A TEXT-CENTRED RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S LETTER TO TITUS

BY
ALDRED AUGUSE GENADE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTOR IN PHILOSOPHY DEGREE IN THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FREE STATE

SUPERVISOR: PROF. DR. D.F. TOLMIE

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE
FACULTY OF THEOLOGY

NOVEMBER 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this scope and size is never an individual endeavour, at least not for the believer. As one most unworthy of being called a servant of God, I wish to acknowledge help received-that mysterious combination of divine and human assistance.

First. All glory alone to God, maker of Heaven and Earth, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ for saving me and equipping me to serve His Church.

Next. While there no doubt have been many, *koinonia* in this project have been more direct with the following, individuals, groups and institutions:

1. My *Doktorvater*, Prof D.F. Tolmie, whom I've grown to love and respect, an example of diligent labour, thorough scholarship and reverence for God's Word.
2. My wife Celeste who helped me to remain focused during this time, for her timeous and delightful "distractions"
3. Bellville Baptist church for their magnanimous accommodation while I finished this project, especially the Saturday morning prayer group, who held me accountable and kept me before the throne of grace by their prayerful support.
4. Br. Chris Mathews and Rev. Dr. Taeheon Song who "saw" this journey ere I set but one foot to traverse it.
5. The Faculty of Theology of UFS for financial assistance

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation/thesis hereby submitted by me for the Ph.D. degree at the University of the Orange Free State is my own independent work and has not previously been submitted by me at another university/faculty. I furthermore do cede copyright of the dissertation/thesis in favour of the University of the Free State.

Signature**:**________________________________

Aldred Auguse Genade

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

SECTION 2

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW OF EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP

1.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Current research focusing on the Letter to Titus evinces several interesting trends. Starting with authorship of the Pastorals, it will be shown that a clear link exists between that and the treatment of Titus in the areas of theology, structure and coherence, and rhetoric. It will be shown that the, perhaps unintentional, cumulative effect of the authorship debate was the marginalisation of the Letter to Titus. The literature evidence will bear out that for a long time there was not much talk about, for example, the theology of Titus as opposed to the theology of the Pastorals. Thus, a rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus must begin with an appreciation for the multiplicity of influences that have impacted upon the scholarly interest in this letter. The present chapter will review these trends, illustrating in particular how they have impacted upon the treatment of the letter to Titus.

In order to establish a comprehensive assessment, various categories of research will be investigated. These include commentaries, recent books and related journal articles. Due to the enormous expansion within the field of rhetorical criticism, boundaries are required to stay within the focus area of this study. Therefore, the selection of commentaries, books and articles will be governed by their direct relevance to the problem of the relationship between rhetorical criticism and the Pastorals, specifically the Letter to Titus.

The review will attempt to show that the Letter to Titus still has to benefit from a thorough rhetorical critical analysis that will demonstrate its uniqueness as a coherent, comprehensive portion of New Testament literature that can be interpreted independently from the two letters to Timothy.

1.1.2 AUTHORSHIP OF TITUS

1.1.2.1 Introductory remarks

The issue of authorship is undoubtedly the dominant contention in regard to the Pastorals. The authorship of the Letter to Titus is directly tied to the current debate, because of the relatively recent tendency to categorise the three letters into a single unit. Scholarship is generally divided into two camps. At the one end of the spectrum, there are those who maintain that the letters were authored by Paul, in accordance with the self-identification of the letter. In this regard, some scholars display an unqualified acceptance of Pauline authorship, for example, Hiebert (1978:421) and McArthur (1996:ix). Until the turn of the nineteenth century, this was the unchallenged traditional position. An alternative position has emerged since the beginning of the twentieth century. Scholars, at the opposite end of the spectrum, maintain that these letters are later, non-Pauline or pseudonymous creations.

Among supporters of the traditional view, are commentators and authors who display an unqualified acceptance of Pauline authorship. On both sides of the debate, there are also authors who present careful and thorough presentations to defend their particular hypotheses. That there are some cogent arguments for either view is evidenced by the confession of some authors who "converted" from one view to another (Johnson, 1996:2; Hanson, 1982:10). An author's position on this crucial issue has far reaching implications for the interpretation and treatment of this body of correspondence and particularly the Letter to Titus.

Evidence gleaned from multiple literary sources, including commentaries and related journal articles, will demonstrate the extent of the current division and the resultant implications for the treatment of the Letter to Titus. It will, furthermore, show how the presuppositions regarding authorship of this corpus particularly, influence the treatment of the Letter to Titus by scholars.

The content of the authorship debate is an established academic fact and is well documented in most commentaries and scholarly literature. Mere recitation, therefore, of these facts would not be conducive to the intent of this chapter.

A rather more interesting avenue of investigation is to attempt the extrapolation of any insight that will advance our understanding of how scholars have come to the positions they so intrepidly defend. This study will focus on a rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus. However, it will soon become evident that the Letter to Titus does not enjoy the attention of New Testament scholars to the extent that the Timothean correspondence does. While there is undoubtedly some justification for this, and without oversimplifying the complexities involved in the science of biblical interpretation, a probable explanation for this apparent 'neglect', would appear to emerge from an investigation of current literature. The question begs to be asked, would scholars maintain their views on the authenticity issue if a different methodology were to be utilised? Could the disparate position be attributable to a 'flawed' methodology? I have isolated and classified what I term reading principles or methodologies that occur in literature on the Pastoral Letters. While not part of the core discussion of the present study, the way in which scholars read these letters, illumines our understanding of the scholarly treatment of these letters. Additionally, it bolsters the case for an appreciation of the individualistic peculiarities of the Letter to Titus.

1.1.2.2 Overview of the debate on authenticity

The content and range of the debate on authorship of the Pastoral Letters is settled. Scholars have unequivocally sided themselves with one of two positions, namely those who argue that these letters are genuinely the product of Paul's hand and those who argue that these are not from Paul. Therefore, a mere replication of the facts will not be presented in this section.

What is important is to attempt to establish a link between the authorship debate, and the rhetorical criticism of the Pastoral Letters, specifically the position of the Letter to Titus. It remains to be shown that the authenticity debate has bearing on the resultant neglect of academic appreciation for the individuality of the Letter to Titus. This can be established by highlighting the operative reading methodologies gleaned from New Testament academic literature. This matter will receive attention in the following sections. In order to add perspective, a summary of the present position, together with the key points of dispute in the authenticity debate will be presented.

1.1.2.3 The present position of the debate

a) The authenticity of the Pastoral Letters challenged

Until the turn of the nineteenth century, the authenticity of the Pastoral Letters was unchallenged. Subsequently, there followed a succession of dissident voices, mainly from Germany that snowballed into the present polarity on this issue. The names of Friedrich Schleiermacher and Ferdinand Christian Bauer should be mentioned as the original catalysts in what has become the authenticity debate. The grounds upon which the authenticity of the letters was considered spurious related primarily to linguistic and stylistic discrepancies. An outline of the main criteria follows later in this study.

The rejection of the authenticity of all three letters occurred rapidly though not automatically. In this regard, it is interesting to note how early scholars contradicted each other. It is well documented, how some accepted the authenticity of one letter while rejecting the rest and *vice versa*. This problem goes back a long time. From the early church era, Tatian is cited by Dibelius and Conzelmann (1972:2) as an example of one who rejected 1 and 2 Timothy, but accepted the Letter to Titus as authentically Pauline. The same ambivalence is noticeable among the German scholars. In his *Historical-Critical introduction to the New Testament*, J.E.C Schmidt (1804) questioned whether 1 Timothy could have been written by the same author who penned the other two. During the same time, Edward Evanson (1805:318-319) expressed doubt that Titus came from the hand of Paul, but upheld the authenticity of the Timothean correspondence. Even Schleiermacher, consistently identified as pioneer of the debate, accepted only the authenticity of Titus and 2 Timothy. By 1812, however, J.G. Eichhorn would reject all three Pastorals.

A gradual consensus in German critical scholarship emerged throughout the rest of the nineteenth century that effectively denied the Pauline authorship of all three letters. Late in the second half of the nineteenth century, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (1880) confirmed the German consensus on the non-Pauline authorship of these Letters. Two dissenting German voices to this general consensus made themselves heard. One came from the commentary of J. Jeremias, who in 1963, defended the authenticity of these letters. The other was T. Zahn, who in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (1953), insisted that the Pastorals were written during Paul's lifetime.

The notion that these letters were not from Paul had far reaching implications, not least of which relates to the twin concerns, namely date of composition and authorship. Logically, the date of composition would necessarily be post-Pauline, which in turn raised a new question of authorship: if not Paul, then who? In this regard, several hypotheses were presented and some are still maintained.

Once it was established that Paul could not have written the Pastorals, the debate shifted to the determination of a probable date of composition. F. C. Baur in 1835 propounded the hypothesis that the Pastorals belong to the second century. He maintained that there were similarities between elements raised in the Pastorals and the Gnostic threat opposed by Irenaeus. This led him to conclude that these letters represent an early second century response to the Gnostic heresy. Interestingly, this conclusion has elicited criticism from among some modern proponents in the non-Pauline forum (Harding, 1998:10). More voices from the rest of the world joined the choir of dissent from the traditional interpretation. Today, from South Africa to the USA, a significant majority of biblical scholars deny the authenticity of these three letters.

The final word on this matter belongs to Collins, “By the end of the twentieth century New Testament scholarship was virtually unanimous in affirming that the Pastoral Letters were written some time after Paul’s death” (Collins 2002:4). Presently, this status of virtual unanimity is consistently assigned to almost every discussion of the authenticity issue. Thus, for example, J. Roloff (1988:376) insists that “today there should not even be a doubt that Paul did not write directly or indirectly the PE”, a view that is illustrative of the prevailing adamance on the issue. Miller (1997:4) considers pseudonymity to be “entrenched”, while Harding (1998:16) finds “any insistence on the Pauline authorship of the PE, problematical”. Such comments are indicative of the present state of the debate, which has effectively polarised academia.

J. Jeremias was, however, not the only contender to challenge the virtual unanimity on the authenticity issue. Reaction from other quarters of the globe to German scholarship was equally rapid. In fact, from the early eighteen sixties till the early nineteen hundreds, an impressive list of conservative scholars, like C. J. Ellicott, being the earliest, J. H. Bernard, T. Zahn (1906) and J. D. James (1906) came to the fore (Guthrie, 1957:15; Johnson, 1996:4). From Great Britain J.B. Lightfoot (1893) articulated an influential defence of Pauline authorship in the English speaking world. Still, the twentieth century saw scholars increasingly oppose the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Letters.

Lists of scholars representative of either position are accessible in several extant works and most good commentaries on the Pastorals (Guthrie, 1957:15; Lea and Griffin, 1992:23; Childs, 1984:378-379; Stott, 1997:21; Collins, 2002:3, 4; Hultgren, 1984:13, 14; Quinn, 1990:17, 18).

Twentieth century scholarship is almost equally divided on the authorship issue, represented by careful scholarship on both sides of the debate. Lea and Griffin (1992:23) list the following twentieth century adherents to pseudonymity: P.N. Harrison, M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, F.D. Gealy, C.K. Barrett, N. Brox, A Strobel, J.H. Houlden, S.G. Wilson, A.T. Hanson and

J. Quinn. Their list of scholars adhering to Pauline authorship include W. Lock, O. Roller, D. Guthrie, J.N.D. Kelly, J. Jeremias, C.F.D. Moule, C. Spicq, B. Reicke, W. Metzger and D.E. Hiebert.

The debate continues to elicit support for both positions. Contemporary defenders of Pauline authorship include George W. Knight (1992), Phillip Towner (1994), Luke T. Johnson (1996), William D. Mounce (2000), J.D.G. Dunn (2000), Andreas J. Köstenberger (2003), and Ray van Neste (2003). Equally on the other side very recent proponents of non-Pauline authorship include Mark Harding (1998), Raymond F. Collins (2002) and I. Howard Marshall (2002). Thus, we see respected scholars on both sides of the debate approaching the matter of authorship as something not to be regarded lightly. The complexity of the debate has been succinctly summarised by Quinn (1990:17) as follows: “All scholars of the PE draw inferences from practically the same concrete data in and about the letters, analysing the linguistic, historico-sociological, and theological components of the correspondence. Yet, these data have provoked the most dramatically different hypotheses to explain the origin and purpose of the PE.”

b) Summary of key dispute issues

In view of the centrality of the authenticity debate, it is expedient to delineate in broad strokes the most salient elements of the debate. They include the following:

Vocabulary and style: Comparative studies reveal that these letters collectively contain a high percentage of unique vocabulary and stylistic fluctuations that are uncharacteristic of accepted Pauline letters. Likewise, words that are present in the rest of the Pauline corpus are absent from the Pastorals, while linguistic affinities between the Pastorals and second century literature have been established (Barrett, 1963:6).

Developed church order: The various church officers mentioned in these letters are understood to be indicative of an advanced state of ecclesial organisation. The initially charismatic community developed towards a more settled state, a household of God. Within this household, a hierarchy of authority has developed, comprising presbyters, deacons, episcopal bishops and overseers (1 Tim. 3:1-13; 5:3-22; Tit. 1:5-9). This supposed, multi-level leadership structure indicates a later period in the history of the church, hence, post-Pauline.

Recipients: The instructions contained in these letters appear redundant, if addressed to the two historical individuals namely Timothy and Titus, since they would have been very familiar with Paul's teachings. Scholars argue that these letters only make sense if the actual addressees were later congregations. Thus, 'Timothy' and 'Titus' must be understood in a representational capacity, as representative addressees of the actual recipients, namely second or third generation leadership or congregations.

Gnostic opposition: The Pastorals make several references to opponents (Titus 1:10, 14; 3:9; 1 Tim. 1:1-3, 7; 6:20). They appear to be primarily Jewish, and their teachings involve elements of asceticism and secret knowledge. Critics denying Pauline authorship, therefore, deduce some form of post-Pauline Judeo-Gnosticism or even that the author wrote in response to Marcion (based on 1 Tim. 6:20: "*falsely called knowledge"*).

Irreconcilable Pauline chronology: Critics aver that the historical data in the Pastorals do not fit into the Lukan record according to the Book of Acts. In order to facilitate some reconciliation, supporters of the traditional view have responded with what is known as the second imprisonment hypothesis. According to this theory, the Book of Acts was never intended to provide a comprehensive record of Paul's ministerial activities. Furthermore, the open ended conclusion of the Book of Acts is cited as probable support for a second imprisonment, implied by the historical data in the Pastorals.

Uncharacteristic Pauline theology: Scholars claim that these letters are inauthentic because of theological emphases that are at variance with what are known from genuine Pauline letters. So, for example, there appears to be a muted focus on the fatherhood of God since the title 'Father' with reference to God, never occurs in the body of these letters (Guthrie, 1957:40, 41). The characteristic Pauline emphases on the cross and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit are glaringly absent from the Pastorals. Instead, these letters testify to a growing concern for orthodoxy and the transmission of correct doctrine in view of a delayed *parousia*. The imminence of the Lord's return has faded and believers are encouraged to live godly lives within secular society.

Most of the literature, cited in this study, treats the above and some additional points in great detail and may be consulted if more information is required. The summary of issues above was intended to provide insight into the key points of contention in the authenticity debate and to aid the survey of scholarship to follow rather than to be exhaustive.

c) Further developments

The advent of German criticism of the traditional understanding raised a cloud of doubt about the authenticity of the Pastoral Letters. Once scholars established that Paul was not the author, alternative theories were posited to explain the existence and purpose of these letters. Of the four propositions, one no longer enjoys any significant support among New Testament scholars. The hypotheses are as follows: the pseudonymous or fiction hypothesis, fragment hypothesis, secretary or amanuensis hypothesis, and the allonymity or allepigraphy theory (Marshall, Travis, *et al.* 2002:175-176; Mounce, 2000: cxviii-cxxix; Hanson, 1982:6-11; Dibelius and Conzelmann, 1972:4, 5). These four theories are diametrically opposed to the direct Pauline authorship hypothesis. The four theories will be discussed briefly to aid perspective on the current position of the debate and eventually shed light on the academic diffidence particularly towards Titus.

i) Pseudonymity or fiction hypothesis

In Germany, it was J.G. Eichorn, who in 1812 argued for the pseudonymity of each letter. Gradually, this snow-balled to become what some have termed "contemporary critical orthodoxy" (Carson, Moo, *et al*. 1992:360). One contemporary scholar considers the original argument of Holtzmann so watertight that he alleges incorrectly that Holtzmann's five objections still wait to be rebutted (Lea and Griffin, 1992:22). Such a rebuttal has been adequately proffered by the respected scholar and commentator, Donald Guthrie (1957:11-53). Still, it remains true to say that pseudonymity was initially a formidable challenge to the authenticity of the Pastoral Letters. The simplistic, outright rejection of Pauline authorship has developed some rather complex twists and turns since its original conception in Germany.

At its simplest level, pseudonymity implies that the letters were written by someone other than Paul at a time much later than that of the apostle. This person is designated a Paulinist (Harrison, 1921:9), while at other times he is awkwardly referred to as the mysterious "pastor" (Harding, 1998:103, 16; Goulder, 1996:242). In the majority of instances, he is simply called the "author" who was probably a disciple of the apostle (Goulder, 1996:243; Dibelius and Conzelmann, 1972:1). It is argued, that since this "disciple" was familiar with the writings of the apostle, he wanted to preserve the teaching of the apostle for a new (second) generation church setting in the light of the delay of the *parousia*, as well as for subsequent generations (Dibelius and Conzelmann, 1972:8; Beker, 1991:35-75).

Pseudonymity raised several tricky questions that have kept scholars occupied and continue to do so. A major implication relates to the content of these letters and the matter of authorship. If Paul did not write them, then the people and historical references contained in this corpus are not real. Caution is sounded not to assume "that the historical data of these pseudonymous Epistles are necessarily true" (Barrett 1963:30). Hence, some scholars refer to pseudonymity as the fiction hypothesis (Mounce, 2000: cxviii; Marshall, Travis *et al.* 2002:179). Thus, references to Paul, Timothy, Titus, Crete, Ephesus, etc. are not referring to actual people or places. Moreover, the situations depicted within the letters are not real. This implies that the perceived threats were not real, but the imaginative creations of the pseudonymous author, who envisaged future developments and wrote to protect and guide the church by means of these letters. A representative of this fictive Pauline authorship is Michael Wolter, who believes that what we have in the Pastoral Letters is an attempt to represent Pauline tradition for the current situation of the author (Wolter, 1988:11-25). Timothy and Titus function typologically as the kind of leaders who have to shoulder the responsibility to maintain the Pauline deposit. The plot thickens, because if this is true, then more than simple pseudonymity is on the table. Hence, according to Raymond Collins (2002:10), these letters are "doubly pseudonymous". Since Timothy and Titus would probably have been dead by the time these letters were written, they simply "lent their names to the Pastor's work, because they represented Paul's presence". Thus, the author and recipients are "literary fictions" (Collins, 2002:10). Apart from complicating the matter, this interpretation weakens the pseudonymity view. Where do we then stop? Several other names appear in this corpus. Are we, therefore, to assume they are also the product of a healthy imagination? Besides, the letters are indirectly addressed to the congregation through the evidence of the second persona plural pronoun, "you", that occurs within these letters. Was the congregation therefore also imaginary? While double pseudonymity might be a novel term, it does nothing to ease an already complex situation.

Scholars are unanimous in their assessment of the complexity of the matter and correctly caution against any dogmatic tendencies when so much depends on conjecture and so little certainty prevails (Achtemeier, Green *et al.* 2001:464). The implications of pseudonymity have however not gone unchallenged.

Reactions to the pseudonymity hypothesis

Several key works highlight the substantial reaction by various scholars to the claims of those who espouse pseudonymity. The foremost work is undoubtedly Guthrie's Tyndale commentary on the Pastorals. Given the limited size and scope of this series, his treatment is so comprehensive that several commentators cite his work as an authoritative reference on the introductory matters (Demarest, 1984:149).

Critics of the pseudonymous theory base their contentions on four areas, namely ethics, history, hermeneutics and apostolic or scriptural objections.

Ethics

Several scholars find it hard to reconcile the practice of pseudipigraphy and honesty. Stott (1997:30) is representative of this concern. It is alleged by proponents of pseudipigraphy that it was an acceptable practice devoid of fraudulent intent. In response, Stott and others demand historical evidence for the acceptance of New Testament pseudipigraphy. Quoting, as an example, Donelson, a proponent of pseudipigraphy, Stott (1997:30) highlights the paradoxical acknowledgement/confession that "in Christian circles pseudonymity was considered a dishonourable device". Stott continues to ask the following probing questions: If no one intended to deceive, why write in the name of someone else? Why invent pseudo-historical persona and situations? In the end, Stott finds the very notion of deceit psychologically irreconcilable to the human conscience irrespective of whether the dissemblance stems from noble intentions. To some scholars, there is no neutral ground. These letters are either genuinely Pauline or they must be blatant fabrications. Thomas Oden (1989:15) is representative of this position. The final word on this matter belongs to him:

> If not Paul, the surrogate had to be blatantly fabricating when he instructed Timothy to "bring the cloak that I left with Carpus at Troas, also the books, and above all the parchments" (2Timothy 4:13). What possible motive could there be for inventing such a sentence? Is not the whole of 2 Timothy 4 so saturated with intimate, personal, loving details that no one but Paul could have written it …? On what imaginable hypothesis would a forger have put in the mouth of Paul a claim to be "chief of sinners" (1Timothy 1:15, KJV)? How could a deceiver, however well-intentioned, write so movingly of "God, who

never lies" (Titus 1:2)? The case against Pauline authorship reeks with difficulties.

History

Historically, it is also difficult to uphold the claim for pseudonymity on the charge that the church viewed pseudonymity as acceptable. Quite the opposite seems true, if one evaluates how well intentioned false authors and their works were treated. Two examples of spurious letters written in the name of Paul are the *Acts of Paul* and the *Epistle to the Laodiceans*. Once it was discovered that the letters were not written by the alleged author, it was rejected. Where a fraudster was apprehended, he faced severe consequences (Carson, Moo, *et al* 1992:368-369). For example, a presbyter in Asia, who wrote in Paul's name, once he was convicted and confessed to have done so, "from the love of Paul", was removed from office. Contrary to what is claimed, the early church did not deal kindly with dissemblers or with their written products (Eusebius, 6.12; Tertullian, 1919:67, 68).

Contrary to the claim that pseudonymous authorship was an acceptable practice among the early church, Carson, Moo and Fee (1992:368) raise several valid concerns. The first relates to the fact that writings were valued for divine content rather than the names attached to them. Thus, we find several New Testament writings that do not bear the names of authors. Therefore, attaching an apostolic name was no guarantee that the church would accept it unquestioningly, as authentic.

Hermeneutics

Andreas Köstenberger and Brevard Childs draw attention to the problematical hermeneutical implications of the pseudipigraphical theory. Köstenberger (2003:4) addresses the matter by asking and answering several pertinent questions, namely,

1. Was pseudonymous letter-writing attested in the first century?
2. If so, was such a practice ethically unobjectionable and devoid of deceptive intent or not?

3. Could pseudonymous letters have been acceptable to the early church?
4. If so, is pseudonymity more plausible than authenticity in the case of the Pastorals?

He concludes that whereas pseudonymity was not uncommon, "pseudonymous letters were exceedingly rare" (Köstenberger, 2003:5; See also Bauckham, 1988:487; Carson, Moo, *et al.* 1992:371).

According to Köstenberger (2003:7), pseudipigraphy renders all historical data fictional, but no extant example of the so called "fictive epistolary" genre in the first or second century exists. This creates the problem of interpreting the letters, since some parts of it must be discarded, being incidental. Moreover, it leaves the interpreter with the unpleasant task of having to decipher which of the didactic portions would be significant. The problem is this: By what criteria does one make the distinctions? The interpreter is thus faced with this hermeneutical conundrum.

Brevard Childs (1984:383) argues that the hermeneutical assumptions flowing from the attribution of pseudipigraphy to the Pastoral Letters have resulted in "serious exegetical distortions". In this regard, he highlights three dangers.

1. A pseudipigraphal interpretation objectifies Paul. Since Paul is not regarded as the author, a shift must occur with respect to the author's focal position or view point. The letters are no longer *from* Paul but *about* Paul. A historical critical assumption has thus modified the canonical shaping of the Pastorals. In essence, this shift reduces the Pastorals to the level of post-apostolic references to Paul, such as, for example, as can be found in Polycarp. The canonical distinction in the image of Paul is thus obliterated.

2. The addressees are not who the text *prima facie* identifies them to be. Pseudipigraphical interpretation renders them to be mere fictional representatives of a later office. This has the effect of relinquishing the canonical portrayal of Timothy and Titus in place of "a hermeneutical theory of

meaning as determined by historical referentiality" (Childs, 1984:384). In other words, correct understanding of the letter is made conditional upon the "historical assumption that the real addressee must be critically reconstructed" first (Childs, 1984:383).

3. The acute presentation of the heresy is made indistinct through the pseudipigraphal genre. The tension between the heresy as a present and future threat is compromised by an interpretative assumption that views the heresy as occurring fifty years after the letter was composed (Childs, 1984:384).

All of the above represent a summary of the general academic rejoinders to the pseudonymous authorship theory. A fourth response, suggested here, is the apostolic or scriptural objections.

Apostolic objections

We have evidence from Scripture that is indicative of the apostolic attitude to pseudonymous works.

In 2 Thessalonians 3:17 and 2:2, we find what appears to be an apostolic caution. It comes in the form of a warning against false writings. In the former reference, Paul draws attention to the "distinguishing mark", the mark that would indicate to his readers the authenticity of a letter purporting to be from him. Additionally, he adds that this mark is in every letter. In several other writings, Paul reminds his readers of the fact that he is writing in his own hand (1Cor. 16:21; Gal. 6:11; Col. 4:8; Philemon 19).

The second scripture reference (2 Thes. 2:2) contains a warning to the readers not to be perturbed by a "letter as if from us". This clearly constitutes a safeguard against any duplicitous letters. Thus, Paul himself apparently took measures to safeguard the church against any counterfeit correspondence in his name. It would, therefore, seem improbable for the early church to carelessly veer from this apostolic injunction, and thereby risk opening themselves up to spurious material in the name of an apostle.

In the same vein, the *attitude of* the Pastorals appears to weaken the claim of pseudonymity. These letters lay such stress on the integrity of the author and so vehemently warn against deceivers, making it increasingly unlikely that a pseudonymous author would stress honesty (1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:13; Tit. 1:10). In Titus 3:3, the author confesses to having once been a deceiver. However, he is one no longer since he is now saved. Neither would a deceiver extol with such passion the character of God as “God who never lies” (Tit. 1:2).

This general survey has attempted to show that pseudonymity is not an insurmountable theory and that insistence upon the authenticity of the letters is not an unreasonable one (Collins, 2002:4). Doubtless, there are valid theological perceptions put forward by proponents of pseudonymity (Childs, 1984:384), but the above factors still demand an adequate response. Proponents of pseudonymity have yet to produce proof for the acceptance of pseudonymous letters by the church and the onus rests upon them in this regard to produce such evidence (Carson, Moo, *et al.* 1992:371; Knight, 1992:47; Stott, 1997:33, Lenski, 1961:474). The insistence, that these letters owe their existence to a hand other than that of Paul, is therefore far from conclusive.

ii) Fragment hypothesis

Some distinctly Pauline elements and the rather distasteful associations of pseudonymity have led some scholars to postulate alternative authorship theories. The so called *fragment theory* has a modern proponent in Paul N. Harrison, but was apparently formulated as early as the late eighteen thirties by K.A. Credner. Harrison suggests that the author used authentic fragments written by Paul. This theory thus attempts to bridge the gaps left by the initial pseudonymity theory of Baur’s Tübingen school. It seeks to account on the one hand for the presence of vintage Pauline traits in these letters, and on the other to explain what these critics call the “incoherence” of these letters (Carson, Moo, *et al.* 1992:366). Harrison originally identified five genuine fragments: Tit. 3:12-15; 2 Tim. 4:13-15, 20, 21a; 2 Tim. 4:16-18a and 2 Tim. 4:9-12,22b. He later modified his findings, reducing the number of fragments to three.

James D. Miller, in his book, *The Pastoral Letters as composite documents,* critiqued Harrison’s theory. Miller amended the theory, arguing that the fragments should not be regarded as haphazardly preserved scraps of Pauline letters. Instead, the fragments should be seen as the original Pastoral letters. Miller best puts it as follows: “Each of our three Pastorals originated as an authentic note written by the apostle to Timothy and Titus” (1997:146). During the process of transmission from one generation to the next, these original letters were expanded by various editors who wanted to preserve the traditions as taught by the apostle for their own contexts. Miller claims, in support, that a similar process accounts for the book of Jeremiah. It must be conceded that Old Testament literature has influenced New Testament literature. However, what must be borne in mind is that the book of Jeremiah is not only an Old Testament document, but is also a different literary genre compared to the Pastorals. The Pastorals are epistolary literature, largely modelled after Greco-Roman prototypes. Moreover, it cannot be categorically maintained that the book of Jeremiah originated in the manner alleged by Miller. According to Miller, there are more than fifteen original “core Pauline notes” within the corpus (1997:147, 149, 150).

