general characteristic, or that this is understood by the leaders or prime movers in that apostasy. In regard to the applicability of this to the ministers of the Papal communion, and the question whether they teach what they know to be false, we may observe:

- (1)** that many of them are men of eminent learning, and there can be no reason to doubt that they KNOW that many of the Catholic legends are false, and many of the doctrines of their faith contrary to the Bible.
- (2)** Not a few of the things in that communion MUST be known by them to be false, though not known to be so by the people. Such are all the pretended miracles performed by the relics of the saints; the liquefying of the blood of Januarius, etc.; see the notes on ~~2~~ 2 Thessalonians 2:9. As the working of these tricks depends wholly on the priesthood, they must know that they are “speaking lies in hypocrisy.”
- (3)** The matter of fact seems to be, that when young men who have been trained in the Catholic Church, first turn their attention to the ministry, they are sincere. They have not yet been made acquainted with the “mysteries of iniquity” in the communion in which they have been trained, and they do not suspect the deceptions that are practiced there. When they pass through their course of study, however, and become acquainted with the arts and devices on which the fabric rests, and with the scandalous lives of many of the clergy, they are shocked to find how corrupt and false the

whole system is. But they are now committed. They have devoted their lives to this profession. They are trained now to this system of imposture, and they must continue to practice and perpetuate the fraud, or abandon the church, and subject themselves to all the civil and ecclesiastical disabilities which would now follow if they were to leave and reveal all its frauds and impostures. A gentleman of high authority, and who has had as good an opportunity as any man living to make accurate and extensive observations, stated to me, that this was a common thing in regard to the Catholic clergy in France and Italy. No one can reasonably doubt that the great body of that clergy “must” be apprized that much that is relied on for the support of the system is mere legend, and that the miracles which are pretended to be performed are mere trick and imposture.

Having their conscience seared with a hot iron The allusion here is doubtless to the effect of applying a hot iron to the skin. The cauterized part becomes rigid and hard, and is dead to sensibility. So with the conscience of those referred to. It has the same relation to a conscience that is sensitive and quick in its decisions, that a cauterized part of the body has to a thin, delicate, and sensitive skin. Such a conscience exists in a mind that will practice delusion without concern; that will carry on a vast system of fraud without wincing; that will incarcerate, scourge, or burn the innocent without compassion; and that will practice gross enormities, and indulge in sensual gratifications under the mask of piety. While there are many eminent exceptions to an application of this to the Papal communion, yet this description will apply better to the Roman priesthood in the time of Luther — and in many other periods of the world — than to any other “body of men” that ever lived.

~~50B~~ **1 Timothy 4:3.** *Forbidding to marry* That is, “They will depart from the faith through the hypocritical teaching — of those who forbid to marry;” see notes on ~~50D~~ 1 Timothy 4:2. This does not necessarily mean that they would prohibit marriage altogether, but that it would be a characteristic of their teaching that marriage would “be forbidden,” whether of one class of persons or many. They would “commend” and “enjoin” celibacy and virginity. They would regard such a state, for certain persons, as more holy than the married condition, and would consider it as “so” holy that they would absolutely prohibit those who wished to be most holy from entering into the relation. It is needless to say how accurately this applies to the views of the papacy in regard to the comparative purity and advantages of a state of celibacy, and to their absolute prohibition of

the marriage of the clergy. The tenth article of the decree of the Council of Trent, in relation to marriage, will show the general view of the papacy on that subject.

“Whosoever shall say that the married state is to be preferred to a state of virginity, or celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be joined in marriage; let him be accursed!” Compare Peter Dens’ Moral Theology, pp. 497-500.

And commanding to abstain from meats, ... The word “meat” in the Scriptures, commonly denotes “food” of all kinds; ~~<101>~~ Matthew 3:4; 6:25; 10:10; 15:37. This was the meaning of the word when the translation of the Bible was made. It is now used by us, almost exclusively, to denote animal food. The word here used — **βρωμα** ~~<103>~~ — means, properly, whatever is eaten, and may refer to animal flesh, fish, fruit, or vegetables. It is often, however, in the New Testament, employed particularly to denote the flesh of animals; ~~<300>~~ Hebrews 9:10; 13:9; ~~<5415>~~ Romans 14:15,20; ~~<108>~~ 1 Corinthians 8:8,13. As it was animal food particularly which was forbidden under the Jewish code, and as the questions on this subject among Christians would relate to the same kinds of prohibition, it is probable that the word has the same limited signification here, and should be taken as meaning the same thing that the word “meat” does with us. To forbid the use of certain meats, is here described as one of the characteristics of those who would instruct the church in the time of the great apostasy. It is not necessary to suppose that there would be an “entire” prohibition, but only a prohibition of certain kinds, and at certain seasons. That “this” characteristic is found in the papacy more than anywhere else in the Christian world, it is needless to prove. The following questions and answers from Dr. Butler’s Catechism, will show what is the sentiment of Roman Catholics on this subject.

“Question: Are there any other commandments besides the Ten Commandments of God? Answer: There are the commandments or precepts of the church, which are chiefly six. Question: What are we obliged to do by the second commandment of the church? Answer: To give part of the year to fast and abstinence. Question: What do you mean by fast-days? Answer: Certain days on which we are allowed but one meal, and “forbidden flesh meat.” Question: What do you mean by days of abstinence? Answer: Certain days on

which we are forbidden to eat flesh meat; but are allowed the usual number of meals. Question: Is it strictly forbidden by the church to eat flesh meat on days of abstinence? Answer: Yes; and to eat flesh meat on any day on which it is forbidden, without necessity and leave of the church, is very sinful.”

Could there be a more impressive and striking commentary on what the apostle says here, that “in the latter days some would depart from the faith, under the hypocritical teaching of those who commanded to abstain from meats?” The authority claimed by the papacy to issue “commands” on this subject, may be seen still further by the following extract from the same catechism, showing the gracious permission of the church to the “faithful.”

“The abstinence on Saturday is dispensed with, for the faithful throughout the United States, for the space of ten years (from 1833), except when a fast falls on a Saturday. The use of flesh meat is allowed at present by dispensation in the diocess of Philadelphia, on all the Sundays of Lent, except Palm Sunday, and once a day on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday in each week, except the Thursday after Ash Wednesday, and also excepting Holy-week.”

Such is the Roman Catholic religion! See also Peter Dens’ Moral Theology, pp. 321-330. It is true that what is said here “might” apply to the Essenes, as Koppe supposes, or to the Judaizing teachers, but it applies more appropriately and fully to the Papal communion than to any other body of men professing Christianity, and taken in connection with the other characteristics of the apostasy, there can be no doubt that the reference is to that.

Which God hath created The articles of food which he has made, and which he has designed for the nourishment of man. The fact that God had “created” them was proof that they were not to be regarded as evil, and that it was not to be considered as a religious duty to abstain from them. All that “God” has made is good in its place, and what is adapted to be food for man is not to be refused or forbidden; compare ^{<201618>} Ecclesiastes 5:18. There can be no doubt that in the apostasy here referred to, those things would be forbidden, not because they were injurious or hurtful in their nature, but because it might be made a part of a system of religion of self-righteousness and because there might be connected with such a prohibition the belief of special merit.

1 Timothy 4:4. *For every creature of God is good* Greek, “all the creatures, or all that God has created” — $\pi\alpha\nu$ ^{<3956>} $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ ^{<2938>}: that is, as he made it; compare ^{<0010>}Genesis 1:10,12,18,31. It does not mean that every moral agent remains good as long as he is “a creature of God,” but moral agents, human beings and angels, WERE good as they were made at first; ^{<0010>}Genesis 1:31. Nor does it mean that all that God has made is good “for every object to which it can be applied.” It is good in its place; good for the purpose for which he made it. But it should not be inferred that a thing which is poisonous in its nature is good for food, “because” it is a creation of God. It is good only in its place, and for the ends for which he intended it. Nor should it be inferred that what God has made is necessarily good “after” it has been perverted by man. As God made it originally, it might have been used without injury. Apples and peaches were made good, and are still useful and proper as articles of food; rye and Indian-corn are good, and are admirably adapted to the support of man and beast, but it does not follow that all that “man” can make of them is necessarily good. He extracts from them a poisonous liquid, and then says that “every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused.” But is this a fair use of this passage of Scripture? True, they “are” good — they “are” to be received with gratitude as he made them, and as applied to the uses for which he designed them; but why apply this passage to prove that a deleterious beverage, which “man” has extracted from what God has made, is good also, and good for all the purposes to which it can be applied? As “God” made these things, they are good. As man perverts them, it is no longer proper to call them the “creation of God,” and they may be injurious in the highest degree. This passage, therefore, should not be adduced to vindicate the use of intoxicating drinks. As employed by the apostle, it had no such reference, nor does it contain any “principle” which can properly receive any such application.

And nothing to be refused Nothing that God has made, for the purposes for which he designed it. The necessity of the case the “exigency of the passage” — requires this interpretation. It “cannot” mean that we are not to refuse poison if offered in our food, or that we are never to refuse food that is to us injurious or offensive; nor can it anymore mean that we are to receive “all” that may be offered to us as a beverage. The sense is, that as God made it, and for the purposes for which he designed it, it is not to be held to be evil; or, which is the same thing, it is not to be prohibited as if

there were merit in abstaining from it. It is not to be regarded as a religious duty to abstain from food which God has appointed for the support of man.

If it be received with thanksgiving see the notes on <60B>1 Corinthians 10:31; <48B>Ephesians 5:20; <50B>Philippians 4:6.

<50B>**1 Timothy 4:5.** *For it is sanctified by the word of God* By the authority or permission of God. It would be profane or unholy if he had forbidden it; it is made holy or proper for our use by his permission, and no command of “man” can make it unholy or improper; compare <00C>Genesis 1:29; 9:3.

And prayer If it is partaken of with prayer. By prayer we are enabled to receive it with gratitude, and everything that we eat or drink may thus be made a means of grace.

<50B>**1 Timothy 4:6.** *If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things* Of the truths just stated. They are, therefore, proper subjects to preach upon. It is the duty of the ministry to show to the people of their charge what “is” error and where it may be apprehended, and to caution them to avoid it.

Nourished up in the words of faith That is, you will be then “a good minister of Jesus Christ, as becomes one who has been nourished up in the words of faith, or trained up in the doctrines of religion.” The apostle evidently designs to remind Timothy of the manner in which he had been trained, and to show him how he might act in accordance with that. From one who had been thus educated, it was reasonable to expect that he would be a faithful and exemplary minister of the gospel.

Whereunto thou hast attained The word used here means, properly, to accompany side by side; to follow closely; to follow out, trace, or examine. It is rendered “shall follow,” in <01G7>Matthew 16:17; “having had understanding,” in <00B>Luke 1:3; and “hast fully known,” in <50B>2 Timothy 3:10. It does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament. The meaning here seems to be, that Timothy had followed out the doctrines in which he had been trained to their legitimate results; he had accurately seen and understood their bearing, as leading him to embrace the Christian religion. His early training in the Scriptures of the Old Testament (<50B>2 Timothy 1:5; 3:15), he had now fully carried out, by embracing the Lord Jesus as the Messiah, and by evincing the proper results of the early teaching which

he had received in connection with that religion. If he now followed the directions of the apostle, he would be a minister of the Lord Jesus, worthy of the attainments in religious knowledge which he had made, and of the expectations which had been formed of him. No young man should, by neglect, indolence, or folly, disappoint the reasonable expectations of his friends. Their cherished hopes are a proper ground of appeal to him, and it may be properly demanded of every one that he shall carry out to their legitimate results all the principles of his early training, and that he shall be in his profession all that his early advantages make it reasonable to “expect” that he will be.

^{<501>}**1 Timothy 4:7.** *But refuse* That is, refuse to pay attention to them, or reject them. Do not consider them of sufficient importance to occupy your time.

Profane The word here used does not mean that the fables here referred to were blasphemous or impious in their character, but that they had not the character of true religion; ^{<5126>}2 Timothy 2:16.

And old wives’ Old women’s stories; or such as old women held to be important. The word is used here, as it is often with us, in the sense of silly.

Fables Fictions, or stories that were not founded on fact. The pagan religion abounded with fictions of this kind, and the Jewish teachers were also remarkable for the number of such fables which they had introduced into their system. It is probable that the apostle referred here particularly to the Jewish fables, and the counsel which he gives to Timothy is, to have nothing to do with them.

And exercise thyself rather unto godliness Rather than attempt to understand those fables. Do not occupy your time and attention with them, but rather cultivate piety, and seek to become more holy.

^{<5018>}**1 Timothy 4:8.** *For bodily exercise profiteth little* Margin, “for a little time.” The Greek will admit of either interpretation, and what is here affirmed is true in either sense. The bodily exercise to which the apostle refers is of little advantage compared with that piety which he recommended Timothy to cultivate, and whatever advantage could be derived from it, would be but of short duration. “Bodily exercise” here refers, doubtless, to the mortifications of the body by abstinence and penance which the ancient devotees, and particularly the Essenes, made so

important as a part of their religion. The apostle does not mean to say that bodily exercise is in itself improper, or that no advantage can be derived from it in the preservation of health, but he refers to it solely as a means of religion; as supposed to promote holiness of heart and of life. By these bodily austerities it was supposed that the corrupt passions would be subdued, the wanderings of an unholy fancy lettered down, and the soul brought into conformity to God. In opposition to this supposition, the apostle has here stated a great principle which experience has shown to be universally correct, that such austerities do little to promote holiness, but much to promote superstition. There must be a deeper work on the soul than any which can be accomplished by the mere mortification of the body; see the notes on [Colossians 2:23](#), and compare [1 Corinthians 9:25-27](#).

But godliness Piety or religion.

Is profitable unto all things In every respect. There is not an interest of man, in reference to this life, or to the life to come, which it would not promote. It is favorable to health of body, by promoting temperance, industry, and frugality; to clearness and vigor of intellect, by giving just views of truth, and of the relative value of objects; to peace of conscience, by leading to the faithful performance of duty; to prosperity in business, by making a man sober, honest, prudent, and industrious; to a good name, by leading a man to pursue such a course of life as shall deserve it; and to comfort in trial, calmness in death, and immortal peace beyond the grave. Religion injures no one. It does not destroy health; it does not enfeeble the intellect; it does not disturb the conscience; it does not pander to raging and consuming passions; it does not diminish the honor of a good name; it furnishes no subject of bitter reflection on a bed of death. It makes no one the poorer; it prompts to no crime; it engenders no disease. If a man should do that which would most certainly make him happy, he would be decidedly and conscientiously religious; and though piety promises no earthly possessions directly as its reward, and secures no immunity from sickness, bereavement, and death, yet there is nothing which so certainly secures a steady growth of prosperity in a community as the virtues which it engenders and sustains, and there is nothing else that will certainly meet the ills to which man is subject. I have no doubt that it is the real conviction of every man, that if he ever becomes certainly “happy,” he will be a Christian; and I presume that it is the honest belief of every one that the true and consistent Christian is the most happy of people. And yet, with

this conviction, people seek everything else rather than religion, and in the pursuit of baubles, which they know cannot confer happiness, they defer religion — the only certain source of happiness at any time — to the last period of life, or reject it altogether.

Having promise of the life that now is That is, it furnishes the promise of whatever is really necessary for us in this life. The promises of the Scriptures on this subject are abundant, and there is probably not a lack of our nature for which there might not be found a specific promise in the Bible; compare ^{<4201>}Psalm 23:1; 84:11; ^{<5049>}Philippians 4:19. Religion promises us needful food and raiment, ^{<4165>}Matthew 6:25-33; ^{<2336>}Isaiah 33:16; comfort in affliction, ^{<1637>}Deuteronomy 33:27; ^{<859>}Job 5:19; Psalm 46; ^{<3135>}Hebrews 13:5; support in old age and death, ^{<2404>}Isaiah 46:4; ^{<4204>}Psalm 23:4; compare ^{<2402>}Isaiah 43:2; and a good reputation, an honored name when we are dead; ^{<4970>}Psalm 37:1-6. There is nothing which man really “needs” in this life, which is not promised by religion; and if the inquiry were made, it would be surprising to many, even with our imperfect religion, how literally these promises are fulfilled. David, near the close of a long life, was able to bear this remarkable testimony on this subject:

“I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread;” ^{<4575>}Psalm 37:25.

And now, of the beggars that come to our doors, to how few of them can we give a cup of cold water, feeling that we are giving it to a disciple! How rare is it that a true Christian becomes a beggar! Of the inmates of our alms-houses, how very few give any evidence that they have religion! They have been brought there by vice, not by religion. True piety sends none to the alms-house; it would have saved the great mass of those who are there from ever needing the charity of their fellow-men.

And of that which is to come Eternal life. And it is the only thing that “promises” such a life. Infidelity makes no “promise” of future happiness. Its business is to take away all the comforts which religion gives, and to leave people to go to a dark eternity with no promise or hope of eternal joy. Vice “promises” pleasures in the present life, but only to disappoint its votaries here; it makes no promise of happiness in the future world. There is nothing that furnishes any certain “promises” of happiness hereafter, in this world or the next, but religion. God makes no promise of such happiness to beauty, birth, or blood; to the possession of honors or wealth; to great attainments in science and learning, or to the graces of external

accomplishment. All these, whatever flattering hopes of happiness they may hold out here, have no assurance of future eternal bliss. It is not by such things that God graduates the rewards of heaven, and it is only “piety” or “true religion” that furnishes any assurance of happiness in the world to come.