Harrison’s original theory does not enjoy much support among scholars today, largely due to the lack of indisputable evidence (Hanson, 1982:10; Hultgren, 1984:18, Ellis, 1979:54). Its waning popularity is also related to the fact that this theory raises more questions than the answers it attempts to give (Carson, Moo, *et al.* 1992:366; Guthrie, 1990:636; Lea and Griffin, 1992:23, 24).

iii) Secretary or amanuensis hypothesis

Scholars on both sides of the debate account for the vocabulary and stylistic differences between the Pastorals and the undisputed Paulines by arguing that Paul employed the services of secretaries or amanuenses. The forerunner to this theory was Otto Roller in 1933. It was elaborated by E.R. Richards in 1991. The differences from the undisputed corpus are therefore attributable to a secretary who had more freedom of expression as was the case in the undisputed Paulines (Fee, 1988:26). Both Luke and Tychicus have been proposed by some as possible candidates (Lock, 1924: xxix; Moule, 1965:430-452; Strobel, 1968:191-210; Jeremias, 1963:8). Mounce (2000:cxxxix) believes that this theory offers more advantages in regard to the internal and external evidence without introducing additional problems and is therefore to be preferred over the fiction and fragment hypotheses.

iv) Allonymity or allepigraphy hypothesis

A very recent and novel alternative to Pauline authorship has come from the pen of I. Howard Marshall. While rejecting both Pauline authorship as well as pseudonymity, Marshall endorses a theory he defines as *allonymity* or *allepigraphy* (Marshall, Travis, *et al.* 2002:176). In his own words, it "describes the writing of a letter by somebody other than the named author, but without the attempt to deceive people: from the beginning the readers knew what was going on". This theory thus attempts to soften the charge of deception associated with pseudonymity.

This theory by default appears to confirm what some scholars find problematic with pseudonymity, namely the connotation of dishonesty. Furthermore, as Köstenberger (2003:4) points out, allonymity fictionalises the recipients Timothy and Titus. Köstenberger continues to criticise a theory that reverses the traditional and canonical order, when it makes 2 Timothy the primary work of Paul and the letter upon which the "allonymous" author based 1 Timothy and Titus (Köstenberger, 2003:176).

1.1.2.4 Conclusion

The various theories testify to the complexity of the issues at hand. The debate is not about liberals versus conservatives or vice versa. Reputable scholars, who honour the integrity of the Scriptures, are to be found on either side of the table. Some scholars changed their perspectives when more evidence was forthcoming or after finding a theory lacking scholarly evidence. However, what has been an unfortunate consequence of debate was the effect upon the succeeding treatment of the three letters.

The essence of the individual messages of the three letters, put mildly, faded into the background, when the authenticity issue became central. The dominance of the pseudonymous position affected the subsequent treatment of these letters. They were treated as if they had nothing more to offer.

Luke T. Johnson (1996:4) observes that the Pastorals all but disappeared from scholarly consideration. Johnson cites a 1989 survey of New Testament scholarship by the Society of Biblical Literature. An article entitled "Pauline Studies" contains one reference to the Pastorals mentioned in a single line with reference to their inauthenticity. Three books were honoured with only a single reference in an article purporting to treat Pauline studies! Johnson is therefore not unreasonable when he avers that the determination of authenticity or inauthenticity also affected the appreciation or depreciation of the Pastorals as Christian witnesses (Johnson, 1996:5).

The relevance of this review for the topic at hand must now be considered. If the authenticity debate has negatively impacted on the entire corpus in terms of further treatment, what has been the effect on a single letter, like Titus? Initially, it was not good at all. But the tide is changing. McKnight and Osborne (2004:292) observe that the burgeoning interest in literary studies has shifted the scholarly magnifying glass from matters of authorship and is focusing it increasingly upon the text itself - "its theology, rhetoric, and reception". Some of the developments in this regard will be discussed later.

While this transition is encouraging, we still have some way to go. It would appear that the two letters to Timothy have been especially dusted off and placed back on the table - or a different table as the following article and paper indicate. The 1997 article by J.W. Aageson, is entitled “2 Timothy and its theological pattern”, while in 1996 J.L. Sumney presented a paper entitled “A reading of the theology of 1 Timothy without authorial presuppositions” to the Theology of the Disputed Paulines Group at a meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. The same can however not be said of the Letter to Titus.

A 1994 collection of Pauline studies has absolutely zero references to Titus, but at least one to 1 and 2 Timothy (Lambrecht, 1994:464). The Pretoria conference on Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology of 1996 has no contributions dealing with the Pastorals, yet the index discloses three pages of references to the early Christian writings and the classical authors. Suffice it to say that at this stage, the reasons for the peripheral treatment of the Letter to Titus could be traced right back to all the events that started in Germany at the turn of the nineteenth century. It is important to note that, with regard to the original challenge of scholars accepting pseudonymity, those who defended Pauline authorship largely modelled their responses to the claims of the challengers. In terms of the actual points of debate, nothing new has been added. This is an important observation and one that will be revisited later in this study.

The brief Letter to Titus has been relegated to the margins of scholarly attention which often views it as a book that primarily addresses pastors and has little to say to the rest of the church (Van Neste, 2003:18). Listen however to what Martin Luther (1960:389) said about this letter:
“This is a short epistle, but a model of Christian doctrine, in which is comprehended in a masterful way all that is necessary for a Christian to know and to live”.

Excursus: Cumulative-complimentary versus individualistic-contrastive. Causal theory for conclusions on authorial presuppositions of the Pastorals

All scholars build their case, whether for or against Pauline authorship, on data derived from the texts of the three letters. In this regard certain peculiarities surface as to the methodology these authors adopt, whether consciously or unconsciously, in order to prove the correctness of their particular positions. The most common approach I have categorised as the *cumulative-complimentary* reading principle. An emergent variation is what I call the *individualistic-comparative* reading principle.

In the *cumulative-complimentary* category, the author interprets the three letters as one, with each letter understood to complement the data of the other. Thus, any "gaps" in one letter are filled with reference to the others. Subsequent interpretation regarding, for example, authenticity or inauthenticity is then based on a cumulative picture derived from a collation of data from the three individual letters. The majority of scholars, irrespective of their position on authorship, apply this first principle when interpreting the Pastorals.

In the *individualistic-comparative* category, the author treats each book in the corpus on an individual basis, accentuating the distinctiveness of each book, through comparative analysis with the rest of the corpus. Conclusions on, *inter alia*, authorship are primarily based on the unique and individualistic content of each letter. Only after the individual discourse has been analysed on its own, similarities are considered on a comparative basis with all other literature of a similar nature, i.e. letters.

Operation of the cumulative-complimentary reading principle

The operation of the cumulative-complimentary reading principle goes back to the first time doubts were raised about the integrity of the letters. Ferdinand Baur and Julius Holtzmann evaluated the Pastoral corpus from a comparative perspective when they eventually concluded that the style, ecclesiology, theology and the identity of the false teachers point to an author later than Paul (Harding, 1998:9). As more points of contention and divergence were added, scholars simply focused on the issues of contention. In the early nineteen seventies Dibelius and Conzelmann (1972:5) drew attention to the affinities between the letters and on that basis spoke about the "literary character of the Pastoral Epistles". Interestingly, they correctly observe the different character of 2 Timothy as opposed to the other two (Dibelius and Conzelmann, 1972:7). Donald Hagner (1998:558) put it bluntly when he stated that "these letters need ultimately to be considered together". Quinn goes so far as to declare the three one. He regards the Letter to Titus as the introductory letter of the entire corpus while viewing the two letters addressed to Timothy as complimentary to one another (Quinn, 1990:7, 19-20).

The language employed is very insightful. Commentators and the like speak about "the theology of the Pastorals" or of *their* ecclesiology or of the false teachers in the Pastorals, and so forth. The only problem is that such blanket categorisations cannot be substantiated from the texts. Let us consider some concrete examples.

Ecclesiology

The literature refers to the "structure" of the church in the Pastorals. Truth of the matter is that church structure *per se* in Titus is very different from that which we find in 1 Timothy. In 2 Timothy, we can hardly speak about "church structure" (Mounce, 2000: lxxxviii). Harding (98:30) refers to Norbert Brox who sees the Pastoral Letters as the product of pseudonymity that sought to present Paul as the model care giver of the churches for successive generations of officials. The problem with this interpretation is the fact that 2 Timothy does not deal with churches *per se*. In this regard, Fitzmyer (2004:582) summarises the content of these letters in the following manner: "They deal with the structured ministry of the early church and a concern for orthodox teaching". Such blanket statements obscure the intentions expressed in the three individually and should rather be avoided.

Old Testament in the Pastorals

Sometimes researchers allow themselves to be overly influenced by a prior supposition. Hanson (1968:112) expresses such an overzealous commitment to the non-Pauline position that he completely misses the wood for the trees. Nowhere is this more evident than in his assumptions about the appearance of the Old Testament in the Pastorals. In this instance, there are at least allusions to the Old Testament in 1 and 2 Timothy, but the same does not hold true for Titus.

Background of the Pastorals

It is not only scholars, who maintain of anti-Pauline sentiments that make themselves liable to this methodological fallacy. Andreas Köstenberger (2003:8), a staunch defender of Pauline authorship, commits the same error. Thus, when he treats the background of Pastoral Letters to establish cultural relativity, he extensively cites passages from 1 Timothy. Now this may by due to the limitations of space or because the use of the singular source was expedient, but it cannot be maintained that there is such a thing as the background of the Pastorals.

Suffering of the apostle/teacher in the Pastorals

Harding (1998:141) highlights the sufferings of the apostle together with concomitant calls to suffering and training. We can speak of hardship or the suffering motif in 1 and 2 Timothy, but not in Titus.

φυλάσσω in the Pastorals

Harding (1998:148) states that the verb φυλάσσω appears in the Pastorals five times. The truth of the matter is that it appears in 1 Timothy twice (5:21, 6:20) and in 2 Timothy thrice (1:12, 14; 4:15). It does not feature in Titus at all. So, are the Pastorals referring to the Timothean correspondence with Titus on the side? What do scholars mean when they enumerate characteristics of the Pastorals, when in fact those characteristics are not true of every letter comprising the Pastorals?

Lumping or clustering apparent opposition

According to Young (1995:276), the opposition constitutes a group of teachers of "gnosis falsely so called". The problem is that this description is only mentioned in 1 Timothy.

Heresy or Heresies?

Bailey (1994:335) speaks of the heresy as a single indistinguishable entity identical in all three letters. However, 2 Timothy has very little information on the heresy. In Titus, the description is comparatively vague. This does not leave much room for anything but conjecture.

God: Sovereign Creator and Sustainer

Another example of the cumulative contrastive reading principle is found in Bailey (1994:341). In a subsection that deals with God's involvement in his works, the following sentence occurs, clearly illustrative of the assumptions of the author: "Three times in these letters Paul credited God with being the Creator and Sustainer of everything (1 Tim. 4:4; 6:13, 15)". Notice how the author refers to three letters, when in actuality he only cites three instances from *one* of the three letters! This is another example of the operation of the cumulative-complimentary reading fallacy by a scholar who supports Pauline authorship of this corpus.

The above suffice as examples of the cumulative-complimentary reading principle (fallacy?). Today, there are increasing calls among New Testament scholarship to acknowledge the individuality of the letters. Thus, according to Mounce (2000:cxx), the three are "so significantly different that apart from a few verses on church structure and the opponents, there is little overlap of content". This recognition of the distinctiveness of the three and exhortations to appreciate the individuality of the three letters are gaining momentum. A detailed critique of "grouping" can be consulted in Johnson's commentary (1996:8-18).

Individualistic-contrastive principle

An emerging trend, among scholars in the Pastoral Letters, favours an approach that prioritises the study of each letter apart from and prior to comparison with the rest of the corpus (Van Neste, 2002:120; Johnson, 1996:7, 19, 22). The most vociferous proponent of this approach is Luke Timothy Johnson. In his commentary, he summarises his approach stating that he will pay careful attention to the "literary form of each letter … individually and in particular rather than in general and as a group" (1996:32). A host of scholars have recently made significant contributions to the study of the letter to Titus. These include contributions by Harris (1980), Hagner (1998), Thurston (1999), Kidd (1999), Classen (2002), Van Neste (2002), Van Neste (2003) and Faber (2005). My rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus is motivated in part by the recognition that the letter has its own *voice* and can stand on its own. Like Johnson, I too believe that if scholars evaluated the letters individually first, and then compared them with the rest of the Pauline corpus, the conclusions on pseudonymity would stand on shaky ground (Johnson, 1996:7; Carson and Moo, 2005:555).

==

1.1.3 THE THEOLOGY OF TITUS

1.1.3.1 Introduction

Theology is one of the contested areas, which contributed to the rejection of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals. As was indicated in the above excursus, scholars on both sides of the debate addressed the matter by combining and extracting data from the three letters in order to arrive at the theology of the Pastorals as opposed to the theology of 1 or 2 Timothy, or of Titus. It was, furthermore, a picture of a "Pastoral" theology as compared with a composite image formed from the so called "undisputed" Pauline letters. Thus, a combination of three different letters was being compared with a combination of several letters to form a single opinion resulting in the rejection of an entire collection of works. For many years, little, if any, research was devoted to the theology of the individual letters of the Pastoral collection, with even less to the brief Letter to Titus. For example, in their recent survey McKnight and Osborne (2004:292) laud a shift from matters of authorship to a focus upon the text itself. However, in their footnotes, the only examples of this supposed shift are references to works dealing with literary aspects of the Timothean correspondence. The consistent marginalisation of the Letter to Titus *vis a vis* 1 and 2 Timothy is a general trend in present scholarship, although there are exceptions.

1.1.3.2 Trends

In light, therefore, of the resilience of the authorship debate and the resultant neglect of the individuality of these letters, two recent works are encouraging indicators of an emerging trend, namely moving away from the earlier stalemate in and dominance of the authenticity issue. While the proverbial dust remains far from settled, when it comes to the authorship debate, there appears to at least be a tendency or willingness to move on beyond the matter of authorship. Thus, we see scholars setting out to investigate and appreciate these letters on a more individual level; Titus in particular. However, there is much that remains to be done as the sparseness of works seems to suggest.

On the topic of the theology of Titus, two recent journal articles have surfaced. The first is by Raymond F. Collins entitled, "The theology of the Epistle to Titus". The other is by Bonnie Thurston, whose article is entitled simply, "The theology of Titus". The approach of both scholars is very similar. Their articles are not apologetic treatises of the authenticity issue. They generally limit their attention to their stated subject matter. Thurston, in a footnote, states that she makes no presuppositions regarding authorship (1999:171). Collins categorically states his support for pseudonymity (2000:56, 57). Both struggle to cut themselves free from the resilience of the authenticity issue. Collins especially runs the risk of being interpreted to approach the topic with an agenda to prove his assumption of pseudonymity, or double pseudonymity (Collins, 2000:57). This is an unfortunate tendency, because it obscures our appreciation for the individuality of the letter. The complexity of the debate is translated into the text itself. By his insistence to raise the authenticity issue in his article, Collins has to create an additional person. Why must he say the following, "For the pastor the commission entrusted to Paul to proclaim the word ...?" (Collins, 2000:63). Paul is transformed into an object, thereby complicating the reading, not to mention the interpretation of an otherwise straightforward sentence. Because Collins prefers not to designate Paul as the author, and opts instead for the more obscure "fictive Paul", a degree of 'awkwardness' characterises this otherwise helpful article. The following examples will suffice, namely, "The pseudonymous author's intention to present ..." or "The author of Titus has enhanced the image of Paul ..." (p. 64) or "The real author of the epistle goes on...", and finally "... the pastor attributes to Jesus ..." This kind of hazy language heightens the sense of clumsiness to an otherwise good article that would normally exemplify an appreciation for the unique theological contribution of this short letter.

Thurston (1999:176) confesses that, on the surface, the Letter to Titus appears to be practical rather than theological. For Collins, on the other hand, exactly the opposite holds true. He describes it as "[a] most blatantly theological ... composition" (Collins, 2000:56).

1.1.3.3 Theology and Christology

We have in this letter an interesting, if not inseparable combination of theology and Christology. Collins maintains the former emphasis, while Thurston stresses the latter. The two authors concur in their identification of three major theologically loaded sections, namely 1:1-4, 2:11-14, and 3:4-7. Not all scholars agree that there are three theological sections in Titus. Bailey (1994:351, 352) categorises seven in total, scattered throughout the three letters. Two of these occur in the Letter to Titus, namely 2:11-14 and 3:3-7. He does concur in his assessment that Christology and theology are central emphases in Titus. Instead, he prefers not to distinguish these distinctive foci from the "theology of the Pastorals" (Bailey, 1994:340, 343).

a) Jesus Christ: salvation

Thurston (1999:177, 178) sees a Christological soteriology as the focal point of the Letter to Titus. In her words, "The theological core of Titus, its writer's main theological interest, is Christology", understood as "any evaluation of Jesus in respect to who he was and the role he played in the divine plan". The main focus of Titus' Christology is soteriology, the saving role Jesus played in God's plan or put differently "the theology of God-as-Saviour" (Thurston, 1999:183).

In the entire Pastoral corpus, the most frequently occurring name is Jesus Christ or Christ Jesus or simply Christ as in 1 Timothy 5:11. The name makes no less than 32 appearances in the entire corpus of which 4 occur in the Letter to Titus. This may not seem like much, but in view of the brevity of the letter, it is a comparatively high number of times for any name to be repeated within one book. Interestingly, this name appears in every chapter of this small letter, namely 1:1, 1:4; 2:13, and 3:6.

Furthermore, the name Jesus Christ appears within a very definite context, namely a theological cluster that once precedes (1:1-4) and twice succeeds (2:11-14; 3:4-7) sections containing instructions (1:5-16; 2:1-10; 3:1-3). Most scholars agree that these theological clusters appear in at least the second and third chapters while some do not regard the section in the salutation as the third theological section. Nevertheless, within these theological hubs both God and Jesus Christ are mentioned. More importantly though, are the remarkable titles attached to the name Jesus Christ or Christ Jesus.

As mentioned elsewhere, the title σωτήρ makes ten appearances in the Pastoral Letters. God and Jesus Christ equally share six uses of this title. In Titus, Jesus is referred to as Saviour in chapters 1:4, 2:13 and 3:6. This titular attribution designates Jesus implicitly a co-Saviour with the Father, who is also referred to as σωτήρ (Bailey, 1994:344; Thurston, 1999:183).

b) Jesus Christ: Deity

One verse, in Titus 2:13, has been the subject of much debate with reference to the deity of Christ. Scholars have long debated whether the verse applies to Jesus Christ only or whether it makes separate reference to God and Jesus Christ.

Murray J. Harris, in his paper entitled "Titus 2:13 and the deity of Christ", offers an evaluative summary of the various interpretive options on this verse. His conclusion is that the verse should be understood to refer to a singular predicate, namely Jesus Christ (Harris, 1980:171). His comprehensive analysis is well documented and should be consulted for a detailed overview of the possibilities (Quinn, 1990:156; Harris 1980:263-271). For the purposes of this study, only a bare summary of the different categories will be replicated. He lists and discusses several translation possibilities under three main interpretive constructions.

A. δόξα and σωτήρ are dependent on ἐπιφάνεια (with θεοῦ dependent on δόξα):

"... the appearing of the glory of the great God [= the Father] and [the appearing] of our Saviour, Jesus Christ".

Dubbed the double epiphaneous view, this interpretation argues for two manifestations, namely one by the Father and the other by Jesus Christ. The problem is that it requires the merging of an impersonal subject (δόξα) and a personal subject (σωτήρ). While some commentators have avoided this conclusion (Harris, 1980:263), there are additional complications. These relate to the fact that σωτήρ does not have an article and could therefore be associated either with θεοῦ or δόξα. Additionally, it is unnatural to separate σωτήρ from θεοῦ. These two words have great cultic significance. They always refer to a single deity when employed in this particular relationship.

B. θεοῦ and σωτήρ depend on ἐπιφάνεια (with τῆς δόζης as a "Hebrew genitive) and as referring to either *one:*

"... the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ" (NIV).

or *two persons:*

"... the glorious appearing of the great God and [of] our Saviour Jesus Christ" (KJV).

As Harris (1980:264) points out, this interpretation compromises the verbal parallelism between verses 11 and 13. By ignoring the article that modifies δόξα (verse 13), it undoes the corresponding idea in verse 11, namely ἡ χάρις. Whereas the first appearance is a manifestation of divine grace, the second will be a manifestation of divine glory (Harris, 1980:264). The rendition of this δόξα as an adjective reduces significantly the connotative value of the term δόξα. Saying that "a person's appearance will be 'resplendent' or 'attended by glory' is a far cry from saying that the person's *own* 'glory will be revealed'" (Harris, 1980:264).

C. 1. θεοῦ and σωτήρ depend on δόξα and refer to t*wo persons*:
"... the appearing of the glory of the great God and [the glory of] our Saviour Jesus Christ" (RSV, ASV, NEB).

C. 2. θεοῦ and σωτήρ depend on δόξα and refers to *one person* (with Jesus Christ in apposition to this δόξα):
"... the appearing of [him who is] the Glory of our great God and Saviour [= the Father, which glory is/that is] Jesus Christ" (F.J. A. Hort).

C. 3. θεοῦ and σωτήρ depend on δόξα and refers to *one person* (with Ἰησοῦ Χριστου in apposition τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆροι)
"… the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ" (RV, ASV mg, TCNT, Weymouth, NEB, JB, TEV).

The expression θέος καί σωτήρ was standard cultic language in the first century and widely used. In every instance, it denoted a single deity. The second reason in support of this interpretation is that grammatically, two co-ordinate nouns referring to the same person are usually joined by a singular article (Harris, 1980:267). Harris supplies extensive corroborative evidence that may be accessed for further study.

c) God: Salvation

Collins sees God as the central focus of the letter. He attaches correctly so, great significance to the quintuple appearance of the noun God within the first four verses of the letter (Collins, 2000:56). God is specified as having a servant in Paul (1:1), having an elect (1:1), un-lying (1:2), being a Saviour (3) and a Father (4). However, if we consider all the verbs in the salutation together with the other nouns occurring in this section, then far more is being said about God than is indicated by the frequency of the nouns. Implicitly, it could be said that God promised (1:2), God manifested (1:3), has a word (1:3) and has a commandment (1:3). Paul discloses that he, the servant of God, has been entrusted with a message. The passive voice implies that God, whose servant Paul identifies himself as in the introductory verse, entrusted this message to Paul. Thus, over and above the five nominal references to God, far more is said with reference to God, making the salutation glaringly theological. In sum, "God is identified in terms of the attributes of truth, paternity, and salvation" (Collins, 2000:56). According to Collins (2000:59), the theological foundations established by the pseudonymous author in the introduction is developed and elaborated in the body of the letter.

The titular reference σωτήρ occurs ten times in the Pastoral Letters. Six of these designate the Father, and three of the citations appear in each chapter of the Letter to Titus, namely 1:3, 2:10, and 3:4. The Father, like the Son, is presented as an active agent in the salvific process.

All that is introduced concerning God is related to His activity, His character and the influence of these upon the individuals and the community. Thus, is introduced, not only a knowledge of God, but several related mini-themes like servanthood, godliness, the ecclesia, promise and hope (Collins, 2000:56-65). These are all interpreted in the light of what is said about God and developed as the letter progresses.

Paul's self-description as "servant of God" (1:1) links him to other Old Testament servants of God, like Moses. In this way, the significance and credibility of the person of the apostle is established (Collins, 2000:60, 65). The quality of Paul's service is indicated by the designation, "apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1).

Collins goes on to discuss the topic of godliness as well as the phrase the "hope of eternal life" (Collins, 2000:61, 62). He connects the discussion of the term godliness to the designation of the church as the elect of God occurring earlier. Godliness, therefore, constitutes the behavioural characteristic of those qualified to be called God's chosen ones. God's calling of Paul, His election of the church; His promise and the fulfilment of that promise accentuate the unmistakable role of God as the initiator and guarantor of salvation.

d) God: Sovereignty

Salvation is only possible because God is in absolute control. Temporal references in relation to the apostle, God, and the church, paint another interesting picture reminiscent of God calling Abraham and the Israelites and God's promise to the patriarch. In Titus, God operates within the narrative framework of eternity πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων. Paul's ministry to the elect of God is situated at the appropriate historical moment, ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίοις. Thus, God is presented as transcendent; operating at once outside of the boundaries of time, yet at the same time manifesting Himself in time. When humanity is saved, this salvation depends entirely upon the Lord (3:4-7). God is the "un-lying" sovereign who keeps His promises.

Collins (2000:66) links the second theological passage, Titus 3:4-7, to the salutation. Themes introduced in the latter are developed in this passage. One of these is the concept of divine paternity (1:4; 3:5, 7), where a link can be established between God as Father and the related concepts of birth and inheritance that surface in chapter 3. There, the un-lying God of chapter 1 is elaborated. He is "kind" (χρηστότης), "loving" (φιλανθρωπία) and "merciful" (ἔλεος). This knowledge of God is deducible from the appearance of Jesus Christ, whose incarnation and atonement are interpreted as the manifestation of God's goodness and love. Divine mercy is the singular cause of salvation. The three nouns, kindness/goodness, love and mercy, are combined to collectively express the quality of divine "grace" or χάρις (3:7). Grace is then presented as the basis of the hope of eternal life (3:7; 1:2).

e) The Holy Spirit: Salvation

Titus contains only one direct reference to the Holy Spirit, namely in 3:5, and one implicit reference in a relative pronoun in 3:6. The sparseness of references to the Holy Spirit in the Pastorals is interpreted by Bailey (1994:348) as indicative of an assumed knowledge of the Spirit's work on the part of Paul. Thurston does not elaborate upon the role of the Holy Spirit apart from mentioning His agency and that He comes through Jesus Christ (Thurston, 1999:181,182). This is presumably due to her interpretation that the heart of this letter is Christological. What she is prepared to emphasise, and to which Collins concurs, is her conviction that Titus 3:4-7 is a hymn or creedal fragment (Thurston, 1999:181; Collins, 2000:66, 67; See also Hanson, 1968:78-96; Karris, 1996:80). Scholars also concede the conspicuously Trinitarian emphasis of this section. What is being emphasised is the role of the Spirit in regeneration and renewal (Bailey, 1994:349).

1.1.3.4 Conclusion

Central in the theology of Titus is the historical act of salvation. It is a salvation that God and Jesus Christ share as co-saviours. Christologically, the letter evinces a very high view of Jesus Christ, who in 2:13 is designated as God. It is not an overstatement to say that Titus has an exalted Christology. The interpretation of such an elevated view of Christ is not without complexities as the debate around Titus 2:13 clearly testifies to. The introduction of the Holy Spirit, in the last chapter, completes the Trinitarian emphasis of the letter.

1.1.4 STRUCTURE AND COHERENCY

1.1.4.1 Introduction

Any appreciation for the structure of the Letter to Titus must begin with the recognition of the difficulty of such an endeavour. This problem relates to the prevalence and influence of the authenticity debate which, on the one hand, informed an attitude of alienation from matters related to the structure and composition of these letters. Thus, scholars and commentators, in particular, just simply ignored the existence of structural concerns. It was observed, for example, as recent as 1997 that “most commentators on the Pastorals do not address the question of literary structure within these letters” (Miller, 1997:159). On the other hand, a related response was the fostering of a negative interest that tended to focus on the exploitation of structural issues in order to prove issues of authorship, without appreciating the potential value of the insights gleaned from structural analysis to advance our understanding of the content of the letters. The implications of some positions related to the matter of structure and coherency are so severe as to render these letters meaningless.

Fortunately, a shift in scholarly mindset looms on the horizon. The dust having almost settled on the authorship debate and the non-Pauline view in the proverbial driving seat, scholars are slowly, though increasingly focusing their attention on other aspects, like the structure and linguistic features of these letters. It must be pointed out that scholars on both sides of the debate have sometimes weighed and found wanting any structural coherence in these letters. Paradoxically, some scholars are of the view that the majority of contemporary scholarship affirms the fundamental coherence of the Pastoral Letters (Van Neste, 2002:119). That the matter is far from settled is evidenced by the fact that even those who defend the Pauline integrity of these letters doubt the coherency of the corpus. No less than Donald Guthrie himself, in this regard, found the letters to evince "lack of studied order, some subjects being treated more than once in the same letter without apparent premeditation", concluding that the letters are "far removed from literary exercises" (Guthrie, 1957:12). This apparent disjunctiveness, however, bolsters his conviction that Paul authored this corpus. Non-Pauline proponents likewise, interpret the alleged structural "inconsistencies" to galvanise their position. While a comparatively great amount of work has been done on the letters to Timothy, the Letter to Titus, even on this issue, has largely been relegated to the margins.

1.1.4.2 Two positions

There are essentially only two positions when addressing the specific matter of the structure of Titus. The first is that Titus, in the light of the whole corpus, has no structure and is incoherent. The key proponent of this position is James D. Miller. The second alternative is that Titus has a definite and justifiable structure, and constitutes a coherent unit of discourse.

Representative of this position is Ray van Neste. Several scholars have argued for the coherency of the Pastorals. These include P. Towner (1989), L. Donelson (1986), B. Fiore (1986), and D. Verner (1983). Only Van Neste has exclusively focused on Titus.

a) James D. Miller

Miller's book entitled, *The Pastoral Letters as composite documents*, investigates all three letters. He does however have one section that deals exclusively with the Letter to Titus, entitled *"Titus: A compositional analysis"* (1997:124-137).

He divides the letter as follows:

1:1-4	Epistolary Salutation
1:5	Epistolary motive
1:6-9	Qualities required of a good leader
1:10-16	Polemical warnings
2:1-10	Domestic rules: qualities of good community members
2:11-14	Creedal fragment
2:15	Literary marker
3:3-8	Creedal fragment
3:9-11	Polemical admonitions: on dealing with opponents
3:12-15	Personalia and greetings

Miller's conclusion on the composition of the Pastorals collectively is representative of his views on the structure of the Letter to Titus. Some examples will suffice:

"... the letters have no driving concern, no consistent focus of interest; instead, they read like an anthology of traditions, many arranged mechanically together by topic, some simply juxtaposed" (Miller, 1997:138).

"... [o]rganization and development of thought ... the Pastorals are characterized by a remarkable lack of both" (Miller, 1997:139, 140).

Miller (1997:124) is particularly uncomplimentary in his appraisal of the salutation of Titus. Thus, he considers it to be “notoriously complicated and confusing”. Moreover, he finds the style of the salutation “overloaded”, its grammar “confusing” and its content “unusual”. These “peculiarities” Miller (1997:125) attributes to the hand of a later editor. He is prepared to concede that the section on leadership displays evidence of unity, but maintains, on vocabulary evidence and what he terms as “abrupt” and “sudden” changes in sentences, that more than one author was involved (Miller, 1997:126). Earlier, I have dealt with Miller, in the section on authorship, and since the matters are related, I refer the reader to those sections. Basically, Miller denies that Titus has any structure. Moreover, the present form of the letter is attributable to intersections of different material by different authors at different stages during the formation of this document. Miller’s conclusions, which have been challenged recently by Ray van Neste, are applicable to the entire corpus and, as mentioned earlier, apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Letter to Titus.

b) R. van Neste

Ray Van Neste has found in the hypothesis of Miller, that the letters are composite texts, originating as short Pauline compositions, elaborated over time, through multiple editorial embellishments, a great challenge to the theology and meaning of the Pastorals (Van Neste, 2002:119, 120). To counter the threat, he calls for an analysis of what he terms the “linguistic cohesiveness” of the text (Van Neste, 2002:118, 119). This literary or linguistic approach must seek to investigate the linguistic mechanisms by which links are created between various discourses. In other words, it needs to be established how we recognise coherency in a piece of discourse.

Van Neste (2002:121) defines cohesion as “the quality of a text which creates a sense that it ‘hangs together’, and makes sense”. A text is cohesive when there are links between all the material comprising that text, so much so that “an understanding of one element requires an understanding of other elements in the text” through continuity and repetition (Van Neste, 2002:121).

In other words, there should be an element of textual inter-dependence within the discourse unit.

Van Neste (2002:121) focuses on three ways in which cohesion in Titus is created. First, is cohesion shift analysis (122-126); next, are transitional devices (126-127) and finally repetitions (127-130). Quoting linguists Brown and Yule, Van Neste (2002:122) explains the first method as follows: "Between two contiguous pieces of discourse which are intuitively considered to have two different 'topics' there should be a point at which the shift from one topic to the next is marked". Transitions between adjacent units are usually identifiable by significant shifts in "cohesion fields". Cohesion fields signify "genre, topic, subject, participants, verb tense, person and number as well as temporal and local frames of reference" (Van Neste, 2002:122). Continuity between the different fields greatly enhances the cohesiveness of the discourse while discontinuity indicates development within the discourse (Van Neste, 2002:122). High levels of shifts will indicate paragraphic transitions, signifying the start of a new textual unit. Applied to the Letter to Titus, Van Neste demonstrates that the unit evinces remarkable cohesiveness, linked by the dual concern of ethics and doctrine which "bind unit to unit throughout the letter" (Van Neste, 2002:126). His efforts are targeted at averting the challenge of Miller's hypothesis, which he does very convincingly. Under the heading of "transitional devices", Van Neste (2002:126) finds evidence in the text of Titus for the presence of "hook" words. He discusses and applies two variations of this linguistic device found in the letter, namely the "distant hook word" and the "hooked keyword" (Van Neste, 2002:126). One example of these is the recurrent phrase in 2:10, "God our Saviour", which Van Neste demonstrably judges to introduce and provide cohesion with 2:11-14. He, thus, disagrees with Miller's criticism that the transitions between these two units are not smooth and also that the logical relationships are not obvious (Van Neste, 2002:127). Van Neste demonstrates that the utilisation of transitional devices indicates the intentional cohesion within the first part of the letter, again disputing Miller's insistence that 1:10-16 and 2:1-10 are isolated units, independent from the rest of the context.

Next, Van Neste goes on to show how the repetition of words, phrases or ideas provides cohesion and structure to the Letter to Titus. He sees and demonstrates the operation of lexical cohesion between the salutation (1:1-4) and the doctrinal sections (2:11-14, 3:3-7). He, furthermore, argues for the presence of an *inclusio* between 2:1 and 2:15 with the repetition of the words "to teach" and "to exhort" (Van Neste, 2002:129). He then proceeds to demonstrate the parallels between the two sections, 3:1-8 and 2:1-15. He observes that both have in view ethical living based on an introductory command, both are followed by a doctrinal section introduced by the word "for" (γάρ), both shift back to the present tense with an exhortation instructing Titus to teach authoritatively. Finally, he suggests that 2:1-15 and 3:1-8 should be read as a single unit intimating that the earlier reference has a more complete introduction that is complimented best by the latter reference's more complete conclusion (Van Neste, 2002:129-130).

The article is a significant attempt to defend the integrity of the letter and to guard against the implications of the incoherency theory which effectively reduces the letter and its theology to meaninglessness.

Van Neste's cry, which must be heeded, is for "further analysis of the structure and cohesion of the Pastoral Epistles, and Titus specifically" (2002:118). It is to this task that the present study will address itself.

1.1.5 RHETORICAL APPROACHES TO TITUS

1.1.5.1. Introduction

Exclusive treatises of the rhetoric of the Letter to Titus are, to put it mildly, hard to locate, except for perhaps a mention in a footnote or some other place of obscurity. There are several reasons for this situation. The first relates, perhaps, to the relative novelty of the rhetorical critical methodology. The second reason is perhaps the fact that the Letter to Titus is much shorter than the other two Pastorals. There appears to be so much more to say about the

Letters to Timothy, because their scope and content are comparatively more extensive. The net result, or impression, is unfortunately that the compendious Letter to Titus appears to be treated as a footnote within discussions of the larger Timothean corpus. One gets the impression that it is almost “tacked” on to whatever is said in regard to the other two letters. An exception to this perception is the magisterial work by Jerome Quinn, whose posthumous volume on Titus is accorded “[p]ride of place” in a recent evaluation of commentaries on the Pastorals (Marshall, 2006:140). A final and most important reason for the perceived marginalisation of the Letter to Titus is the inextricable relationship with the authenticity debate and the cumulative-complimentary reading of the letters.

Over the last three decades, there has been a tremendous surge of interest in rhetorical criticism and the literature of the New Testament. Unfortunately, very little of this rekindled interest has been directed towards the Pastorals collectively and even less to the Letter to Titus. If a glance at several academic journals is anything to go by, then much remains to be done.

For example, a collection of essays entitled *Pauline studies* (Lambrecht, 1994:464-465) has zero references to Titus, although 1 and 2 Timothy share six. A 1996 collection entitled *Rhetoric, Scripture and theology,* edited by S. Porter and T. Olbricht, has nothing on any of the three letters, but three pages of references from “Early Christian Writings and Classical authors”. In a 1999 series, entitled, *The rhetorical interpretation of Scripture*, Christian and Classical share five pages of references. 1 Timothy is mentioned twice, followed by 2 Timothy, which is mentioned four times. Titus is referred to only once. A 2002 supplement entitled *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*, edited by S. Porter and L. Stamps, has four and a half pages of references to “Post Biblical Jewish Literature”, including Josephus, classical authors and other ancient sources. This more than 500 page collection has one reference each to the Timothean corpus, and zero references to the Letter to Titus. While not conclusive, the data is suggestive of a need for a corrective in the area of the rhetorical treatment of the corpus and more so of each one individually.

There have been some recent exceptions with one warranting a mention, namely Mark Harding's, *Tradition and rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles*. As the title indicates, Harding treats and interprets the letters collectively, arguing for the "literateness of the PE as letters and as persuasive communications of the received Pauline heritage ..." (Harding, 1998:4). His extensive treatment of this group of letters, while valuable, is weakened by the cumulative-complimentary reading of the texts. Plotting the way forward, he fortunately expresses the conviction that these letters are "readily susceptible ... to rhetorical analysis" (Harding, 1992:234).

There is to my knowledge, with the exception of Harding and Quinn, still room or even a need for extensive rhetorical analysis of the individual letters, Titus in particular. This little letter must be rescued from beneath the shadow of its counterparts. Joachim Classen appears to be the only scholar who has recently done a rhetorical interpretation or, as he calls it, "reading" of the Letter to Titus.

1.1.5.2 Carl Joachim Classen: "A rhetorical reading of the Epistle to Titus"

a) Introduction

In the book, *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament,* C. J. Classen has one section in which he deals with the rhetoric of the Letter to Titus, entitled "A rhetorical reading of the Epistle to Titus". Classen (2002:45) defines rhetoric as "the deliberate calculated use of language for the sake of communicating various kinds of information in the manner intended by the speaker (and the theory of such use)". He explains rhetorical reading as,

> [R]eading a text in order to grasp the information it intends to impart, to understand its meaning or its message by appreciating and explaining the function of every single part of it as well as of the composition as a whole (Classen, 2002:46).

This implies:

> [R]eading a text as composed by an authoress or an author with the particular intention of addressing a particular audience or individual at a particular moment or a wider public (wider both with regard to space and time) and, therefore, formulated in a carefully considered manner (Classen, 2002:46).

In his definition of rhetorical reading, Classen understands three aspects to be materially significant. First, there is the text itself, then the relationship between author and audience as discernable, and thirdly the structure of the text.

Classen begins his reading with a brief reference to authorship in regard to which he opts for pseudonymous authorship (Classen, 2002:48). Furthermore, he avers that the letter should be analyzed, not in isolation, but rather by comparison with the authentic Pauline corpus.

b) Structure

Classen's final structure is divided into seven sections:

1:1-4:	Salutation
15-13a:	The mandate to Titus, qualifications for eldership and the characterisation of the opponents
1:13b-2:15:	A long section, involving a general instruction for Titus to address Cretan unbelief
3:1-7:	Specific "aspects" with justifications
3:8-11:	Some admonitions and promises related to unbelievers and believers respectively
3:12-14:	Particular instructions
3:15:	Final greetings

c) Methodology

The author performs his analysis of the letter in two parts.

The first part of the analysis is essentially linguistic. It focuses on the explanation of the unique phrases and vocabulary of the letter (Classen, 2002:48-63). This takes the form of an analysis of the first few sentences of the letter, with particular emphasis upon the introductory vocabulary. Throughout his evaluation, he highlights the significance of and relationship between some of the distinctive words.

In the second part of his analysis, Classen attempts to show how the sentences are related by drawing attention to the linguistic mechanisms that tie the letter into a coherent whole. According to Classen (2002:63), these include a number of individual keywords that make several reappearances in the body of the letter: πίστις, σωτήρ, ἀψευδής, ἐφανέρωσεν, and ζωή αἰώνιος.

He shows that the salutation flows, without transition markers, into the specific instructions to Titus (1:5-6). This section is then followed by the characterisation of elders, which concludes with the requirement that elders be able to hold on to the faithful word and to oppose those in opposition (ἵνα δυνατὸς ᾖ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν, 1:9). Classen points out how this requirement of elders introduces the section dealing with the opposition through the words, τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας (1:9) and “many”, πολλοί (1:10). The description of the opposition is a tightly knit section that concludes with a description of the motives from which these illegitimate teachers teach (1:11) followed by the prophet’s quotation in verse 12. The affirmation expressed by the use of the faithful saying (1:13) concludes the section. Classen draws attention to the linguistic link between verses 7, μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ and 11, μὴ δεῖ αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν.

Classen highlights the rebuke in verse 13, ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς, which is said to draw upon the earlier description of the opponents in verse 9, τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν. He does not draw attention to these linguistic links except to mention it without further elaboration. Next, he highlights the repetition of the ideas of sound teaching and belief repeated at various intervals in the letter (1:13 ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει; cf. 1:9 ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου; 1:4 πίστιν) in order to accentuate coherence of the various parts of the letter (Classen, 2002:64). The section concludes with another characterisation of the opponents (ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν). Classen ties the entire section from 1:1-13a together as expressive of a mandate for Titus, involving justification for his authority, based upon the characterisations of the elders and the opponents. The additional pejorative references to the opposition (1:15-16) fall within the next division that forms part of a general instruction to Titus.

Classen attaches great significance to the appearance of imperatival verbs. It appears to be the singular influence in his decisions about the structure of the letter. His next division commences from 1:13b, which contains an imperative. Thus, he does not regard chapter two as introducing a new section, preferring instead, to draw a correlation between the imperative in 2:1, λάλει and 1:13, ἔλεγχε. The recurring emphasis on soundness persuades him further in this decision; thus ὑγιαινούσῃ in 2:1 and the verb ὑγιαίνωσις in 1:13. He finds additional corroboration in the linguistic allusion between the expressions ἃ πρέπει occurring in 2:1 and ἃ μὴ δει in 1:11. Due to the occurrence of the imperative verb forms and the similarity in vocabulary, Classen justifies his decision to treat the section from 1:13b till the end of chapter 2 as a unit.

Further links with earlier sections are established through the repetition of the word ἀντιλέγοντες occurring in 2:9 as well as in 1:9. However, Classen (2002:57, 58) overplays his hand when he attempts to link 2:10 with 2:11 by translating ἐν πᾶσιν (2:10) as “amongst all *men*”, in order to make it run parallel with 2:11, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. He, furthermore, prefers to skip the rest of the instructions given to the servant category. Instead, he disregards the rest of the instructions in 2:9 and 10 focussing only on the ἵνα-clause in the latter verse. Furthermore, the dual occurrence of the adjective, πάς, in verse 10 is deliberate, a point which the author does not explain in his book. More importantly though, Classen is not consistent in this translation of the expression, ἐν πᾶσιν, which also occurs in verse 9. Unfortunately, he does not offer any translations in this regard. Thus, Classen's decision to translate the adjective substantively as "all men" in verse 10 is perhaps a tinge arbitrary in order to justify his divisions of the letter.

Classen (2002:65) observes that 2:1-15 comprises an independent unit in a section beginning in 1:13b and ending at 2:15 that contains specific instructions about sound belief to different categories of Cretans. The section is cordoned off by several imperatival verbs. There are three, namely, λάλει, which introduces the section and that is repeated in verse 15. The other two are, παρακάλει and ἔλεγχε.

The next imperative in 3:1, ὑπομίμνησκε relates back to the preceding imperatives and is understood to link the two sections (Classen, 2002:65). The reason why Titus is given this instruction is attributable, according to Classen, firstly to human weaknesses (3:3) and secondly, to divine love (3:4-7). He draws a very faint connection between 3:1-7 and 2:11, without highlighting any specific emphases (Classen, 2002:65). Two final imperatives, in 3:9, περιΐστασο, and 3:10, παραιτοῦ, underscore the nature of the letter, which Classen summarises as follows:

> It is a letter with instructions, mandates, injunctions, admonitions and warnings, particular orders which are justified with the help of general considerations and put forward in a very clear and carefully structured arrangement" (Classen, 2002:65).

These orders or instructions to Titus are programmatic for the structure of the letter. They are key signals together with the repetition of special vocabulary provided by the author to aid the reader's understanding of the letter (Classen, 2002:65). Classen defines in one sentence the rhetorical elements of *inventio*, *dispositio* and rhetorical situation (Classen, 2002:65) without offering any further elaboration.

In the very last section, Classen (2002:65, 66) indicates what he considers to constitute the basic emphases of the author,

1. “The belief of the people of God in his graciousness and promises of salvation and eternal life;
2. The need to know the sound teaching;
3. The need to live a moderate life and to perform καλά ἔργα”.

d) Conclusion

The article concludes with an outline of the letter based on the rationale as presented earlier.

1.1.5.3 Critical evaluation of rhetorical approaches to Titus

It is fair to say that very little, if any work, has been done that has made the rhetoric of the Letter to Titus its exclusive focus. The prevalence of the authenticity debate appears to have had a restraining effect on the scholarly treatment of the entire corpus. Even commentators treat and interpret the letters in the light of the authorship debate, displaying an apparent apprehensiveness to appreciate the individuality of Pastorals. Titus tends to be treated in the light of the other two. Critical works dedicated to a rhetorical study of the Pastorals continue to concentrate upon the Timothean corpus, as a survey of recent rhetorical conferences, has shown.

Generally, therefore, there appears to be a dearth of rhetorical attention when it comes to the collective treatment of the Pastorals, which becomes even less in the case of the Letter to Titus. In this regard, I am aware of only one study that pays direct attention, in a more or less comprehensive manner, to the rhetoric of Titus, namely that of Joachim Classen discussed above, whose book is dedicated to the rhetorical criticism of the New Testament. He apportions 23 pages of his book to the rhetorical treatment of Titus.

Classen’s work has much to commend it. His decision to take the letter seriously and to evaluate it on its own merits is in itself commendable. The decision to structure the letter around the occurrence of imperatives is rather novel. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only analysis of Titus to attach such significance to that particular construct. His initial analysis of the sentences also renders helpful insight despite a subsequent tendency towards a selective analysis of only parts of sentences. Unfortunately, there are also some weaknesses in his rhetorical reading.

Persuasion is a key aspect of rhetorical criticism. At no stage in his treatment of the letter does Classen even allude to this element. The issue should be "Why does the author say what he is saying in the way he says it?" Classen's examination highlights what is there, i.e. in the text. He never attempts to go beyond that and answer the next question, namely, why is it there? Leading on from this is, perhaps, a more serious shortcoming of the study.

Classen's assessment is more exegetical than rhetorical. His critical treatment interprets the contents of the text without disclosing any indication of motive. His article merely offers knowledge about the peculiar vocabulary of the letter, the special phrases, and the syntactical flow of ideas between sentences. The role of the unique vocabulary and what the peculiar sentence flow communicate about the intention of the author are left unexamined. His study is far more textual and focused on the linguistic aspects of the text than the rhetoric thereof. This fact is evident from his definition of rhetoric and rhetorical reading (Classen, 2002:45, 46), which emphasises "understanding" the message, while "appreciating" and "explaining the function" of the parts as well as of the whole composition (Classen, 2002:46). Classen (2002:63) places great emphasis on the fact that this is a letter and not a speech. While this is true, it is equally true that ancient letter writers wrote in an oral, and even an aural manner. Yes, in form it is a letter, but it is not merely a letter. The phenomenon of the so called apostolic *parousia* is an accepted feature in New Testament scholarship. It has been demonstrated that the epistolary format also functions to communicate the apostolic presence. This phenomenon in part contributes to an appreciation of the literary format of New Testament letters. Classen's study does not pay any consideration to this dimension in his investigation. He would appear to exclude the possibility that even letters can be employed with persuasive intent.

Moreover, this is not a comprehensive treatment of the whole letter. Several words and parts of sentences are left unexplained. This situation could perhaps be attributed to the fact that the author merely attempted to demonstrate rhetorical criticism using Titus because of its relative brevity. In other words, his intention might not have been to conduct a comprehensive analysis.

A surprising omission in Classen's enquiry is the silence on the theology of the letter. Whereas the majority of scholars, at worst, allude to the distinctive theological emphases of the letter, Classen's study, at best, hints at it (Classen, 2002:50, 51). The reason, why he seemingly misses or selectively mutes the evident theological emphases, is not clear. Perhaps, it is because he is so committed to prove the relationship of the various imperatives to the structure of the letter. As shown in the overview, he is probably overstating his case in this regard. Still, the theological sections are underplayed and what are highlighted are the orders given to Titus. The theological sections are interpreted as mere justifications for the instructions given to Titus. The references to possible rhetorical categories are limited to the end of his article and even then in only one sentence. Other rhetorical aspects, for example, pathos and ethos are not considered in this study.

1.1.5.4 Conclusion

Rhetorical treatments of the Letter to Titus are sparse. In the light of the modern burgeoning of this ancient critical technique, this is surprising. Considered, however, against the backdrop of the authenticity debate, this marginalisation of the Letter to Titus is logically explicable. A rhetorical treatment of Titus is commendable because it will elevate the significance of this letter as one that can stand in its own right. In other words, the letter needs to be seen as a biblical text that has its own contribution to make, rather than as a supplement to the Timothean correspondence. The letter, furthermore, has a distinctive theological character that will be highlighted by a thorough rhetorical analysis. In this way, the stalemate situation resulting from the authenticity debate can be overcome. Already, there are calls from within the halls of academia for the three letters to be appreciated individually (Van Neste, Thurston, Johnson). A rhetorical treatment of this small letter will answer that call.

1.2 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS AND METHODOLOGY

1.2.1 RESEARCH PROBLEM

The above review has shown that the Pastoral Letters, as a corpus, have and continue to enjoy significant scholarly attention. Furthermore, the rise of rhetorical criticism over the last fifty years has proved beneficial for New Testament hermeneutics and exegesis generally, and the Pastorals particularly. A preliminary evaluation of current research in the Pastorals (as presented above), discloses interesting tendencies in the way researchers have treated them as a corpus and individually. This treatment highlights what is potentially problematic with regard to the relationship between rhetorical criticism and the Pastorals and hence the motivation for this study. The multi-faceted nature of the problem involves, firstly, the primacy of the Timothean correspondence versus the neglect of the Letter to Titus. Secondly, it involves the treatment of the Pastorals as a unit or corpus versus the individuality of the Letter to Titus. Finally, it involves the rhetorical praxis versus the theological and practical implications of the Letter to Titus.

1. Primacy of the Timothean correspondence versus the neglect of the Letter to Titus

Presently, with minor exceptions, the majority of scholars concentrate their efforts on the issues of epistolary theory and the authenticity of the Pastoral corpus, specifically the Letters to Timothy. On the other hand, the Letter to

Titus, with some exceptions, continues largely to be relegated to the periphery of scholarly endeavours.

2. The Pastorals as a unit or corpus versus the individuality of the Letter to Titus

Following on from the above, the individuality of the different letters has not been sufficiently appreciated while under the microscope of scholarly investigation. Despite preoccupying themselves with the Pastoral corpus, scholars appear largely to have done so, at the risk of failure to observe that this 'unit' actually comprises three individual letters. Each of these, despite their commonality, manifests sufficient degrees of original emphases, revealing remarkable idiosyncrasy. Still, the Pastoral Letters continue largely to be treated as a unit with primary emphasis falling on the Letters to Timothy.

3. Rhetorical praxis versus the theological and practical implications of the Letter to Titus

A major advance, due to the utilisation of rhetorical criticism, was that the biblical text again came to enjoy centrality, over against the approach of the historical critical methodology. Unfortunately, this has not translated into a serious application of rhetorical criticism to the text of particularly the Letter to Titus. It appears as if a plateau has been reached in regard to the potential of rhetorical criticism. In other words, the promise that rhetorical criticism holds is not being maximised as a technique to enhance our encounter with the text, climaxing in proclamation and edification of the Church.

The relationship between rhetorical criticism and the Pastorals seems to have reached an impasse: authorship and rhetorical theory. The investigation needs to be advanced and the promise of rhetorical criticism must be tested. Whereas certain aspects of the theology and rhetoric of the Letter to Titus have recently come under the spotlight, there remains room for a comprehensive rhetorical analysis of this letter that will bring together and develop, what has apparently, till now, been considered in isolated studies.

Accordingly, the research hypothesis on which this study is based will be as follows: *A thorough text-centred rhetorical approach to the Letter of Titus (i.e., without relating it to the other two Pastoral Letters or approaching it in terms of the authenticity/inauthenticity debate) will yield new insights for its interpretation*.

1.2.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The first section of this research focused upon an overview of existing scholarship on the Letter to Titus. The second section will be dedicated to the actual analysis of the text with a view to reconstruct the rhetorical strategy from the text itself. Above, in the presentation of the research hypothesis, I have already indicated that the rhetorical approach that will be followed is a "text-centred" approach. A text-centred approach is exactly that: it involves an analysis of the rhetoric of a text that focuses primarily upon identifying and describing the rhetorical strategies from the text itself instead of imposing pre-selected systems or rhetorical models upon the text and making the text fit into such systems or models. Thus, the major disadvantage of using pre-selected models is that the text is forced to comply with a particular model. Furthermore, such an approach implies that a particular rhetorical model can explain every aspect of the text. It seems better, however, to let the text "speak for itself" or to "trust in the text and in its own internal logic" (Meynet, 1998:177) instead of contorting it to fit into the rigours of a pre-existent model.

The fruitful results from Tolmie's rhetorical approach to the Letter of Galatians open new possibilities for "other Pauline (and New Testament) letters" (2005:247) and will be followed in this rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus. I will use an adapted version of Tolmie's (2005) *minimal theoretical framework approach*. The following summary is given for the benefit of readers, who might be unfamiliar with his approach. It comes from Tolmie's book, "*Persuading the Galatians: A Text-Centred Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter*" (2005:28-29).

Starting with the text itself, this approach aims to reconstruct the author's rhetorical strategy from the text itself. This involves a text-centred descriptive analysis of the way in which the author attempts to persuade his audience. The analysis is guided by a “minimal theoretical framework” used as a general guideline and involves several steps. I have outlined it below as a series of sequential steps only for the sake of an orderly presentation, although Tolmie does not present it in this way.

- Step 1: Identify the dominant rhetorical strategy of a section. This involves answering two primary questions:
  - How can one describe the author's primary rhetorical objective in the particular section?
  - How does the author set about achieving this objective?

  The answers to the above questions enable one to describe the dominant rhetorical strategy of the section, which is then expressed in a single sentence.

- Step 2: A detailed analysis of the author’s rhetorical strategy in a particular section. While flexibility is maintained with regard to the approach for each section, a general rather than a fixed methodological approach is followed to achieve the following outcomes:
  - § A description of the *main characteristics* of the author’s strategy in a particular section which may involve describing
    - *The type of argument* or the nature of a specific argument (Tolmie, 2005:28), or
    - *The way in which an author argues* or the process of argumentation employed to achieve a particular rhetorical objective (Tolmie, 2005:29).

- Step 3: Where deemed necessary, identify the “supportive” rhetorical strategies important for the overall argument of a section or for the entire discourse (Tolmie, 2005:29). Strategies that cannot be directly related to the dominant rhetorical objective fall into this category. In the present study, I have not deemed it necessary to identify any "supportive" strategies, hence this terminology will not be utilised.

- Step 4: Identify the rhetorical techniques within a section. These involve the ways in which an author enhances the effectiveness of his communication.
    - E.g. metaphor, rhetorical questions, paronomasia, the way sentences are constructed and chiasm (Tolmie, 2005:29).

- Step 5. Describe the organisation of the argument in the letter as a whole. This final step is done after completion of the analysis and is therefore presented in the conclusion of this study.

Section 2 will be the actual rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus. Section 3 will contain my conclusion and a summary of the prospective areas of study stimulated by the present study.

SECTION 2

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TITUS

2.1 RHETORICAL SITUATION

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

A rhetorical analysis must consider the broader rhetorical environment within which a discourse is created and functions. Scholars refer to this environment as the rhetorical situation. In this chapter, we will do a rhetorical analysis of Titus. The first section of the analysis will describe the rhetorical situation of the letter. A clarification of definitions will be expedient in this regard and will be considered forthwith.

2.1.2 DEFINITION

The concept, 'rhetorical situation', is based on the presupposition that every discourse owes its existence to a particular situation that necessitated its creation. Definitions of what constitutes a rhetorical situation span various degrees of complexity. At its most basic level, it refers to "the situation in which a piece of communication functions rhetorically"[1] (Tolmie, 2007). A more elaborate explanation comes from Lloyd F. Bitzer (1968:6) who defines the rhetorical situation as:

> A complex of *persons*, *events*, objects, and *relations* presenting an actual or potential exigency which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigency. (Emphasis added.)

[1] Spoken by Prof. Tolmie in a private consultation with me during 2007.

The rhetorical situation corresponds in some ways to the *Sitz im Leben* of form criticism. Other synonymous terms are the historical situation or the epistolary occasion (Stamps, 1993:193). However, these equivalents are all historically orientated whereas the rhetorical situation is essentially oriented towards the text. This, according to Wuellner (1987:456), means that the rhetorical critic is preoccupied with the "premises of a text as appeal or argument". In this regard, Wuellner (1991:99) speaks of the 'rhetorical' or 'argumentative' situation. It is the text-centeredness of the approach that distinguishes it from the conventional historical critical categories.

A rhetorical situation may also involve a 'rhetorical problem' that confronts the speaker, for example, prejudice towards the speaker, the undermining of his authority or the complicated nature of the message (Kennedy, 1984:36). The persons, events and relations that make up the rhetorical situation of Titus will be considered, based on Bitzer's definition. Because we are dealing with a particular genre, namely the epistolary genre, the role of people forms a significant component of the interpretation of the letter. A letter would normally have a sender and a recipient or recipients. The Letter to Titus has a dual level recipiency, several secondary characters and an amorphous opposition group.

2.1.3 PAUL

Paul is the self designated author of the letter (1:1). This is followed by two additional self elaborations, δοῦλος and ἀπόστολος, which are further modified by the two nouns θεός and Ἰησοῦς Χριστός respectively.

Paul's location at the time of writing can only be conjectured. The letter suggests that Paul could be *en route* to Nicopolis although he is definitely not there yet as the word ἐκεῖ indicates. With regard to the time of the year, the text indicates that it is not yet winter when Paul is writing (3:12).