1 Timothy 4:9. *This is a faithful saying* see the notes on **1 Timothy 1:15**.

1 Timothy 4:10. *For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach* In making this truth known, that all might be saved, or that salvation was offered to all. The “labor” was chiefly experienced in carrying this intelligence abroad among the Gentiles; the “reproach” arose chiefly from the Jews for doing it.

Because we trust in the living God This does not mean, as our translation would seem to imply, that he labored and suffered “because” he confided in God, or that this was the “reason” of his sufferings, but rather that this trust in the living God was his “support” in these labors and trials. “We labor and suffer reproach, for we have hope in God. Through him we look for salvation. We believe that he has made this known to people, and believing this, we labor earnestly to make it known, even though it be attended with reproaches.” The sentiment is, that the belief that God has revealed a plan of salvation for all people, and invites all people to be saved, will make his friends willing to “labor” to make this known, though it be attended with reproaches.

Who is the Saviour of all men This must be understood as denoting that he is the Saviour of all people in some sense which differs from what is immediately affirmed — “especially of those that believe.” There is something pertaining to “them” in regard to salvation which does not pertain to “all men.” It cannot mean that he brings all people to heaven, “especially” those who believe — for this would be nonsense. And if he brings all people actually to heaven, how can it be “especially” true that he does this in regard to those who believe? Does it mean that he saves others “without” believing? But this would be contrary to the uniform doctrine of the Scriptures; see **Mark 16:16**. When, therefore, it is said that he “is the Saviour of ‘all’ people, ‘especially’ of those who believe,” it must mean that there is a sense in which it is true that he may be called the Saviour of

all people, while, at the same time, it is “actually” true that those only are saved who believe. This may be true in two respects:

- (1) As he is the “Preserver” of people (^{<1872>}Job 7:20), for in this sense he may be said to “save” them from famine, and war, and peril — keeping them from day to day; compare ^{<1947>}Psalm 107:28;
- (2) as he has “provided” salvation for all people. He is thus their Saviour — and may be called the common Saviour of all; that is, he has confined the offer of salvation to no one class of people; he has not limited the atonement to one division of the human race; and he actually saves all who are willing to be saved by him.

(See supplementary note ^{<4782>}2 Corinthians 5:24. This passage however is not regarded a proof text now on the extent of the atonement, as the fair rendering of σωτηρ ^{<4990>} is “Preserver.” Dr. Wardlaw has accordingly excluded it in his recent work.)

Specially of those that believe This is evidently designed to limit the previous remark. If it had been left there, it might have been inferred that he would “actually save” all people. But the apostle held no such doctrine, and he here teaches that salvation is “actually” limited to those who believe. This is the speciality or the uniqueness in the salvation of those who actually reach heaven, that they are “believers;” see the notes on ^{<4166>}Mark 16:16. All people, therefore, do not enter heaven, unless all people have faith. But is this so? What evidence is there that the great mass of mankind die believing on the Son of God?

^{<5011>}**1 Timothy 4:11.** *These things command and teach* As important doctrines, and as embracing the sum of the Christian system. It follows from this, that a minister of the gospel is solemnly bound to teach that there is a sense in which God is the Saviour of all people. He is just as much bound to teach this, as he is that only those will be saved who believe. It is a glorious truth — and it is a thing for which a man should unceasingly give thanks to God that he may go and proclaim that He has provided salvation for all, and is willing that all should come and live.

^{<5012>}**1 Timothy 4:12.** *Let no man despise thy youth* That is, do not act in such a manner that any shall despise you on account of your youth. Act as becomes a minister of the gospel in all things, and in such a way that people will respect you as such, though you are young. It is clear from this

that Timothy was then a young man, but his exact age there is no means of determining. It is implied here:

- (1) that there was danger that, by the levity and indiscretion to which youth are so much exposed, the ministry might be regarded with contempt; and
- (2) that it was possible that his deportment should be so grave, serious, and every way appropriate, that the ministry would not be blamed, but honored. The “way” in which Timothy was to live so that the ministry would not be despised on account of his youth, the apostle proceeds immediately to specify.

But be thou an example of the believers One of the constant duties of a minister of the gospel, no matter what his age. A minister should so live, that if all his people should closely follow his example, their salvation would be secure, and they would make the highest possible attainments in piety. On the meaning of the word rendered “example,” see the notes on ^{<3087>}Philippians 3:17; ^{<3107>}1 Thessalonians 1:7.

In word In “speech,” that is, your manner of conversation. This does not refer to his “public teaching” — in which he could not probably be an “example” to them — but to his usual and familiar conversation.

In conversation In general deportment. See this word explained in the notes on ^{<3087>}Philippians 1:27.

In charity Love to the brethren, and to all; see notes on 1 Corinthians 13.

In spirit In the government of your passions, and in a mild, meek, forgiving disposition.

In faith At all times, and in all trials show to believers by your example, how they ought to maintain unshaken confidence in God.

In purity In chasteness of life; see ^{<3482>}1 Timothy 5:2. There should be nothing in your contact with the other sex that would give rise to scandal. The papists, with great impropriety, understand this as enjoining celibacy — as if there could be no “purity” in that holy relation which God appointed in Eden, and which he has declared to “be honorable in all” (^{<3334>}Hebrews 13:4), and which he has made so essential to the wellbeing of mankind. If the apostle had wished to produce the highest possible degree of corruption in the church, he would have enjoined the celibacy of the clergy and the celibacy of an indefinite number of nuns and monks. There

are no other institutions on the earth which have done so much to corrupt the chastity of the race, as those which have grown out of the doctrine that celibacy is more honorable than marriage.

1 Timothy 4:13 *Till I come*; notes, ^{<5013>}1 Timothy 3:14,15.

Give attendance to reading The word here used may refer either to public or to private reading; see ^{<4135>}Acts 13:15; ^{<4034>}2 Corinthians 3:14; compare Esdr. 9:48. The more obvious interpretation here is to refer it to private reading, or to a careful perusal of those books which would qualify him for his public work. The then written portions of the sacred volume — the Old Testament — are doubtless specially intended here, but there is no reason to doubt that there were included also such other books as would be useful, to which Timothy might have access. Even those were then few in number, but Paul evidently meant that Timothy should, as far as practicable, become acquainted with them. The apostle himself, on more than one occasion, showed that he had some acquaintance with the classic writings of Greece; ^{<4173>}Acts 17:28; ^{<3012>}Titus 1:12.

To exhortation see the notes on ^{<5128>}Romans 12:8.

To doctrine To teaching — for so the word means; compare notes on ^{<5127>}Romans 12:7.

1 Timothy 4:14. *Neglect not the gift that is in thee* An important question arises here, to what the word “gift” refers; whether to natural endowment; to office; or to some supposed virtue which had been conferred by ordination — some transmitted influence which made him holy as a minister of religion, and which was to continue to be transmitted by the imposition of apostolic hands. The word which is here used, is rendered “gift” in every place in which it occurs in the New Testament. It is found in the following places, and with the following significations: deliverance from peril, ^{<4011>}2 Corinthians 1:11; a gift or quality of the mind, ^{<4007>}1 Corinthians 7:7; gifts of Christian knowledge or consolation, ^{<3011>}Romans 1:11; ^{<4007>}1 Corinthians 1:7; redemption or salvation through Christ, ^{<3515>}Romans 5:15,16; 6:23; 11:29; the miraculous endowments conferred by the Holy Spirit, ^{<5126>}Romans 12:6; ^{<4524>}1 Corinthians 12:4,9,28,30,31, and the special gift or endowment for the work of the ministry, ^{<5014>}1 Timothy 4:14; ^{<5006>}2 Timothy 1:6; ^{<4040>}1 Peter 4:10. The “gift” then referred to here was that by which Timothy was qualified for the work of the ministry. It relates to his office and qualifications — to “every thing”

that entered into his fitness for the work. It does not refer “exclusively” to any influence that came upon him in virtue of his ordination, or to any new grace that was infused into him by that act, making him either officially or personally more holy than other people, or than he was before — or to any efficacy in the mere act of ordination — but it comprised “the whole train of circumstances” by which he had been qualified for the sacred office and recognized as a minister of religion. All this was regarded as a “gift,” a “benefit,” or a “favor” — **χαρισμα** ^{<5486>} — and he was not to neglect or disregard the responsibilities and advantages growing out of it. In regard to the manner in which this gift or favor was bestowed, the following things are specified:

- (1) It was the gift of God; ^{<5006>}2 Timothy 1:6. He was to be recognized as its source; and it was not therefore conferred merely by human hands. The call to the ministry, the qualifications for the office, and the whole arrangement by which one is endowed for the work, are primarily to be traced to him as the source.
- (2) It was given to Timothy in accordance with certain predictions which had existed in regard to him — the expectations of those who had observed his qualifications for such an office, and who had expressed the hope that he would one day be permitted to serve the Lord in it.
- (3) It was sanctioned by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. The call of God to the work thus recognized by the church, and the approbation of the Presbytery expressed by setting him apart to the office, should be regarded by Timothy as a part of the “gift” or “benefit” (charisma) which had been conferred on him, and which he was not to neglect.
- (4) An additional circumstance which might serve to impress the mind of Timothy with the value of this endowment, and the responsibility of this office, was, that Paul himself had been concerned in his ordination; ^{<5006>}2 Timothy 1:6. He who was so much more aged (^{<5009>}Philemon 1:9; compare ^{<5006>}2 Timothy 4:6,7); he who had been a father to him, and who had adopted him and treated him as a son had been concerned in his ordination; and this fact imposed a higher obligation to perform aright the functions of an office which had been conferred on him in this manner. We are not to suppose, therefore, that there was any mysterious influence — any “virus” — conveyed by the act of ordination, or that that act imparted any additional degree of holiness. The endowment for the ministry; the previous anticipations and hopes of friends; and the manner in which he

had been inducted into the sacred office, should all be regarded as a “benefit” or “favor” of a high order, and as a reason why the gift thus bestowed should not be neglected — and the same things now should make a man who is in the ministry deeply feel the solemn obligations resting on him to cultivate his powers in the highest degree, and to make the most of his talents.

Which was given thee by prophecy That is, the prophetic declarations and the hopes of pious friends in regard to your future usefulness, have been among the means by which you have been introduced to the ministry, and should be a reason why you should cultivate your powers, and perform faithfully the duties of your office; see the notes on ^{<4018>}1 Timothy 1:18.

With the laying on of the hands of the presbytery it was common to lay on the hands in imparting a blessing, or in setting apart to any office; see ^{<4095>}Matthew 19:15; ^{<4065>}Mark 6:5; ^{<4040>}Luke 4:40; 12:13; ^{<4084>}Leviticus 8:14; ^{<4023>}Numbers 27:23; ^{<4088>}Acts 28:8; 6:6; 8:17; 13:3. The reference here is undoubtedly to the act by which Timothy was set apart to the office of the ministry. The word rendered “presbytery” — *πρεσβυτεριον* ^{<424>} — occurs only in two other places in the New Testament — ^{<426>}Luke 22:66, where it is rendered “elders;” and ^{<425>}Acts 22:5, where it is rendered “estate of the elders.” It properly means an “assembly of aged men; council of elders.” In ^{<426>}Luke 22:66, and ^{<425>}Acts 22:5, it refers to the Jewish “sanhedrin;” see the notes on ^{<4152>}Matthew 5:22. In the passage before us, it cannot refer to that body — for they did not ordain men to the Christian ministry — but to some association, or council, or body of elders of the Christian church. It is clear from the passage:

- (1) that there was more than “one person” engaged in this service, and taking part in it when Timothy was ordained, and therefore it could not have been by a “prelate” or “bishop” alone.
- (2) That the power conferred, whatever it was, was conferred by the whole body constituting the presbytery — since the apostle says that the “gift” was imparted, not in virtue of any particular power or eminence in anyone individual, but by the “laying on of the hands of the presbytery.”
- (3) The statement here is just such a one as would be made now respecting a Presbyterian ordination; it is not one which would be made of an Episcopal ordination. A Presbyterian would choose “these very words” in giving an account of an ordination to the work of the ministry; an

Episcopalian “would not.” The former speaks of an ordination by a “presbytery;” the latter of ordination by a “bishop.” The former can use the account of the apostle Paul here as applicable to an ordination, without explanations, comments, new versions or criticisms; the latter cannot. The passage, therefore, is full proof that, in one of the most important ordinations mentioned in the New Testament, it was performed by an association of men, and not by a prelate, and therefore, that this was the primitive mode of ordination. Indeed, there is not a single instance of ordination to an office mentioned in the New Testament which was performed by one man alone. See this passage examined at greater length in my “Enquiry into the organization and government of the apostolic church,” pp. 208-221.

~~<5015>~~ **1 Timothy 4:15.** *Meditate upon these things* Upon the train of events by which you have been led into the ministry, and upon the responsibilities and duties of the office. Let your mind be deeply impressed with these things; make them the subject of profound and serious thought.

Give thyself wholly to them Greek “Be in them” — a phrase similar to that of Horace — “totus in illis.” The meaning is plain. He was to devote his life wholly to this work. He was to have no other grand aim of living. His time, attention, talents, were to be absorbed in the proper duties of the work. He was not to make that subordinate and tributary to any other purpose, nor was he to allow any other object to interfere with the appropriate duties of that office. He was not to live for money, fame, or pleasure; not to devote his time to the pursuits of literature or science for their own sakes; not to seek the reputation of an elegant or profound scholar; not to aim to be distinguished merely as an accomplished gentleman, or as a skillful farmer, teacher, or author. Whatever was done in any of these departments, was to be wholly consistent with the direction, **εν** ~~<1722>~~ **τουτοις** ~~<5125>~~ **ισθι** ~~<2468>~~ — “be in these things” — be absorbed in the appropriate duties of the ministerial office. It may be remarked here that no man will ever make much of himself, or accomplish much in any profession, who does not make this the rule of his life. He who has one great purpose of life to which he patiently and steadily devotes himself, and to which he makes everything else bend, will uniformly rise to high respectability, if not to eminence. He who does not do this can expect to accomplish nothing.

That thy profiting Greek Thy going forward; that is, thy advancement, or progress. A minister of the gospel ought to make steady improvement in all that pertains to his office. No man ought to be satisfied with present attainments.

To all Margin, “in all things.” The margin is the more correct rendering, but either of them makes good sense. It should be apparent to all persons who attend on the stated preaching of a minister of the gospel, that he is making steady advances in knowledge, wisdom, and piety, and in all things that pertain to the proper performance of the duties of his office. If a man really makes progress, it will be seen and appreciated by others; if he does not, that will be as well understood by his hearers.

~~50116~~ **1 Timothy 4:16.** *Take heed unto thyself* This may be understood as relating to everything of a personal nature that would qualify him for his work. It may be applied to personal piety; to health; to manners; to habits of living; to temper; to the ruling purposes; to the contact with others. In relation to personal religion, a minister should take heed:

- (1) that he has true piety; and
- (2) that he is advancing in the knowledge and love of God.

In relation to morals, he should be upright; to his contact with others, and his personal habits, he should be correct, consistent, and gentlemanly, so as to give needless offence to none. The person of a minister should be neat and cleanly; his manners such as will show the fair influence of religion on his temper and deportment; his style of conversation such as will be an example to the old and the young, and such as will not offend against the proper laws of courtesy and urbanity. There is no religion in a filthy person; in uncouth manners; in an inconvenient and strange form of apparel; in bad grammar, and in slovenly habits — and to be a real gentleman should be as much a matter of conscience with a minister of the gospel as to be a real Christian. Indeed, under the full and fair influence of the gospel, the one always implies the other. Religion refines the manners — it does not corrupt them; it makes one courteous, polite, and kind — it never produces boorish manners, or habits that give offence to the well-bred and the refined.

And unto the doctrine The kind of teaching which you give, or to your public instructions. The meaning is, that he should hold and teach only the

truth. He was to “take heed” to the whole business of public instruction; that is, both to the matter and the manner. The great object was to get as much truth as possible before the minds of his hearers, and in such a way as to produce the deepest impression on them.

Continue in them That is, in these things which have been specified. He was ever to be found perseveringly engaged in the performance of these duties.

For in doing this thou shalt both save thyself By holding of the truth, and by the faithful performance of your duties, you will secure the salvation of the soul. We are not to suppose that the apostle meant to teach that this would be the meritorious cause of his salvation, but that these faithful labors would be regarded as an evidence of piety, and would be accepted as such. It is equivalent to saying, that an unfaithful minister of the gospel cannot be saved; one who faithfully performs all the duties of that office with a right spirit, will be.

And them that hear thee That is, you will be the means of their salvation. It is not necessary to suppose that the apostle meant to teach that he would save all that heard him. The declaration is to be understood in a popular sense, and it is undoubtedly true that a faithful minister will be the means of saving many sinners. This assurance furnishes a ground of encouragement for a minister of the gospel. He may hope for success, and should look for success. He has the promise of God that if he is faithful he shall see the fruit of his labors, and this result of his work is a sufficient reward for all the toils and sacrifices and self-denials of the ministry. If a minister should be the means of saving but one soul from the horrors of eternal suffering and eternal sinning, it would be worth the most self-denying labors of the longest life. Yet what minister of the gospel is there, who is at all faithful to his trust, who is not made the honored instrument of the salvation of many more than one? Few are the devoted ministers of Christ who are not permitted to see evidence even here, that their labor has not been in vain. Let not, then, the faithful preacher be discouraged. A single soul rescued from death will be a gem in his eternal crown brighter by far than ever sparkled on the brow of royalty.

NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY 5

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter (1 Timothy 5) embraces the following subjects:

- (1) The proper method of admonition when others err — to wit, an aged man should be entreated as a father, younger men as brethren, the aged women as mothers, and the younger with the pure feelings which one has for a sister; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:1,2.
- (2) Instructions respecting the proper treatment of widows; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:3-16.
 - (a) Those who were true widows were to be regarded with honor and respect.
 - (b) Who sustained this character; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:4-7. Those who had evinced piety at home in taking charge of those who were dependent on them, and who were steady in their devotions. No one was to be received into this number who was not of the age of sixty, who had been married to more than one man, and who had not given evidence in all the duties of domestic fidelity and charity, that she was imbued with the spirit of religion; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:9,10.
 - (c) Those who were young were not to be admitted into this class; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:11-15. The reasons given are, that they would marry again, or that they would be idle, and would be intermeddlers in the affairs of others. It was better, therefore, that they should marry, and have charge of a family of their own; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:14,15.
 - (d) The duty of the individual members of the church to sustain helpless and dependent widows, if they had such among their relations; ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:16. In these verses (^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:3-16) it is evident that the apostle had his eye on a class of widows that sustained some such relation to other females as the elders did to the whole church. They were aged women to whom was entrusted the superintendence of the females of the church — probably because from the customs then prevalent, men had much less liberty of access to the other sex, and much less freedom of contact was allowable, than now.

- (3) The duty of supporting and honoring those who ruled in the church; ^{<54B7>}1 Timothy 5:17,18.
- (4) The suitable guarding of the rights of the elders in the church. No accusation was to be received, unless it was sustained by two or three witnesses; ^{<54B9>}1 Timothy 5:19.
- (5) No one who was guilty was to be spared. All who sinned were to be publicly rebuked; ^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:20
- (6) A solemn charge is given to Timothy to keep these commandments; ^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:21.
- (7) The statement of his duty not to ordain any person rashly or hastily to the sacred office; ^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:22.
- (8) To guard his health; ^{<54E3>}1 Timothy 5:23.
- (9) A declaration respecting sin — that sometimes it is open beforehand, and sometimes it is concealed until it is revealed at the judgment, closes the chapter; ^{<54E4>}1 Timothy 5:24,25.

The design of this closing statement seems to be, to show Timothy that he should not judge people by appearances, but that he should evince great caution in forming his estimate of their character.

^{<54E1>}**1 Timothy 5:1.** *Rebuke not an elder* The word “elder” here is not used in the sense in which it often is, to denote an officer of the church, a presbyter, but in its proper and usual sense, to denote an aged man. This is evident, because the apostle immediately mentions in contradistinction from the elder, “the younger men,” where it cannot be supposed that he refers to them as officers. The command to treat the “elder” as a “father,” also shows the same thing. By the direction not to rebuke, it is not to be supposed that the minister of the gospel is not to admonish the aged, or that he is not to show them their sins when they go astray, but that he is to do this as he would to a father. He is not to assume a harsh, dictatorial, and denunciatory manner. The precepts of religion always respect the proprieties of life, and never allow us to transgress them, even when the object is to reclaim a soul from error, and to save one who is wandering. Besides, when this is the aim, it will always be most certainly accomplished by observing the respect due to others on account of office, relation, rank, or age.

But entreat him as a father As you would a father. That is, do not harshly denounce him. Endeavor to persuade him to lead a more holy life. One of the things for which the ancients were remarkable above most of the moderns, and for which the Orientals are still distinguished, was respect for age. Few things are enjoined with more explicitness and emphasis in the Bible than this; ^{<GREE>}Leviticus 19:32; Job 29; ^{<GREE>}Proverbs 20:20; 30:17; compare ^{<GREE>}Daniel 7:9,10; ^{<GREE>}Revelation 1:14,15. The apostle would have Timothy, and, for the same reason, every other minister of the gospel, a model of this virtue.

And the younger men as brethren That is, treat them as you would your own brothers. Do not consider them as aliens, strangers, or enemies, but entertain toward them, even when they go astray, the kindly feelings of a brother. This refers more particularly to his private conversation with them, and to his personal efforts to reclaim them when they had fallen into sin. When these efforts were ineffectual, and they sinned openly, he was to “rebuke them before all” (^{<GREE>}1 Timothy 5:20), that others might be deterred from following their example.

^{<GREE>}**1 Timothy 5:2.** *The elder women as mothers* Showing still the same respect for age, and for the proprieties of life. No son who had proper feelings would rebuke his own mother with severity. Let the minister of religion evince the same feelings if he is called to address a “mother in Israel” who has erred.

The younger as sisters With the feelings which you have toward a sister. The tender love which one has for a beloved sister would always keep him from using harsh and severe language. The same mildness, gentleness, and affection should be used toward a sister in the church.

With all purity Nothing could be more characteristic of Paul’s manner than this injunction; nothing could show a deeper acquaintance with human nature. He knew the danger which would beset a youthful minister of the gospel when it was his duty to admonish and entreat a youthful female; he knew, too, the scandal to which he might be exposed if, in the performance of the necessary duties of his office, there should be the slightest departure from purity and propriety. He was therefore to guard his heart with more than common vigilance in such circumstances, and was to indulge in no word, or look, or action, which could by any possibility be construed as manifesting an improper state of feeling. On nothing else do the fair character and usefulness of a youthful minister more depend, than on the

observance of this precept. Nowhere else does he more need the grace of the Lord Jesus, and the exercise of prudence, and the manifestation of incorruptible integrity, than in the performance of this duty. A youthful minister who fails here, can never recover the perfect purity of an unsullied reputation, and never in subsequent life be wholly free from suspicion; compare notes, ^{<4153>}Matthew 5:28.

^{<5415>}**1 Timothy 5:3.** *Honour widows* The particular attention and respect which are enjoined here, seem to refer to the class of widows who were supported by the church, and who were entrusted with the performance of certain duties toward the other female members, see ^{<5415>}1 Timothy 5:9. It is to be remembered that the contact of the sexes was much more circumscribed in Oriental countries than it is among us; that access to the female members of the church would be much less free than it is now, and that consequently there might have been a special propriety in entrusting the duty of watching over the younger among them to the more aged. This duty would be naturally entrusted to those who had not the care of families. It would also be natural to commit it, if they were qualified, to those who had not the means of support, and who, while they were maintained by the church, might be rendering a valuable service to it. It would seem, therefore, that there was a class of this description, who were entrusted with these duties, and in regard to whose qualifications it was proper that Timothy should be instructed. The change of customs in society has made this class less necessary, and probably the arrangement was never designed to be permanent, but still it may be a question whether such an arrangement would not now be wise and useful in the church. On this subject, see the notes on ^{<5101>}Romans 16:1.

That are widows indeed Who are truly widows. We associate with the word “widow,” commonly, not only the idea of the loss of a husband, but many other things that are the usual accompaniments of widowhood — a poor and dependent condition; care and solicitude; sadness and sorrow. This idea is implied in the use of the word employed here — $\chi\eta\rho\alpha$ ^{<5503>} — which means properly one who is “bereaved,” (from the adjective $\chi\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma$, “bereaved”), and which, as Calvin says, conveys the idea of one in distressed circumstances. What Paul regarded as constituting true widowhood, he specifies in ^{<5415>}1 Timothy 5:4,5,9,10. He connects with it the idea that she had no persons dependent on her; that she was desolate, and evinced true trust in God; that she was so aged that she would not

marry again; and that by her life she had given evidence of possessing a heart of true benevolence; ^{<418>}1 Timothy 5:10.

^{<418>}**1 Timothy 5:4.** *But if any widow have children* Who would be dependent on her care, and who might themselves contribute to her support.

Or nephews The word nephew now commonly means the son of a brother or sister. Formerly the English word also meant grandchildren, or descendants of any description. Webster. The Greek word here — **εκυονα** ^{<154>} — has the latter meaning. It denotes those “sprung from or born of;” and then descendants of any kind — sons, daughters, grandchildren. The Greek word would not, in fact, properly include nephews and nieces. It embraces only those in a direct line.

Let them learn first to show piety at home Margin, “or kindness.” That is, let the children and grandchildren learn to do this. Let them have an opportunity of performing their duty toward their aged parent or grandparent. Do not receive such a widow among the poor and dependent females of the church, to be maintained at public expense, but let her children support her. Thus they will have an opportunity of evincing Christian kindness, and of requiting her for her care. This the apostle calls “showing piety” — **ευσεβειν** ^{<215>} — that is, “filial piety;” piety toward a parent by providing for the needs of that parent in advanced age. The word is commonly used to denote piety toward God, but it is also used to denote proper reverence and respect for a parent. Robinson.

And to requite their parents To repay them, as far as possible, for all their kindness. This debt can never be wholly repaid, but still a child should feel it a matter of sacred obligation to do as much toward it as possible.

For that is good and acceptable before God It is a duty everywhere enjoined; compare notes on ^{<418>}Matthew 15:5-7; ^{<418>}Ephesians 6:1,2.

^{<418>}**1 Timothy 5:5.** *A widow indeed, and desolate* The word rendered “desolate” means “solitary, alone.” It does not necessarily imply the idea of discomfort which we attach to the word desolate. The sense is, that she had no children or other descendants; none on whom she could depend for support.

Trusteth in God She has no one else to look to but God. She has no earthly reliance, and, destitute of husband, children, and property, she feels her dependence, and steadily looks to God for consolation and support.

And continueth in supplications and prayers night and day Continually; compare notes on ^{<5400>}1 Timothy 2:1; see also the description of Anna in ^{<4026>}Luke 2:36,37. The apostle regards this as one of the characteristics of those who were “widows indeed,” whom he would have received into the class to be maintained by the church, and to whom the charge of younger members of the church might be entrusted.

^{<5406>}**1 Timothy 5:6.** *But she that liveth in pleasure* Margin, “delicately.” The Greek word (^{<4684>}σπαταλαω) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, except in ^{<5405>}James 5:5, “Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth.” It properly means to live in luxury, voluptuously; to indulge freely in eating and drinking; to yield to the indulgence of the appetites. It does not indicate grossly criminal pleasures; but the kind of pleasure connected with luxurious living, and with pampering the appetites. It is probable that in the time of the apostle, there were professedly Christian widows who lived in this manner — as there are such professing Christians of all kinds in every age of the world.

Is dead while she liveth To all the proper purposes of life she is as if she were dead. There is great emphasis in this expression, and nothing could convey more forcibly the idea that true happiness is not to be found in the pleasure of sense. There is nothing in them that answers the purposes of life. They are not the objects for which life was given, and as to the great and proper designs of existence, such persons might as well be dead.

^{<5406>}**1 Timothy 5:7.** *And these things give in charge* Announce, or declare these things, to wit, particularly respecting the duty of children to their widowed mothers, and the proper duty of those who are widows.

^{<5406>}**1 Timothy 5:8.** *But if any provide not for his own* The apostle was speaking (^{<5404>}1 Timothy 5:4) particularly of the duty of children toward a widowed mother. In enforcing that duty, he gives the subject, as he often does in similar cases, a general direction, and says that all ought to provide for those who were dependent on them, and that if they did not do this, they had a less impressive sense of the obligations of duty than even the pagan had. On the duty here referred to, compare notes, ^{<5127>}Romans 12:17; ^{<4021>}2 Corinthians 8:21. The meaning is, that the person referred to is to

think beforehand (*προνοει* ^{<4306>}) of the probable needs of his own family, and make arrangements to meet them. God thus provides for our needs; that is, he sees beforehand what we shall need, and makes arrangements for those needs by long preparation. The food that we eat, and the raiment that we wear, he foresaw that we should need, and the arrangement for the supply was made years since, and to meet these needs he has been carrying forward the plans of his providence in the seasons; in the growth of animals; in the formation of fruit; in the bountiful harvest. So, according to our measure, we are to anticipate what will be the probable needs of our families, and to make arrangements to meet them. The words “his own,” refer to those who are naturally dependent on him, whether living in his own immediate family or not. There may be many distant relatives naturally dependent on our aid, besides those who live in our own house.

And specially for those of his own house Margin, “kindred.” The word “house,” or “household,” better expresses the sense than the word “kindred.” The meaning is, those who live in his own family. They would naturally have higher claims on him than those who did not. They would commonly be his nearer relatives, and the fact, from whatever cause, that they constituted his own family, would lay the foundation for a strong claim upon him. He who neglected his own immediate family would be more guilty than he who neglected a more remote relative.

He hath denied the faith By his conduct, perhaps, not openly. He may be still a professor of religion and do this; but he will show that he is imbued with none of the spirit of religion, and is a stranger to its real nature. The meaning is, that he would, by such an act, have practically renounced Christianity, since it enjoins this duty on all. We may hence learn that it is possible to deny the faith by conduct as well as by words; and that a neglect of doing our duty is as real a denial of Christianity as it would be openly to renounce it. Peter denied his Lord in one way, and thousands do the same thing in another. He did it in words; they by neglecting their duty to their families, or their duty in their closets, or their duty in attempting to send salvation to their fellow-men, or by an openly irreligious life. A neglect of any duty is so far a denial of the faith.

And is worse than an infidel The word here does not mean an infidel, technically so called, or one who openly professes to disbelieve Christianity, but anyone who does not believe; that is, anyone who is not a sincere Christian. The word, therefore, would include the pagan, and it is

to them, doubtless, that the apostle particularly refers. They acknowledged the obligation to provide for their relatives. This was one of the great laws of nature written on their hearts, and a law which they felt bound to obey. Few things were inculcated more constantly by pagan moralists than this duty. Gelgacus, in Tacitus, says, "Nature dictates that to every one, his own children and relatives should be most dear." Cicero says, "Every man should take care of his own family" — *suos quisque debet tueri*; see Rosenmuller, in loc., and also numerous examples of the same kind quoted from Apuleius, Cicero, Plutarch, Homer, Terence, Virgil, and Servius, in Pricaeus, in loc. The doctrine here is:

- (1) that a Christian ought not to be inferior to an unbeliever in respect to any virtue;
- (2) that in all that constitutes true virtue he ought to surpass him;
- (3) that the duties which are taught by nature ought to be regarded as the more sacred and obligatory from the fact that God has given us a better religion; and
- (4) that a Christian ought never to give occasion to an enemy of the gospel to point to a man of the world and say, "there is one who surpasses you in any virtue."

~~5:9~~ **1 Timothy 5:9.** *Let not a widow be taken into the number* Margin, "chosen." The margin expresses the sense of the Greek more accurately, but the meaning is not materially different. Paul does not here specify into what "number" the widow is to be "taken," or for what purpose she is to be "chosen," but he speaks of this as a thing that was well understood. There can be no doubt, however, what he means. In the Acts of the Apostles (~~5:1~~ 1 Timothy 6:1) we have this account: "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a complaining of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations." "It appears that from the first formation of the Christian church, provision was made out of the public funds of the society for the indigent widows who belonged to it;" see Patey's *Horae Paulinae* on 1 Timothy No. 11. To this, as to a well-known practice, Paul here evidently refers. The manner in which he refers to it is such as to show that the custom had an existence. All that was necessary in the case, was, not to speak of it as if it were a new arrangement, but to mention those who ought to be regarded as proper subjects of the charity. It would seem,

also, that it was understood that such widows, according to their ability, should exercise a proper watch over the younger females of the church. In this way, while they were supported by the church, they might render themselves useful.

Under threescore years old For such reasons as those mentioned in ^{<S4B1>}1 Timothy 5:11-14.

Having been the wife of one man There has been much diversity of opinion whether this means that she had never had but one husband, or whether she had been the wife of but one man at a time; that is, whether she had cast off one and married another; see Whitby, in loc. The same difficulty has been felt in regard to this as on the passage in ^{<S4B2>}1 Timothy 3:2; see the notes on that verse. Doddridge, Clarke, and others, suppose that it means, “who had lived in conjugal fidelity to her husband.” The reason assigned for this opinion by Doddridge, is, that the apostle did not mean to condemn second marriages, since he expressly (^{<S4B4>}1 Timothy 5:14) commends it in the younger widows. The correct interpretation probably is, to refer it to one who had been married but once, and who, after her husband had died, had remained a widow. The reasons for this opinion briefly are:

- (1) That this is the interpretation most naturally suggested by the phrase;
- (2) that it agrees better with the description of the one that was to be enrolled among the “number” — those who were “widows indeed” — as we should more naturally apply this term to one who had remained unmarried after the death of her husband, than to one who had been married again;
- (3) that, while it was not unlawful or improper in itself for a widow to marry a second time, there was a degree of respect and honor attached to one who did not do it, which would not be felt for one who did; compare ^{<A1B2>}Luke 2:36,37, “She was a widow of great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity; and she was a widow of about fourscore and four years.” The same is true now. There is a higher degree of respect felt for such a widow than there is for one who has been married again, though she may be again a widow.
- (4) Among the pagans, it was regarded as especially honorable to have been married to but one man, and such widows were the Pudicitioe Coronam, or crown of chastity; Val. Max. L. i.c. ii.; compare Livy, L. 10:c. 23; see Whitby.