2.1.4 PAUL AND TITUS

Paul writes to Titus, who is in Crete with an assignment, namely to complete unfinished business (1:5). It seems that Paul did not stay long enough to implement the organisation of leadership structures at the churches in Crete.

Titus is on Crete by apostolic mandate. In other words, he did not appoint himself. His presence is furthermore of limited duration. The original situation appears on the one hand to have been serious enough to require the presence of an apostolic delegate (1:5 ἀπελιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ). On the other hand, it appears not to have been as serious as to warrant that Titus remains there permanently. In fact, this letter reflects an additional purpose, namely the redeployment of Titus, who is instructed to reunite with Paul at Nicopolis (3:12). He is also informed that he would be replaced by either Artemas or Tychicus (3:12). The presence of these delegates seems a satisfactory measure in the present situation. Thus, at no stage is there any intimation that the apostolic delegate would not be able to deal with whatever trouble there was on Crete.

The letter gives evidence that Paul was aware of the difficulties related to the opposition at the time he left. Paul displays an acute cognisance of the natural moral disposition of the Cretans (1:12). Despite this fact, Paul left anyway, leaving Titus behind. Whatever the nature of the threat or the opposition, it was not as severe as to merit the physical presence of the apostle to address it.

Paul's instructions to Titus are very specific. It does not appear to constitute fresh instructions to Titus. The aorist indicative middle verb διεταξάμην (1:5) suggests an earlier time in the past when Paul must have instructed Titus. What we encounter in the text appears to be a summary of obligations given at a prior occasion and time.

Titus' primary assignment is to appoint elders. However, the elders do not receive any direct instruction anywhere within the letter. This is significant, because it means that all the instructions are directed to someone who is not going to remain permanently. At what stage are the elders supposed to exercise their roles: παρακαλεῖν and τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν (1:9)? A reasonable inference is that Titus represents a model or example to the elders.

Furthermore, at no stage does Paul circumvent or undermine Titus' authority. Instead, he galvanises it. In the introduction (1:4), he refers to Titus as γνήσιον τέκνον. All the instructions are directed at Titus. Paul never addresses the elders (or prospective elders, since they are not yet appointed, cf. Acts 20:17-38). Titus represents leadership in transition or intermediary leadership while the elders, whom he must appoint, will constitute the permanent or resident leadership structure. Why then does the apostle not address the prospective elders directly? It is suggested that they are too recently converted and unskilled at that stage to deal with the challenges facing this group of churches. Hence, Titus must demonstrate or model the leadership role to them. The apostle is setting up a priority chain of leadership. First in this chain was Paul, then came Titus (Artemas or Tychicus), followed by the local leaders.

The letter does not merely concern the elimination of the threat to the health of the church. It also involves the implementation of measures to ensure the continued health of the church. In the mind of the apostle, the measures implemented would be sufficient to keep false teachers at bay. These opponents must be treated with firmness of speech as the following imperatives indicate: ἐλέγχειν (1:9), ἐπιστομίζειν (1:11), ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως (1:13), and παραιτοῦ (3:10).

2.1.5 PAUL AND THE CRETAN BELIEVERS

The evidence suggests that Paul's original stay at Crete was very brief. Thus, Paul's relationship with the congregation is not characterised by explicit warmth. Paul apparently did not stay long enough to oversee the implementation of the leadership of the churches in Crete. Instead, he left this to Titus.

Compared, for example, with the Letter to Philippians there are no explicit confessions of delight in the congregation and other terms of endearment like ἀγαπητοί. However, Paul implicitly relates to the congregations as fellow beneficiaries of God's salvific activity.

At the very beginning of his letter, he acknowledges their divine origin as the people of God, ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ (1:1). At the same time, he introduces himself in similar language by locating the origin of his office in God and Jesus Christ, δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:1). In so doing, he identifies himself from the outset with the believers at Crete. He continues this notion throughout the letter.

His language suggests the notion of inclusivity in this regard. Thus, in 2:12, God's grace instructs "us" (παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς); in 2:13, Jesus is referred to as "our" God and Saviour (θεός καὶ σωτήρ ἡμῶν); in 2:14, Jesus gave Himself for "us" (ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) and redeemed "us" (λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς). In 3:3, Paul continues with this notion of corporate identification when he lists particular sins. It is "we", Ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς, who once were guilty of the listed activities. Also noticeable in this verse, is how the combined use of the verb in the first person plural together with the first person plural pronoun, fulfils an emphatic role in the sentence. In 3:5, God saves "us" (ἡμεῖς) not on the basis on deeds which "we" have done (ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς). In the latter citation, the emphatic use of the personal pronoun, together with a verb in the first person plural, is noticeable. In 3:6, the Holy Spirit's outpouring, in terms of the recipients, is a corporate action; He is poured out "on us" (ἐφ' ἡμᾶς).

Throughout the letter, Paul shares with the believers in the relationship with God and Jesus Christ, both of whom are qualified as "our" God or Saviour (1:3; 1:4; 2:10; 2:13; 3:4; 3:6). The conduct of the believers implicates the reputation of believers as well as that of the apostles. Thus, their behaviour should not give the “opponent anything bad to say about us” (περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον). In this instance, the pronoun could refer to the apostles; alternatively it could refer to all believers. Whatever interpretation we attach to the pronoun, in this instance, the notion of identification is too explicit to miss.

In 3:7, the apostle shares in the justification believers have experienced. The participle δικαιωθέντες is passive, nominative plural. This is followed by the verb γίνομαι in the first person plural passive, γενηθῶμεν. Here, Paul shares the hope of eternal life together with the believers. The identification is categorical and unambiguous.

In 3:8, Paul pays them a compliment by acknowledging their faith in God. Here, he refers to them as οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ. This reference has the effect of differentiating them from those who make false professions of faith (1:16).

The conciliatory tone climaxes with the designation found in 3:14. Here, Paul calls them "our people". He deviates from the use of the personal pronoun ἥμεις. Instead, here, Paul uses the possessive pronoun ἡμέτερος. Paul speaks as one who owns them; who feels possessive over them. He shares this ownership with Titus as the nominative plural suggests, and shared ownership implies shared responsibility for the believers of Crete. This notion of ownership, of possession, explains the comparatively formal tone that pervades the letter. Paul wants the people (their people) to learn and not to be unfruitful (3:14). In the concluding greeting in 3:15, after Titus is greeted, Paul passes on a greeting to the believers, referring to them in endearing terms as φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει. The apostle seems to assume that the believers of Crete are favourably, in fact lovingly, predisposed towards him and those with him. The letter concludes with a greeting in the second person plural of the pronoun ὑμεῖς, modified by the adjective πᾶς.

To conclude, Paul feels deeply responsible for the congregations of Crete. He writes as one who owns them; who feels a responsibility towards them. His concern for the well-being of the congregation is suggested by his unwillingness to leave them unattended. This is deducible from his plans to send Artemas or Tychicus to replace Titus.

Paul also writes as a co-recipient of God's salvific grace, by identifying fully with the believers in their past sinful actions. He refers to God and Jesus Christ as “our” (ἡμῶν) Saviour, thereby including himself, Titus and the congregations as mutual benefactors of God’s saving actions. The relationship between Paul, Titus and the congregations is at once a relationship between equals. At the same time, it is reminiscent of that which characterises the relationship between a superior and a subject. While on the surface therefore, the letter appears formal, it is so in a warm sense. The author assumes that a relative degree of intimacy and endearment exists between him and the recipients.

2.1.6 PAUL AND THE OPPOSITION

The opponents are introduced very early in the letter. They are called τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας (1:9). They appear to be a mixed group, dominated by a Jewish segment (1:10, 14; 3:9). Paul is extremely negative towards them. He describes them, in 1:10-16, as a very sordid bunch. In 3:10, he mentions a factious or heretical individual (αἱρετικος ἄνθρωπος) and the measures to deal with him.

Paul has no direct relationship with the unqualified teachers. They are not attacking him, his teaching or his credentials. However, their teachings are affecting the congregations negatively and this is part of the reason for the apostle's letter. Their teachings are unhealthy or unwholesome and result in equally negative conduct (1:16). Interestingly, Paul does not elaborate upon their teaching, nor is he very specific in his identification of the aberrant teachers. Instead, he advises that this recalcitrant faction be opposed with healthy teaching from qualified teachers. While the unqualified teachers appear to have the ear of some believers (1:11), their teaching can still be stopped by the introduction of sound doctrine (1:9, 13). The treatment of these unqualified teachers is concentrated in chapter one, except for a brief mention to something similar in 3:9. The bulk of the letter is concerned with instructions to believers. These two factors confirm that Paul, at the time of writing, does not consider the false teachers and their teaching as major threats. It seems as if the influence of the unqualified teachers among the churches could be controlled, if not eliminated, by this extreme negative portrayal of them.

2.1.7 PAUL AND OTHER CHARACTERS

Several peripheral characters appear in the letter. These include Artemas, Tychicus, Zenas and Apollos. The first two are only mentioned (3:12). One of them would be dispatched to release Titus and enable him to re-unite with Paul at Nicopolis (3:12). Thus, Titus is hereby informed or reminded that his mission in Crete is not indefinite.

Zenas and Apollos appear to be at Crete (3:13). The congregation must render them support for their impending journey (3:14). In this way, they present an opportunity to the congregation to demonstrate good works that is in evidence for healthy doctrine.

2.1.8 CONCLUSION

So why did Paul write, if the opposition was not a major threat to the Cretan churches, and if Titus knew what was expected of him?

The letter evinces a construct I call layered or dual recipiency. On the surface layer Titus is the designated recipient. However, the temporary duration of his term of office, the appointment of elders who would eventually be responsible to quell the opposition and the detailed nature of the instructions suggest a second layer of recipients. Paul has already instructed Titus (1:5), so why would he have to repeat himself to Titus in such detail? Additionally, Paul's use of inclusive language suggests that the intended audience of the letter extends beyond that of Titus.

Paul's rhetorical objective is to persuade Titus directly, and the congregations indirectly (3:15 ὑμῶν) that divinely sanctioned church leadership and divinely sanctioned doctrine is necessary for the maintenance of the divine character of God's people in the present world. He does this through positive and negative stereotyping, persuading the congregation to avoid the latter while pursuing the former.

2.2 RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

2.2.1 Titus 1:1-4: Adapting the salutation to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry

The salutation is one of five categories of a typical Pauline letter. In it, Paul would identify himself as the sender, specify the recipient(s), followed by a greeting, thanksgiving or a prayer (McRay, 2003:265, 267; Harvey, 1998:18; Tolmie, 2005:31). Titus demonstrates that Paul could deviate from his normal pattern with relative ease, since this letter, for example, does not contain a thanksgiving section. Scholars recognise the unusual nature of this salutation and in this regard Collins (2000:59) observes that “salutations were much more than an envelope for a letter: they too had a rhetorical function”, which he argues involved getting the attention of the audience and rehearsing facts upon which the audience and the speaker agreed. He continues by observing that salutations were similar to the first century rhetorical categories of *exordium* and *narratio*. In the case of the Letter to Titus, the dominant rhetorical objective of the salutation is *to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry*. The analysis of this section will show that multifaceted objectives lie behind Paul’s digression from his usual pattern.

2.2.1.1 Emphasising the legitimacy of his ministry

This letter opens in a most unique manner. Paul situates his modified self-identification within the realm of the divine. By means of two anarthrous nouns, he immediately relates himself to God and Jesus Christ, first as a servant of the former, next, as an apostle of the latter. At the same time, Paul is relating himself to God and Jesus Christ. He thus, from the outset, communicates belief in the equality of God and Jesus Christ. He reiterates this by repeating it in verse 4. Additionally, there is a sense in which Paul stresses the dual authorisation of his ministry by locating it with God as well as with Jesus Christ. While his ministry derives its authority from God and Jesus Christ, it remains focused on a single entity, namely the elect of God.

Later in the sentence, Paul again emphasises this notion of divine sanction of his ministry. In 1:3, he declares that he has been entrusted (ἐπιστεύθην) with a message. The emphatic use of the personal pronoun ἐγω is unequivocal. Paul continues to accentuate the divine authorisation of his ministry by stressing that he is serving according to the command of God (κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ … θεοῦ). In effect, he is also persuading his audience why they should listen to him. He seems keen to persuade his audience that only those who serve God and Jesus Christ can serve the church or advance the faith and knowledge of the church, for the purpose of godliness.

One fact is made very clear, namely, that qualified or legitimised service in the church is a necessity. Paul seems to communicate the notion that he did not simply wake up one day and decide that serving the church would be a noble vocation. No. He was entrusted, commanded. He was serving God. He was sent by Jesus Christ. Thus, divine authorisation or a theological motivation for legitimate ministry seems to be a central feature of this section.

It remains to be asked, why Paul is so emphatic about the authorisation of his ministry. A reasonable conjecture must be presented. He appears, in this introductory sentence, to counter a tendency among Cretan believers to accept or tolerate unqualified teachers. According to him, this is an untenable situation, because the spiritual progress, namely, faith and knowledge, of a church, depends upon the quality of the leadership. Paul is thus establishing himself as the supreme example of an authorised servant; one who has the right to speak to the church. However, unlike the situation envisioned in the Letter to the Galatians, here it is clear that Paul's authority or credibility is not under attack. Paul is not writing to defend his ministry. He can reasonably be said to set himself up as an example of legitimised ministry and as one that has the right to address the church.

2.2.1.2 Emphasising legitimate teaching

a) References of a doctrinal nature

Paul's ministry is directed towards the faith and knowledge (κατὰ πίστιν … καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν) of the church or the elect of God (ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ)**.** Thus, these two specific areas comprise the realm of legitimate ministry. It is a very specific knowledge that is the focus of attention, namely knowledge of "*the* truth" (ἀληθείας τῆς). Through an intricate series of prepositional phrases, Paul develops the twin concepts of faith and knowledge to their ethical conclusion, expanding it through a series of prepositional phrases. The preposition κατά features prominently in this opening section: κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν (1:1), κατ' εὐσέβειαν (1:1), κατ' ἐπιταγήν (1:3), and κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν (1:4). According to Wallace (1996:377), one of the basic functions of κατά with the accusative is to indicate standard, in which instance it is then translated as "in accordance with" or "corresponding to". However, in the first instance above, the preposition is best understood to indicate the purpose of Paul's service and apostleship (Bernard, 1980 [1899]:155). Thus, his ministry is "for the purpose of (the) faith", to further the faith (Knight, 1992:283), "for (the) faith" (Mounce, 2000:379; Quinn 1990:62), or "in the interest of faith" (Hendriksen, 1957:340). The repetition of the preposition, in this section, serves as a rhetorical technique that adds to the cohesiveness of this section. Interestingly, the unusual repetition of this preposition is located rather strategically throughout this section forming what could be seen as an *inclusio*:

κατὰ πίστιν … (1:1)
κατ' εὐσέβειαν … (1:1)
κατ' ἐπιταγὴν … (1:3)
κατὰ (κοινὴν) πίστιν (1:4)

While some take a different view, the second instance of the preposition also indicates purpose. This time it is not related to Paul but rather to faith and knowledge. Faith and knowledge have as their goal or outcome, the godliness of the elect. Faith is emphasised through the repetition of the word πίστις (1:1, 4) as well as through paranomasia of the same word group: πίστις (1:1, 4) and πιστεύω (1:3) in this section: Godliness in turn, is motivated by, or premised upon, the hope of eternal life (1:2). Paul is meticulous in defining knowledge. He uses the genitive to limit the meaning to "knowledge of the truth" (ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς). Here, "the truth", modified by the article, constitutes the gospel, in particular that body of objective truth.

Faith of God's elect, knowledge, the truth and godliness specify the parameters of legitimate ministry. In the first place, there is a specific group or category of people that are related to God in a particular manner. God elected them. Thus, they are His. Next, the legitimate ministry relates to a specific body of truth, namely ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσεβειαν. The purpose of the apostolic ministry is to bring about a behavioural or ethical adjustment (εὐσέβεια) in view of the life to come.

The certainty of this hope is guaranteed. Paul bases his argument upon the *integrity of the divine* or the reliability of God, specifying that His ethical character is ἀψευδής. He continues to emphasise that this hope was never dependent upon man. God promised it, God brought it about. Through the use of temporal references, namely, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων (1:2) and καιροῖς ἰδίοις (1:3), Paul ensures that no credit accrues at any stage to any human being. His argument is based on *divine authorisation* and *divine initiation*. The hope of eternal life was manifested in the word of God (τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ). Verse 3 reiterates the divine authorisation of the apostle's ministry, in which he strips even himself from any credit for the proclamation (κηρύγμα). Thus, the messenger as well as the content of the message must be divinely authorised.

b) References to God

There are five references to God in this section. This constitutes a high occurrence-ratio for a single noun in such a small section. The noun is used twice, first in v.1 and again in v.4, as part of the *inclusio* that cordons off this section. Excepting this usage, the remaining three occurrences are very significant, highlighting the theocentric emphases of this opening section. The *inclusio* mentioned previously refers to the repetition of the nouns "God" and "Jesus Christ" in verses 1 and 4.

The use of the word "God" establishes a relationship between God and the Church, who is described as ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ. This expression is juxtaposed with δοῦλος θεοῦ in verse 1. Thus, Paul's service and apostleship are directed towards a particular group, namely the elect of God. The kind of ministry presented here is specified as a divinely sanctioned ministry (δοῦλος θεοῦ), directed towards a group, whose origins the apostle locates in the divine (ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ).

Next, God's character is accentuated by the expression ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεός (1:2). This description occurs in the context of the promise that God made. Thus, the divine character or ethic is used to highlight the reliability of the divine promise. What God has promised He has fulfilled. The affirmation of the divine character furthermore implies the imposition of a norm. If God cannot lie, then His servant cannot either or at least would be expected to be honest.

The third reference occurs in 1:3 where God is referred to as Saviour (σωτήρ). Thus, we are dealing here with the divine origin of salvation. In the next verse, the same description is applied to Jesus Christ.

This section is suffused with the role of the divine. The elect has their origin in God. The promise made before the ages was fulfilled because of the character of God. The reason there is an elect, the reason for the ethic required of the elect is because God is also the one who saved them. Thus, central in this first section is the notion of the divine. It takes away all credit from man and places the focus on the central and dominating character of God.

c) References to Jesus Christ

Verses 1-4 contain two references to Jesus Christ. The first reference in 1:1 is repeated, but reversed in 1:4. These references appear to accentuate the divinity of Jesus Christ who, in both instances, is presented as equal to God. In the first instance, the name of Jesus is mentioned in the context of ministry, specifically the apostolic office. In the next instance, it is mentioned in the context of salvation. Interestingly, though, God is also mentioned in both of these contexts.

In 1:1, Paul relates his ministry first to God and next, as apostle, to Jesus Christ. The first reference to Jesus Christ is in a coordinate relationship with the noun θεός. Some commentators interpret the conjunction δέ in a connective sense as "and". However, it can also be interpreted in a contrastive or adversative sense as "yet" or "but". The apostle thus introduces himself by laying the foundation for his authority to address Titus and the church. On the one hand, he is only a bond-servant of God. However, on the other hand, his office is that of an apostle, authorised by Jesus Christ.

In 1:4, he refers to Jesus Christ as σωτήρ ἡμῶν. This is the exact designation used in the preceding verse to refer to God. Thus, God and Jesus Christ are introduced as co-saviours to whom the salvific activity is attributed. This is accentuated through the rhetorical technique known as a *chiasm*:

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (1:3)
Χριστοῦ ᾿Ιησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (1:4)

Another striking feature of this passage is the way in which it begins and ends. Verse 1 starts with θεοῦ …᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστου, while verse four ends with θεοῦ… Χριστοῦ ᾿Ιησοῦ). Except for the reversal of Jesus Christ to Christ Jesus, the order is essentially identical. This is known as an *inclusio*. Why did the apostle deem it necessary to accentuate the divinity of Jesus in this manner, namely by equating Him with God? Why is he so painstakingly meticulous to ensure that the recipient(s) are properly orientated towards Jesus Christ? Could it be that he was perhaps pre-empting erroneous notions about the divinity of Christ? Was part of the erroneous doctrine that was perpetuated by the false teachers related to an incomplete or compromised Christology? An answer in the affirmative would not seem unreasonable in this regard.

2.2.1.3 Emphasising the legitimacy of the ministry of Titus

Whereas Paul's authority is derived from God, the legitimisation of the ministry of Titus comes from the apostle. Titus is referred to by name (1:4). This designation is expanded through the use of kinship language as exemplified in the expression γνησίον τέκνον. In return, the kinship is made emphatic by the assonance of the ω-sound when referring to Titus as, Τίτῳ γνησίῳ τέκνῳ. Furthermore, the language serves to bestow honour upon Titus before the congregation. This is an early occurrence of the rhetorical technique called *honorific referencing* or - *classification*.

Towards the end of the salutation, the transcendent quality of the language yields to the language of imminence, activated through familial or relational referents. Tenderness is introduced by referring to Titus as Paul's child and later claiming God as Father (1:4). The reference to God as "Father" levels the proverbial playing fields, since it makes God the source of Paul and of Titus. The ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ are from a salvific perspective the offspring of the divine, but so are Paul and Titus. Titus' ministry at Crete is couched in the language of a son who stands in the service of his father, conjuring up images of loyalty and trustworthiness. This choice of language constitutes an argument of authorisation based on paternal or parental validation. Furthermore, it has the effect of confirming to the audience (including the illegitimate teachers) that Titus is acting as an authorised representative of the apostle.

2.2.1.4 Conclusion

In this section, Paul's dominant rhetorical strategy has been *to adapt the salutation to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry*. He starts by establishing his own authority and concludes by endorsing the ministry of Titus by apostolic and divine authorisation. His reason for doing this is not because he is under attack, but rather to highlight the notion of legitimate ministry. It remains to be asked: Why does the apostle adopt this specific approach?

The salutation contains information that would be redundant if primarily addressed to someone who knew the apostle as well as Titus. Instead, the very nature of the address, the loftiness of the theology and the inflexible insistence upon highlighting the role of the divine, suggest that Paul had a wider audience in mind. Most scholars come to this conclusion based on the reference in 3:15, but it can be detected right here in the salutation. The use of *inclusive language* at this stage of the letter confirms this fact. In 1:3 Paul refers to God as ὁ σωτήρ <u>ἡμῶν</u>. Are we expected to believe that the apostle is referring here exclusively to himself and Titus? In other words, is the apostle suggesting that God is only the Saviour of the two of them? Would someone like Titus need to be persuaded about Paul's authority? Or would he need to be taught about the content of legitimate teaching? The answer is obvious. Paul is addressing the church at Crete. The reference to θεός πατέρ is another example of the rhetorical technique *inclusive language* that cannot simply be applicable to the apostle and his delegate. It is interesting to note the expansion or development with reference to God. In 1:1 Paul is δοῦλος θεοῦ, and the church is ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ. The next description that follows describes God as ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεός. Beyond this point, God is mentioned in the context of a plural modifier as σωτήρ ἡμῶν and in a paternal nuance as θεός πατέρ. God is therefore the key protagonist, the leading actor in this unfolding drama of salvation.

Other rhetorical techniques used in this section, include the unusual repetition of the preposition κατά, *inclusio*, *chiasm*, paranomasia, *honorific referencing* or -*classification*, and the repetition of the πίστις-word group.

2.2.2 Titus 1:5-9: Outlining the criteria for legitimate local leadership

Having established himself as a legitimate minister of the church, the apostle concludes the salutation by introducing and affirming Titus as his representative. From verse 5 onwards, he develops the concept of legitimate ministry, by embarking upon his dominant rhetorical objective namely outlining the criteria for legitimate local congregational leadership. Conspicuously remiss at this point, is the characteristic thanksgiving section (Classen, 2002:51). A possible reason for this absence, could be because there was nothing to give thanks for, which in turn, could confirm scholarly conjecture that the congregation was relatively young, established fairly recently. Since there is nothing to give thanks for, Paul unceremoniously launches into his topic with great eagerness.

Paul employs arguments based on authority, namely apostolic authority, in order to firstly justify Titus's presence on the island of Crete and secondly, to underscore his authority among the Cretan believers. In verse 5, Paul declares that he left Titus in Crete (ἀπέλιπον σε ἐν Κρήτῃ). Now, in all probability, Titus knew that Paul had left him in Crete. He would also have understood or at least had some idea, before his arrival, of the nature of his assignment. So why would Paul now write in this manner? The answer lies in our understanding of who the recipients of the letter are. The language suggests that Titus cannot be the only recipient. It has to include a wider audience, in whose presence, in all probability, this letter would have been read. Verse 5 answers questions like, "What are you doing here in Crete?" or

"By whose authority are you implementing these procedures?" or "Who gave you command over us?" These kinds of questions are answered by the details provided in verse 5. The concluding clause provides the authorisation for Titus to fulfil his mandate. In this regard, the use of the first person personal pronoun (ἐγώ) together with the verb in the first person singular, διεταξάμην, is deliberately emphatic. Paul stresses that *he* is the one who has directed Titus. Interestingly, the tense of the verb, namely aorist middle, points to a time prior to that when Titus would have received this letter. These are therefore not new directives. Although the verb διατάσσω (1:5) is weaker in import than the noun ἐπιταγή in 1:3, it functions in the same way as the noun. This is an instance of the use of synonyms for emphasis and to fascilitate intra-sectional cohesion. Paul's authority derives directly from God while that of Titus comes indirectly from the apostolic directive. In other words, there is a hierarchy of command where authority flows from the divine through the apostle to Titus and ultimately to the local leaders. However, Paul's choice of language indicates that he does not consider his authority, in this instance, to be equal with that of God. Hence, he *directs* (διατάσσω) Titus, but God *commanded* (κατ' ἐπιταγήν) him, i.e. Paul. It remains to be asked, why Paul would write in such a round-about manner. The apostle is perhaps adopting an anticipatory stance in view of some opposition against the presence of Titus. Already, we find in Crete teachers who were "upsetting whole households" (1:11). Titus' presence would not be amicably received within such a context. The teachers, no doubt, held at least some degree of sway among the congregations. The difference between them and Titus is a significant one, as the salutation and verse 5 indicate: Titus represents legitimate leadership, while those in Crete are illegitimate. At a different level, the apostle is educating the Cretan believers about legitimate church leadership. He is about to develop his lesson, by providing objective criteria to ensure that the believers would be able to distinguish legitimate teachers from those who presume to be teachers. By so doing, he is laying a foundation for the appointment of leaders in the future, i.e. in the absence of apostles and apostolic delegates.

The basis upon which these other teachers came to exercise influence over the church is not clear. There seems to have been an indiscriminate tolerance, if not acceptance, by the church of these persons as well as of their teachings. Paul's purpose, in this section therefore, seems to be to provide objective evaluation criteria for the establishment of legitimate or authorised leadership in the Cretan church.

In the salutation, Paul alluded to the purpose of legitimate ministry, namely the maintenance of the character of God's people as ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ. Starting with himself, Paul showed that even he had to comply with certain criteria through the use of the nouns δοῦλος and ἀπόστολος.

Now, in verses 6-9, he is developing the notion that serving the church of God is not the domain of individual preference. There are conditions to be met. Since compliance criteria are acceptable in secular business, how much more among the ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ? Those who serve in the church ought to serve the interests of God rather than their own interests. The overseer is after all called a θεοῦ οἰκονόμος (1:7). Note how Paul, in his capacity as the δοῦλος θεοῦ (1:1) serving the ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ (1:1), now prescribes the criteria for those whom he refers to as the θεοῦ οἰκονόμοι (1:7). The consistent pattern emerging from these few verses makes all who minister in the church, accountable to God (θεός).

Paul's objective is clear, namely to provide observable or measurable criteria by which to ensure legitimate leadership in the church. Mappes (2003:214) suggests that the qualitications for elders serve as a polemic against the false teachers. Some, like Dibelius and Conzelmann (1972:158) have pointed out the resemblance between the lists in the Pastorals and first century character codes. The stipulated criteria would also serve to explain or defend Titus' selection of some and not others. In other words, these standards effectively clear Titus' actions from potential charges of arbitrariness or subjectivity. More importantly though, is the rhetorical significance of the list. In a recent work, Tolmie (2005:216, 217) categorised similar lists in Galatians as constituting "shared knowledge". The qualities cited in verses 6-9 are not exclusive to the Christian context. Extra-biblical evidence corroborates that such norms were considered reasonable by the broader society of first century Hellenistic culture (Dibelius and Conzelmann, 1972:158). If secular Cretan society therefore endorsed these standards, it would be very hard to defend the behavioural conduct of leaders that do not comply with these shared or common standards. Rhetorically, this has the positive effect of rendering Paul's prescriptions reasonable, since his audience would be familiar with these criteria. Negatively, it would be almost impossible to justify tolerating anyone whose actions contradict the societal norm.

Those responsible to minister to the ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ ought to be examples of the power of the truth (1:1). Their lives and conduct must give evidence of the reliability of the promises of God. The first to manifest εὐσέβεια are the leaders. Faith in God, or the εὐσέβεια ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου (1:1, 2), is neither cerebral nor merely confessional (cf. 1:16). Instead, it is practical and observable. Scholars, who overeagerly emphasise the similarity these character requirements share with secular lists, downplay the powerful statement made here concerning the gospel or *the truth* (1:1). Those appointed become the direct antitheses of the illegitimate teachers. That men of this calibre can even be found in such a context, is an incredible testimony to the power of God's word. In other words, the manifestation of the divine promise is not an abstract event. It changes lives; produces the kind of men described in 1:6-9.

To whom is this written? Both Titus and the Cretans are the intended audience of these lists. However, Titus is only a secondary recipient. He perhaps needs only a reminder. The primary recipients are the Cretans. The sheer detail provided in this section suggests a didactic function. There can be no mistaking that anyone hearing the content of this letter would leave with an almost graphic image of the legitimate leader. Doubtless, there would be those followers of the illegitimate teachers who would now be empowered with an objective standard by which to measure their teachers to whose influence they have fallen victim (1:11).

According to Johnson (1996:220), the catalogue of vices and virtues in 1:6-9 evinces several instances of unique vocabulary. It contains three New Testament (ἐπιδιορθόω, φιλάγαθος, ἐγρατής) and fifteen Pauline *hapax legomena*. Of the latter, nine appear in the rest of the Pastorals (ἀπολείπω, φιλόξενος, πάροιμος, πλήκτης, αἰσχροκερδῆς, σώφρον, πρεσβυτέρος, ὅσιος, ὑγιαίνω) while six never occur in the Pauline corpus (Κρήτη, λείπω, κατηγορία, ἀνυπότακτος, αὐθάδης, ὀργίλος). Incidentally, Johnson (1996:221) maintains that the variation in vocabulary can be explained by the variation in subject matter. It is preferable to interpret these *hapaxes* as context specific vocabulary. This is based on the assumption that in the mind of the author the recipients would have been familiar with the vocabulary. The anaphoric μη is another device employed to highlight the five vices in 1:7. Anaphora is also used in two words in the virtue list. They occur in 1:8, namely φιλόξενος and φιλάγαθος. Both adjectives are compound nouns prefixed by the noun, φιλός. These rhetorical techniques highlight the arenas of the elder-overseer's personal life under observation, namely his marriage, family life and his personality or attitudinal behaviour. Moreover, the prefix, φιλός emphasises the attitude of love that should characterise the elder-overseer.

The cohesion between this section and the salutation is effected through the repetition of specific vocabulary. For example, the noun πίστις recurs several times in the space of a few verses: κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεου` (1:1), κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν (1:4), ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ ... πιστοῦ λόγου (1:9). Additionally, the word λόγος (1:3) is repeated in verse 9.

Paul also uses transitional devices to introduce the different sections. In 1:4 he introduced Titus and proceeded to address him in verse 5. Now, in 1:9, he introduces the opposition or the illegitimate teachers as οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες. What is it that they contradict or oppose? It must be the teaching, here made conspicuous by the interchangeable use of the nouns διδαχή and διδασκαλία respectively within the same sentence: κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν and ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ. The conditions for elders culminate in verse 9 with the criterion to “hold to the faithful word”, ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου. Thus, over and above the character requirements, the relationship of the individual elder to the word is paramount. The idea of “the word” was introduced in the salutation, 1:3. There, it was the divine word that was ‘manifested’, ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίοις τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. According to 1:9, the elder must cling to the “faithful word”. This description would call to mind the earlier reference in 1:3. The authority of the elder derives directly from the word, which enables him to do two things, namely “to exhort” (παρακαλεῖν) and “to refute” or “convince” (ἐλέγχειν). It is at this point that the issue of opposition is introduced. The distinguishing factor between legitimacy and illegitimacy hinges on the relationship of the opposing parties to the manifested word. The antithesis between the two groups is highlighted through the intentional play on the two participles used to refer to them: ἀντεχόμενοι and ἀντίλεγοντες. Both are prefixed by the preposition ἀντί, generally meaning “against” (Zodhiates, 1992:190). The first word connotes a positive stance, the second a negative action. Paul, in this way, introduces the next step in his strategy namely, the vilification of the opposition. In this transitionary sentence, the apostle juxtaposes their negative behaviour with the positive behaviour of the overseer. The opposition is thus introduced here as “the ones who speak against”. They contradict the action of the overseers who “holds against” or “clings to”. The rhetorical objective of this brilliant use of a prefix is to launch his denigration of the opposition.

Conclusion

In this section, the dominant rhetorical objective is *to outline criteria for the establishment of legitimate local leadership in the church*. His arguments are primarily based on authority, particularly apostolic authority. Thus, Titus’ presence and jurisdiction are authorised by apostolic directive. The detailed explanations, in the form of a catalogue of vices and virtues, are examples of the rhetorical technique called *shared knowledge*. Its use suggests that this section is primarily targeted at the congregation. It addresses Titus only secondarily. The leader must be blameless in his family life as well as in his behaviour. In other words, his life must bear testimony to the fact that he has embraced the Christian doctrine. Through the rhetorical technique of repetition, Paul links this section to the preceding salutation, developing certain notions like faith and the primacy of the word. Another rhetorical technique, anaphora is used to draw attention to the vices and virtues related to the elder-overseers and concludes the catalogue by specifying the most important qualification, namely the ability to teach the word. In this regard, the elder-overseers are made responsible for exhortation and refutation.

Also present on the island are "those who contradict" and their followers. Paul uses the list of virtues and vices to educate the congregation regarding legitimate and illegitimate leadership. The list also represents shared knowledge, which constitutes an irrefutable argument in favour of the validity of the requirements for legitimate leadership. Another rhetorical technique used in this section is that of synonyms.

This section concludes with the legitimate leaders being pitched against the illegitimate ones. Furthermore, the closing sentence (1:9) serves as a transitional device that introduces the vilification of the illegitimate leaders. In the following section, the disparagement of the opposition takes on a more fully developed form. This section presents a clear picture of the legitimate leaders and introduces the problem of the illegitimate ones.

2.2.3 Titus 1:10-16: Discrediting the illegitimate teachers

In verse 6 and following, Paul focuses the attention upon the "opposition", whom he would eventually expose as being presumptive teachers (1:11). Through the use of a transitional sentence, Paul introduces them in the latter part of verse 9, as τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας. We first encounter them in the context of a conflict situation, at the receiving end of the ministry of the elders, who must reprove (ἐλέγχειν) them. This sentence introduces an "us-them" dichotomy at the front end of this letter (1:9) that is expanded in the subsequent verses (1:10-16). The dominant rhetorical objective in this section is to discredit the illegitimate teachers primarily by magnifying their illegitimacy. The rhetorical technique employed involves vilification of the illegitimate teachers.

Vilification

Vilification is a persuasive technique used by an author or speaker to present opposing parties or their viewpoints in a negative light, by magnifying some aspects of character or propositional weakness, with a view to influence an audience to disassociate themselves from the opposition or the viewpoint and associate themselves with or endorse the position or person of the speaker or writer. Du Toit (1994:404) considers it to have been a "widespread convention … obtained throughout the Mediterranean world". Botha (1993:421) calls it "invective", which aimed to "dispose hearers favourably to the speaker and to shame and humiliate the 'enemy'". One of the ways in which it was employed, involved portraying the opposition as those who are perverting the true faith and who are negative influences for the faith of others (Du Toit, 1994:409). In order to achieve his dominant rhetorical objective, Paul makes extensive use of vilification to portray the opposition in a very negative light. The impact and overall domination of the technique in this section becomes obvious from the following list:

1. insubordinate, empty talkers, deceivers (v.10)
2. upsetting whole families (v.11)
3. teaching for gain (v.11)
4. teaching without the right to teach (v.11)
5. liars/evil beasts/lazy gluttons (v.12)
6. giving heed to Jewish myths (v.14)
7. giving heed to the commands of men who reject the truth (v.14)
8. corrupt and unbelieving (v.15)
9. minds and consciences are corrupt (v.15)
10. deny God by their deeds (v.16)
11. detestable, disobedient, unfit for any good deed (v.16)

Verse 10 immediately takes up and builds upon the hostility introduced in the latter part of verse 9. The apostle unleashes his verbal artillery upon the aberrant ones through a technique I call *emphatic clustering*. He groups together three words to launch his vilification campaign, namely ἀνυπότακτος, ματαιολόγος and φρεναπάτης. This linguistic triplet, combined with the adjective πᾶς, intensifies the hostile sentiment that this section intends to create. It furthermore serves as justification for the apostolic directives that this correspondence conveys. Structurally, it cordons off this section and magnifies the denigration to follow.

The vilification procedure is facilitated by several additional techniques, such as *implicit contrasting*. That which is contrasted is not made obvious within a sentence. In other words, the author gives no linguistic clues that a contrast is being made. Instead, the author provides the information in such a manner that the hearer or reader, almost intuitively, "sees" the glaring contrasts within the larger discourse unit. For example, the description of the opposition in this section is implicitly contrasted with the positive character requirements associated with the office of the overseer mentioned earlier. The negative attitude of the opposition towards the word (1:9), is made plausible by the pejorative description of their character, which manifests firstly as insubordination (ἀνυπότακτος). This noun was used earlier with reference to the children of elders (1:6). This is an example of repetition. The effect is to evoke strong disapproval from the congregation for childish behaviour on the part of the opposition. Unruly behaviour demands strong disciplinary retaliation.

The noun ματαιολόγος follows rapidly upon the first and is suggestive of the apostolic view of the aberrant teaching. It is vain, empty, and lacking substance. In fact, the false teachers are the personification of what they teach. They themselves are empty and vain. The final noun in this cluster, φρεναπάτης, describes the opposition as deceivers or impostors. In other words, they are unauthorised, invalid and hence unqualified to minister to the church. Implicit contrasting is also operative here. Thus, compared to everyone mentioned in the previous two sections, this group of impostors does not match the profile. While the group may be substantial, the apostle appears to single out a Jewish faction within the larger group, through the adjectival phrase μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς. Johnson (1996:227, 228) suggests that this expression might refer to Gentile Cretans who have come to embrace Judaism through the influence of Jewish teachers. If this is so, the resemblance to Galatians would be, in his words, “all the more striking” (Johnson, 1996:228).

The effect upon the hearers is nothing short of riveting: If this is what the apostle says about these people, how dare some believers (perhaps) think amicably about them? At this very point, the congregants are forced to pick sides. The tone of the letter has been positive up to the first half of verse 9: Paul, Titus, the elders elect. It will, however, from here onwards become calculatedly negative.

Verse 11 offers additional justification for the severe treatment of this insubordinate faction. The reasoning relates firstly to the effect of their “ministry” among the believers. It is considered absolutely essential that these people be silenced or muzzled (ἐπιστομίζειν). Paul and the elders, however, are allowed to speak to or teach the believers (1:3, 9). The impact of the activities of the illegitimate teachers, is that it subverts or overturns whole households or families (οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν). The emphasis upon the negative effect on the family institution, constititutes a further element in the vilification campaign against these people. The reference to households (οἴκοι) can either indicate house churches or families. Paul’s vilification here is based on the family or kinship theme. This calls to mind related ideas that were introduced in the previous two sections. For example, in 1:4, God is referred to as θεός πατήρ while Titus is called Paul’s τέκνον. The language is relational and familial. This kind of relationship is characterised by order and submission. The notion of family also features prominently in the criteria for elders. In 1:6, the elder is expected to demonstrate a positive influence upon his own family. All these disclose a positive attitude towards the family. The negative impact of the illegitimate teachers upon the family institution is thus exacerbated by the use of the kinship argument. This implicit contrast highlights an underlying argument suggestive of the importance of a stable family life in the ancient world. Whereas elder-overseers must maintain a stable family life, the opposition threatens that stability and are vilified for it. The text, therefore, suggests that it is a severe form of vilification to accuse someone of threatening the family institution. Johnson (1996:235) mentions that "[i]n the Greco-Roman world, insubordination or instability in the *oikos* was reason enough to condemn a religious movement". Through a clever play on the word οἶκος, the apostle exploits the connotative value of the kinship argument with direct application to the church. In 1:7, he described the overseer as a θεοῦ οἰκονόμος. The false teachers on the other hand, are subverting whole οἶκοι. Again, by implicit comparison to the elders, these impostors are shown to be illegitimate by highlighting the negative impact of their activities upon the church or individual families. They must be avoided because they prove to be outsiders, non-family, and predatory.

The next justification for the ruthless treatment of the impostors, relates to the content of and the motivation for their teaching, which serves as a further basis for their vilification. Their illegitimacy relates to the content of their teaching, here described very unflatteringly as ἃ μὴ δεῖ ("things not necessary"). The insignificance of what they teach is expressed by the use of the relative pronoun (neuter) ἅ. The illegitimate teachers simply teach "things". Again, this is the opposite of what Paul and the elders teach. The selection of vocabulary heightens the polarity between the two groups. "Things" do not quite compare with "the truth", "the faithful word", "the teaching", and "healthy teaching" or "healthy doctrine" (1:1, 9). The readers must choose between being taught illegitimate "things" and legitimate "teaching".

The next two words αἰσχροί κέρδοι, are further examples of paranomasia. It intentionally recalls a quality listed in the earlier catalogue of vices with reference to overseers, namely αἰσχροκερδής. If an overseer may not be αἰσχροκερδής, and these false teachers are teaching for the sake of αἰσχροί κέρδοι, then there is no way that the latter group can ever legitimately serve in God's οἶκος. They are disqualified. The language implies a warning to the believers. It is as if the apostle is saying, "Watch out. They are out to exploit you!" Clearly, he cannot be speaking to Titus. Those who stand to benefit from these caveats are the believers.

In verse 12, the apostle intensifies his strategy of vilifying the illegitimate teachers. His rhetorical strategy involves the use of *alienating* or *exclusive language* and *appeal to an external source of authority*. Paul's use of "them-us" serves to alienate the believers from the illegitimate teachers. It also harnesses the notion of community and belonging. Here, he uses it negatively with reference to the illegitimate teachers. The repetition of the third person, plural, of the pronoun αὐτός (ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης) emphasises the notion of "them" and "us". More importantly, however, the repetition of the pronoun functions to corroborate the accusation that is expressed in the form of that infamous quote. Thus, here we have information about the false teachers from the proverbial horse's mouth; here is an inside story.

Paul's rhetorical strategy furthermore involves an appeal to an external authority. The quote, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί, effectively points the attention of the hearers away from Paul. It is as if Paul is saying: "Don't be surprised. I'm not sucking these things out of my thumb. Here's what is said about them by someone who knows them. Here is what you know is true about them". The citation suggests a known source, insinuating that this is public knowledge. One could read into this citation a mild or implicit rebuke towards the congregation. They should have known these things. However, if there is a rebuke, it is softened by the earlier use of the "them-us" language.

The quote demonstrates another instance of *emphatic clustering*. More specifically, we have here an example of *asyndetic emphatic clustering*. Together with verse 10, it ties this section into a neat unit and maintains the vilification of the false teachers. The vocabulary employed is significant.

Firstly, there is a play on the antonyms noticeable in the expressions, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται and ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεός (1:2). This is an instance of *implicit contrasting* where the character of the Cretans is juxtaposed with that of God. It furthermore establishes an argument based on example, and in this occurrence it is an irrefutable one, since the character of the opposition is presented as being diametrically opposed to the character of the divine. The next two descriptions, namely κακὰ θηρία and γαστέρες ἀργαί, have the effect of portraying the opposition as dehumanised by refering to them as beasts (θηρία) and lazy gluttons, or literally "idle stomachs". The rhetorical effect of this quotation is that it belittles the opposition in the eyes of the church. On its own, such vilification is rather damaging to any person's reputation. In the context of a local congregation, the relational consequences would be devastating.

In verse 13, the rhetorical strategy involves an *apostolic verification* of the saying regarding the Cretans' moral disposition. The use of the demonstrative pronoun αὕτη links this sentence to the citation. Here, Paul had opportunity to limit the applicability of the earlier quotation; instead he affirms the veracity of the Cretan poet's adage. There is a sense of irony associated with the combination of the quote and the apostolic affirmation: A Cretan poet brands Cretans as pathological liars, lazy bones and gluttons. Scholars refer to this as the liar's paradox (Mounce, 2000:398), since it makes the statement a logical impossibility. The apostolic verification serves to corroborate the truth of the statement. Furthermore, we have repetition of the same word in the adjective ἀληθής. The corresponding noun ἀληθεία was introduced in the salutation. Opponents would be hard pressed to refute the characterisation, which is here intensified by the apostolic corroboration. A comparative view of the various units in chapter 1, discloses the development of a deliberate tension between truth and lies or liars: Paul's ministry is focused on the knowledge of ἀληθεία (1:1). God is ἀψευδής (1:2). Next, the Cretans are ψεῦσται (1:12), while the statement is ἀληθής (1:13). Structurally, one could almost argue for an ABBA structure, but that is not the concern of this study.

The second part of verse 13 contains an instruction on the treatment of these false teachers. The second person singular imperative of ἔλέγχω points to Titus as the primary addressee. This verb is repeated, having occurred earlier, where it applied to the overseer (1:9). Therefore, the responsibility to refute is shared by Titus and the overseers. Titus implicitly, models to the others how an elder must exercise his ministry. The purpose clause, introduced by the conjunction ἵνα, serves to defend Paul's instructions against charges of malevolence. In spite of how bad they are, there is still hope for the impostors to become sound or healthy in the faith (… ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει). The clause ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει brings together in a single expression two words used in earlier sections, namely πίστις (1:1, 4, 6, 9) and the verb ὑγιαίνω. In the latter instance, it is the participial equivalent, namely ὑγιαινούσῃ (1:9) that is employed. Verse 13 suggests the possibility for transformation. Those who may have been led astray can become sound in the faith. The verse also expresses an implicit caution against the abuse of authority since the harsh treatment has a noble end, namely return to *the* faith. The article in this instance specifies the body of objective gospel teaching, synonymous to *the* truth (1:1).

Verse 14 describes the content of the false teaching that the impostors are embracing, thereby continuing the vilification. Through the use of two related verbs, the difference between legitimate and illegitimate teachers is intensified. While not directly synonymous, the two verbs are related, in that they share the verb ἔχω. Whereas the overseer must "cling to" (ἀντέχω) the faithful teaching, false teachers must *not* "pay attention" (μὴ προσέχω) to wrong doctrine. Several parallels are apparent in the description of the two groups. Firstly, both verbs share the primary root verb. Next, they are both in the present participial form. Thirdly, there is a definite contrast in regards to the content of the different teachings. In verse 14, the attention is apparently focused on Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων. In verse 9, it is τοῦ (κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν) πιστοῦ λόγου. Note, how the authorisation of the illegitimate leaders derives from human authority (ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων), while that of Paul originates directly from the divine (1:1-4). The ministry of Titus and the elders derives more indirectly from apostolic authorisation (1:5-9). In this part of the verse, the object of vilification shifts temporarily from individuals to the doctrinal origin of the false teaching. False doctrine derives from man and is authorised by man. Sound doctrine derives from God and is authorised by God.

The next participial phrase, ἀποστρεφομένοι τὴν ἀλήθειαν refocuses the attention on those who are targets of the vilification campaign. Throughout this entire sentence, the comparisons are implicit. The illegitimate teachers have reneged "the truth" (τὴν ἀλήθειαν) while Paul's entire ministry is focused on ἐπίγνωσιν <u>ἀληθείας τῆς</u> κατ' εὐσέβειαν (1:1). This description in verse 14, of the opposition's relationship to the truth, constitutes the climax in the vilification of the opposition. Here, is the fundamental difference between legitimate and illegitimate ministry, namely the latter's abandonment of the truth. Verses 13 and 14 are one sentence in Greek. It opens and closes with the word ἀληθεία, first as an adjective and then as a noun. The word-chain is thus continued and serves to tie all the various units of this chapter together. The fact that God is ἀψευδής does not bid well for the false teachers and their relationship to (the) truth. The repetitive use of the truth-lie dichotomy highlights the illegitimacy of the false teachers and presents them in a diametrically opposite stance from the divine.

In verse 15, the apostle appears to zoom in on a key notion within the teaching of the false teachers, namely purity. He continues his vilification campaign by elaborating on the description of the teachings he introduced in verse 14. He accomplishes this through a technique described as antithetic presentation (Tolmie, 2005:33) or antithetic chiasmus (Quinn, 1990:101) which he combines with assonance of the vowel α. Additionally, he uses the repetition of several key words to intensify his focus. The most obvious is the word καθαρός, which appears three times in this verse: πάντα <u>καθαρὰ</u> τοῖς <u>καθαροῖς·</u> τοῖς δὲ καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν <u>καθαρόν</u>. Next, is the verb μεμίανω: μεμιαμμένοις... μεμίανται. Earlier, Paul used the noun πίστις, now he employs the antonym ἀπίστος, which accentuates the contrasts between the different groups. He relentlessly pursues his objective of vilifying the opponents, this time through contrasting the pure and the impure and name calling: μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις. A final technique is the parallelism in the structure AABA, which can be indicated as follows:

A πάντα καθαρα;	A τοῖς καθαροῖς·
B τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις	A' οὐδὲν καθαρόν

The sentence introduces two groups: the pure versus the defiled and unbelieving. The sentence accentuates the futility of trying to attain purity when you are already defiled and unbelieving. The participle, μεμιαμμένος, is in the perfect tense and in the passive voice. It is translated as "those who have been defiled". The repetition of key vocabulary and concomitant parallel structure, plus the rhetorical technique of assonance, draw attention to what may have been a dominant feature of the aberrant teaching, namely ritual purity. Paul shoots this notion down by convincingly illustrating its futility. The second clause emphasises the hopelessness of the efforts of the false teachers. Their defilement is not merely external but also internal: ἀλλὰ μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις. In other words, they are totally defiled or utterly incapable of purity because their defilement extends to their minds (ὁ νοῦς) and their consciences (ἡ συνείδησις).

In verse 16, Paul's rhetorical strategy involves focusing on the ethical inconsistency of what the opponents are doing. They confess to know God (θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι) but instead they deny God by their works (τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται). The contrast between "to know" and "they are denying" is obvious and intentional. The vilification comes in the form of an accusation that the false teachers are not serving God by their deeds, which is one of the fundamental tenets of Judaism and Christianity (cf. Mathew 7:21). The rhetorical effect of this is to provide the hearers with additional criteria by which to evaluate these false teachers. This final criterium is the most damning of them all, since what the opponents believe about God finds ultimate expression in the way they conduct their lives. In their case, it amounts to a complete denial of the foundational teachings of Christianity and Judaism.

The verse concludes with an instance of polysyndetic *emphatic clustering* to complete this phase of vilification. The illegitimate teachers are βδελυκτοὶ (ὄντες) καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ (πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν) ἀδόκιμοι. The underlined words are all adjectives, masculine, nominative plural and are linked by conjunctions. Contrary to their appearance of purity, Paul describes the false teachers as ἀδόκιμος (abominable or detestable). This interesting word is a New Testament *harpax legomenon*. It denotes that which is an abomination to God (Zodhiates, 1992:330; Mounce, 2000:403). ἀπειθής denotes unwillingness to be persuaded, unbelieving, disobedient (Zodhiates, 1992:549). The last word in the trilogy, ἀδόκιμος, means unapproved, unworthy, spurious or worthless (Zodhiates, 1992:96). An ironic picture concludes this section. Those who profess to know God is considered an abomination (to God). Having earlier referred to them as ἀπίστος, the apostle now uses the word ἀπειθής to express a similar thought but in stronger terms: they are beyond persuasion**.** The final word concludes the picture by accentuating the illegitimacy of these false teachers. The expression πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν is a transitionary device in lieu of the next section and will be developed in the subsequent sections. The point is that such works cannot be expected from the false teachers and also not from those who subscribe to their teaching.

Conclusion

In this section Paul's dominant rhetorical objective has been *to discredit the illegitimate leaders*. His primary rhetorical strategy involves vilification of the opposition. Paul uses several techniques to facilitate his objective, reducing the opposition to a less than human state. Through the technique called *emphatic clustering*, he immediately and directly focuses the attention upon the impostors. This strategy magnifies the illegitimacy of the false teachers and provides justification for the apostolic vitriol that they receive in this section. The vilification is furthermore intensified through techniques like implicit contrasting. The negative qualities of the false teachers follow after the description of the qualifications for elders-overseers. The proximity of the two pictures inevitably encourages the drawing of comparisons between the two groups. Paul goes beyond this to compare the false teachers with everyone else mentioned earlier, including God. This is made possible through the ingenious repetitions of synonyms and antonyms. For example, there is a deliberate play upon the truth-lie dichotomy made possible entirely by the repetition of words like truth, liars and "unlying". The false teachers' lack of commitment to the truth is also highlighted through the repetition of the words "truth" and "the truth".

Alienating language, which involves the use of them-us language, is another technique employed in this section. This has the effect of isolating the false teachers as well as discouraging those believers who might be tempted to embrace the aberrant teaching. In verse 12, Paul draws on external evidence to substantiate his position.

Example is another one of several effective techniques employed in this section. Paul implicitly appeals to the example of the divine character when, through the use of the quote, he calls to mind verse 2 where God is described as one who cannot lie. In this quote, the Cretans are branded as liars. The parallel is glaring.

Paul eventually highlights an aspect of the false teaching that emphasises purity. He exposes the futility of the teaching, by using parallelism and concludes the section with another dose of emphatic clustering, just for emphasis. He also uses the rhetorical technique of assonance and introduces a new concept that he will develop in subsequent sections. This latter tendency is an example of a transitional device, something Paul has consistently done throughout this chapter.

2.2.4 Titus 2:1: Distinguishing Titus as a minister of sound doctrine on the basis of apostolic authorisation

The dominant rhetorical objective in this section is to distinguish Titus as a minister of sound doctrine on the basis of apostolic authorisation. This section follows on from the previous section in which the author discredited the opposition through the rhetorical technique of vilification. Here, he is distinguishing Titus by commending him as a minister of sound doctrine with apostolic endorsement. Furthermore, the mandate of Titus is extended in that he becomes responsible not only for the appointment of office bearers but also for the disbursement of sound doctrine to the believers. Titus is thus presented here as one who is qualified to teach the church as opposed to the opposition (1:11).

The ministry of Titus is set apart from that of the false teachers in various ways. To achieve this task, the apostle uses several linguistic markers. First, there is the emphatic placement of the second person singular personal pronoun σύ at the beginning of the sentence, together with the adversative conjunction δέ. While marking off the section as separate from the previous one, it also contrasts Titus' ministry by drawing attention to the apostolic imperative from which his ministry originates. If someone from Crete were to ask "Why are you teaching these things to us?" Titus could answer, "The apostle Paul commanded me to". Next, Titus is commanded to "speak", λαλέω. This is an interesting word choice. The false teachers were "teaching", διδάσκοντες (1:11). So, why does Paul not instruct Titus to "teach" (διδάσκω)? Why this change of vocabulary? Could it be that he wants to create some distance between Titus, here representing legitimate ministry and the false teachers who represent illegitimate ministry? Another option is that the close proximity to the remaining words in the sentence could have distorted the meaning of particularly διδασκαλία. Thus, he appears to be protecting the distinctive or technical sense of the word διδασκαλία. Alternatively, the variation of vocabulary might have been intended to avoid redundancy. This is an example of the rhetorical technique paranomasia (word play). A third marker is the use of the plural of the neuter relative pronoun, ἃ. This pronoun has an immediate correlation to the false teachers who, according to 1:11, teaches ἃ μὴ δεῖ. Rhythmically, with reference to metre, as well as aurally, with reference to assonance of the vowel α, and the diphthong ει, the relation between the words in their different contexts is undeniable. A hearer would immediately have picked up this similarity of sound and noticed the intended difference between what is said to Titus and what is said about the false teachers. Titus, unlike the false teachers must speak, ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ. Interestingly, the expression ἡ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλία is here reversed, when compared to its first occurrence in 1:9. Furthermore, the first time these two words appear together is in the context of elders-overseers, who must παρακαλέω the teaching. Now, Titus shares that responsibility as he must λάλεω it. Here, repetition is used to establish a positive association. The parallel between the verbs used is also unmistakable. Thus, Titus and the elders-overseers are shown to be allies or associates, while the false teachers are shown to be aliens. Purely through the choice of vocabulary, the apostle manages to distinguish the ministry of Titus and the elders-overseers from that of the false teachers through the ingenious combination of the neuter article and an expression used earlier with reference to another set of validated ministers of the church: ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ.

Conclusion

This section appears upon a first inspection to be addressed to Titus. However, from a rhetorical angle, the manner in which the apostle ties this section to the preceding one suggests that a wider audience is intended. The opening sentence is directed *to distinguish Titus and what he does* as the apostolic delegate among the Cretan believers (cf. 1:5). This is the dominant rhetorical objective of this section. More importantly though, is the fact that this verse also introduces the notion of healthy doctrine. In the next section (2:2-10), the concept of healthy doctrine will be developed in a comprehensive sense. The doctrine of the false teachers has been discredited in the previous section and their profession of faith was shown to be nothing more than hot air because of their works (1:16). The false teachers were teaching "things not necessary" (1:11). Titus is distinguished as one entitled to teach something very specific, namely "things fitting for sound doctrine". In this section, Paul is simply "backing" or validating his man. The rhetorical techniques used in this section include: paronomasia, metre, assonance, emphatic use of pronouns and repetition.

2.2.5 Titus 2:2-10: Persuading the Cretans that personal conduct compliant with sound doctrine is compulsory and should characterise all believers

The dominant rhetorical strategy of this section is to persuade the Cretans that personal conduct compliant with sound doctrine is compulsory and should characterise all believers. Sound doctrine is given its fullest explanation in this section. In this section, Paul's objective is to give substance to the notion of sound doctrine. In other words, it sets out to answer the question: What does sound doctrine *look* like?" Paul correlates sound doctrine to the manifestation of right behaviour. Earlier, in 1:10-16, right behaviour was shown to be the key indicator of a genuine profession of faith in God (1:10-16). The false teachers by their deeds are denying God; conversely, believers by their deeds must confess God. Thus, the inseparable correspondence between deeds and sound doctrine is at the heart of Paul's rhetorical objective in this section. The author makes extensive use of the rhetorical method of implicit contrast to achieve this objective.