(5) As these persons were not only to be maintained by the church, but appear also to have been entrusted with an office of guardianship over the younger females, it was of importance that they should have such a character that no occasion of offence should be given, even among the pagan; and, in order to that, Paul gave direction that only those should be thus enrolled who were in all respects widows, and who would be regarded, on account of their age and their whole deportment, as “widows indeed.” I cannot doubt, therefore, that he meant to exclude those from the number here referred to who had been married the second time.

^{<545D>}**1 Timothy 5:10.** *Well reported of for good works* Of good character or reputation; see the notes on ^{<548D>}1 Timothy 3:7.

If she have brought up children Either her own or others. The idea is, if she has done this in a proper manner.

If she have lodged strangers If she has been characterized by hospitality — a virtue greatly commended in the Scriptures; compare notes on ^{<548D>}1 Timothy 3:2.

If she have washed the saints' feet It is not certain whether this is to be understood literally, or whether it merely denotes that she had performed offices of a humble and self-denying kind — such as would be shown by washing the feet of others. It was one of the rites of hospitality in the East to wash the feet of the guest (^{<01804>}Genesis 18:4), and Paul might have spoken of this as having been literally performed. There is not the slightest evidence that he refers to it as a religious rite, or ordinance, any more than he does to the act of bringing up children as a religious rite; compare notes on ^{<543D>}John 13:1-10.

If she have relieved the afflicted If it has been her character that she was ready to furnish relief to those who were in distress.

If she have diligently followed every good work This is one of the characteristics of true piety. A sincere Christian will, like God, be the friend of all that is good, and will be ready to promote every good object according to his ability. He will not merely be the friend of one good cause, to the neglect of others, but he will endeavor to promote every good object, and though from special circumstances, and special dealings of Providence, he may have been particularly interested in some one object of

charity, yet every good object will find a response in his heart, and he will be ready to promote it by his influence, his property, and his prayers.

1 Timothy 5:11. *But the younger widows refuse* That is, in respect to the matter under discussion. Do not admit them into the class of widows referred to. It cannot mean that he was to reject them as members of the church, or not to treat them with respect and kindness.

For when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ There is probably a thought conveyed by these words to most minds which is by no means in the original, and which does injustice both to the apostle and to the “younger widows” referred to. In the Greek there is no idea of wantonness in the sense of lasciviousness or lewdness; nor was this, though now a common idea attached to the word, by any means essential to it when our translation was made. The word “wanton” then meant “wandering” or “roving in gaiety or sport; moving or flying loosely; playing in the wind; then, wandering from moral rectitude, licentious, dissolute, libidinous” — Webster. The Greek word here used, **καταστηνιαζω** ^{<2691>}, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The word **στηνιαω** ^{<4763>} — however, is used twice, and is in both cases translated “lived deliciously;” ^{<6812>} Revelation 18:7,9. The word is derived from **στηνος** ^{<4764>} (whence “strenuous”), properly meaning “rudeness, insolence, pride,” and hence, “revel, riot, luxury;” or from — **στηνης**, the adjective — “strong, stiff, hard, rough.” The verb then means “to live strenuously, rudely,” as in English, “to live hard;” also, to live wild, or without restraint; to run riot, to live luxuriously. The idea of strength is the essential one, and then of strength that is not subordinate to law; that is wild and riotous; see Pussow and Robinson, Lexicon. The sense here is, that they would not be subordinate to the restraints implied in that situation, they would become impatient, and would marry again. The idea is not that of wantonness or lewdness, but it is that of a mind not subdued by age and by trials, and that would be impatient under the necessary restraints of the condition which was contemplated. They could not be depended on with certainty, but they might be expected again to enter into the married relation.

They will marry It is clear, from this, that the apostle did not contemplate any vows which would prevent their marrying again; nor does he say that it would be absolutely wrong for them to marry, even if they were admitted in to that rank; or as if there were any vows to restrain them from doing it. This passage, therefore, can never be adduced in favor of that practice of

taking the veil in nunneries, and of a vow of perpetual seclusion from the world.

1 Timothy 5:12. *Having damnation* Or, rather, having “condemnation;” or incurring guilt. This does not mean of necessity that they would lose their souls; see the phrase explained in the notes on **1 Corinthians 11:29**. The meaning is, that they would contract guilt, if they had been admitted among this class of persons, and then married again. The apostle does not say that that would be wrong in itself (compare notes on **1 Timothy 5:14**), or that they would be absolutely prohibited from it, but that injury would be done if they were admitted among those who were “widows indeed” — who were supported by the church, and who were entrusted with a certain degree of care over the more youthful females — and then should leave that situation. It might give occasion for scandal it might break in upon the arrangements; it would show that there was a relaxing of the faith, and of the deadness to the world, which they were supposed to have; and it was better that they should be married (**1 Timothy 5:14**), without having been thus admitted.

Because they have cast off their first faith This does not mean that they would lose all their religion, or wholly fall away, but that this would show that they had not the strong faith, the deadness to the world, the simple dependence on God (**1 Timothy 5:5**), and the desire which they had to be weaned from worldly cares and influences, which they once had. When they became widows, all their earthly hopes seemed to be blasted. They were then dead to the world, and felt their sole dependence on God. But if, under the influence of these strong emotions, they were admitted to the “class of widows” in the church, there was no certainty that they would continue in this state of mind. Time would do much to modify their grief. There would be a reviving love of the world, and under the influence of this they would be disposed to enter again into the marriage relation, and thus show that they had not the strong and simple faith which they had when the blow which made them widows fell heavily upon them.

1 Timothy 5:13. *And withal* In addition to the prospect that they may marry again, there are other disadvantages which might follow from such an arrangement, and other evils to be feared which it is desirable to avoid.

They learn to be idle That is, if supported by the church, and if without the settled principles which might be expected in those more aged and experienced, it may be feared that they will give themselves up to an indolent life. There would be a security in the age and established habits of these more advanced in life, which there could not be in their case. The apostle does not mean that widows are naturally disposed to be idle, but that in the situation referred to there would be danger of it.

Wandering about from house to house A natural consequence of supposing that they had nothing to do, and a practice not only profitless, but always attended with mischief.

Tattlers also Literally, “overflowing;” then overflowing with talk; praters, triflers. They would learn all the news; become acquainted with the secrets of families, and of course indulge in much idle and improper conversation. Our word “gossippers” would accurately express the meaning here. The noun does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. The verb occurs in ^{<RB1>}John 3:10; rendered, “prating against.”

And busy-bodies see the notes on ^{<RB1>}2 Thessalonians 3:11. The word means, probably, “working all round, overdoing,” and then “an intermeddler.” Persons who have nothing to do of their own, commonly find employment by interesting themselves in the affairs of their neighbors. No one likes to be wholly idle, and if anyone is not found doing what he ought to do, he will commonly be found engaged in doing what he ought not.

Speaking things which they ought not Revealing the concerns of their neighbors; disclosing secrets; magnifying trifles, so as to exalt themselves into importance, as if they were entrusted with the secrets of others; inventing stories and tales of gossip, that they may magnify and maintain their own consequence in the community. No persons are commonly more dangerous to the peace of a neighborhood than those who have nothing to do.

^{<RB1>}**1 Timothy 5:14.** *I will therefore* I give it as my opinion; or this is my counsel; compare notes, ^{<RB1>}1 Corinthians 7:6,10,40.

That the younger women marry The word “women” is not expressed or necessarily implied in the original — νεωτερας — and it is evident that the apostle here had particular reference to “widows,” and that the injunction

should be understood as relating to them. We are not to suppose that he gives this as an absolute and universal command, for it might not always be at the option of the widow to marry again, and it cannot be doubted that there may be cases where it would be unadvisable. But he speaks of this as a general rule. It is better for such persons to have domestic concerns that require their attention, than it is to be exposed to the evils of an idle life. We may learn from this:

- (1) that second marriages are not improper or unlawful, but that in some circumstances they may be preferable to widowhood;
- (2) that marriage itself is in a high degree honorable. How different are the views of the inspired apostle Paul about marriage from those of the Papists!

Bear children, guide the house These words signify, says Bloomfield, to “exercise and occupy themselves in the duties of a wife.” It is better to be employed in the duties growing out of the cares of a family, than to lead a life of celibacy.

Give none occasion to the adversary The enemy of religion — the pagan or the infidel.

To speak reproachfully Margin, “for their railing.” That is, on account of a life which would do no honor to religion. In the performance of domestic duties, when fully employed, they would avoid the evils specified in ^{<515>}1 Timothy 5:13. Every one who professes religion should so live as to give no occasion to an infidel or a man of the world to speak reproachfully of the cause of the Redeemer.

^{<515>}**1 Timothy 5:15.** *For some are already turned aside after Satan* That is, some young widows. The meaning is, that in the respects above mentioned (^{<515>}1 Timothy 5:13), they had followed the great Tempter, rather than the Lord Jesus. This is stated as a reason why they should not be admitted into the number of the widows who were to be maintained at the expense of the church, and to whom the care of the younger female members was to be committed.

^{<515>}**1 Timothy 5:16.** *If any man or woman that believeth* Christians are often simply called “believers,” because faith is the leading and most important act of their religion.

Have widows Widowed mothers, or grandmothers, or any other widows whose support would naturally devolve on them.

Let them relieve them That is, let them support them. This was an obvious rule of duty; see the notes on ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:8. Nothing can be more unreasonable than to leave those who are properly dependent on us to be supported by others, when we are able to maintain them ourselves.

That it may relieve, ... That it may have the means of supporting those who are truly dependent. To require or expect the Church, therefore, to support those whom we ought ourselves to support, is, in fact, to rob the poor and friendless. In regard to these directions respecting widows (^{<548B>}1 Timothy 5:3-16), we may remark in general, as the result of the exposition which has been given:

(1) they were to be poor widows, who had not the means of support themselves.

(2) They were, probably, to be not merely supported, but to be usefully employed in the service of the church, particularly in overseeing the conduct, and imparting instruction to the female members.

(3) They were to be of such age and character that there would be security of stability and correctness of deportment; such that they would not be tempted to leave the situation or to act so as to give occasion of reproach.

(4) It is by no means certain that this was intended to be a permanent arrangement. It grew probably out of the special customs respecting contact between the sexes in the Oriental world, and would undoubtedly be proper now in similar circumstances. But it by no means follows that this arrangement is binding on the churches where the customs of society are different. Yet

(5) the passage inculcates the general principle that the poor widows of the church are to be assisted when they have no relatives on whom they can naturally depend. No class of people are more helpless than aged widows, and for that class God has always shown a special concern, and his people should do so likewise.

^{<548T>}**1 Timothy 5:17.** *Let the elders that rule well* Greek, *πρεσβυτεροι* ^{<4245>}, Presbyters. The apostle had given full instructions respecting bishops (^{<548B>}1 Timothy 3:1-7); deacons (^{<548B>}1 Timothy 3:8-13); widows (^{<548B>}1

Timothy 5:3-16); and he here proceeds to prescribe the duty of the church toward those who sustain the office of elder. The word used — “elder” or “presbyter” — properly refers to age, and is then used to denote the officers of the church, probably because the aged were at first entrusted with the administration of the affairs of the church. The word was in familiar use among the Jews to denote the body of men that presided in the synagogue; see the notes on ^{<415P>}Matthew 15:2; ^{<411B>}Acts 11:30; 15:2.

that rule well Presiding well, or well managing the spiritual interests of the church. The word rendered “rule” — **προεστωτες** ^{<429I>} — is from a verb meaning to be over; to preside over; to have the care of. The word is used with reference to bishops, ^{<410S>}Titus 1:5,7; to an apostle, ^{<410I>}1 Peter 5:1; and is such a word as would apply to any officers to whom the management and government of the church was entrusted. On the general subject of the rulers in the church; see the notes on ^{<412B>}1 Corinthians 12:28. It is probable that not precisely the same organization was pursued in every place where a church was established; and where there was a Jewish synagogue, the Christian church would be formed substantially after that model, and in such a church there would be a bench of presiding elders; see, on this subject, Whately’s “Kingdom of Christ delineated,” pp. 84-80. The language here seems to have been taken from such an organization. On the Jewish synagogue, see the notes on ^{<40E3>}Matthew 4:23.

Be counted worthy of double honour Of double respect; that is, of a high degree of respect; of a degree of respect becoming their age and office; compare ^{<415I>}1 Thessalonians 5:12,13. From the quotation which is made in ^{<415B>}1 Timothy 5:18, in relation to this subject, it would seem probable that the apostle had some reference also to their support, or to what was necessary for their maintenance. There is no improbability in supposing that all the officers of the church, of whatever grade or rank, may have had some compensation, corresponding to the amount of time which their office required them to devote to the service of the church. Nothing would be more reasonable than that, if their duties in the church interfered with their regular employments in their secular calling, their brethren should contribute to their support; compare notes on 1 Corinthians 9.

Especially they who labour in word and doctrine In preaching and instructing the people. From this it is clear that, while there were “elders” who labored “in the word and doctrine,” that is, in preaching, there were also those who did not labor “in the word and doctrine,” but who were

nevertheless appointed to rule in the church. Whether, however, they were regarded as a separate and distinct class of officers, does not appear from this passage. It may have been that there was a bench of elders to whom the general management of the church was confided, and that a part of them were engaged in preaching; a part may have performed the office of “teachers” (see the notes on ^{<517>}Romans 12:7; ^{<428>}1 Corinthians 12:28), and a part may have been employed in managing other concerns of the church, and yet all were regarded as the προεστωτες ^{<4291>} πρεσβυτεροι ^{<4245>} — or “elders presiding over the church.” It cannot, I think, be certainly concluded from this passage, that the ruling elders who did not teach or preach were regarded as a separate class or order of permanent officers in the church. There seems to have been a bench of elders selected on account of age, piety, prudence, and wisdom, to whom was entrusted the whole business of the instruction and government of the church, and they performed the various parts of the duty as they had ability. Those among them who “labored in the word and doctrine,” and who gave up all their time to the business of their office, would be worthy of special respect, and of a higher compensation.

^{<518>}**1 Timothy 5:18.** *For the Scripture saith* This is adduced as a reason why a church should show all due respect and care for its ministers. The reason is, that as God took care to make provision for the laboring ox, much more should due attention be paid to those who labor for the welfare of the church.

Thou shalt not muzzle the ox see this passage explained, and its bearing on such an argument shown, in the notes on ^{<498>}1 Corinthians 9:8-10.

And, The labourer is worthy of his reward This expression is found substantially in ^{<400>}Matthew 10:10, and ^{<407>}Luke 10:7. It does not occur in so many words in the Old Testament, and yet the apostle adduces it evidently as a quotation from the Scriptures, and as authority in the case. It would seem probable, therefore, that he had seen the Gospel by Matthew or by Luke, and that he quoted this as a part of Scripture, and regarded the Book from which he made the quotation as of the same authority as the Old Testament. If so, then this may be regarded as an attestation of the apostle to the inspiration of the “Gospel” in which it was found.

^{<519>}**1 Timothy 5:19.** *Against an elder* The word “elder” here seems to be used in the sense in which it is in the previous verse as relating to

“office,” and not in the sense of an aged man, as in ~~<5001>~~1 Timothy 5:1. The connection demands this interpretation.

Receive not an accusation He was not to regard such a charge as well founded unless sustained by two or three witnesses. It is clear from this, that Paul supposed that Timothy would be called on to hear charges against others who were in the ministerial office, and to express his judgment on such cases. There is no reason, however, to suppose that he meant that he should hear them alone, or as a “bishop,” for this direction does not make the supposition improper that others would be associated with him. It is just such counsel as would now be given to a Presbyterian or congregational minister, or such as would be given to an associate justice in a court, on the supposition that a brother judge was at any time to be tried by him and his colleagues.

But before two or three witnesses Margin, “under.” The meaning is, unless supported by the testimony of two or three persons. He was not to regard an accusation against a presbyter as proved, if there was but one witness in the case, however positive he might be in his testimony. The reasons for this direction were probably such as these:

(1) This was the requirement of the Jewish law in all cases, which had thus settled a principle which the apostle seems to have regarded as important, if not obligatory, under the Christian dispensation; see ~~<5176>~~Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:15; compare notes on ~~<4087>~~John 8:17; ~~<4710>~~2 Corinthians 13:1.

(2) There would be much greater reason to apprehend that one person might be deceived in the matter on which he bore witness, or might do it from malignant motives, or might be bribed to give false testimony, than that two or three would give such testimony; and the arrangement, therefore, furnished important security for the innocent.

(3) There might be reason to apprehend that evil-minded persons might be disposed to bring charges against the ministers of the gospel or other officers of the church, and it was important, therefore, that their rights should be guarded with anxious care. The ministers of religion often give offence to wicked people by their rebukes of sin (compare ~~<4067>~~Mark 6:17-20); wicked people would rejoice to see an accusation against them sustained; the cause of religion would be liable to suffer much when its ministers were condemned as guilty of gross offences, and it is right, therefore, that the evidence in the case should be as free as possible from

all suspicion that it is caused by malignity, by hatred of religion, or by conspiracy, or by a desire to see religion disgraced.