The distinction between "sound" and "unsound" is consistently highlighted in this section. The objective involves providing the Cretan believers with reasons why they should embrace sound doctrine rather than the "things" of the false teachers. The text suggests that part of what the apostle is countering in this letter is the tendency among Cretan Christians to tolerate unhealthy teachers. This weakness corroborates the theory of the relative newness of the church of Crete. It appears that they have not yet learnt to discern between healthy and unhealthy teaching and was still in need of instruction in this regard. “Healthy doctrine” is never defined anywhere in this letter. This is probably explicable from the fact that Paul does not seem to treat it as a theoretical concept. Instead, sound doctrine appears to be manifested in practical, personal and public conduct by all believers.

In 2:2-10, Paul delineates the behaviour that will characterise obedience to healthy doctrine as manifested through the lives of different categories of believers. These groups seem to be arranged in a particular order and are clearly cordoned off from each other. In a footnote, Hendriksen (1957:363) draws attention to the rhetorical technique of a chiastic arrangement of the first four groups in this section:

older men (2:2)	older women (2:3)
young women (2:4-5)	young men (2:6)

In verses 2-5, the author describes what behaviour fitting for sound doctrine looks like for older men, older women and younger women. This is followed by a purpose statement in the form of a ἵνα-clause. In verses 6-7 he deals with the behaviour of young men and of Titus, also followed by a ἵνα-clause. The behaviour of slaves is the final social category (2:9-10) and this too is followed by a ἵνα-clause. The section thus comprises verses 2-10 and is further subdivided by three ἵνα-clauses. The list is general and comprehensive.

2.2.5.1 The behaviour of older men

In verse 2, Paul directs attention to the conduct of older men in the congregation that will comply with sound doctrine. Here the noun πρεσβύτης (older man) appears, while earlier (1:5) its adjectival form, namely πρεσβυτέρος, is used to refer to an officer of the church. The change in terminology suggests that this group is distinct from the leaders mentioned previously. Fee (1988:185) argues that the agreement between the characteristics for elder-overseers and older men could be attributed to the fact that the former would be appointed from latter group. Nevertheless, the language suggests that as members of the church older men are expected to manifest observable behaviour that confirms their standing as legitimate believers. Through the repetition of a similar word, the idea is communicated that there ought to be congruency between the behaviour of older men in the church and that of the leaders and vice versa. Thus, by their conduct, older men will confirm their allegiance to the teaching of those ministering to the church.

Next, the apostle employs *shared knowledge* as he lists the reasonable, expected conduct of those associated with the church. These constitute borrowings from secular society (Towner, 1994:236; Dibelius & Conzelmann, 1972:50-51). They must be νηφαλίοι, σεμνοί, σώφρονοι and ὑγιαίνοντες. The first and third adjectives communicate the idea of sensibleness, self-control, and sobriety. σεμνός refers to the dignified conduct of an elderly man in society and the church. Through the use of the adjective σώφρονος, this section is tied to the virtues associated with elders-overseers (cf. 1:8) in the same way that Titus is associated with the elders-overseers through the words ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλία.

The participle ὑγιαίνοντες is the fourth quality in this list and is modified by three nouns that are all dative, feminine and singular: τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῃ. This is another instance of asyndetic *emphatic clustering*. Paul expects older men to manifest spiritual health or wholeness. In 1:13, Titus must rebuke false teachers that they may be “sound in the faith” (ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει). The same thing is expected of older men: ὑγιαίνοντες τῇ πίστει. This parallel expression signifies an instance of implicit *contrast* being made between the older men and the false teachers. The latter might become “sound” or “healthy” only after severe rebuke. The older men on the other hand, are “sound” or “healthy” as a result of legitimate teacher(s) who must λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλία. Older men must also be healthy in love and perseverance. The combination of these positive qualities appears to balance the citation with the three negative traits in 1:12. These qualities are therefore, presented as commendable, made almost desirable. Thus, legitimate teaching is presented in a very positive light through the use of these rhetorical devices. The rhetorical objective is evidently to motivate the believers to manifest behaviour that gives evidence of their compliance to ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ.

The participle of ὑγιαίνω is used in all three instances thus far, namely 1:9, 2:1 and 2:2. This is an instance of direct repetition. Sound doctrine ought to manifest as soundness that will in turn affect other areas of the individual life. The intention behind these lists is to provide criteria for the kind of behaviour that would be viewed as evidence for compliance to sound doctrine by older men. It communicates the following notion: "Older men, if you really are obedient to sound doctrine you will behave in these particular ways. If you are not behaving in these ways, it must be reasonably concluded that you are not obedient to sound doctrine". Paul is not suggesting that the older men are leaders though. As was said about elders-overseers, the lists constitute what is called *shared knowledge* although is highly likely that local leaders were selected from this category (Fee, 1988:185, Towner, 1994:236; Dibelius & Conzelmann, 1972:50-51). The positive qualities enunciated here were qualities that the broader society considered commendable. Paul however, attributes such behaviour to the influence of sound teaching and expects that the older men by their conduct must manifest submission to sound teaching. Here. the audience is presented with behaviour that complies with sound doctrine and that would be considered good by the rest of society.

2.2.5.2 The behaviour of older women

In verse 3, older women (πρεσβῦτις) are required to manifest behaviour compliant with sound doctrine. The adverb ὡσαύτως relates this sentence to the previous one. For older women, compliance to sound doctrine involves their behaviour or demeanour (καταστήμα). The *hapax legomenon*, ἱεροπρεπής, refers to religious conduct or behaviour. It means "to act like a sacred person" (Zodhiates, 1992:762). While these lists are also examples of "shared knowledge", they undergo a change in the hand of the apostle. This is brought about, here and elsewhere, through the use of special religious language. The word ἱεροπρεπής is a case in point. According to Collins (2002:341), it was used by classical authors to describe "priests and priestesses, religious processions and the like". The author goes on to emphasise this characteristic by immediately restating it with a double negative, namely μὴ διάβολοι and μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμέναι. Both are observable behaviour and where they are lacking such a person cannot be said to be ἱεροπρεπής. Hence, they would not be manifesting compliance to sound doctrine. Paul employs these lists to establish objective criteria by which to measure a profession of faith in God. Changed lives that benefit society are the only evidence to demonstrate the effect of healthy teaching. Finally, older women must also be καλοδιδάσκαλοι. This compound word is made up of the word καλός (good) and διδάσκαλος (teacher). It is another instance of the rhetorical technique called paranomasia. It repeats a similar idea following on from the immediate context of 2:1 and links it to earlier sections (1:9, 10). Older women must therefore be "teachers of what is good". Older women who qualify are hereby authorised to teach. They would be recognised as legitimate teachers in the church, although it would appear to be in a limited capacity. Interestingly, the privilege to teach is made subject to the fulfilment of prior criteria and thus comes at the end of the list. This same principle applies to elders-overseers who can only teach (παρακαλεῖν) if they have proven themselves in their family and private lives (1:5-9). Older women, likewise, are authorised to teach in so far as they themselves demonstrate their willingness to be taught. By way of *implicit contrast*, older women are distinguished from false teachers, since the latter are unauthorised to teach and "upset whole families" (1:11), while the former are authorised to "teach what is good". Paul employs the same argument here as in the case of older men. The behaviour that older women are expected to manifest, are considered to be both Christian, as well as behaviour that society associates with older women.

2.2.5.3 The behaviour of younger women

In verse 4, older women are made responsible to teach younger women (αἱ νέαι). The verb σωφρονίζωιν is present active subjunctive, third person plural.

The subject is the older women. This is another interesting vocabulary switch or *use of alternative vocabulary*. Titus must speak (λάλεω), and older women on the other hand must advise, encourage or urge (σωφρονίζω). Thus, neither Titus nor the older women must διδάσκω like the false teachers (1:11). The rhetorical objective seems to be the maintenance of a gap between legitimate and illegitimate teachers, or to avoid confusing associations between the opposing groups. More importantly though, is the focus area of the teaching, namely the family. The illegitimate teachers with their "things" (ἁ) had a subversive effect upon ὅλοι οἴκοι (1:11). In contradistinction, legitimate teaching proves to be to the advantage of families. As was mentioned elsewhere (cf. 81), Greco-Roman culture placed great significance on stable family institutions. According to Johnson (1996:235), Christian households that ignored the mores of civil society could jeopardise the credibility of the Christian message. The apostle begins by emphasising the husband-wife and parent-child relationships (4). The family focus is perpetuated throughout this sentence, verse 5, through the use of words like οἰκουργός that contains the words οἰκός and ἐργός. This emphasis confirms the belief surrounding the importance of the family unit to the Cretans. The prior vilification section and this reference to the family, suggest that people were judged based on their commitment to the progress or destruction of the family unit. The behaviour commended in verse 4 would constitute a strong argument in favour of complying with sound doctrine.

Through the *repetition of key words*, the author is able to maintain a sense of coherence and momentum in the discourse. Such a word is the word σώφρων. The verbal cognate appears with reference to older women σωφρονίζωσιν. The adjective also appears in the virtue lists pertaining to older men (2:2) and elders-overseers (1:8).

The reference to younger women also comprises a list of virtuous qualities that constitute *shared knowledge*. However, Paul adapts the list to achieve theological objectives through the use of religious language. For example, ἁγνός constitutes such religious language. Particular sounds and words are also intentionally repeated for emphatic effect. For example, the words τὰς νέας (φιλάνδρους εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους) σώφρονας ἁγνὰς (οἰκουργοὺς) ἀγαθάς, and ὑποτασσομένας all give evidence of the deliberate repetition of the ας-sound. The same holds true for the ους -sound in φιλάνδρους (εἶναι), φιλοτέκνους (σώφρονας ἁγνὰς) οἰκουργοὺς ἀγαθάς.... The word φίλος appears in the two compound nouns φιλάνδρους and φιλοτέκνους and emphasises endearment within the family context. The prefix φίλος, is another instance of anaphora used earlier with reference to the elders-overseers (cf. 1:8). A definite link is established between the sound behaviour of the younger women and the conduct of the elders-overseers. When these women conduct themselves in their homes in compliance to sound doctrine, their behaviour places them in company with those who teach and obey sound doctrine. No one in the audience would suggest that a wife feel any different about her husband and her children. Who would be able to discredit teaching that encourages behaviour reflecting such an elevated view of the family; that encourages its adherents to serve it; that encourages a view of the family institution that even secular society aspires after? It would be extremely difficult to resist being persuaded to adopt behaviour fitting for sound doctrine.

Verse 4 introduces another angle from which Paul argues for compliance to sound doctrine. He has argued on the basis of shared knowledge that the behaviour characteristic of sound doctrine is behaviour that the rest of society values. The behaviour is however, more than simple compliance to human expectations. God expects those who believe in Him to manifest this particular kind of behaviour! The ἵνα-clause functions to distinguish the virtue lists from any secular lists. Arguing on the basis of divine authorisation, Paul shows that God expects His followers to behave in a specific manner so that His word will not be maligned, ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημῆται. Paul's argument is that the expected behaviour is of a transcendent quality, being behaviour that God requires. The consequence for non-compliant behaviour is also transcendent in nature, namely the maligning of the divine word. Thus, the relationship between sound doctrine and sound deeds is ultimately transcendent and presented as inseparable. Wrong behaviour will impact negatively upon the ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. In other words, more is at stake than simply the good reputation of individuals. The very reputation of the word of God, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, depends upon the manifestation of proper behaviour by believers, especially by young wives in submission to their husbands. Just like Paul was entrusted with the manifest word of God (1:3), so now the Cretan believers are required to manifest the word of God through godly character. If they would not, God's word would be discredited (βλασφημέω) in the eyes of outsiders. The divine nature of the consequences attached to this teaching makes it necessary that believers behave in accordance to sound doctrine.

2.2.5.4 The behaviour of young men

Verse 6 is related to the previous category through the adverb ὡσαύτως. Thus, everything said so far also applies to young men, νεωτέροι, whom Titus must "exhort" (παρακάλει). The verb παρακάλει is another instance of a direct repetition of a word used earlier with reference to the task of elders-overseers (1:9). It accentuates the proximity between Titus and the overseers and supports the idea of Titus functioning as role model to the elders. Titus must exhort the young men to σωφρονεῖν. This is also an instance of repetition of a similar word. Earlier, a cognate of this verb was used in connection with the role of older women who must σωφρονίζω younger women.

2.2.5.5 The behaviour of Titus

The teaching is extended in verse 7 to Titus who must "present himself" (σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος) as "an example" (τύπος) of "good works" (καλά ἔργά). The latter expression takes up a similar expression introduced in 1:16 as ἔργον ἀγαθὸν. The two words are close synonyms. The implicit contrast is undeniable: Titus, as a τύπος καλῶν ἔργων, must distinguish himself from those who are "worthless for any good work", πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι (1:16). The repetition of the adjective πάς is emphatic and suggests the perpetuation of the contrast between the two opposing groups. Another direct repetition occurs in the word διδασκαλία, which here is part of a prepositional phrase, in regard to which Titus must be incorruptible (ἀφθορία).

The combination of three nouns, of which two are modified, is another instance of *emphatic clustering*. The trio comprises the nouns ἀφθορία, σεμνότης and λόγος ὑγιής, which are here modified by the adjective ἀκατάγνωστος (irreproachable). The minister of legitimate teaching must be unmistakably distinguishable from the illegitimate teachers. A more important implication is this: even Titus is not above sound teaching. His life must correspond to the doctrine. This is totally in line with everything that has been taught so far in this letter.

As in verse 5, where the integrity of the teaching (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) was tied to the conduct of submissive wives, so in the case of Titus the integrity of the teachers are tied to the example of Titus. The second ἵνα-clause alludes to opposition (ἐξ ἐναντίας) who would be put to shame (ἐντρέπω) and prevented from saying bad things about the legitimate teachers. Most commentators understand this sentence to refer to Paul and Titus only. But it begs the question as to whether Titus, who is introduced as a "son" of the apostle, would behave in a manner that would compromise the integrity of the mission and even that of the apostle. A conclusion in the negative seems more probable, coupled with the suggestion that the pronoun ἡμεῖς, represents the entire Christian movement. The use of the pronoun is a rhetorical technique to facilitate identification; to engender the "us-them" sentiment. The apostle speaks as an insider. In this way, he is in effect saying that if they (the opposition) bad-mouth you, they bad-mouth me. This part of the sentence also evinces assonance of the ϵ-sound: "… ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐντραπῇ μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν …". This is for emphatic purposes, to highlight the serious consequences of compromising conduct. Believers must conduct themselves in compliance with sound doctrine because the apostle expects this behaviour from them. This constitutes an argument based upon apostolic authorisation.

2.2.5.6 The behaviour of slaves

In verses 9-10 the behaviour of Christian slaves (δούλοι) is addressed. There are several instances of direct repetition from earlier sections that ties this section to the content of the entire discourse. It includes the following words: δοῦλος (1:1), ὑποτάσσω (2:4), ἀντιλέγω (1:9), πᾶς (1:15, 16; 2:7), πίστος (1:1, 4, 6, 9, 13; 2:2), ἀγαθός (1:16; 2:5), διδασκαλία (1:9, 11; 2:1, 7), σωτῆρ (1:3, 4), θεός (1:1 – twice, 7, 16; 2:5), and the expression σωτήρ ἡμῶν θεός (1:3). The rhetorical significance of this extensive repetition lies in the parallels and comparisons that are drawn through it. It is also important for the cohesion of this unit.

Paul introduced himself as a δούλος in 1:1. This self-signification softens any negative connotation associated with this word. In fact, it places the master-slave relationship in a positive light, thus serving an ameliorative purpose. Furthermore, Paul's identification with those at the bottom end of the social ladder would do much to commend him and especially the content of this letter to the congregation. On another level, Paul takes the place of a role model as he demonstrates his obedience to God. There is therefore, a sense in which Paul is speaking here, not as a high-handed apostle, but rather as a fellow slave in submission to the great Master. It is from this perspective that he can "urge" slaves in the congregation to follow his example. The rest of the congregation would be hard pressed to reject those who are lower in the social order, since they would then have to reject even Paul. Thus, through the use of this word, the apostle is facilitating harmony within the congregation.

Slaves must "submit" (ὑποτάσσω) to their (own) masters in the same way that younger women are expected to "submit" (ὑποτάσσω) to their (own) husbands (2:4). By contrast, the false teachers have been vilified as ἀνυπότακτοι (1:10). Through paronomasia, Paul establishes on the one hand, a positive connection between the various groups of believers while on the other hand facilitating a contrast with the opposition. The paranomasia maintains the polarity between those who are "sound" and those who are "unsound". Paul makes a very persuasive case for the adoption of sound doctrine and the resultant compliant behaviour since sound doctrine manifests as ὑποτάσσω, while false doctrine manifests as behaviour vilified as ἀνυπότακτος. The audience must choose. Another word that was used to describe the opposition is repeated in this address to slaves, namely ἀντιλέγω. The repetition serves a similar objective as the earlier word, namely to discourage such behaviour by drawing the parallel with the false teachers. This is an instance of negative role modelling or stigmatisation. By associating this word with the opposition, it becomes negative; an attitude or behaviour that must be avoided. Paul does the same, in a positive sense, through the word δούλος.

While the false teachers are "worthless for any good work" (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι), the slaves must "show/demonstrate all good faith" (πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένοι ἀγαθήν). The disparity between the two groups is intensified by the work-faith antithesis. Slaves who obey the legitimate teaching demonstrate by that their alliance to "*the* faith". The rhetorical objective is to alienate the false teachers through stigmatisation and to attract the believers through positive association with those who demonstrate compliance to sound doctrine by good behaviour.

The third ἵνα-clause, 2:9 is positive, unlike the previous two (2:5, 6) that are phrased in such a way as to discourage the negative consequences of non-compliance to sound doctrine. God expects behaviour compliant to sound doctrine, because it "adorns" or "beautifies" (κοσμέω) the teaching of God (ἡ διδασκαλία ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ). This is the third example of an argument based upon divine authorisation. The triple repetition of this argument is in itself an emphatic strategy. It emphasises the truth that these behavioural characteristics are mandatory, not primarily because the rest of society expects it, but rather because God expects people to behave in these ways.

The apostle reserves the highest commendation for the lowest sector of society by ascribing to them the honour of adorning the doctrine of God. The divine nature of the teaching is emphasised by referring to it as belonging to or originating from God (τοῦ … θεοῦ). This reference to God takes up a theme introduced in the salutation. In the present instance, it serves as a transitionary device that will be developed in the subsequent section. In this way, the apostle systematically ties the various sections together into a unified whole.

The exhortation, to adorn the doctrine of God, is a beautiful variation of rhetorical strategy. When one wants to persuade, it is good to present a positive challenge to people that encourages the desired outcome instead of merely speaking in prohibitory tones.

There is clearly a parallel between the reference in 2:5 to ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ and ἡ διδασκαλία … τοῦ … θεοῦ. On the one hand, the expressions are synonymous. On the other hand, they reveal a contrast and progression within the section. In the respective sentences, the verbs that are employed progress from negative (βλασφημέω) to positive (κοσμέω). Additionally, there is development in the theological dimension of the two sentences. The reference τοῦ θεοῦ in 2:5, becomes σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ. Finally, the presence of the personal pronoun is an instance of inclusive language or the "us-them" reference. Again, Paul cannot be understood to imply that God is only the Saviour of himself and Titus. Everything that has been said about the apostle's use of vocabulary militates against such a narrow interpretation. There appears therefore, to be an evident theological progression that will climax in the next section. It is as if Paul has not said everything he wants to say; he wants to ground the teaching expressed in chapter 2. This is exactly what he is going to do in the ensuing section.

Conclusion

In this section, the dominant rhetorical strategy is *to persuade the Cretans that personal conduct compliant with sound doctrine is compulsory and should* *characterise all believers*. The comprehensive nature of sound doctrine is demonstrated by applying it to various sectors of the social strata of Crete. Even Titus is not excluded from the influence of legitimate teaching.

Two lines of argument are used to achieve the dominant objective. The first argument is based upon the notion of shared knowledge. Christians must manifest the right behaviour because the rest of society also considers such behaviour to be good. The next line of argument is transcendent in nature. The behaviour that believers must manifest is behaviour that God expects from people (5, 6, 9). The repetition of this line of reasoning suggests that the apostle considers it to be more authoritative and binding upon believers. In other words the behaviour that believers must manifest exceeds the maintenance of a good public image - they must live up to the expectations of God!

Through rhetorical techniques like repetition, behaviour compliant with sound doctrine is demonstrated to characterise all believers; thus, the correspondence between the behavioural characteristics of older men and elder-overseers and between Paul being a slave of God and the Christian slaves in Crete. The positive effect of Christian behaviour in the home is negatively contrasted with the damaging effect of false teachers (1:11). Similarly, the behaviour of “teaching what is good” (2:3) spoken about older women is contrasted with the false teachers who “teach things not necessary” (1:11). These techniques maintain the tension between “sound” and “unsound”, forcing the audience to choose a position.

The superiority of legitimate teaching over against illegitimate teaching is a secondary outcome of this section. Thus, sound doctrine must be embraced and the corresponding behaviour must be manifested because it is superior to false doctrine. This superiority is more implicit rather than explicit in the text. Sound teaching benefits the family institution, by respecting the authority of the husband. This is the same argument used with reference to slaves. Furthermore, some *theological progression* is discernible from the references to God and this paves the way for the next section. The expression σωτῆρ ἡμῶν θεοῦ is taken up here, having first appeared in the salutation and serves as a transitionary device that will be developed in the next section.

Other rhetorical techniques used in this section include inclusive language, paronomasia, role modelling and stigmatisation, while the use of implicit contrast occurs constantly.

2.2.6 Titus 2: 11-15: Emphasising the divine basis of obedience to sound doctrine

The dominant rhetorical objective in this section is to emphasise the divine basis of obedience to sound doctrine. In the previous section, Paul highlighted the relationship between sound doctrine and deeds compliant with the doctrine. Deeds corresponding to sound doctrine were shown to comply with the expectations of the rest of society. In verses 5 and 10, he alluded to the transcendent nature of the prescribed behaviour, namely that it is behaviour that God expects from people. He furthermore, emphasised the benefits that legitimate teaching has for the broad spectrum of the congregation as well as the beneficial influence of legitimate teaching upon social institutions like the family and servant-master relationships. Now, Paul is going to proverbially "clinch the deal" by a final argument. He is going to justify the divine expectation for sound behaviour in accordance with sound doctrine by arguing on the basis of the divine origin of this teaching. Not only is the behaviour in line with that which God expects, but so is the doctrine that prescribes the behaviour. Paul is now arguing that God is the one teaching the doctrine, making the doctrine and the behaviour inseparable. The teaching as well as the Teacher are transcendent and must therefore be obeyed because it is not of human origin. It applies, and the Cretans are radically bound to it. In other words, sound doctrine must be obeyed, because it is the exact opposite of "the commandments of men" (1:14). Not to obey the doctrine and therefore not manifesting these particular behavioural characteristics is tantamount to disobedience to God. This is the point that Paul develops in this section.

Verses 11-14 are one sentence in the original Greek. This is the second unusually long sentence in this letter. The use of such a long sentence is in itself a strategic rhetorical technique used to emphasise the material communicated by it. Fee (1988:193) calls it a “marvellous passage” with “so much theological grist that it is easy to analyze it solely on its own merits and thereby overlook its place in the context of the letter”. Most commentators appear not to see any relationship between the theological references in verses 5 and 9 and those in the present section but correctly recognise the theological import of the section and its explanatory function with regard to 2:2-10 (Mounce, 2000:433; Quinn, 1990: 162; Johnson, 1996:240-241). The section is related to the previous section by the use of the conjunction γάρ, which here functions in an explanatory capacity. A number of linguistic parallels tie these two sections together. For example, the words in verse 10, τοῦ … θεοῦ and the proximate word, σωτήρ, are repeated in verse 11. There is also a transition from τὴν διδασκαλίαν … τοῦ … θεοῦ (2:10) to ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (2:11).

The author employs repetition, unique vocabulary and other rhetorical techniques to accomplish his objectives in this section. The dominant rhetorical objective is to emphasise the theological foundation of the conduct expounded in 2:2-10, by highlighting the divine origin of the teaching. The teaching should be embraced because it is not a human idea.

The best explanation for what Paul is doing in this instance is the analogy of an eavesdropper. Paul is ostensibly in a conversation with Titus. Hultgren (1984:19, 20) describes this as “talking past” Titus to the community. Paul’s conversation with Titus is done, in such a manner as to “invite” or attract others to become part of it. While there is no direct communication with the Cretan believers at any stage in this discourse, they are an integral part of it.

This explains the use of inclusive language, which is perpetuated throughout this section.

2.2.6.1 The universal appearance of grace in the past

In verse 11, the transcendent nature of the teaching that mandates the behaviour is emphasised first. The transformation that the Cretans are required to manifest (2-10) is explicable with reference to the appearance of the saving grace of God (Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος ...). It appeared to all men (πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις), including the Cretans at some point in the past, as suggested by the aorist tense of the verb ἐπιφαίνω. The universal appearance and inclusiveness of divine grace is a key emphasis in this part of the sentence. Furthermore, the combination of the verb ἐπιφαίνω, and the adjective πάς, suggests that this event was neither a clandestine occasion nor limited to a particular group. According to Quinn (1990:163), the expression πάς ἄνθρωπος is used by Paul outside of the Pastorals for polemical purposes. Thus, the use of the adjective πάς here suggests a polemical purpose against the illegitimate teaching, which may have encouraged mythological, secretive and exclusive tendencies. The immediate context confirms such an interpretation since Paul takes great pains to specify the different categories that can be found in the church. The lowest category, namely "slaves", is presented positively being afforded the privilege to "adorn the doctrine of God" (2:10).

2.2.6.2 The particular instruction of grace in the present

In verse 12, the expression παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς introduces a limitation. The participle form of the verb παιδεύω is present active. Thus, grace continues to instruct in the present. Grace now, at present, instructs, παιδεύω, only a very particular group, namely "us". Again, this cannot merely refer to Paul and Titus. Instead, it is another instance of *inclusive language* that includes the "eavesdroppers". By using inclusive language, Paul is clearly showing his approval and submission to this teaching or instruction. He is also in complete community with those who are so instructed. Commentators debate the interpretation of the verb παιδεύω, arguing that it denotes both chastisement or discipline and education (Mounce, 2000:423, 424; Johnson, 1992:241; Quinn, 1990:163, 164). A punitive connotation does not suit the immediate context. Instead, the focus of the chapter is upon instruction or sound doctrine in which case discipline or education is the better interpretation. Thus, grace is now “educating us” (Classen, 2002:58). It is also explicable as an instance of the use of a synonymous expression to differentiate legitimate from illegitimate teaching. Additionally, this verb suggests the notion of family, since instruction would first occur in the family. If this interpretation is tenable, then Paul’s use of the third person pronoun is a good strategy to facilitate identification and community.

A new aspect to Paul’s strategy is the use of personification. He applies this rhetorical technique to the concept of grace, which appeared (11) and now instructs (12) the believers. Kelly (1960:244) does not interpret grace as personified but prefers instead to interpret it as “God’s free favour, the spontaneous goodness by which he intervenes to help deliver men”. The present tense of the verb makes the teaching act (παιδεύω) real, personal and imminent or as Johnson (1996:240) puts it “contemporary and continuous”. Obedience to the instruction becomes obedience to “someone”, rather than something. This is a very persuasive angle. Grace offers the complete opposite of what the false teachers have to offer. This formulation of the proposition makes sound doctrine more appealing and the argument for compliance to it more persuasive. Furthermore, by personifying grace, the notion of accountability is reinforced. Paul’s audience would have been familiar with the concept of discipline and instruction. By phrasing it in this manner, the point that religious obedience demands the same obedience is driven home.

The significance of what grace accomplishes is emphasised through assonance of the α-vowel in verse 12: παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας.

Furthermore, through the direct repetition of the verb ἀρνέομαι the author creates an implicit contrast. Those instructed by grace deny τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, whereas the false teachers are vilified as denying God (1:16). In this way, the diametrical opposition between the two groups is highlighted. The repetition serves to maintain the polarity, keeping the two groups at opposite ends and closing the door for any compromise or endorsement. The word ἀσέβεια constitutes religious language. The antonym, ἀσέβεια is the opposite of εὐσέβεια. Paul's point is that sound doctrine, does not have its origin in man and encourages the denial of ἀσέβεια or, positively, the manifestation of εὐσέβεια in the present life. This argument links up with the salutation where faith and knowledge of "God's elect" is said to be for the purpose of εὐσέβεια (1:1). To thus claim to know God (be instructed by God's grace), requires a denial of everything that would contradict that claim. Thus, the two are mutually exclusive since the students of divine grace cannot manifest both ἀσέβεια and εὐσέβεια.

Paranomasia is also evident from the two cognate words κοσμικάς (12) and κοσμῶσιν (10). The latter verb is a positive action that slaves must perform in regard to the teaching of God and is therefore encouraged. The former relates to the world in a negative sense and must therefore be denied. The paranomasia serves to maintain the polarity between "sound" and "not sound", which leaves the audience with a choice to make.

Another key concern revolves around the difference between legitimate and illegitimate teaching. There is an almost concentric or circular progression detectable with regard to the theme of teaching. Through the use of concentric or circular progression, the dichotomy between legitimacy and illegitimacy is maintained. The progression becomes evident as different 'categories' of legitimate teaching sources are identified. In chapter 1, it includes Paul, Titus and the elders-overseers. In chapter 2, it again includes Titus and extends to the ministry of older women. Finally, the readers are informed about the manifestation of divine grace that appeared and now teaches. There is a sense in which the argument has gone full circle, if we take into consideration the opening verses of the letter where the manifestation of the divine word is mentioned. In the present section, the teaching grace of God is presented as another manifestation of the divine word.

The contrast between that which must be denied and that which must be practiced, is highlighted through the juxtaposition of κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας and σωφρόνως (verse 12). The latter word is another instance of repetition. This word has been used positively throughout the section and in earlier parts of the letter. It now forms part of another *emphatic cluster* along with δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς. Quinn (1990:168) correctly identifies assonance and the rhyming -ῶς of the adverbs, the polysyndeton and the adverbial usage. He proposes that this cluster is clearly emphatic and suggestive of the inseparability of these qualities in Christian living. Thus, in the instruction of grace, the three qualities come together to form a unity characteristic of those who profess to know God. Each of the three words in this cluster has been used previously, but this is the first time they are combined. In this regard, one can almost refer to them as *doubly emphatic*.

In the case of δικαίως, it should be noted that the adjective δίκαιος was used first with reference to elders-overseers (1:8). It now is a characteristic of all who are instructed by grace. Its repetition serves to enhance the identification and community of the students of grace. Thus, if the believers manifest conduct corresponding to sound doctrine they are in community with those identified in 1:5-9 and not with the opposition who are incapable of manifesting δίκαιος.

In the case of εὐσεβῶς, it should be noted that the emphatic repetition and recollection of εὐσέβεια, first raised in 1:1, makes an important point regarding the consistency of the divine intent. The purpose of the apostolic ministry was for the sake of godliness (1:1). The appearance of grace, who instructs "her" students in godliness, emphasises that Paul is not introducing anything new. He expects the Cretans to be in total agreement with the divine mandate. There is absolute consensus between what the apostle is appointed to do and what grace is instructing the believers to do. The fact that the audience can observe this consistency adds to the persuasiveness of Paul's argument.

Paul thus gives "shared knowledge" a theological nuance to the extent that he attributes the manifestation of these virtues in those instructed by grace to a transcendent or a divine act. There is therefore nothing "ordinary" about these characteristics. Johnson (1996:240) in this regard observes "that civilisation, and culture are not necessarily "natural" and that the habits of the heart that build communities of meaning and of meaningful relationships can be forgotten and lost or abused and destroyed. Sometimes, civilisation needs to be taught for the first time to the savage heart or relearned by the heart grown savage". Through "religious language", the theological nature of the appropriate conduct is intensified while, by implicit contrast, the positive qualities are shown to be in direct contrast to the three in the vilification section (1:12). What these and other rhetorical techniques do, is to press home the distinction between "sound" and "not sound" and to impress upon the audience the inseparable relationship between doctrine and deeds: the false teachers are unsound because of their deeds and their deeds are unsound because of their doctrine! Likewise, divine and apostolic authorised teachers are sound because of their deeds and their deeds are sound because of their doctrine.

Another instance of the rhetorical technique "inclusive language" is evident in the verb ζήσωμεν. It includes all of those who are instructed by grace, whose lives give evidence of being lived "sensibly, righteously and godly". The technique enhances the sense of community and presents Paul as one who is teachable and in submission to the instruction of divine grace. Furthermore, it adds to his credibility and facilitates his rapport with the audience.

The temporal phrase, ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, "in the now age", recalls and relates to the reference in the salutation (1:2) about God's divine promise, which was before the ages. This serves to enhance a sense of coherence between the various sections of this letter. More importantly, it is very emphatic about the implications legitimate teaching has for this present life. The sentence demonstrates multiple time dimensions moving from past to present and in verse 13 to future. This heightens the temporal momentum that is evident in this section. The motivation behind this notion is clearly to illustrate to the Cretans that their conduct does not take place in a vacuum. Their positive conduct in the present is attributable to the historical intervention of God.

Verse 13 takes up the future dimension that is also present in the salutation. The ἐλπίς ζωῆς αἰωνίου in 1:2 now becomes ἡ μακαρία ἐλπίς. Paul ties the blessed hope to the fact of the return of Jesus Christ, whom he identifies here as God. The past-present-future time references place the congregation between two appearances: the first was when divine grace appeared in the past; the second appearance will be in the future when Jesus Christ will return. Complying to sound doctrine with corresponding behaviour is not only the wisest option because of its divine origin. Right (or wrong) behaviour has implications for the future: those who manifest compliant behaviour do so because they demonstrate thereby that they have a "blessed hope". Negatively, the implication is that those who do not manifest obedience to the instruction of grace must remember that Jesus Christ is going to appear again in the future. In other words the "now age" is the age of compliance.

The divinity of Jesus Christ relates directly to the salutation. Elsewhere, I have indicated my concurrence with the interpretation that the expression “our great God and Saviour” applies to Jesus Christ. (cf. p. 30). The reference to Jesus as ἡμῶν is another example of “inclusive language”. If Paul’s arguments in chapter 2:2-10 can be described as sociological or even missiological (Collins, 2002:12-13; Karris, 1979:113, 116), his argument in this section can be described as theological. Paul amasses theological terms in this part of the sentence, in order to convince his audience of the transcendent implications of legitimate teaching. The transcendent nature of sound doctrine places it in a class of its own and superior to “Jewish myths and the commandments of men” (1:14). The evidence serves as proof for the insistence upon adherence and submission to sound doctrine. Through the use of inclusive language, Paul demonstrates that he is himself in submission to the teaching and lives as one anticipating the return of Jesus Christ.

Most commentators agree that this section serves to explain the preceding instructions (Demarest, 1984:320; Johnson, 1996:240; Clark, 2002:111). Rhetorically, however, more is involved. Paul is not only saying: "The reason I want you to do this (2-10) is because of this (11-14)." Instead, he is claiming: "The teaching that I want you to embrace and the behaviour I want you to manifest are superior to what those presumptive fellows are trying to sell you. Their teaching originates from a human mind. Just look at the way they live! This doctrine is divine. If you do not accept it, you are in direct opposition to God. It is a choice between teaching that is human and teaching that is divine." It leaves the hearer-reader in the awkward position of having to decide. It offers no neutral grounds.

The vocabulary selected in this section places the emphasis on the uniqueness and the distinctiveness of God's people. There is a sense in which Paul almost indirectly uses the language to pointing to the ideal. He does not tell or specify to the Cretans that they are a special people; that *they* have been chosen of God. Instead, the emphasis appears to be on the notion of privilege to have been chosen by God.

There are in verse 14 two final instances of inclusive language. Jesus is said to have given himself "for us", to redeem "us" (ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ <u>ἡμῶν</u>, ἵνα λυτρώσηται <u>ἡμᾶς</u>). The emphasis in the final verse is on the activity of the divine. Having identified Jesus Christ as God "our Saviour", the sentence goes on to describe what He has done: He gave himself for us, in order that He might save us. This *us* then become a "unique and peculiar people, zealous for good works" (2:14). The reality of the divine intervention thus constitutes the reason why Christians or Cretan believers ought to be characterised by the performance of good works compliant with sound doctrine.

The final reason why the Cretans must manifest the behaviour stipulated in this chapter relates to themselves. They have been changed by the divine intervention, namely the appearance of grace. They have become in Jesus Christ the objects of divine interest, when He gave himself for them (ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). The inclusive language in this part is also emphatic. They are no longer mere Cretans, but the people of God; His own peculiar people (ἑαυτῷ λαός περιούσιος). Their identity and consequently their natures have been changed. They have been made God's own "unique people". This expression reinforces the communal sense prevalent in this section. Thus, when Cretan believers perform good deeds, in other words when they obey the instructions of divine grace, they are acting consistent with their new character. Together with the inclusive language, this becomes a compelling reason to conform, since it is implied that failure to do so has consequences, for example, it could result in exclusion and loss of privileges. God "redeemed" (λυτροόμαι) and "cleansed" (καθαρίζῳ) them "from all lawlessness" (ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας). This is an instance of a divine authorisation argument based on the notion of *the right of the divine* or *the divine prerogative*. God has a right over the Cretans. He purchased them and He cleansed them. By implication therefore, they do not belong to themselves, but to God.

The irony lies in the notion that the Jewish segment of the false teachers would probably have wanted to get the Cretans to submit to the law of ritual purity. Here, Paul stresses that it is God who cleanses from lawlessness. Hence, they can no longer act in a way that contradicts all that they have become through Jesus Christ. In fact, they should be "zealous for good works" (ζηλωτὴς καλῶν ἔργων). The argument is based on the notion of *irreconcilable conduct*. This is the opposite of the false teachers (and their disciples) who are "worthless for any good work" (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι). The choice is clear: whether you are of God or not of God will be shown by your works. The contrast could not be more blatant than this.

The section closes with the apostle reiterating his affirmation of Titus' ministry. In 2:15 the apostle reaffirms the ministry of Titus. The sentence is a more developed and emphatic rejoinder to verse 1. Opening with ταῦτα (these things) it reveals another *emphatic cluster*: λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε.

The demonstrative pronoun, ταῦτα, functions *vis a vis* the relative pronoun in 1:11. The false teachers teach "things" and do so without authorisation. Titus, however, is authorised to teach and is told what to teach. This affirmation not only involves affirming Titus; instead it involves the apostolic affirmation of sound doctrine. The congregation has just been instructed not only to manifest but also to identify and evaluate sound doctrine; they have been reminded what sound doctrine "looks" like. The reference is clearly to the content of chapter 2. Paul seems to be saying: "Anyone who does not teach 'these things' that Titus will be teaching is not a teacher of sound doctrine. Beware!"

All the verbs in the emphatic cluster are in the present tense and in the imperative mood. They can also be considered *doubly emphatic* because each one is repeated throughout the letter. Their occurrence here is exceptional since they all appear together in one sentence.

The first verb, λάλει, links the concluding and opening sentences of this chapter thereby forming a tidy border around the teaching section. The next verb, παρακάλει, is a repetition from 1:9 and 2:6. The latter reference is also applicable to Titus. The former occurs as part of the duties of elders and correlates the ministry of Titus to that of elders-overseers. The only way elders are going to know how to perform this ministry is by observing Titus. The final of the trio, ἔλεγχε, occurs in 1:9 and in 1:13. As with the previous word, ἔλεγχε, also links the ministry of Titus to that of the elder-overseers (1:9). Both occurrences of the word appear in the context of rebuking the opposition, first by the elder-overseers (1:9) then by Titus (1:13). Thus, by means of this verbal association, ministerial parallels are drawn between Titus' ministry and that of the future leaders of the church at Crete.

The prepositional phrase, μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς, is a further validation of Titus' mandate at Crete. The word ἐπιταγή recalls what was said earlier (1:3) with reference to God. It seems to suggest that just like Paul was commanded by God, that is, by divine authorisation, so now by apostolic authorisation, Titus must exercise all command or authority.

The final command, μηδείς σου περιφρονείτω, is an instance of tautology. Paul is restating the same thing in different words, that is, negatively, for the purpose of emphasis. Wendland (1999:338) argues that the expression is intended to reinforce the authority with which Titus is expected to execute his ministry in Crete. It is clear that the rhetorical objective in verse 15 is the apostolic reaffirmation of Titus' ministry in the Cretan context.

Conclusion

In this section, Paul's dominant rhetorical objective is *to emphasise the divine basis of obedience to sound doctrine*. His argument is based upon the divine origin of the right teaching. The appearance of the grace of God was the watershed moment in the lives of the Cretans. The historical intervention of the divine is emphasised through the use of time references. The past–present–future perspectives contribute to the sense of temporal momentum that permeates the letter. It also provides a context for the conduct that is enjoined upon the believers. They must demonstrate in the present the required behaviour because something happened in the past. They continue in this behaviour because of something else that will happen in the future, namely the return of the Lord Jesus Christ. The basic arguments rallied involve irreconcilable conduct and the divine prerogative or the right of the divine. In terms of the former argument, the Cretans are compelled to act in accordance to their new natures. In the case of the latter argument, God has a right over the Cretans and can therefore dictate His required conduct to them.

The origin of this teaching lies in the divine, since grace itself is teaching the believers. The usual rhetorical techniques in this section include inclusive language, implicit contrasting, emphatic clustering and religious language.

Another technique is personification, by means of which grace is presented as the one teaching all believers. The word “teach”, παιδεύω, is a totally new and distinctive word that suggests the notion of family.

Having dealt with issue of origin, Paul proceeds in the same sentence to insist upon compliance to the teaching based on the argument of the *divine prerogative*. Christ gave Himself for them, purchased them and cleansed them. By implication therefore, they do not belong to themselves anymore. God has a right to require specific behaviour from those whom He has made his own.

Paul proceeds by arguing for compliant behaviour based on the notion of irreconcilable *conduct*. Through divine intervention, the Cretan believers have been changed and therefore their behaviour must testify to this transformation. They are now God’s people, recipients of His favour. Consequently, a propensity towards good works should be the natural manifestation of this reality. Through the combination of the communal reference God’s “unique people”, and inclusive language, the author exploits the desire to belong. Negatively, it amounts to use of the fear of exclusion to enforce compliant behaviour. The persuasive effect of this strategy is that the hearers would be more inclined to demonstrate compliant behaviour. They are not given any options. The argument is presented in such a compelling manner that no compromises are possible; no neutral ground is offered. Sound doctrine is of transcendent origin, while the false teaching comes from man. Behaviour contrary to what grace teaches is behaviour that God does not approve. Believers presently live between the two appearances both of which have implications for their lives. The section concludes with a final apostolic affirmation of Titus’ ministry as well as that of the elders. This is effected through the doubly emphatic cluster, which draws close parallels between the ministries of Titus and elder-overseers.

2.2.7 Titus 3:1-2: Persuading the Cretans of the compulsory treatment of all unbelievers in a manner consistent with sound doctrine

Several commentators consider this section as a continuation of the instructions given in 2:1-10 (Johnson, 1996:246; Quinn, 1990:182; Fee, 1988:200; Collins, 2002:356). Mounce (2000:443) even views it as a repetition of 2:1-14. It is, however, possible to view this as a new section that introduces a different rhetorical objective. Paul's dominant rhetorical objective can be summarised as *persuading the Cretans of the compulsory treatment of all unbelievers in a manner consistent with sound doctrine*. Commentators agree that the pronoun αὐτούς refers to all believers. However, Quinn (1990:182) interprets the pronoun as a reference to, what he calls, the Jewish Christian opponents of 1:10, 16. Some differences are however noticeable between these two sections. The earlier section in 2:1-10 distinguished between various categories of believers, with instructions specific to each group. In the present section, the pronoun αὐτούς suggests that the earlier categories are now viewed as the collective group of Cretan believers.

Thus far, Titus has been given many instructions. The verb ὑπομίμνῃσκω, in this instance, indicates another aspect of his ministry as a teacher of sound doctrine. It is also in the imperative second person singular like that of 2:15 and expresses a continuation of the ministry of Titus, who here represents legitimate teaching. The choice of this word to describe an aspect of legitimate teaching could indicate a caution against accepting novel teachings. Paul turns the attention in this section to the whole congregation. The pronoun αὐτούς refers to everyone who was mentioned in chapter 2:1-10. The use of the pronoun signifies a comprehensive expansion of the teaching ministry. Whereas in the previous section the apostle specified particular categories of people, he now includes everyone by the use of the pronoun.

Verses 1-2 are a single sentence in Greek. It contains a list of seven virtues. This is counterbalanced in verse 3 by a list of seven vices. The strategy that the apostle adopts to persuade his audience consists of an argument based on *an appeal to the prior knowledge of his audience* to motivate them to manifest the ensuing list of positive behavioural traits. The verb ὑπομίμνῃσκω represents a possible variation in vocabulary to distinguish the ministry of Titus from that of the false teachers. The function of this verb is open to several interpretive possibilities. It, first of all, seems to introduce another dimension of legitimate teaching, namely "remembering". Next, the use of the verb suggests a polemic against novel teachings. It also suggests the succession of legitimate ministry. In other words, if sound doctrine is consistent and void of novelties, it becomes transmittable from one generation to the next by a succession of teachers. The task of new teachers would therefore involve reminding the congregations. This implies that the audience is expected to be familiar with the teaching, since one reminds people of things that they already know. In other words, they have had prior exposure to the instructions that are about to follow, having already received instruction in it. It is as if the apostle is saying, "Here are things that people already know but need to be reminded of again". In 1:13, Titus had to ἐλέγχειν αὐτούς, with particular reference to the false teachers. In the present sentence, the verb ὑπομίμνῃσκω has as its direct object the pronoun αὐτούς. Titus is hereby authorised to take up the task of reminding the believers. He is given the responsibility to continue what someone else has begun. This is therefore another instance of apostolic affirmation of Titus' ministry, through the use of an alternative verb in the imperative mode.

The choice of the verb demands further explanation. "Remind them" implies knowledge pre-existent or known beforehand to the hearers. In other words, at some stage, when they were first exposed to the gospel, the Cretans were exposed to this information. It thus constitutes an argument based on the existence of prior knowledge or an argument based on the appeal to memory. This argument emphasises the temporal priority of legitimate teaching that the Cretans were initially exposed to, over against the illegitimate teaching, which must have come afterwards. This argument thus puts the hearers in a position to evaluate the veracity of the legitimate teaching. They are able to measure what they are being taught now with what they have been taught previously. The motive could be to prove the consistency of legitimate teaching over against the implied inconsistency of illegitimate teaching. Thus, by implication, the Cretans have been practising legitimate teaching all along, and are now in danger of forsaking that which they have embraced. If the Cretans do not embrace and practise sound doctrine, they are implicitly acting against themselves. Their behaviour would be interpreted as self-contradictory.

Another interpretation would be to view it as a polemic against illegitimate teaching. The latter could have encouraged the people, namely the Cretans to conduct themselves in a manner contrary to the good conduct that is being advocated in this section. Whatever the content of the illegitimate teaching might have been, its implications may have involved encouraging the believers to conduct themselves in a manner unbecoming of good citizens.

The appeal to prior knowledge relates to knowledge of what is considered positively by the secular society. The believers must, therefore, be reminded of that behaviour which they have known to be commendable and which society admires. They are to make a positive contribution towards society, namely demonstrable submissive conduct. In other words, they must not abandon that conduct which they have known to be good. The discourse suggests the existence of a need to remind the believers lest they make themselves guilty of conduct that would elicit a negative response from the rest of society and government authorities; conduct that would make them appear separatist, exclusivist and insurrectionary since it is to the ἀρχαί ἐξουσίαι that they must submit. This interpretation seems to make the best sense in the present context, and explains the structure of the section: seven virtues (1-2) followed by seven vices (3) with several supportive rhetorical techniques, including asyndeton, direct repetition, assonance and paranomasia.

Believers must submit to the ἀρχαί ἐξουσίαι. Commentators struggle with the asyndeton here. This leaves them to interpret the two nouns very differently.

Most commentators treat ἐξουσίαι as modifying ἀρχαί, translating it as "governing/ government authorities" or "legitimate rulers" (Quinn, 1990:178; Fee, 1988:201; Collins, 2002:357). Some commentators supply a conjunction and treat the two adjectives as separate, for example, "rulers and authorities" (Johnson, 1996:245). Bernard (1980 [1899]:176) translates this literally as "to rulers, to authorities". There would be no need to add a conjunction since the absence of the conjunction conforms to the structure of this entire section. Furthermore, asyndeton is a rhetorical technique used regularly in this letter.

The absence of conjunctions in both lists is rather conspicuous. The asyndeton is for emphatic purposes. It accentuates the interrelatedness or inseparableness of the various elements that make up these lists. The cohesiveness is enhanced by the use of the infinitive mode in the first five verbs of verses 1 and 2: ὑποτάσσεσθαι, πειθαρχεῖν, εἶναι, βλασφημεῖν and εἶναι. The list is completed with two adjectives namely ἐπιεικεῖς and πραΰτητα.

The relationship between believers and the governing authorities is one that ought to be characterised by submission on the part of believers. The verb ὑποτάσσεσθαι is an instance of paranomasia and a repetition from 2:5 and 2:9. Just as in the context of the home, the wife's relationship to her husband is characterised by submission and in the context of employment the servant's relationship is characterised by submission to the master, so in the context of society the believer's relationship to government authorities must be characterised by submission. The progression in the theme of submission is remarkable when considered in the light of 2:1-3:1. It involves the distinct realms where submission is required, namely in the home, then in the workplace, culminating with submission in the public sector. Then there is progression in the three levels of recognised authority: first to a husband, then to a master, and finally to governing authorities. There is also progression in regard to the sectors from which submission can be expected: Christian wives, Christian slaves and Christian citizens. Thus, irrespective of whether you are a wife or a slave, a Christian must demonstrate submission to all authority. Paradoxically, the false teachers are described as ἀνυπότακτοι (1:10) while the children of elders-overseers must not manifest this characteristic (1:6). A compound noun, it has as its root the word ὑποτάσσω. The paranomasia serves to facilitate an implicit contrast between those who manifest submission and those who manifest rebellion. Thus, sound doctrine can only lead to ὑποτάσσω, while illegitimate ministry can only encourage behaviour that is ἀνυπότακτος, which is behaviour that society in general would condemn.

The next infinitive, πειθαρχεῖν, is another instance of paranomasia. The antonym, ἀπειθής (1:16) was used in the context of false teachers. Furthermore, the noun ἀρχή occurring in the first part of the sentence is also present in the verb πειθαρχέω. By using paranomasia, the author contrasts the dispositions of the false teachers and believers, perhaps with specific emphasis upon their relationship to authority. Whereas previously, the implicit contrasts were being drawn between legitimate teachers and illegitimate teachers, now it is illegitimate teachers and legitimate believers that are being contrasted. The separation between legitimate and illegitimate is thus being maintained.

The expression, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἑτοίμους εἶναι, but for the infinitive and the adjective, is an exact replication of a previous prepositional phrase: πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι (1:16). This is also an instance of implicit contrast, between the illegitimate teachers and the legitimate believers. Through implicit contrast, the difference between legitimate and illegitimate is highlighted and maintained. The apostle takes great pains to prevent any blurring of the boundaries between these two opposing sides. Thus, whereas illegitimate teaching renders the one group “worthless for any good work”, legitimate teaching makes believers “ready for every good work”.

In verse 3 the verb βλασφημεῖν is also a repetition from an earlier occurrence, βλασφημῆται in 2:5. This repetition also constitutes paranomasia. Thus, two things ought not to be spoken evil of, namely God's word, and any other person. Interestingly, both instances of this verb appear in close association with the verb ὑποτάσσω. Just as it would be wrong for unbelievers to speak evil of God's word, it would be equally wrong for believers to speak evil of any other person. In fact, evil speaking would put the believer on par with those who speak against the word of God. The adjective μηδείς functions to accentuate the scope of this prohibition, making it applicable to all people – unbelievers and believers alike.

The next two expressions, ἀμάχοι εἶναι (to be uncontentious) and ἐπιεικαί (kind, gentle, tolerant) emphasise the peaceable nature that ought to characterise the believer. It is reminiscent of two synonymous traits associated with elders-overseers in 1:7, namely, μὴ ὀργίλος (not quick tempered) and μὴ πλήκτης (not pugnacious).

The final characteristic, πραΰτης, is emphasised through alliteration of the p-consonant: πᾶσαν (ἐνδεικνυμένους) πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. The participial clause states in a positive manner that which was stated negatively earlier, namely, μηδένα βλασφημεῖν and ἀμάχοι εἶναι. The repetition of the adjective πάς reinforces the mandatory and uncompromising nature of these characteristics. This is further enhanced by the pairing of the antonyms, πάς (all) and μηδείς (none). Thus, any behaviour to the contrary is completely unjustifiable – “all gentleness” to “all people”, without exceptions.

Conclusion

In this section, the dominant rhetorical objective may summarised as an attempt *to persuade the Cretans of the compulsory treatment of all unbelievers in a manner consistent with sound doctrine*. Paul argues on the basis of the *prior knowledge* of or *appealing to the memory of his audience* to convince them to behave in a socially responsible manner towards authorities and society in general. Verses 1-2 comprise behaviour that the audience have known to be commendable; a societal ideal. Implicitly, this appeal seems to be motivated by a concern about the negative influence of illegitimate teaching and the resultant discrediting of the gospel or the Christian movement in

Crete. The appeal to memory is a powerful persuasive strategy because it originates from within the individual.

The section begins with the apostolic endorsement of Titus' ministry through the use of an alternative verb in the imperative mode. Several supportive rhetorical techniques include: asyndeton, direct repetition, assonance and paranomasia. These facilitate intra- and inter-sectional cohesion. The section also evinces an interesting development in the theme of submission through the paranomatic repetition of the verb ὑποτάσσω. In each of the three occurrences of this verb, there is a different subject and indirect object, and increasing spheres of authoritativeness. This technique ties this section to the rest of the letter and highlights the significance of submission in the Cretan context. The emphasis on submission also calls to mind the false teachers, whose behaviour is described as the exact opposite, being ἀνυπότακτος. (1:10). This noun is made up of the privative α (without) and ὑποτάσσω (Zodhiates, 1992:198). It is also a characteristic that should not manifest in the children of teachers in the church (1:6). This is an instance of the rhetorical technique of paranomasia used here to facilitate a contrast between those who are sound and those who are not. Another striking example of explicit contrast is seen in the direct repetition of the prepositional phrase, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, which facilitates inter-sectional cohesion as well as implicit contrast between the illegitimate teachers and the legitimate believers. The ultimate objective is to encourage the Cretans to disassociate themselves from those who seem to encourage behaviour considered to be disruptive or subversive. In this way, the apostle launches his strategy to enforce compliance to legitimate teaching by forcing the Cretans to look inside themselves and evaluate whether what he is saying is true or not. But the apostle is not going to leave it there, and in the next section it will be shown how he continues his persuasive strategy through the use of a list of vices.

2.2.8 Titus 3:3: Evoking disgust with past sinful behaviour in order to reinforce behaviour in the present that comply with sound doctrine

The seven virtues in the previous two verses are counterbalanced in verse 3 by seven vices. The dominant rhetorical objective of this section is to *evoke the audience to be disgusted with their past sinful behaviour in order to reinforce behaviour in the present that comply with sound doctrine*. This interpretation requires some justification in light of the different ways in which commentators treat the list.

Structurally, scholars correctly identify the "once-now" or "ποτε-ὅτε" scheme that characterises this section, concluding that the purpose of this section is to contrast the old and the new person (Collins, 2000:358). Towner (1994:253, 254), and Johnson (1996:245) refer to this as a transition or conversion formula respectively, which purpose is to indicate the transition to the new life. According to Mounce (2000:446), verse 3 forms part of the theological motivation for the kind of conduct enumerated in the previous section. He maintains that these sins are not directed towards the opponents as much as they are a reflection of the sins of humanity in general. Towner (1994:253) makes the point that the vice list emphasises the actuality or reality of the change that has occurred. Latching on to this, Hultgren (1984:168), claims that the reference to a former life in contrast to the present is a literary device employed to make a theological analysis of the pre-salvific state, without necessarily having any direct bearing on the author or recipients. Fee (1988:202) also believes that the list depicts the general "human fallenness" and regards 3:3 as the evangelistic motive behind the appeal of 3:1-2. While all of these interpretations are probably correct and highly reasonable, they do not satisfactorily explain the purpose of the list itself. Furthermore, these conclusions are based on premature assumptions about the applicability of these vices to the stated recipients. Scholars are hesitant to apply the vices listed here to those whom the apostle identifies as "we". Thus, Quinn (1990:200) avers that these lists are "not biographical, much less autobiographical" and "the items of this vice catalogue are not vices as such; they are adjectival of persons". While there may be a modicum of truth in this comment, it downplays what the text intends to communicate about the recipients and the purpose behind the list. Bernard (1980 [1899]:177) captures the intent of this verse as indicated by his chapter heading: "No reason for pride". Unfortunately he does not elaborate upon this in the rest of his commentary. In a single sentence, Simpson (1954:114) succinctly expresses the intention of the list, namely "to inspire disgust". In all fairness to Quinn (1990:208) he does eventually, in his explanation for the abrupt conclusion of verse 3, allude to the function of these lists as "bring[ing] the reader up short." The "affective" function of these lists, particularly that of the vice list, is a notion that most commentators seem not to appreciate fully. These lists were intended to affect the recipients. The graphic description of the vices, which fills even a modern audience with disgust, supports such an interpretation. The overarching rhetorical objective in 3:3 is to fill the audience with disgust, to show them up. Why? The candour of the apostle is only justifiable if he is enforcing compliance to sound doctrine.

Most modern commentators provide more than adequate explanations for the vocabulary that comprises verse 3 and may be consulted for that purpose. This study will highlight some of the rhetorical techniques employed that tie this section into a coherent unit. These include alliteration and rhyme, chiasmus, inclusive language, implicit contrast, and "emphatic pairing".