(4) The character of a minister of the gospel is of value, not only to himself and family, as is the case with that of other people, but is of special value to the church, and to the cause of religion. It is the property of the church. The interests of religion depend much on it, and it should not be wantonly assailed; and every precaution should be adopted that Christianity should not be deprived of the advantage which may be derived in its favor from the piety, experience, and talents of its public defenders. At the same time, however, the wicked, though in the ministry, should not be screened from the punishment which they deserve. The apostle gave no injunction to attempt to cover up their faults, or to save them from a fair trial. He only demanded such security as the nature of the case required, that the trial should be fair. If a minister of the gospel has been proved to be guilty of crime, the honor of religion, as well as simple justice, requires that he shall be punished as he deserves. He sins against great light; he prostitutes a holy office, and makes use of the very reputation which his office gives him, that he may betray the confidence of others; and such a man should not escape. There should be no “benefit of clergy,” and neither a black coat, nor bands, nor the lawn should save a villain.

~~400~~ **1 Timothy 5:20.** *Them that sin* That have been proved to have committed sin — referring probably to the elders mentioned in the previous verse, but giving the direction so general a form that it might be applicable to others.

Rebuke before all Before all the church or congregation. The word “rebuke” properly denotes to reprove or reprehend. It means here that there should be a public statement of the nature of the offence, and such a censure as the case demanded. It extends only to spiritual censures. There is no power given of inflicting any punishment by fine or imprisonment. The power of the church, in such cases, is only to express its strong and decided disapprobation of the wrong done, and, if the case demands it, of disowning the offending member or minister. This direction to “rebuke an offender before all,” may be easily reconciled with the direction in ~~400~~ 1 Timothy 5:1, “Rebuke not an elder.” The latter refers to the private and pastoral conversation with an elder, and to the method in which he should be treated in such contact — to wit, with the feelings due to a father; the direction here refers to the manner in which an offender should be treated

who has been proved to be guilty, and where the case has become public. Then there is to be a public expression of disapprobation.

That others also may fear That they may be kept from committing the same offence; compare ^{<4024>}1 Peter 2:14. The end of punishment is not the gratification of the private feelings of him who administers it, but the prevention of crime.

^{<4021>}**1 Timothy 5:21.** *I charge thee before God* compare ^{<4026>}Luke 16:28; ^{<4022>}Acts 2:20. The word rendered “charge” means, properly, to call to witness; then to affirm with solemn attestations; and then to admonish solemnly, to urge upon earnestly. It is a word which implies that the subject is of great importance. Paul gives this charge as in the presence of God, of the Redeemer, and of the elect angels, and wishes to secure that sense of its solemnity which must arise from the presence of such holy witnesses.

And the Lord Jesus Christ As in the presence of the Lord Jesus; with his eye resting upon you.

And the elect angels It is not uncommon in the Scriptures to speak as if we were in the presence of holy angels, and of the disembodied spirits of the good; compare notes on ^{<3821>}Hebrews 12:1. No one can prove that the angels, and that the departed spirits of holy men, are not witnesses of what we do. At all events, it is right to urge on others the performance of duty as if the eye of a departed father, mother, or sister were fixed upon us, and as if we were encompassed by all the holy beings of heaven. Sin, too, should be avoided as if every eye in the universe were upon us. How many things do we do which we would not; how many feelings do we cherish which we would at once banish from our minds, if we felt that the heavens above us were as transparent as glass, and that all the holy beings around the throne were fixing an intense gaze upon us! The word “elect” here seems to imply that there had been some influence used to keep them, and some purpose respecting them, which had not existed in regard to those who had fallen. Saints are called “elect” because they are chosen of God unto salvation (notes on ^{<4004>}Ephesians 1:4,5), and it would appear that it is a great law extending through the universe, that both those who remain in a state of holiness, and those who are made holy, are the subjects of purpose and choice on the part of God. The fact only is stated; the reasons which led to the choice, alike in regard to angels and human beings, are unknown to us; compare notes on ^{<40125>}Matthew 11:25.

That thou observe these things Probably referring to all the things which he had enjoined in the previous parts of the Epistle.

Without preferring one before another Margin, “prejudice.” The meaning is, “without previous judgment” — *χωρίς* ^{<565>} *προκριματος* ^{<429>} — without any prejudice on account of rank, wealth, personal friendship, or predilection of any sort. Let there be entire impartiality in all cases. Justice was beautifully represented by the ancients as holding a pair of scales equally balanced. It is as important that there should be entire impartiality in the church as in civil transactions, and though it is not wrong for a minister of the gospel to have his personal friends, yet in the administration of the affairs of the church he should remember that all are brethren, and all, of whatever rank, color, sex, or age, have equal rights.

Partiality Greek, “inclination,” or “proclivity” — that is, without being inclined to favor one party or person more than another. There should be no purpose to find one guilty and another innocent; no inclination of heart toward one which would lead us to resolve to find him innocent; and no aversion from another which would make us resolve to find him guilty.

^{<512>} **1 Timothy 5:22.** *Lay hands suddenly on no man* Some have understood this of laying on hands to heal the sick (Koppe); others of the laying on of hands to absolve penitents, but the obvious meaning is to refer it to ordination. It was usual to lay the hands on the heads of those who were ordained to a sacred office, or appointed to perform an important duty; notes, ^{<504>} 1 Timothy 4:14; compare ^{<416>} Acts 6:6; 8:17. The idea here is, that Timothy should not be hasty in an act so important as that of introducing people to the ministry. He should take time to give them a fair trial of their piety; he should have satisfactory evidence of their qualifications. He should not at once introduce a man to the ministry because he gave evidence of piety, or because he burned with an ardent zeal, or because he thought himself qualified for the work. It is clear from this that the apostle regarded Timothy as having the right to ordain to the ministry; but not that he was to ordain alone, or as a prelate. The injunction would be entirely proper on the supposition that others were to be associated with him in the act of ordaining. It is just such as a Presbyterian father in the ministry would give in a charge to his son now; it is in fact just the charge which is now given by Presbyterians and congregationalists to those who are set apart to the sacred office, in reference to ordaining others.

Neither be partaker of other men's sins This is evidently to be interpreted in connection with the injunction "to lay hands suddenly on no man." The meaning, in this connection, is, that Timothy was not to become a participant in the sins of another by introducing him to the sacred office. He was not to invest one with a holy office who was a wicked man or a heretic, for this would be to sanction his wickedness and error. If we ordain a man to the office of the ministry who is known to be living in sin, or to cherish dangerous error, we become the patrons of the sin and of the heresy. We lend to it the sanction of our approbation; and give to it whatever currency it may acquire from the reputation which we may have, or which it may acquire from the influence of the sacred office of the ministry. Hence, the importance of caution in investing anyone with the ministerial office. But while Paul meant, doubtless, that this should be applied particularly to ordination to the ministry, he has given it a general character. In no way are we to participate in the sins of other people. We are not to be engaged with them in doing wrong; we are not to patronize them in a wicked business; we are not to be known as their companions or friends; and we are not to partake of their unlawful gains. We are not to lend money, or a boat, or a horse, or a pistol, or a bowie-knife, for an unlawful business; we are not to furnish capital for the slave-trade, or for manufacturing intoxicating drinks, or for an enterprise that contemplates the violation of the Sabbath.

Keep thyself pure Particularly, in regard to participation in the sins of others; generally, in all things — in heart, in word, in conduct.

1 Timothy 5:23. *Drink no longer water* There has been much difficulty felt in regard to the connection which this advice has with what precedes and what follows. Many have considered the difficulty to be so great that they have supposed that this verse has been displaced, and that it should be introduced in some other connection. The true connection, and the reason for the introduction of the counsel here, seems to me to be this: Paul appears to have been suddenly impressed with the thought — a thought which is very likely to come over a man who is writing on the duties of the ministry — of the arduous nature of the ministerial office. He was giving counsels in regard to an office which required a great amount of labor, care, and anxiety. The labors enjoined were such as to demand all the time; the care and anxiety incident to such a charge would be very likely to prostrate the frame, and to injure the health. Then he remembered that Timothy was yet but a youth; he recalled his feebleness of constitution

and his frequent attacks of illness; he recollected the very abstemious habits which he had prescribed for himself, and, in this connection, he urges him to a careful regard for his health, and prescribes the use of a small quantity of wine, mingled with his water, as a suitable medicine in his case. Thus considered, this direction is as worthy to be given by an inspired teacher as it is to counsel a man to pay a proper regard to his health, and not needlessly to throw away his life; compare ^{<4023>}Matthew 10:23. The phrase, “drink no longer water,” is equivalent to, “drink not water only;” see numerous instances in Wetstein. The Greek word here used does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament.

But use a little wine Mingled with the water — the common method of drinking wine in the East; see Robinson’s Bibliotheca Sacra, 1:512,513.

For thy stomach’s sake It was not for the pleasure to be derived from the use of wine, or because it would produce hilarity or excitement, but solely because it was regarded as necessary for the promotion of health; that is, as a medicine.

And thine often infirmities **ασθενειας** ^{<769>} — Weaknesses or sicknesses. The word would include all infirmities of body, but seems to refer here to some attacks of sickness to which Timothy was liable, or to some feebleness of constitution; but beyond this we have no information in regard to the nature of his maladies. In view of this passage, and as a further explanation of it, we may make the following remarks:

(1) The use of wine, and of all intoxicating drinks, was solemnly forbidden to the priests under the Mosaic law, when engaged in the performance of their sacred duties; ^{<800>}Leviticus 10:9,10. The same was the case among the Egyptian priests. Clarke; compare notes on ^{<548B>}1 Timothy 3:3. It is not improbable that the same thing would be regarded as proper among those who ministered in holy things under the Christian dispensation. The natural feeling would be, and not improperly, that a Christian minister should not be less holy than a Jewish priest, and especially when it is remembered that the reason of the Jewish law remained the same — “that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and clean and unclean.”

(2) It is evident from this passage that Timothy usually drank water only, or that, in modern language, he was a “tee-totaller.” He was, evidently, not in the habit of drinking wine, or he could not have been exhorted to do it.

(3) He must have been a remarkably temperate youth to have required the authority of an apostle to induce him to drink even a little wine; see Doddridge. There are few young men so temperate as to require such an authority to induce them to do it.

(4) The exhortation extended only to a very moderate use of wine. It was not to drink it freely; it was not to drink it at the tables of the rich and the great, or in the social circle; it was not even to drink it by itself; it was to use “a little,” mingled with water — for this was the usual method; see Athaeneus, Deipno. lib. 9: x. 100:7.

(5) it was not as a common drink, but the exhortation or command extends only to its use as a medicine. All the use which can be legitimately made of this injunction — whatever conclusion may be drawn from other precepts — is, that it is proper to use a small quantity of wine for medicinal purposes.

(6) There are many ministers of the gospel, now, alas! to whom under no circumstances could an apostle apply this exhortation — “Drink no longer water only.” They would ask, with surprise, what he meant? whether he intended it in irony, and for banter — for they need no apostolic command to drink wine. Or if he should address to them the exhortation, “use a little wine,” they could regard it only as a reproof for their usual habit of drinking much. To many, the exhortation would be appropriate, if they ought to use wine at all, only because they are in the habit of using so much that it would be proper to restrain them to a much smaller quantity.

(7) This whole passage is one of great value to the cause of temperance. Timothy was undoubtedly in the habit of abstaining wholly from the use of wine. Paul knew this, and he did not reprove him for it. He manifestly favored the general habit, and only asked him to depart in some small degree from it, in order that he might restore and preserve his health. So far, and no further, is it right to apply this language in regard to the use of wine; and the minister who should follow this injunction would be in no danger of disgracing his sacred profession by the debasing and demoralizing sin of intemperance.

~~5:24~~ **1 Timothy 5:24.** *Some men’s sins are open beforehand* This declaration, though it assumes a general form, is to be taken evidently in connection with the general subject of introducing men to the ministry (~~5:22~~ 1 Timothy 5:22); and ~~5:23~~ 1 Timothy 5:23 is to be regarded as a

parenthesis. The apostle had given Timothy a charge (~~5:17~~ 1 Timothy 5:22) respecting the character of those whom he should ordain. He here says, in reference to that, that the character of some people was manifest. There was no disguise. It was evident to all what it was, and there could be no danger of mistake respecting it. Their conduct was apparent to all. About such people he ought not to hesitate a moment, and, no matter what their talents, or learning, or rank in the community, he ought to have no participation in introducing them to the ministry.

Going before to judgment Their character is well understood. There is no need of waiting for the day of judgment to know what they are. Their deeds so precede their own appearance at the judgment-bar, that the record and the verdict can be made up before they arrive there, and there will be scarcely need even of the formality of a trial. The meaning here is, that there could be no doubt about the character of such people, and Timothy should not be accessory to their being introduced into the office of the ministry.

And some men they follow after That is, their character is not fully understood here. They conceal their plans. They practice deception. They appear different from what they really are. But the character of such people will be developed, and they will be judged according to their works. They cannot hope to escape with impunity. Though they have endeavored to hide their evil deeds, yet they will follow after them to the judgment-bar, and will meet them there. The meaning, in this connection, seems to be, that there ought to be circumspection in judging of the qualifications of men for the office of the ministry. It ought not to be inferred from favorable appearances at once, or on slight acquaintance, that they are qualified for the office — for they may be of the number of those whose characters, now concealed or misunderstood, will be developed only on the final trial.

~~5:18~~ **1 Timothy 5:25.** *Likewise also the good works of some are manifest beforehand* The character of some people is clear, and accurately understood. There can be no doubt, from their works, that they are good people. We need not wait for the day of judgment to determine that, but may treat them here as good men, and introduce them to offices which only good men can fill. The idea here is that their character may be so certain and undoubted that there need be no hesitation in setting them apart to the office of the ministry.

And they that are otherwise cannot be hid That is, they cannot be ultimately concealed or misunderstood. There are arrangements in the divine government for bringing out the character of every man so that it may be clearly understood. The expression here refers to good men. The idea is, that there are some good men whose character is known to all. Their deeds spread a glory around them, so that no one can mistake what they are. They correspond, in respect to the publicity of their character with those mentioned in ^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:24, whose “sins are open beforehand;” for the good deeds of the one are as manifest as the sins of the other. But there are those who are “otherwise.” They are modest, retiring, unobtrusive, unknown. They may live in obscurity; may have slender means for doing good; may be constitutionally so diffident that they never appear on the stage of public action. What they do is concealed from the world. These correspond in respect to publicity with those mentioned in ^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:24, “whose deeds follow after them.” Yet, says the apostle, these cannot always be hid. There are arrangements for developing every man’s character, and it will be ultimately known what he is. The connection here, seems to be this. As Timothy (^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:24) was to be on his guard in introducing men into the ministry, against those whose character for evil was not developed, but who might be concealing their plans and practicing secret sins, so he was to endeavor to search out the modest, the unobtrusive, and those who, though now unknown, were among the excellent of the earth, and bring them forward to a station of usefulness where their virtues might shine on the world.

Apart from the reference of this beautiful passage (^{<54E2>}1 Timothy 5:24,25) to the ministry, it contains truth important to all:

(1) The character of many wicked people is now clearly known. No one has any doubt of it. Their deeds have gone before them, and are recorded in the books that will be open at the judgment. They might even now be judged without the formality of appearing there, and the universe would acquiesce in the sentence of condemnation.

(2) The character of many wicked people is concealed. They hide their plans. They are practicing secret iniquity. They do not mean that the world shall know what they are. More than half the real depravity of the world is thus concealed from human view, and in regard to more than half the race who are going up to the judgment there is an entire mistake as to their real

character. If all the secret wickedness of the earth were disclosed, no one would have any doubt about the doctrine of human depravity.

(3) There is a process steadily going forward for bringing out the real character of people, and showing what they are. This process consists, first, in the arrangements of Providence for developing their character here. Many a man, who was supposed to be virtuous, is shown, by some sudden trial, to have been all along a villain at heart. Many a minister of the gospel, a lawyer, a physician, an officer in a bank, a merchant, whose character was supposed to stand fair, has been suffered to fall into open sin, that he might develop the long-cherished secret depravity of his soul. Secondly, the process will be completed on the final trial. Then nothing will be concealed. Every man will be seen as he is. All they whose characters were understood to be wicked here, will be seen then also to be wicked, and many who were supposed on earth to have a good character, will be seen there to have been hollow-hearted and base hypocrites.

(4) Every man in the last day will be judged according to his real character. No one, however successful he may have been here, can hope to practice a deception on his final Judge.

(5) There is a fitness and propriety in the fact that there will be a final judgment. Indeed, there must be such a judgment, in order that God may be just. The characters of people are not fully developed here. The process is not completed. Many are taken away before their schemes of iniquity are accomplished, and before their real characters are understood. If they were to live long enough on the earth, their characters would be ultimately developed here, but the divine arrangement is, that man shall not live long here, and the development, therefore, must be in the future world.

(6) The modest, the retiring, the humble, and those here unknown, will not be overlooked in the last great day. There is much good, as there is much evil in the world, that is now concealed. There are many plans of benevolence formed which they who formed them are not permitted to complete; many desires of benefiting others are cherished which there are no means of gratifying; many a deed of kindness is performed which is not blazoned abroad to the world; and many a wish is entertained for the progress of virtue, the freedom of the enslaved, the relief of the oppressed, and the salvation of the world, which can find expression only in prayer. We are not to suppose then that all that is concealed and unknown in the world is evil.

(7) There will be amazing developments in the last great day; and as it will then be seen in the revelations of the secret deeds of evil that human nature is corrupt, so it will be seen that there was much more good in the world than was commonly supposed. As a large portion of the wickedness of the earth is concealed, so, from the necessity of the case, it is true that no small portion of the goodness on earth is hidden. Wickedness conceals itself from shame, from a desire better to effect its purposes, from the dread of punishment; goodness, from its modesty, its retiring nature, and from the want of an opportunity of acting out its desires; but whatever may have been the cause of the concealment, in all cases all will be made known on the final trial — to the shame and confusion of the one class; to the joy and triumph of the other.

NOTES ON 1 TIMOTHY 6

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter (1 Timothy 6) embraces the following subjects of counsel and exhortation:

- (1) The kind of instruction which was to be given to servants; ^{<500>}1 Timothy 6:1-5. They were to treat their masters with all proper respect, ^{<501>}1 Timothy 6:1; if their masters were Christians, they were, on that account, to serve them with the more fidelity, ^{<502>}1 Timothy 6:2; and any opposite kind of teaching would tend only to stir up strife and produce dissatisfaction and contention, and could proceed only from a proud and self-confident heart.
- (2) The advantage of piety and of a contented mind; ^{<503>}1 Timothy 6:6-8. The argument for this is, that we brought nothing into the world, and can carry nothing out; that our essential needs here are food and raiment, and that, having enough to make us comfortable, we should be content.
- (3) The evils of a desire to be rich (^{<504>}1 Timothy 6:9,10) — evils seen in the temptations to which it leads; the passions which it fosters, and the danger to religion itself.
- (4) An exhortation to Timothy, as a minister of religion, to pursue higher and nobler objects; ^{<505>}1 Timothy 6:11-16. He was:
 - (a) to avoid these worldly things; he was
 - (b) to pursue nobler objects. He was to follow after righteousness, and to fight the good fight of faith. To do this, he was to be encouraged by the assurance that the Great and only Potentate would, in due time, place the crown on his head.
- (5) The duty of those who were rich — for it is supposed that some Christians will be rich — either by inheritance, or by prosperous business; ^{<506>}1 Timothy 6:17-19. They are:
 - (a) not to be proud;
 - (b) nor to trust in their riches so as to forget their dependence on God;

(c) to do good with their property; and

(d) to make their wealth the means of securing eternal life.

(6) A solemn charge to Timothy to observe these things, and not to be turned from them by any of the arguments and objections of pretended science; ^{<506d>}1 Timothy 6:20,21.

^{<506d>}**1 Timothy 6:1.** *Let as many servants* On the word here rendered “servants” — δουλοι ^{<401>} — see the notes on ^{<405>}Ephesians 6:5. The word is that which was commonly applied to a slave, but it is so extensive in its signification as to be applicable to any species of servitude, whether voluntary or involuntary. If slavery existed in Ephesus at the time when this Epistle was written, it would be applicable to slaves; if any other kind of servitude existed, the word would be equally applicable to that. There is nothing in the word itself which essentially limits it to slavery; examine ^{<4037>}Matthew 13:27; 20:27; ^{<4104>}Mark 10:44; ^{<4129>}Luke 2:29; ^{<31515>}John 15:15; ^{<4218>}Acts 2:18; 4:29; 16:17; ^{<500>}Romans 1:1; ^{<4045>}2 Corinthians 4:5; ^{<500>}Jude 1:1; ^{<5000>}Revelation 1:1; 2:20; 7:3. The addition of the phrase “under the yoke,” however, shows undoubtedly that it is to be understood here of slavery.

As are under the yoke On the word yoke, see the notes on ^{<4129>}Matthew 11:29. The phrase here properly denotes slavery, as it would not be applied to any other species of servitude; see ^{<3263>}Leviticus 26:13; Dem. 322,12. ζευγος ^{<2201>} δουλοσυνης ^{<401>}. Robinson’s Lexicon. It sometimes denotes the bondage of the Mosaic law as being a severe and oppressive burden; ^{<4150>}Acts 15:10; ^{<8701>}Galatians 5:1. It may be remarked here that the apostle did not regard slavery as a light or desirable thing. He would not have applied this term to the condition of a wife or of a child.

Count their own masters worthy of all honour Treat them with all proper respect. They were to manifest the right spirit themselves, whatever their masters did; they were not to do anything that would dishonor religion. The injunction here would seem to have particular reference to those whose masters were not Christians. In the following verse, the apostle gives particular instructions to those who had pious masters. The meaning here is, that the slave ought to show the Christian spirit toward his master who was not a Christian; he ought to conduct himself so that religion would not be dishonored; he ought not to give his master occasion to say that the only effect of the Christian religion on the mind of a servant was to

make him restless, discontented, dissatisfied, and disobedient. In the humble and trying situation in which he confessedly was — under the yoke of bondage — he ought to evince patience, kindness, and respect for his master, and as long as the relation continued he was to be obedient. This command, however, was by no means inconsistent with his desiring his freedom, and securing it, if the opportunity presented itself; see the notes on [1 Corinthians 7:21](#); compare, on the passage before us, the notes on [Ephesians 6:5-8](#), and [1 Peter 2:18](#).

That the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed That religion be not dishonored and reproached, and that there may be no occasion to say that Christianity tends to produce discontent and to lead to insurrection. If the effect of religion had been to teach all who were servants that they should no longer obey their masters, or that they should rise upon them and assert their freedom by violence, or that their masters were to be treated with indignity on account of their usurped rights over others, the effect would have been obvious. There would have been a loud and united outcry against the new religion, and it could have made no progress in the world. Instead of this, Christianity taught the necessity of patience, and meekness, and forbearance in the endurance of all wrong — whether from private individuals ([Matthew 5:39-41](#); [1 Corinthians 6:7](#)), or under the oppressions and exactions of Nero ([Romans 13:1-7](#)), or amidst the hardships and cruelties of slavery. These peaceful injunctions, however, did not demonstrate that Christ approved the act of him “that smote on the one cheek,” or that Paul regarded the government of Nero as a good government, — and as little do they prove that Paul or the Saviour approved of slavery.

[1 Timothy 6:2](#). *And they that have believing masters* Masters who are Christians. It is clear from this, that Paul supposed that, at that time, and under those circumstances, a man might become a Christian who had slaves under him. How long he might continue to hold his fellow-men in bondage, and yet be a Christian, is, however, quite a different question. It is quite clear, from the New Testament, as well as from facts now, that God may convert people when pursuing any kind of wickedness. The effect of religion, however, in all cases, will be to lead them to cease to do wrong. It is by no means improbable that many of those who had owned slaves, in accordance with the prevailing custom in the Roman empire, may have been converted — for the fact that a man has been living a life of sin does not prevent the possibility of his conversion. There is no evidence that

Paul refers here to any who had bought slaves after they were converted; nor is there any intimation of any such transaction among Christians in the New Testament. Nor is there any intimation that he regarded it as right and best that they should continue to hold slaves; nor that he would approve their making arrangements to persevere in this as a permanent institution. Nor is it to be fairly inferred from this passage that he meant to teach that they might continue this, and yet be entitled to all the respect and confidence due to the Christian name, or be regarded as maintaining a good standing in the church. Whatever may be true on these points, the passage before us only proves that Paul considered that a man who was a slaveholder might be converted, and be spoken of as a “believer,” or a Christian. Many have been converted in similar circumstances, as many have in the practice of all other kinds of iniquity. What was their duty after their conversion, was another question and what was the duty of their “servants” or slaves, was another question still. It is only this latter question which the apostle is here considering.

Not despise them, because they are brethren Not treat them with any want of the respect which is due to their station. The word here used sometimes denotes “to neglect,” or, “not to care for;” ~~<40>~~ Matthew 6:24; ~~<263>~~ Luke 16:13. Here it is not necessary to suppose that it denotes actual contempt, but only that want of respect which might possibly spring up in the mind if not well instructed, or not on its guard, among those who were servants or slaves. It was to be apprehended that the effect of the master and the slave having both embraced religion, would be to produce in the mind of the servant a want of respect and deference for his master. This danger was to be apprehended from the following causes:

(1) Christianity taught that all people were made of “one blood,” and were by nature equal; ~~<472>~~ Acts 17:26. It was natural, therefore for the slave to infer that by nature he was equal to his master, and it would be easy to pervert this truth to make him disrespectful and insubordinate.

(2) They were equal to them as Christians. Christianity taught them that they were all “brethren” in the Lord, and that there was no distinction before God. It might be natural to infer from this, that all distinctions in society were to be abolished, and that, in all respects, the slave was to regard himself as on a level with his master.

(3) Some, who did not well understand the nature of Christianity, or who might have been disposed to cause trouble, may have taken advantage of

the undeniable truths about the equality of people by nature and by redemption, to produce discontent on the part of the slave. They may have endeavored to embitter the feelings of the slaves toward their masters who held them in bondage. The effect, it is easy to see, may have been to lead those who were in a state of servitude to manifest open and marked disrespect. In opposition to this, the apostle would have Timothy teach that Christianity did not rudely assail the existing institutions of society, and especially did not teach those who were in subordinate ranks to be disrespectful to these above them.

But rather do them service That is, serve them with more cheerfulness and alacrity than they did before the master was converted; or serve them with the more cheerfulness because they were Christians. The reasons for this were, because the master was now more worthy of affectionate regard, and because the servant might look for better treatment at his hands; compare notes on ^{<406>}Ephesians 6:6.

Because they are faithful That is, “because” they are “believers,” or are Christians — *πιστοι* ^{<403>}; the same word which in the beginning of the verse is rendered “believing.” It does not here mean that they were “faithful” to their servants or their God, but merely that they were Christians.

And beloved Probably, “beloved of God;” for so the word is often used. As they are the friends of God, they who are servants should show them the more respect. The idea is, simply, that one whom God loves should be treated with more respect than if he were not thus beloved; or, a good man deserves more respect than a wicked man. In all the relations of life, we should respect those above us the more in proportion to the excellency of their character.

Partakers of the benefit That is, the benefit which the gospel imparts — for so the connection requires us to understand it. It cannot mean, as many have supposed, that they were “partakers of the benefit of the labors of the servant,” or enjoyed the fruits of their labors — for how could this be a reason for their treating them with the more respect? It would be rather a reason for treating them with less respect, because they were living on the avails of unrequited toil. But the true reason assigned is that the master had been, by the grace of God, permitted to participate in the same benefits of salvation as the servant; he had received, like him, the pardon of sin, and he was to be regarded as a fellow-heir of the grace of life. The expression here

might be rendered, “they are partakers of, or are devoted to, the good cause.” Robinson’s Lexicon. The argument is, that they were not infidels, or strangers to religion, or those who would try to hinder the progress of that which was dear to the heart of the servant, but were united with them in that same good work; they participated in the blessings of the same salvation, and they were really endeavoring to further the interests of religion. There ought, therefore, to be the more respect shown to them, and the more cheerful service rendered them.

~~508~~ **1 Timothy 6:3.** *If any man teach otherwise* Any otherwise than that respect should be shown to masters; and that a more cheerful and ready service should be rendered because they were Christians. It is evidently implied here that some might be disposed to inculcate such views of religion as would produce discontent and a spirit of insubordination among those who were held to servitude. Who they were is not known, nor is it known what arguments they would employ to do it. It would seem probable that the arguments which would be employed would be such as these: that God made all people equal; that all had been redeemed by the same blood; that all true Christians were fellow-heirs of heaven; and that it was wrong to hold a Christian brother in bondage, etc. From undeniable principles it would seem that they drew the inference that slaves ought at once to assert their freedom; that they should refuse obedience to their masters; and that the tendency of their teaching was, instead of removing the evil by the gradual and silent influence of Christian principles, to produce discontent and insurrection. From some of the expressions here used by the apostle, as characteristic of these teachers, it would seem to be probable that these persons were Jews. They were people given to subtle disputations, and those who doted about questions and verbal disputes, and who were intent on gain, supposing that that which conduced to mere worldly prosperity was of course religion. These characteristics apply well to Jewish teachers.

And consent not to wholesome words Words conducing to a healthful state of the church; that is, doctrines tending to produce order and a due observance of the proprieties of life; doctrines leading to contentment, and sober industry, and the patient endurance of evils.

Even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ The doctrines of the Saviour — all of which tended to a quiet life, and to a patient endurance of wrongs.

And to the doctrine which is according to godliness Which tends to produce piety or religion; that is, the doctrine which would be most favorable to an easy and rapid propagation of the gospel. The idea seems to be, that such a state of insubordination and discontent as they would produce, would be unfavorable to the promotion of religion. Who can doubt it?

~~<400>~~ **1 Timothy 6:4.** *He is proud* That is, he is lifted up with his fancied superior acquaintance with the nature of religion. The Greek verb means, properly, “to smoke, to fume;” and then to be inflated, to “be conceited, etc.” The idea is, that he has no proper knowledge of the nature of the gospel, and yet he values himself on a fancied superior acquaintance with its principles.

Knowing nothing Margin, “a fool.” That is, that he does not understand the nature of religion as he supposes he does. His views in regard to the relation of masters and servants, and to the bearing of religion on that relation, show that he does not understand the genius of Christianity. The apostle expresses this in strong language; by saying that he knows nothing; see the notes on ~~<400>~~ 1 Corinthians 8:2.

But doting Margin, “sick.” The Greek word — **νοσθεω** ~~<352>~~ — means properly to be sick; then to languish, to pine after. The meaning here is, that such persons had a sickly or morbid desire for debates of this kind. They had not a sound and healthy state of mind on the subject of religion. They were like a sickly man, who has no desire for solid and healthful food, but for that which will gratify a diseased appetite. They desired not sound doctrine, but controversies about unimportant and unsubstantial matters — things that bore the same relation to important doctrines which the things that a sick man pines after do to substantial food.

Questions and strifes of words The Jews abounded much in disputes of this sort, and it would seem probable that the persons here referred to were Jewish teachers; compare notes, ~~<5006>~~ 1 Timothy 1:6,7, and ~~<41815>~~ Acts 18:15.

Whereof cometh envy The only fruit of which is to produce envy. That is, the appearance of superior knowledge; the boast of being profoundly acquainted with religion, and the show of an ability for subtle argumentation, would produce in a certain class envy. Envy is uneasiness, pain, mortification, or discontent, excited by another’s prosperity, or by his superior knowledge or possessions; see the notes on ~~<6129>~~ Romans 1:29.

Strife Or contentions with those who will not readily yield to their opinions.

Railings Harsh and abusive language toward those who will not concede a point — a common effect of disputes, and more commonly of disputes about small and unimportant matters, than of these which are of magnitude. Such railings often attend disputes that arise out of nice and subtle distinctions.

Evil surmisings Suspicions that they are led to hold their views, not by the love of the truth, but from sordid or worldly motives. Such suspicions are very apt to attend an angry debate of any kind. It might be expected especially to exist on such a question as the apostle refers to here — the relation of a master and a slave. It is always very hard to do justice to the motives of one who seems to us to be living in sin, or to believe it to be possible that he acts from right motives.

⁴¹⁸**1 Timothy 6:5.** *Perverse disputings* Margin, “gallings one of another.” In regard to the correct reading of this passage, see Bib. Repository, vol. iii. pp. 61,62. The word which is here used in the Received Text — *παραδιατριβη* — occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It properly means “mis-employment;” then “idle occupation.” (Robinson’s Lexicon) The verb from which this is derived means to “rub in pieces, to wear away;” and hence the word here used refers to what was a mere “wearing away” of time. The idea is that of employments that merely consumed time without any advantage. The notion of contention or dispute is not necessarily implied in this passage, but the allusion is to inquiries or discussions that were of no practical value, but; were a mere consumption of time; compare Koppe on the passage. The reading in the margin is derived from the common usage of the verb “to rub,” and hence our translators attached the idea of “rubbing against” each other, or of “galling” each other, as by rubbing. This is not, however, the idea in the Greek word. The phrase “idle employments” would better suit the meaning of the Greek than either of the phrases which our translators have employed.

Of men of corrupt minds That is, of wicked hearts.

And destitute of the truth Not knowing the truth; or not having just views of truth. They show that they have no correct acquaintance with the Christian system.

Supposing that gain is godliness That that which contributes to an increase of property is of course true religion; or that it is proper to infer that any course which contributes to worldly prosperity must be sanctioned by religion. They judge of the consistency of any course with religion by its tendency to promote outward prosperity. This they have exalted into a maxim, and this they make the essential thing in religion. But how could any man do this? And what connection would this have with the subject under consideration — the kind of instruction that was to be given to servants? The meaning of the maxim seems to be, that religion must necessarily promote prosperity by its promoting temperance, and industry, and length of days; and that since this was the case, it was fair to infer that anything which would not do this could not be consistent with religion. They adopted it, therefore, as a general rule of judging, and one in entire accordance with the wishes of their own hearts, that any course of life that would not do this must be contrary to the true spirit of religion. This maxim, it would seem, they applied to the relation of the slave and his master, and as the tendency of the system was always to keep the servant poor and in an humble condition, they seem to have inferred that the relation was contrary to Christianity, and hence to have excited the servant to disaffection. In their reasoning they were not far out of the way, for it is fair to infer that a system that tends to produce uniform poverty, and to perpetuate a degraded condition in society, is contrary to the genius of Christianity. They were wrong:

(1) in making this a general maxim by which to judge of everything in religion; and

(2) in so applying it as to produce insubordination and discontent in the minds of servants toward their masters; and

(3) in supposing that everything which produced gain was consistent with religion, or that they could infallibly judge of the moral quality of any course of life by its contributing to outward prosperity. Religion will uniformly lead to that which conduces to prosperity, but it does not follow that every way of making money is therefore a part of piety. It is possible, also, that in some way they hoped for “gain” to themselves by inculcating those principles. It may be remarked here, that this is not an uncommon maxim practically among people — that “gain is godliness.” The whole object of life with them is to make money; the rule by which they judge of everything is by its tendency to produce gain; and their whole religion may

be summed up in this, that they live for gain. Wealth is the real object of pursuit; but it is often with them cloaked under the pretence of piety. They have no more religion than they suppose will contribute to this object; they judge of the nature and value of every maxim by its tendency to make people prosperous in their worldly business; they have as much as they suppose will promote their pecuniary interest, and they sacrifice every principle of religion which they suppose would conflict with their earthly advancement.

From such withdraw thyself That is, have no communion or fellowship with them. Do not recognize them as religious teachers; do not countenance their views. Timothy was, in no way, to show that he regarded them as inculcating truth, or to patronize their doctrines. From such people, as having any claim to the character of Christians, every man should withdraw with feelings of unutterable pity and loathing. This passage (~~SALE~~ 1 Timothy 6:1-5) is often appealed to by the advocates and apologists for slavery, to prove that Christianity countenances that institution, and that no direct attempt should be made by the ministers of the gospel, or other Christians, to show the evil of the institution, and to promote its abolition, and to prove that we have no right to interfere in any way with what pertains to these “domestic relations.” It is of importance, therefore, in view of the exposition which has been given of the words and phrases in the passage, to sum up the truths which it inculcates. From it, therefore, the following lessons may be derived:

(1) That those who are slaves, and who have been converted to Christianity, should not be indolent or disorderly. If their masters are Christians, they should treat them with respect, and all the more because they are fellow-heirs of the grace of life. If they are not Christians, they should yet show the nature of religion on themselves, and bear the evils of their condition with patience — showing how religion teaches them to endure wrong. In either case, they are to be quiet, industrious, kind, meek, respectful. This Christianity everywhere enjoins while the relation continues, At the same time, however, it does not forbid the slave earnestly to desire his freedom, or to use all proper measures to obtain it; see ~~ALICE~~ 1 Corinthians 7:21.

(2) That the ministers of religion should not labor to produce a spirit of discontent among slaves, or excite them to rise upon their masters. This passage would undoubtedly forbid all such interference, and all agencies or

embassies sent among slaves themselves to inflame their minds against their masters, in view of their wrongs; to put arms into their hands; or to induce them to form combinations for purposes of insurrection. It is not so much in the true spirit of Christianity to go to those who are wronged, as to those who do the wrong. The primary message in such cases is to the latter; and when it does go to the former, it is to teach them to be patient under their wrongs, to evince the Christian spirit there, and to make use only of those means which are consistent with the gospel to free themselves from the evils under which they suffer. At the same time, nothing in this passage, or in any other part of the New Testament, forbids us to go to the master himself, and to show him the evil of the system, and to enjoin upon him to let the oppressed go free. Nothing in this passage can be reasonably construed as teaching that an appeal of the most earnest and urgent kind may not be made to him; or that the wrongs of the system may not be fully set before him, or that any man or set of men may not lawfully lift up in his hearing a loud and earnest voice in favor of the freedom of all. And in like manner there is nothing which makes it improper that the slave himself should be put fully in possession of that gospel which will apprise him of his rights as a man, and as redeemed by the blood of Jesus. Every human being, whether held in bondage or not, has a right to be made acquainted with all the provisions and truths of that gospel, nor has any man or class of men a right to withhold such knowledge from him. No system of things can be right which contemplates that that gospel shall be withheld, or under which it is necessary to withhold it in order to the perpetuity of the system.

(3) The passage teaches that it is possible that a man who is a slaveholder may become a Christian. But it does not teach that, though he may become a Christian while he is a slaveholder, that it is proper for him to continue this relation after he becomes such. It does not teach that a man can be a Christian and yet go into the business of buying and selling slaves. It does not teach that a man can be a Christian and continue to hold others in bondage, whatever may be true on that point. It does not teach that he ought to be considered as maintaining a “good standing” in the church, if he continues to be a slaveholder; and whatever may be the truth on these points, this passage should not be adduced as demonstrating them. It settles one point only in regard to these questions — that a case was supposable in which a slave had a Christian master. It settles the duty of the slave in such a case; it says nothing about the duty of the master.

(4) This passage does not teach that slavery is either a good thing, or a just thing, a desirable relation in life, or an institution that God wishes to be perpetuated on the earth. The injunctions to slaves to be patient, meek, industrious, and respectful, no more demonstrate this, than the command to subjects to be obedient to the laws proves that God regarded the government of Nero as such an administration as he wished to be perpetuated on the earth. To exhort a slave to manifest a Christian spirit under his oppressions and wrongs, is not to justify the system that does him wrong, nor does it prohibit us from showing to masters that the system is contrary to the gospel, and that it ought to be abandoned.

(5) This passage, therefore, furnishes no real support for slavery. It can no more be adduced in favor of it than any exhortation to those who are oppressed, or in any degrading situation in life, to be patient, proves that the system which oppresses and degrades them, is a good one. Nor does the fact that a man might be converted who was a slaveholder, and might be spoken of as a **πιστος** ^{<410>}, or believer, prove that it would be right and desirable that he should continue that relation, any more than the fact that Saul of Tarsus became a Christian when engaged in persecution, proves that it would have been right for him to continue in that business, or than the conversion of the Ephesians who “used curious arts” (^{<419>}Acts 19:19), proved that it would have been proper for them to continue in that employment. People who are doing wrong are converted in order to turn them from that course of life, not to justify them in it.

^{<416>}**1 Timothy 6:6.** *But godliness* Piety; religion. The meaning is, that real religion should be regarded as the greatest and most valuable acquisition. “With contentment.” This word, as now used, refers to a state of mind; a calm and satisfied feeling; a freedom from murmuring and complaining. The idea is, that “piety, connected with a contented mind — or a mind acquiescing in the allotments of life — is to be regarded as the real gain.” Tyndale gives substantially the same interpretation: “Godliness is great riches, if a man be content with that he hath” Coverdale: “Howbeit, it is of great advantage, who is so godly, and holdeth him content with that he hath.” The word which is used here — **αυταρκεια** ^{<841>} — means, properly, “self-sufficiency,” and is used here, in a good sense, to denote a mind satisfied with its lot. If there be true religion, united with its proper accompaniment, peace of mind, it is to be regarded as the true riches. The object of the apostle seems to be, to rebuke those who supposed that property constituted everything that was worth living for. He tells them,

therefore, that the true gain, the real riches which we ought to seek, is religion, with a contented mind. This does more to promote happiness than wealth can ever do, and this is what should be regarded as the great object of life.

<5487>1 Timothy 6:7. *For we brought nothing into this world ...* A sentiment very similar to this occurs in **<8021>**Job 1:21 — and it would seem probable that the apostle had that passage in his eye; see the notes on that passage. Numerous expressions of this kind occur in the classic writers; see Wetstein, in loc., and Pricaeus, in loc. in the *Critici Sacri*. Of the truth of what is here said, there can be nothing more obvious. It is apparent to all. We bring no property with us into the world — no clothing, no jewels, no gold — and it is equally clear that we can take nothing with us when we leave the earth. Our coming into the world introduces no additional property to that which the race before possessed, and our going from the world removes none that we may have helped the race to accumulate. This is said by the apostle as an obvious reason why we should be contented if our actual needs are supplied — for this is really all that we need, and all that the world is toiling for.

We can carry nothing out compare **<9917>**Psalm 49:17.

“For when he [the rich man] dieth, he shall carry nothing away; his glory shall not descend after him.”

<5488>1 Timothy 6:8. *And having food and raiment* Food and raiment, here, seem to be used to denote supplies for our needs in general. It is not uncommon to denote the whole by a part, and, as these are the principal things which we really need, and without which life could not be sustained, the apostle uses the phrase to denote all that is really necessary for us. We cannot suppose that he would forbid a desire of a comfortable habitation, or of the means of knowledge, or of convenience for worshipping God, etc. The idea is, that having those flyings which meet the actual necessities of our nature, and save us from distress, we should not strive after “uncertain riches,” or make wealth the object of our anxious pursuit; compare notes on **<5041>**Philippians 4:11,12.

<5489>1 Timothy 6:9. *But they that will be rich* Further to enforce the duty of contentment, the apostle refers to some of the evils which necessarily attend a desire to be rich. Those evils have been so great and uniform in all ages, and are so necessary accompaniments of that desire, that, even

amidst many inconveniences which may attend the opposite condition, we should be contented with our lot. Indeed, if we could see all, it would only be necessary to see the evils which the desire of wealth produces in the world, to make us contented with a most lowly condition of life. Perhaps nothing more would be necessary to make a poor man satisfied with his lot, and grateful for it, than to be acquainted with the perplexities and cares of a rich man. There is more emphasis to be placed on the word will, here, in the phrase, “will be rich,” than might be supposed from our translation. It is not the sign of the future tense, but implies an actual “purpose” or “design” to become rich — $\acute{\omicron}\iota$ ^{<3588>} $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ ^{<1014>}. The reference is to those in whom this becomes the object of earnest desire, and who lay their plans for it.

Fall into temptation That is, they are tempted to do wicked things in order to accomplish their purposes. It is extremely difficult to cherish the desire to be rich, as the leading purpose of the soul, and to be an honest man.

And a snare Birds are taken in a snare, and wild beasts were formerly; see the notes on ^{<3818>} Job 18:8,9. The net was sprung suddenly upon them, and they could not escape. The idea here is, that they who have this desire become so entangled, that they cannot easily escape. They become involved in the meshes of worldliness and sin; their movements are so fettered by cares, and inordinate desires, and by artificial needs, that they are no longer freemen. They become so involved in these things, that they cannot well break away from them if they would; compare ^{<1880>} Proverbs 28:20.

And into many foolish and hurtful lusts Desires, such as the love of wealth creates. They are foolish — as being not such as an intelligent and immortal being should pursue; and they are hurtful — as being injurious to morals, to health, and to the soul. Among those desires, are the fondness for display; for a magnificent dwelling, a train of menials, and a splendid equipage; for sumptuous living, feasting, the social glass, company, and riotous dissipation.

Which drown men in destruction and perdition The word which is here rendered, “drown” — $\beta\upsilon\theta\iota\zeta\omega$ ^{<1036>} — means, to “sink in the” deep, or, “to cause to sink;” and the meaning here is, that they become submerged as a ship that sinks. The idea of drowning is not properly that of the apostle, but the image is that of a wreck, where a ship and all that is in it go down together. The destruction is complete. There is a total ruin of happiness, of

virtue, of reputation, and of the soul. The ruling desire to be rich leads on a train of follies which ruins everything here, and hereafter. How many of the human family have thus been destroyed!

<400> **1 Timothy 6:10.** *For the love of money is the root of all evil* That is, of all kinds of evil. This is evidently not to be understood as literally true, for there are evils which cannot, be traced to the love of money — the evils growing out of ambition, and intemperance, and debasing lusts, and of the hatred of God and of goodness. The expression here is evidently a popular saying — “all sorts of evils grow out of the love of money.” Similar expressions often occur in the classic writers; see Wetstein, in loc, and numerous examples quoted by Priceaus. Of the truth of this, no one can doubt. No small part of the crimes of the world can be traced to the love of gold. But it deserves to be remarked here, that the apostle does not say that “money is the root of all evil,” or that it is an evil at all. It is the “love” of it which is the source of evil.

Which while some coveted after That is, some who were professing Christians. The apostle is doubtless referring to persons whose history was known to Timothy, and warning him, and teaching him to warn others, by their example.

They have erred from the faith Margin, “been seduced.” The Greek is, they have been led astray from; that is, they have been so deceived as to depart from the faith. The notion of deception or delusion is in the word, and the sense is, that, deceived by the promises held out by the prospect of wealth, they have apostatized from the faith. It is not implied of necessity that they were ever real Christians. They have been led off from truth and duty, and from all the hopes and joys which religion would have imparted.

And pierced themselves through with many sorrows With such sorrows as remorse, and painful reflections on their folly, and the apprehension of future wrath. Too late they see that they have thrown away the hopes of religion for that which is at best unworthy the pursuit of an immortal mind; which leads them on to a life of wickedness; which fails of imparting what it promised when its pursuit is successful, and which, in the great majority of instances, disappoints its votaries in respect to its attainment. The word rendered “pierced themselves through” — περιπειραν <404> — occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and is a word whose force and emphasis cannot be well expressed in a translation. It is from περιρω <408> ,

and is made more emphatic by the addition of the preposition *περι* ^{<4012>}. The word *πειρω* ^{<4008>}, means, properly, “to pierce through from one end to another,” and is applied to meat that is “pierced through” by the spit when it is to be roasted (Passow); then it means to pierce through and through. The addition of the preposition (*περι* ^{<4012>}) to the word, conveys the idea of doing this “all round;” of piercing everywhere. It was not a single thrust which was made, but they are gashed all round with penetrating wounds. Such is the effect on those who cast off religion for the sake of gold. None can avoid these consequences who do this. Every man is in the hands of a holy and just God, and sooner or later he must feel the effects of his sin and folly.

^{<4081>} **1 Timothy 6:11.** *But thou, O man of God, flee these things* These allurements of wealth, and these sad consequences which the love of gold produces.

And follow after righteousness, ... Make these the grand object of your pursuit. On the virtues here enumerated, see the notes on ^{<4052>}Galatians 5:22,23.

^{<4082>} **1 Timothy 6:12.** *Fight the good fight of faith* The noble conflict in the cause of religion; see the notes on ^{<4060>}Ephesians 6:10-17; compare notes on ^{<4026>}1 Corinthians 9:26,27. The allusion is to the contests at the Grecian games.

Lay hold on eternal life As the crown of victory that is held out to you. Seize this as eagerly as the competitors at the Grecian games laid hold on the prize; see the notes on ^{<4025>}1 Corinthians 9:25.

Whereunto thou art also called That is, by the Spirit of God, and by the very nature of your profession. God does not “call” his people that they may become rich; he does not convert them in order that they may devote themselves to the business of gain. They are “called” to a higher and nobler work. Yet how many professing Christians there are who seem to live as if God had “called” them to the special business of making money, and who devote themselves to it with a zeal and assiduity that would do honor to such a calling, if this had been the grand object which God had in view in converting them!

And hast professed a good profession before many witnesses That is, either when he embraced the Christian religion, and made a public

profession of it in the presence of the church and of the world; or when he was solemnly set apart to the ministry; or as he in his Christian life had been enabled publicly to evince his attachment to the Saviour. I see no reason to doubt that the apostle may have referred to the former, and that in early times a profession of religion may have been openly made before the church and the world. Such a method of admitting members to the church would have been natural, and would have been fitted to make a deep impression on others. It is a good thing often to remind professors of religion of the feelings which they had when they made a profession of religion; of the fact that the transaction was witnessed by the world; and of the promises which they then made to lead holy lives. One of the best ways of stimulating ourselves or others to the faithful performance of duty, is the remembrance of the vows then made; and one of the most effectual methods of reclaiming a backslider is to bring to his remembrance that solemn hour when he publicly gave himself to God.

1 Timothy 6:13. *I give thee charge in the sight God* see the notes on **1 Timothy 5:21**.

Who quickeneth all things Who gives life to all; notes on **Ephesians 2:1**. It is not quite clear why the apostle refers to this attribute of God as enforcing the charge which he here makes. Perhaps he means to say that God is the source of life, and that as he had given life to Timothy — natural and spiritual — he had a right to require that it should be employed in his service; and that, if, in obedience to this charge and in the performance of his duties, he should be required to lay down his life, he should bear in remembrance that God had power to raise him up again. This is more distinctly urged in **2 Timothy 2:8-10**.

And before Christ Jesus As in the presence of Christ, and stimulated by his example.

Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession Margin, “profession.” The same Greek word is used which in **1 Timothy 6:12** is translated “profession.” The reference is to the fact that the Lord Jesus, when standing at the bar of Pilate who claimed to have power over his life, did not shrink from an open avowal of the truth; **John 18:36,37**. Nothing can be better fitted to preserve our minds steadfast in the faith, and to enable us to maintain our sacred vows in this world when allured by temptation, or when ridiculed for our religion, than to remember the example of the Lord Jesus; Let us place him before us as he stood at the

bar of Pilate — threatened with death in its most appalling form, and ridiculed for the principles which he maintained; let us look on him, friendless and alone, and see with what seriousness, and sincerity, and boldness he stated the simple truth about himself, and we shall have one of the best securities that we can have, that we shall not dishonor our profession. A clear view of the example of Christ our Saviour, in those circumstances, and a deep conviction that his eye is upon us to discern whether we are steadfast as he was, will do more than all abstract precepts to make us faithful to our christian calling.

<5084>1 Timothy 6:14. *That thou keep this commandment* Referring particularly to the solemn injunction which he had just given him, to “fight the good fight of faith,” but perhaps also including all that he had enjoined on him.

Without spot It seems harsh, and is unusual, to apply the epithet, “without spot” — **ασπιλος** ^{<784>} — to a command or doctrine, and the passage may be so construed that this may be understood as referring to Timothy himself — “That thou keep the commandment so that thou mayest be without spot and unrebukable.” See Bloomfield, Crit. Dig., in loc. The word here rendered “without spot,” occurs in the New Testament only here and in ^{<3027>}James 1:27; ^{<6019>}1 Peter 1:19; ^{<6084>}2 Peter 3:14. It means without any “stain” or “blemish; pure.” If applied here to Timothy, it means that he should so keep the command that there would be no stain on his moral character; if to the doctrine, that that should be kept pure.

Unrebukable So that there be no occasion for reproach or reproof; see notes on ^{<5045>}Philippians 2:15.

Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ see notes on ^{<5029>}1 Thessalonians 2:19; 4:16; 5:23.

<5085>1 Timothy 6:15. *Which in his times he shall show* Which God will reveal at such times as he shall deem best. It is implied here that the time is unknown to people; see the notes on ^{<4007>}Acts 1:7.

Who is the blessed and only Potentate God, who is the ruler over all. The word used here — **δυναστης** ^{<1413>} — means one who is “mighty” (^{<4012>}Luke 1:22), then a prince or ruler; compare ^{<4027>}Acts 8:27. It is applied here to God as the mighty ruler over the universe.

The King of kings Who claims dominion over all the kings of the earth. In ^{<674>}Revelation 7:14, the same appellation is applied to the Lord Jesus, ascribing to him universal dominion.

Lord of lords The idea here is, that all the sovereigns of the earth are under his sway; that none of them can prevent the accomplishment of his purposes; and that he can direct the winding up of human affairs when he pleases.

^{<566>}**1 Timothy 6:16.** *Who only hath immortality* The word here — **αθανασια** ^{<110>} — properly means “exemption from death,” and seems to mean that God, in his own nature, enjoys a perfect and certain exemption from death. Creatures have immortality only as they derive it from him, and of course are dependent on him for it. He has it by his very nature, and it is in his case underived, and he cannot be deprived of it. It is one of the essential attributes of his being, that he will always exist, and that death cannot reach him; compare the expression in ^{<626>}John 5:26, “The Father hath life in himself,” and the notes on that passage.

Dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto Greek, “Inhabiting inapproachable light.” The light where he dwells is so brilliant and dazzling that mortal eyes could not endure it. This is a very common representation of the dwelling place of God. See examples quoted in Pricaeus, in loc. Heaven is constantly represented as a place of the most pure and brilliant light, needing not the light of the sun, or the moon, or the stars (^{<612>}Revelation 21:23,24; 22:5), and God is represented as dwelling in that light, surrounded by amazing and inapproachable glory compare ^{<606>}Revelation 4:6; ^{<3004>}Ezekiel 1:4; ^{<3003>}Hebrews 1:3.

Whom no man hath seen nor can see notes on ^{<608>}John 1:18.

To whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen see the notes on ^{<613>}Romans 11:36.

^{<567>}**1 Timothy 6:17.** *Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded* One of the evils to which they are particularly exposed. The idea is, that they should not value themselves on account of their wealth, or look down with pride and arrogance on their inferiors. They should not suppose that they are any better people or any nearer heaven, because they are wealthy. Property really makes no distinction in the great things that pertain to character and salvation, It does not necessarily make

one wise, or learned, or great, or good. In all these things, the man who has not wealth may be vastly the superior of him who has; and for so slight and unimportant a distinction as gold can confer, no man should be proud. Besides, let such a man reflect that his property is the gift of God; that he is made rich because God has chosen to arrange things so that he should be; that it is not primarily owing to any skill or wisdom which he has; that his property only increases his responsibility, and that it must all soon be left, and he be as poor as the “beggar that lies at his gate;” and he will see ample reason why he should not be proud.

Nor trust in uncertain riches Margin, “The uncertainty of.” The margin expresses the meaning of the Greek more accurately than the text, but the sense is not materially varied. Riches are uncertain because they may soon be taken away. No dependence can be placed on them in the emergencies of life. He who is rich today, has no security that he will be tomorrow; and if he shall be rich tomorrow, he has no certainty that his riches will meet his necessities then. A man whose house is in flames, or who is shipwrecked, or whose child lies dying, or who is himself in the agonies of death, can derive no advantage from the fact that he is richer than other people; see notes on ^{<2126>}Luke 12:16-21. That against which Paul here directs Timothy to caution the rich, is that to which they are most exposed. A man who is rich, is very liable to “trust” in His riches, and to suppose that he needs nothing more; compare ^{<2129>}Luke 12:19. He feels that he is not dependent on his fellow-men, and he is very likely to feel that he is not dependent on God. It is for this cause that God has recorded so many solemn declarations in his word respecting the instability of riches (compare ^{<2135>}Proverbs 23:5), and that he is furnishing so many instructive lessons in his providence, showing how easily riches may suddenly vanish away.

But in the living God

(1) He is able to supply all our needs, and to do for us what riches cannot do; and

(2) he never changes, or leaves those who put their trust in him. He is able to meet our needs if in the flames, or in a storm at sea, or when a friend dies, or when we lie down on a bed of death, or wherever we may be in the eternal world.

Who giveth us richly all things to enjoy The meaning of this seems to be, that God permits us to enjoy everything. Everything in the works of

creation and redemption he has given to man for his happiness, and he should therefore trust in him. He has not merely given wealth for the comfort of people, but he has given everything, and he on whom so many and so great blessings have been bestowed for his comfort, should trust in the great Benefactor himself, and not rely merely on one of his gifts; compare notes on ^{<4081>}1 Corinthians 3:21-23.

^{<4088>}**1 Timothy 6:18.** *That they do good* On the duty enjoined in this verse, see notes on ^{<4080>}Galatians 6:10; ^{<5830>}Hebrews 13:10.

That they be rich in good works “That their good works may be as abundant as their riches.”

Ready to distribute To divide with others; compare ^{<4088>}Acts 4:34. The meaning is, that they should be liberal, or bountiful.

Willing to communicate Margin, or “sociable.” The translation in the text is a more correct rendering of the Greek. The idea is, that they should be willing to share their blessings with others, so as to make others comfortable; see the notes on ^{<5836>}Hebrews 13:16; compare the argument of Paul in ^{<4083>}2 Corinthians 8:13-15, and the notes on that passage.

^{<4089>}**1 Timothy 6:19.** *Laying up in store for themselves ...* The meaning of this verse is, that they were to make such a use of their property that it would contribute to their eternal welfare. It might be the means of exalted happiness and honor in heaven, if they would so use it as not to interfere with religion in the soul, and so as to do the most good possible. See the sentiment in this verse explained at length in the notes on ^{<2140>}Luke 16:9.

^{<4090>}**1 Timothy 6:20.** *Keep that which is committed to thy trust* All that is entrusted to you, and to which reference has been particularly made in this Epistle. The honor of the gospel, and the interests of religion, had been specially committed to him; and he was sacredly to guard this holy trust, and not suffer it to be wrested from him.

Avoiding profane and vain babblings Greek, “Profane, empty words.” The reference is to such controversies and doctrines as tended only to produce strife, and were not adapted to promote the edification of the church; see the notes on ^{<5000>}1 Timothy 1:4; 4:7.

And oppositions of science falsely so called Religion has nothing to fear from true science, and the minister of the gospel is not exhorted to dread

that. Real science, in all its advances, contributes to the support of religion; and just in proportion as that is promoted will it be found to sustain the Bible, and to confirm the claims of religion to the faith of mankind. See this illustrated at length in Wiseman's Lectures on the connection between science and religion. It is only false or pretended science that religion has to dread, and which the friend of Christianity is to avoid. The meaning here is, that Timothy was to avoid everything which falsely laid claim to being 'knowledge' or "science." There was much of this in the world at the time the apostle wrote; and this, more perhaps than anything else, has tended to corrupt true religion since.

1 Timothy 6:21. *Which some professing* Evidently some who professed to be true Christians. They were attracted by false philosophy, and soon, as a consequence, were led to deny the doctrines of Christianity. This result has not been uncommon in the world.

Have erred concerning the faith see notes on **1 Timothy 1:6,7; 6:10.**

Grace be with thee see the notes **Romans 1:7.**

On the subscription at the close of this Epistle, see Intro., Section 2. It is, like the other subscriptions at the close of the epistles, of no authority.

FOOTNOTES

^{ft} What is the import of the expression “children of wrath”? It is allowed on all hands that it intimates “obnoxiousness to punishment,” that the persons to whom it is applied are worthy of wrath and punishment, or, as our author has it, are exposed or liable to wrath.

But whence comes this obnoxiousness or liability to punishment? Is it because of personal transgression, because of the practice or habit of sin, in which people indulge from the time they become moral agents? On account of these things, indeed, the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience. But such is not the cause assigned here.

People are obnoxious to punishment in another way than by personal transgression, than by acts or habits of sin. How? **Φυσει** ^{<549>} by birth, by original constitution, by nature, in consequence of something that is coeval with one’s very being. That this is the true meaning has been triumphantly established. Several commentators, indeed, have attempted to prove, by citation from the classics, that **φυσικς** ^{<549>} may be explained of confirmed habit or practice, which is sometimes styled a second nature. In most, however, if not in all the places cited by them, the idea of “natural,” in opposition to “acquired,” distinctly enough appears. Bloomfield speaks most emphatically on the point, “My own experience,” says he, “of the Classical writers enables me to confirm the remark of Mr. Scott, that the word was “never” used of any other customs than such as resulted from innate propensities.”

It may be alleged, however, that the text, properly speaking, does not assign a cause for the liability or obnoxiousness to punishment. It simply states the fact that people are “born” so liable, that they come into the world in this condition. But the “inference” is not far to seek, that if the punishment come not in consequence of “personal” sin, as from the nature of the case it cannot, it must come in consequence of the sin of Adam imputed to us — unless we allow, that such obnoxiousness to punishment might arise without sin of any kind, which is repugnant to all our views of God’s character. To say that this obnoxiousness arises from our innate depravity, or is its “regular result,” assigns as a cause that which is merely a consequence. The

depraved “nature” itself is penal, and a consequence of our union with Adam.

The author maintains, that the text proves no more than that people are “born exposed to wrath, or in a situation which would render them liable to wrath, and says nothing about the time “when they began” to be children of wrath. It may be at birth, or further on, for anything this text affirms.” Without doubt, however, the “natural” and just interpretation of the words teaches, that people are obnoxious to wrath from the moment of their birth, or as Calvin has it, in a note on the place, “in ipso utero maledicti essent.” And so the passage has been explained by the general consent of evangelical Christians. Nor can this universal condition of the race be otherwise accounted for, than by reference to our connection with the first Adam, as our head and representative. Even on the modified view that people are born in a situation that, at one time or other, “ultimately” brings them to be children of wrath, how shall we account for such situation? Why should God place human beings in it? It is impossible to escape the conclusion stated above. See the supplementary notes on ~~8612~~Romans 5:12ff. for a full discussion of the question of imputation.

^{ft2} See the supplementary notes, ~~8817~~Romans 8:7; ~~8817~~Galatians 5:17.

Whenever it is said the sinner has power, the kind of power should be defined. Certainly he has not moral power. This, indeed, the author allows, but for want of distinct definition of what he understands by “power,” both here and elsewhere, the reader is apt to misapprehend him.

^{ft3} For remarks on the subject of accommodation. in connection with quotations from the Old Testament into the New Testament, see the supplementary notes, ~~8005~~Hebrews 1:5. and ~~8005~~Hebrews 2:6. The principle of accommodation, if admitted at all, should be used with great caution. Doubtless it is sanctioned by great names both in Europe and America. Yet it must be allowed, that the apostles understood the mind of the Spirit, in the Old Testament, that their inspiration preserved them from every error. When, therefore, they tell us that certain passages have an ultimate reference to the Messiah and his times, through we should never have discovered such reference without their aid, nothing of the kind, it may be, “appearing” in the original places, yet we are bound to receive it “on their testimony.” It is alleged, indeed, that the apostles sometimes use the ordinary forms of

quotation, without intending to intimate thereby any prophetic reference in the passages titus introduced, nay, when such reference is obviously inadmissible. This, in the opinion of many, is a very hazardous statement, and introduces into the apostolic writings, and especially into the argumentative part of them, where so great use is made of the Old Testament, no small measure of uncertainty. Let the reader examine the passages in question, keeping in view. at the same time, the typical nature of the ancient economy, and he will have little difficulty in admitting the prophetic reference in most, if not in all of them. See Haldane on ^{<B017>}Romans 1:17. for a very masterly view of this subject, with remarks on ^{<A126>}Matthew 2:16, and other passages supposed to demand the accommodation theory.

“Nothing can be more dishonorable,” says that prince of English commentators, on the Epistle to the Romans, “to the character of divine revelation, and injurious to the edification of believers, than this method of explaining the quotations in the New Testament from the Old, not as predictions or interpretations, but as mere illustrations, by way of accommodation. In this way, many of the prophecies referred to in the Epistles are set aside from their proper application, and Christians are taught that they do not prove what the apostles adduced them to establish.” In reference to the quotation in this place, there seems little difficulty in connection with the view, that though the primary reference be to the bringing up of the ark to Mount Zion, the ultimate one is to the glorious ascension of Jesus into the highest heavens. The Jews rightly interpret part of this psalm (Psalm 68) of the Messiah. Nor is it to be believed that the apostle would have applied it to the ascension of Christ unless that application had been admitted by the Jews in his time, and unless himself were persuaded of its propriety.

^{†4} Doubtless there is a reciprocal influence between the dark mind and depraved heart. The one acts on the other. Admitting that the understanding is affected “first,” through the will or heart, and that it is a bad heart which makes a spiritually dark mind, still the fact remains the same, that “in consequence of our union with Adam, in consequence of the fall,” ALL our faculties, understanding, will, affections, have been corrupted. See the supplementary notes, Romans 5

^{†5} The grand objection to this view of our author is, that the apostle evidently introduces a citation. In the writings of Paul, the form $\delta\iota\omicron$

<1352> λαγει <3004> is never used in any other sense. Whence then is the quotation taken? There is nothing absurd in supposing, with Scott and Guyse, that the apostle gives the general sense of the Old Testament prophecies concerning the calling of the Gentiles. But <2300> Isaiah 60:1-3, bears a sufficiently close resemblance to the passage in Ephesians, to vindicate the very commonly received opinion, that the apostle quotes that prophecy, in which the subject is the increase of the Church by the accession of the pagan nations. The church is called to arise and shine, and the apostle reminds the converted Ephesians of their lofty vocation. It forms no very serious objection, that between the place in Isaiah and that in Ephesians, there are certain verbal discrepancies. No one will make much of this, who remembers, that in a multitude of cases similar variations occur, the apostles contenting themselves with giving the sense of the places to which they refer. “Accordingly,” says Dr. Dodridge, “the sense of the passage before us is so fairly deducible from the words of Isaiah, that I do not see any necessity of having recourse to this supposition,” namely, that the quotation was from an apocryphal book ascribed to Jeremiah.

^{†6} See the supplementary note, <600> Romans 8:10, on the union between Christ and his people, in which it is shown that a mere union of feeling and love is far beneath the truth.

^{†7} Yet we cannot but regard Paul’s “ignorance in unbelief” as, in itself, a grievous sin. He had abundant means of knowing the truth had he been disposed to inquire with patience and candor. His great abilities and excellent education are a further aggravation of the crime. It is, therefore, impossible to acquiesce in any solution of this clause which seems to make criminal ignorance a ground of mercy. The author, however, intends nothing of this kind, nor would it be fair to put such construction on his words. Yet, a little more fullness had been desirable on a subject of this nature. It is certain, that, independent of the nature of the ignorance, whether willful or otherwise, the character of crime is affected by it. He who should oppose truth, knowing it to be such, is more guilty than he who opposes it in ignorance, or under the conviction that it is not truth, but falsehood. In a certain sense, too, this ignorance, may be regarded as a reason why mercy is bestowed on such as sin desperately or blasphemously under it. Rather, it is a reason why they are not excluded from mercy. It shows why persons so guilty are not beyond its pale. This is, we think, the true key both to the

passage, and that in ~~2731~~ Luke 23:34. The ignorance is not a reason why God should bestow mercy on such persons, rather than on others left to perish, but a reason why they obtain mercy at all, who, by their blasphemies had been supposed to have reached the sin against the Holy Spirit.

Now consider the passage in this view. The apostle had just been showing how great a sinner he had formerly been. His criminality had been so great that it went near to shutting him out from mercy altogether. Had he maliciously persecuted and blasphemed Christ, knowing him to be the Messiah, his had been the unpardonable sin, and his lot that of judicial, final obduracy. But he had not got that length. He was saved from that gulph, and obtained mercy, because, sinning ignorantly and in unbelief, he was not beyond its range.

That Paul should set himself to excuse his guilt is altogether impossible. He does the very reverse. He has but escaped the unpardonable sin. He is chief of sinners. He owes his salvation to exceeding abundant grace. All long-suffering has been exercised toward him. He affirms, that mercy was extended to him, that, to the end of time, there might be a proof or pattern of mercy to the guiltiest. Had he been assigning a reason why he obtained tainted mercy, rather than others left to perish, doubtless that had been what he has elsewhere assigned and defended, "God will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and he will have compassion on whom he will have compassion;" ~~495~~ Romans 9:15.