Paul uses the conjunction γάρ rhetorically (cf. 2:11) to emphasise the relationship between the present section and the previous one. The enclitic particle ποτέ anticipates the follow-up to this verse with its parallel particle in the next verse, namely ὅτε, to form what scholars identify as a transition or conversion formula (Towner, 1994:253; Johnson, 1996:245). Another rhetorical technique occurs in the use of the verb ἦμεν in the first person plural, with the personal pronoun, ἡμεῖς. The purpose is clearly to emphasise inclusiveness and to facilitate identification between the apostle, Titus and the Cretan believers. Quinn (1990:201) believes this expresses a relational purpose while Mounce (2000:446) believes it is emphatic to accentuate the contrast between the past and present life. The latter may be a secondary objective, but its primary objective must certainly be the facilitation of a relationship with the emphasis upon the "rhetorical identification with his audience" (Johnson, 1996:247). It softens the harshness of the list by presenting Paul as an insider and not as a judge speaking from a sanctimonious height. Conversely, it conveys the humility of the apostle to establish apostolic pathos. According to Hendriksen (1972:387) "it causes the reader (Titus) and the hearers (the Cretan believers when the letter is read to them) to feel that the writer is standing on common ground with them and understands them". This interpretation is in line with the pattern that has characterised the discourse thus far. Paul argues from the basis of *identification with his audience* in order to enforce compliance to the required behavioural conduct.

Collins (2002:358) and Quinn (1990:201) offer insightful comments with reference to the rhetorical arrangement of this verse. The opening two vices, ἀνόητος and ἀπειθής both contain alpha privatives. The latter word is an instance of paranomasia and is used for emphasis. It is a direct repetition of the word that appears in 1:16, which describes the false teachers. It is also the antonym of the virtue that appears in 3:1. The effect of this word can best be visualised when we outline the order in which it appears in the discourse:

ἀπειθής (1:16) – negative, false teachers in the present
πειθαρχεῖν (3:1) – positive, believers in the present
ἀπειθής (3:3) – negative, believers in the past

The persuasive effect of this technique is compelling: any manifestation of being ἀπειθής is a step backward; a step into the past; a step into fellowship with the false teachers.

The paronomasia, combined with the double negative, in the form of two alpha privatives, highlight the heinous nature of disobedience, by linking it with the vilification section, more specifically, a section where a profession to know God is cancelled out by ethical conduct that translates into a denial of Him. The present vice list is therefore a graphic picture of behaviour that demonstrates an absence of the knowledge of God. In other words, Paul is saying, "We also were like 'them'". The use of this shame list constitutes what I term *self-vilification,* which serves to induce disgust within the hearers. By forcing them to remember their past, especially the shamefulness thereof, the overarching rhetorical objective of compliance to the sound teaching is compellingly reinforced.

Quinn (1990:201) is particularly helpful when he demonstrates how, through rhyming endings (assonance) in –οι, several items on the list are linked. Thus, ἀνόητοι is linked with the third word, πλανώμενοι, and the sixth, στυγητοί. The list evinces a combination of asyndeton and syndetic pairing. The conjunction, καί, appears very strategically within the two participial phrases of the sentence: δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις <u>καὶ</u> ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις, ἐν κακίᾳ <u>καὶ</u> φθόνῳ διάγοντες. Quinn (1990:201) is perhaps correct when he identifies this as the "central chiasmus" of the section. Moreover, he shows how the assonated sounds encircle the central chiasmus:

δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις

ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες

This chiasmus is introduced and concluded by the alliteration and rhyme of δουλεύοντες … διάγοντες (Quinn, 1990:202).The rhetorical function of the chiasm is to emphasise how servitude to vice (δουλεύοντες) becomes a manner of life (διάγοντες). The verb δουλεύω is furthermore an instance of paranomasia. It has been preceded by the noun δοῦλος in both plural (2:9) and singular (1:1) form. Its use, however, in this present context, is a development of the previous two occasions in that it now functions in a metaphorical sense. The two earlier instances of the theme of slavery were communicated in a positive light, while the present one is presented as negative. Paranomasia and the metaphorical nuance of the slavery thus highlight the negative side of enslavement. True freedom is therefore not freedom from an earthly or divine master, but rather from ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις, and ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες. In other words, the real slaves are not those who serve earthly masters, but those who serve sin. Interestingly, the apostle, by using the first person plural pronoun, presents himself as one who is presently a slave of God (1:1), and as one who was previously (ποτέ) a slave of sin (3:3).

Scholars are keen to interpret the vice list as follows: We were not really much better than other people; "hence let us not be too hard on the people who are still in that condition, but let us strive by godly conduct to win them for Christ" (Hendriksen, 1972:389). Such an interpretation unfortunately ignores the key concern of this discourse, namely, the supremacy, efficacy and necessity of sound teaching and hence the urgency of compliance to sound teaching. The evangelistic efficacy of the gospel follows as a result of the believers' compliance and embracing, through the totality of their lives, of legitimate teaching. The Cretans are not yet at the place where they have grasped or demonstrated that they have grasped the necessity for legitimate teaching. Instead, there is reason to believe that they are allowing themselves to come under the influence of illegitimate teachers and their teaching, resulting in conduct that places the integrity of God's word or legitimate teaching at risk. These two lists present them with an opportunity to evaluate their pre-and post-conversion behaviour. It holds before them two kinds of behaviour that are mutually exclusive. The overall rhetorical impact of this section is to emphasise the utter unworthiness of Paul, Titus, the Cretan believers and the rest of humanity.

Conclusion

The dominant rhetorical objective of the vice list in verse 3 is *to evoke disgust at past sinful behaviour, in order to reinforce behaviour in the present that complies with sound doctrine*. It has been shown how scholars all too often gloss over this section by a) interpreting it exclusively from an evangelistic perspective and b) portraying it as primarily a picture of human sinfulness. The section is applicable firstly to the Cretans, Paul and Titus and then to the rest of humanity.

The section evinces what I refer to as *self-vilification*. The purpose of the shame list is to evoke disgust within the hearers with a concomitant sense of worthlessness. Through the "once-now" or "ποτέ-ὅτε" scheme, which serves as a transitional device, the author is anticipating the event that made the difference in his audience, something they would only appreciate once they've come to terms with their own unworthiness.

Intra-sectional coherence is achieved through rhetorical techniques like alliteration and rhyme, chiasmus, inclusive language, implicit contrast, and "emphatic pairing". Intersectional coherence is achieved through the use of the conjunction γάρ, paranomasia and repetition, particularly of the following words: ἀπειθεῖς and δουλεύοντες. The latter word is also used in a metaphorical way as opposed to its "normal" meaning in the rest of the letter. We also have in this section the simultaneous use of asyndeton and syndeton, with the latter in a structure referred to as syndetic pairing. All of these are emphatic and used to facilitate coherence within the discourse. The apostle argues from the basis of *identification with his audience* in order to achieve his objective of engendering a compliant attitude. This technique provides the apostle with a platform from which to address his audience, effectively reinforcing his authority over or right to speak to them with such candour.

2.2.9 Titus 3:4-7: Persuading the Cretans that displaying good works to those considered undeserving demonstrates conformity to the divine example

In this section, Paul's dominant rhetorical objective is to persuade the Cretans that displaying good works to those considered undeserving, demonstrates conformity to the divine example. In order to achieve this objective, Paul structures his argument by appealing to the divine example. To this extent, he adapts traditional material to remind his audience of God's salvific intervention. The highly theological nature of this section continues to evoke much discussion and debate. A rhetorical analysis of this passage necessitates an evaluation of how scholars tend to treat it. It will become clear how some scholars have already suggested the interpretation adopted in this study without actually developing it far enough.

Some general observations on this passage must precede the evaluation of academic treatment of this passage. Verses 4-7 constitute a single sentence in the original. Salvation is clearly the main focus of the sentence as indicated by the main verb and direct object, ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς. The rest of verse 5 concisely expresses, according to Fee (1988:203), "the *basis* (his mercy), the *what* (new birth, renewal, justified), the *means* (by the Holy Spirit, ('by his [Christ's] grace'), and the *goal* (the hope of eternal life) of salvation". Expressions like the "Gospel in a nutshell" (Simpson, 1954:115), the "essence of the gospel" (Demarest, 1984:326) or "the gospel summarised in a highly condensed form" (Oden, 1989:36) confirm the recognition by scholars of the essential content of this sentence.

Scholarly treatment of this passage is characterised by a debate that is both intense and technical. One area that continues to attract discussion, involves the character and delineation of the section. In regard to the former, scholars cannot decide whether this passage is a hymn (Guthrie, 1957:204; Karris, 1996:127), a liturgical formula, a creedal formula (Mounce, 2000:440; Fee, 1988:203), or a baptismal prayer or act of praise (Hanson, 1968:95). With regard to the latter, Hanson (1968:83, 86, 90, 95, 96) adopts a source-critical approach when he argues for the existence of a common or original source shared by the authors of the Letter to Titus, 1 Peter and Ephesians.

The majority of scholars, however, regard this passage as a hymn. Thus, Karris (1996:127) insists that this section "is indeed a hymn". This insistence is primarily based on typological and, more importantly, textual considerations. Regarding the latter, Karris (1996:128, 131) argues that the section conforms to six of Markus Barth's eleven "objective" criteria "for detecting the existence of hymns in the New Testament". Although he refers to six he only lists the following five:

a) The passage use of verbs as aorist participles in relative clauses and in consecutive clauses (criterion 3)
b) Those who benefit from God's mighty acts speak in the first person plural (criterion 4)
c) The presence of unique words (criterion 6)
d) Artistic structure-"parallelism" (criterion 8)
e) The content of a given passage interrupts the context (criterion 11)

Karris (1996:127, 128) bases his typological considerations on the fact that this section is indented by the editors of the NASB and the *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th edition). Karris believes that it would not be indented if it was not considered poetic or hymnic. He also cites Ralph Martin, a scholar of hymns who includes Titus 3:4-7 as part of the "sacramental" hymns.

Mounce (2000:440) disagrees with Karris, because the suggested hymnic structure is disrupted by the unusual placement of ἔσωσεν ἡμας. Furthermore, there are other criteria suggestive of a creed rather than a hymn. These include the use of plural pronouns and a purpose clause in verse 7 rather than an indicative. According to Fee (1988:203), the sentence "altogether lacks the poetic elements of a hymn".

Unanimity among scholarship is also absent when it comes to the delineation of the formula. This issues from the authenticity debate, and relates to the differentiation between traditional material and Pauline additions. With regard to traditional material, various possibilities are posited: verses 3-7, 5b-6 and 5-7 (Guthrie, 1957:204). The majority of scholars, however, regard verses 4-7 as traditional, with verse 3 as an addition (Knight, 1979:81; Mounce, 2000:440). Still, the matter remains moot, since "it is virtually impossible to differentiate between traditional and Pauline material with any degree of certainty" (Mounce, 2000:441).

Another area of debate relates to the meaning of the word λουτρόν and its relationship to what follows in the rest of the sentence. The word is translated in at least four primary ways: cleansing from sin, baptism, baptism of the Spirit and laver/bath of washing/washtub. Oden (1989:37) follows the classical view that regards baptism as the bath of the new birth. Simpson (1954:115-116) takes issue with the Roman Catholic or sacramental interpretation of this sentence that interprets διὰ λουτροῦ as denoting the material apparatus of baptism, namely the laver or bath. He argues that the word refers to baptism and simply means "washing". Hendriksen (1957:391) supports this interpretation, adding that "the washing referred to is wholly spiritual." Karris (1996:135) disagrees, insisting that the word refers to "a bath", which was a "ubiquitous Roman institution" used for recreation and ablution purposes by all citizens. The image of the bath would strike a chord with the audience of this letter rather than the "dominant image" of baptism in our modern-day Christian language. Mounce (2000:439) and Fee (1988:204) prefer not to interpret the word in a strict baptismal sense. They argue that the word is a metaphor for inner or spiritual "cleansing". In fact, Mounce (2000:439) maintains, "It is possible for the New Testament to use the imagery of cleansing without any reference to baptism". On the other end of the spectrum, we find Hultgren (1984:169) who interprets διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου as a reference to baptismal regeneration in which "God saves through baptism". Towner (1989:115, 117) believes the word is a description of spiritual baptism and emphasises the "salvation-historical orientation of the passage".

A related area of debate focuses on the collection of genitives that follow the preposition διά. The succinct summary of the debate by Fee (1988:204-205) is very helpful and relied upon here. There are three positions, namely:

1. The word λουτροῦ refers to conversion (or baptism) and ἀνακαινώσεως to the coming of the Spirit. Both are dependent upon διά and refer to *two distinct* realities. Thus, “through the ‘washing’ found in rebirth and through the renewal that comes with the gift of the Spirit”. However, the narrow proximity in meaning between the words παλιγγενεσίας and ἀνακαινώσεως weakens this interpretation since it would necessitate an additional διά to make this meaning clear. Interestingly, this is the interpretation propounded by Mounce (2000:442-443) who puts forth the following arguments in defence of his position: a) Regeneration and renewal, though contemporaneous events, are none the less distinct realities; b) renewal is never described as a washing, therefore ἀνακαινώσεως cannot be said to modify λουτροῦ; c) If the imagery of washing suggests a “once-for-all” cleansing and renewal refers to the believer’s initial renewal, then we find in the words παλιγγενεσίας and ἀνακαινώσεως a description of the singular conversion-event from a dual perspective; d) stylistically the dependence upon διά maintains a better parallelism; e) Paul characteristically omits the second preposition (διά) in a construction where a preposition governs a series of phrases connected by καί; f) the absence of an additional article, τοῦ or preposition ὑπό preceding πνεύματος ἁγίου enhances its proximity to ἀνακαινώσεως. The additional article or preposition would have brought παλιγγενεσίας and ἀνακαινώσεως closer together while its absence appears to corroborate the notion that the two are separate; g) the dependence of the four genitives upon the preposition διά eliminates interpreting the sentence as teaching the doctrine of justification by baptism. Mounce (2000:443) concludes that “Paul is describing one event, not two”. Scholars are therefore, not unanimous in their interpretation of the string of genitives and Mounce (2000:442) is prepared to acknowledge “[i]t is difficult to decide between the two, and in many cases the distinctions are not that significant”. He is joined in this regard by Bernard (1980 [1899]:178) who admits that “both (1) and (2) are admissible in grammar”.

2. The word λουτροῦ refers exclusively to baptism and the two genitives παλιγγενεσίας and ἀνακαινώσεως which are effected by the Holy Spirit, depend upon it. Thus, “through the regenerating and renewing work of

baptism effected by the Holy Spirit". The terms therefore, function either synonymously or complimentarily. While this interpretation has much that commends it, it nevertheless tends to emphasise baptism in a manner that stretches the present context.

3. The word λουτροῦ is a metaphor for spiritual cleansing and not a synonym for baptism. The emphasis is on the cleansing, regenerative work of the Holy Spirit. Thus, "through the 'washing' by the Holy Spirit that brings rebirth and renewal". This view conforms to Pauline theology concerning the centrality of the Holy Spirit for Christian existence and is seemingly confirmed by the emphasis in the sentence. Fee (1988:205) believes that παλιγγενεσίας and ἀνακαινώσεως are "twin metaphors for the same spiritual reality-the re-creating work of the Holy Spirit in the believer's life".

In summary, the influence of the authenticity debate is clearly felt in the analysis of the sentence. There is a definite correspondence between the lack of consent around the extent and delineation of the passage and the degree to which scholars regard portions of the sentence or passage as authentic Pauline or not. The same holds for the interpretation of the word λουτρόν. Apart from textual considerations, continuity or discontinuity with Pauline theology significantly affects the interpretation of this word. The debate around the nature of the passage is less influenced by the authenticity issue. The above discussion represents the primary areas of contention in the translation and analysis of this passage. It would be remiss to highlight the areas of disagreement, while ignoring what scholars generally agree upon in regard to this section.

There is widespread consensus around the content of the sentence. Commentators generally agree about the soteriological nature of this passage. The majority acknowledge the unique aspects of the passage, particularly the Trinitarian character of the passage (Mounce, 2000:450; Karris, 1996:129; Towner, 1994:258; Quinn, 1990:212; Oden, 1989:37; Fee, 1988:206; Hendriksen, 1957:392). Similarly, almost all scholars recognise this as a doctrinal section congruent with 2:11-15 (Van Neste, 2003:25). The themes of divine grace and salvation are clearly present in the section and scholars correctly point this out as illustrated by the following quotes:

> Precisely at the point where God has every right to express his judgment of us, he chooses instead to meet us with kindness and love (Demarest, 1984:328).

> Salvation by grace stands forth in clearest relief in the language employed, which effectually excludes all glory on man's part and denies to any stock of good works amassed by any sinner a “merit of congruity” drawing forth the riches of divine mercy (Simpson, 1954:115).

These and every interpretation given by scholars has some degree of legitimacy or represents an accurate interpretation of an aspect of the sentence. However, regarding the full import of what the apostle is communicating, room exists for additional contributions, especially in light of the context of the entire letter thus far.

The shortcomings surrounding scholarly discussions of this section relate to their analysis of the passage within the context of the letter itself. Many interpret the passage within the context of Pauline theology, attempting to reconcile their interpretation with what can be found elsewhere, either extra-biblically or in the rest of the New Testament. For example, Mounce (2000:443, 455), in his otherwise excellent commentary, does not see this section as contributing anything new to the apostle’s argument, observing that “Titus 3:1-11 is a repetition of 2:1-14”. Perhaps I am being overly critical of an unfortunate choice in vocabulary, but as my analysis will show, there is a significant development in this part of the argument; more than a mere repetition of what is said earlier. Likewise, Oden (1989:35) is content to classify this section as the epitomy of “the word of justification by grace”. True, the passage touches on justification by grace, but to imply that it does so exclusively or that this constitutes the primary function of this section is not entirely justified.

Others simply fail to relate this section to the rest of the letter, except for pointing out obvious linguistic correspondences. Collins (2002:359), for example, is of the opinion that this section is simply a return to the epiphany motive. While he is not altogether incorrect, there is more to this passage than simply a thematic revisit of the “saving appearance of Jesus Christ, our Saviour”. In fact, the primary focus of scholarly works consulted is on the nature of the sentence, specifically its origin as a baptismal hymn or creed. Other commentators appear to get lost in linguistic analyses and etymological studies, all of which are valid and render valuable insights into the vocabulary, but unfortunately fail to adequately relate the passage to its immediate and extended contexts.

The tendency to make baptism and salvation the foci of the passage is a major criticism. Thus, scholars approach the text with a preconceived notion of, for example, baptism or baptismal regeneration, utterly disregarding the recorded order of the sentence. In regard to the latter, some (correctly) point out the main verb of the sentence and make that the starting point of their interpretation. But that is not the best way to approach the text. A better approach would be to deal with the structure of the sentence in the way it has been recorded, in order to appreciate the different syntactical relationships within the sentence and the section at large. Thus, the shortcomings relate to the grinding of theological axes and vocabulary analyses instead of appreciating the sentence as it stands and seeking more adequate explanations for the unusual nature of the sentence structure. In this regard, some scholars like George Knight III and Jerome Quinn, prove rather helpful.

Knight (1992:337, 338) drawing attention to the second word in v. 4, namely δέ, captures the essence of this passage and relates it to the preceding verses, 1-3. Contrasts are clearly in view: the characteristics of God and the characteristics of believers’ past condition. In his own words,

> This attitude of God is contrasted with Christians' past attitude (verse 3) so that no one less than God the merciful Saviour can be the *norm* for exhorting Christians "to be gentle, showing all meekness toward all people" (verse 2), since God showed to the Christians his "kindness and love toward mankind" when they were as "all people" are now (Knight, 1992:338, Emphasis added.).

The normative role of the divine example is a key aspect in our understanding of this sentence. Unfortunately, Knight neither takes this up again in the rest his analysis nor does he relate it to the argument of the apostle earlier in the letter.

Quinn (1990:215) gets even closer to target in his summary of this sentence, best presented in his own words:

> Jews were devoted to the God who loved humankind; they could not reasonably hate what their God loved …. Jesus, the savior, was the visible, historical revelation of God's *philanthrōpia* to all human beings. That vision of the baptismal profession became in its turn the antithesis to the vicious existence that converts from extremist Jewish sects had once led. They had formerly been "detested, hating one another." Now, in faith, they have seen "the humane munificence of our savior, God … revealed." *They have no longer any basis for hating those whom God, their Father and savior, has loved* (Emphasis added).

This comparative-contrastive dimension best explains the function of this unusual sentence. The apostle has not abandoned his dominant rhetorical objective, namely to enforce compliance to sound doctrine. Instead, he takes his argument a notch higher in this final of three strategic, though unusually long sentences, occurring here, in 1:1-4 and in 2:11-14. Each of these three long sentences forms a strategic part of the rhetorical strategy of the author. He thus tends to use these sentences to communicate highly concentrated theology. Each of the sentences contains shared knowledge or traditional material apparently known to the recipients. The present sentence is therefore also a strategically placed rhetorical technique. After shaming the believers through *self-vilification* in the opening verses of this chapter, the apostle does not relent. The employment of the ποτέ-ὅτε formula serves to connect this sentence with the previous section. Thus, the argument based on prior knowledge is implicitly perpetuated in this section. The believers must be reminded about good conduct (vv. 1-2), about what they were (v. 3) and now the apostle reminds them of what God did while they were unworthy of his beneficence. Paul is enforcing compliance to sound doctrine arguing now on the basis of *the power of the divine example*. Believers' past negative conduct in v. 3 is juxtaposed with the positive attitude of God in the opening description of v. 4. The ποτε-ὅτε formula emphasises this contrast. Thus, when believers are instructed to manifest the positive behaviour of 3:1-2 to outsiders, lack of compliance will put them at variance not with man, but with God himself. Furthermore, this argument is based on transcendent conduct. When believers manifest these attitudes, their behaviour transcends common decency or what is expected from good citizens. Their conduct testifies about something extraordinary that has happened to them, namely the way God treated them! This is certainly a powerful line of reasoning, highly convincing and persuasive. A schematic presentation of the argument will demonstrate the careful reasoning in which the contrasts between the divine and human actions are accentuated:

(3:1-2) Present: Believers manifesting positive behaviour
(3:3) Past: Believers manifesting negative behaviour
(3:4-7) Past: God manifesting positive behaviour
(3:8) Present: Believers manifesting positive behaviour

Most scholars recognise the temporal aspects of this sentence (3-7), particularly the believers' past conduct and the attitude and intervention of the divine in the past, but are less appreciative of the rhetorical intent and function behind these shifts in temporal perspectives.

The lack of unanimity among scholars, in identifying or categorising this section, prohibits any dogmatic notions about the nature of the section. The most that can be said is that this section contains elements of traditional material. Attempts to classify it as either a hymn or creed, cloud the rhetorical intent behind the sentence. For the purposes of this study, this sentence will be categorised as constituting *shared knowledge* and as forming part of the overall rhetorical intent of the passage. Paul is adapting the traditional material in a manner that draws attention to the salvific activity of the triune God and not primarily to present a comprehensive theological treatise. He wishes instead to accentuate the lavishness of the divine condescension towards people who did not deserve it. The rich and distinct theological flavour is empathic, drawing attention to and highlighting the benevolent action of the divine. In fact, if the structure of the sentence is appreciated, it provides a clearer indication of the apostolic intent of this sentence.

This section is inspired by the rhetorical objective namely, motivating compliance to sound doctrine. If someone dared to ask Titus: "Why must I show kindness to these unsaved Cretans?" the answer would be: "Look at what you were and look at how God treated you". Furthermore, there also appears to be a polemical intention behind this section. The false teaching seems to have encouraged isolationists' tendencies, even hostility towards pagan neighbours, who appear to have been branded as unworthy to associate with. This kind of thinking is confronted head on by the argument of the apostle in this section.

Most commentators provide elaborate and helpful vocabulary studies of this sentence and may be consulted for further information. Classen (2002:61) argues that it is the order of the sentence rather than the unusual vocabulary that demands an explanation: "Here it is the sentences which he arranges in such a way as to give his words special force and emphasis..." Prominent rhetorical features in this section include syndeton, implicit contrast, repetition, and paranomasia. Other features include emotive or anthropopathic, highly theological and inclusive language.

In earlier sections, implicit contrasts are drawn primarily on the human level, whereas in the present situation it takes on a different dimension. The χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία of God are contrasted with the unworthy condition of believers in their pre-conversion state (v. 3). This is borne out by the ποτε-ὅτε construction, which links the two sentences. The words χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία are examples of the rhetorical technique called anthropopathism, so entitled because of the approximation of human emotions to the divine. The rhetorical objective of this strategy is twofold. First, it presents God in a manner that people can identify with; it personalises God. Secondly, it emphasises the stark contrast between the divine attitude and those human qualities listed in 3:3 as well as those negative qualities referred to with respect to false teachers and their followers (1:10-12,15-16). Interestingly, this word pair has been used extra-biblically to describe some emperors (Collins, 2002:361).

The expression ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία is an example of syndeton. Classen (2002:60) points out the "asyndetic enumeration" of the Cretans past behaviour (3:3), here contrasted with the *syndetonic enumeration* of the divine attitude. The use of asyndeton and syndeton thus functions to accentuate the contrast between the opposing attitudes while magnifying the distinctiveness of the divine beneficence. Another helpful enumeration by Classen (2002:61) is the pairing of significant concepts that are evident in this sentence: "χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ("kindness and love for mankind"), ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς/τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ("works done in righteousness which we have performed"/ "his mercy": antithesis), λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου. The notion of contrast between the divine and human is consistently emphasised in this brilliant sentence, reinforced here by the antithesis that Classen highlights. Paul's primary objective is therefore not related to the presentation of a fully orbed Pauline theological treatise. This is an important observation since many scholars appear to get sidetracked here to either want to prove or disprove whether this sentence correctly reflects authentic Pauline theology. The author is simply exalting the excellencies of the divine example over against the poverty of the pre-conversion human condition. If it was simply a matter of conveying knowledge, i.e. theology, then there is much that the apostle is not saying. However, as Tolmie (2005:132) points out, the original hearers would have *heard* this sentence in a manner of seconds. What they would have heard was not detailed information *per se* but rather a rhetorical intention, namely to force them to compare themselves with none other than God himself. An observation in Tolmie (2002:132) pertaining to Galatians is applicable to this current sentence: "This provocative utterance is not arrived at slowly by a careful process of thought. It is flung out in the heat of debate – and the hearer in the sentence is left to consider in what sense or senses it is true". Therefore, in the debate surrounding the nature of the discourse, the adamance to categorise the sentences as either a creed or a hymn proves rather fruitless. It is unquestionable that the sentence resembles traditional aspects. The most that can be maintained is that the apostle has modified this traditional material to serve a rhetorical purpose, namely to emphasise the exemplary nature of the divine example. The net effect of this customisation of traditional material is that the audience is confronted with a choice: either follow inferior teaching modelled by inferior examples or follow sound teaching and a superior example – not Paul, nor Titus, but God. The ultimate consequence of sound teaching is to make the attitude of the adherent thereof conform to that of God Himself.

Other rhetorical strategies include inclusive language, repetition, antithesis, and theological vocabulary. This section contains a high concentration of inclusive language in pronoun and verbal forms:

τοῦ σωτῆρος <u>ἡμῶν</u> θεου (v. 4)
ἐποιήσα<u>μεν</u> <u>ἡμεῖς</u> (v. 5)
ἔσωσεν <u>ἡμᾶς</u> (v. 5)
οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' <u>ἡμᾶς</u> (v. 6)
'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος <u>ἡμῶν</u> (v. 6)
γενηθῶ<u>μεν</u> (v. 6)

In v. 5, the pronoun functions emphatically since the verb ἐποιήσαμεν already contains the first person plural ending. The pronoun highlights the antithesis between divine grace and human works: οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς (works) ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος (grace) ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς. There seem to be a polemical intent behind this sentence, particularly the negation concerning a "works righteousness". It is probable that the false teaching emphasised a "works righteousness" or that there was a leniency towards such a teaching among the Cretan believers, hence the strong negation on the part of the apostle. If we accept the notion that this sentence constitutes some form of tradition or shared knowledge, it would underscore the polemical nuance of the sentence. It makes sense rhetorically to counter any doctrinal aberrance by reciting doctrine already known to the believers.

The sentence ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (v. 4) is parallel to that of 2:11. These two sentences share several commonalities. For example, they contain the same verb in the aorist, namely ἐπιφαίνω. In 2:11 it is ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ that appeared. In 3:4 it is the manifestation of ἡ χρηστότης and ἡ φιλανθρωπία … τοῦ … θεοῦ that is in the spotlight. The use of this verb, together with the synonymous verb in 1:3, namely φανερόω convey the notion of accessibility or absence of secrecy. Everything God has done He did openly and publicly. There are no secrets – whether it is the source of Paul's authority to teach (1:3) or the contents of sound doctrine (2:11-12) or the nature of the divine beneficence (3:4); it is all known. The employment of this verb seems to counter any notions of secrecy perhaps taught by the false teachers.

Paranomasia is seen in the occurrence of the noun σωτήρ and adjective σωτήριος found respectively in 3:4 and 2:11. Also, both sentences contain the expression τοῦ … θεοῦ. In 2:11, it is divine grace that appeared while in 3:4 it is divine kindness and love-for-mankind/people. The presence of the third person singular verb ἐπεφάνη, has lead some scholars to view the expression χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία, as conveying a single concept namely the divine attitude (Knight, 1992:338; Hendriksen, 1957:389). The paranomasia and parallel expressions facilitate inter-textual coherence between the above respective sections. Coherence extends to the rest of the letter, specifically the opening verses of this letter, by an interesting theological exchange of titles between God and Jesus Christ. In 1:3-4, we find the following references to God and Jesus Christ:

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (1:3)
Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (1:4)

In 3:4 and 3:6, the exact references are repeated:
τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (3:4)
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (3:6)

In both of the above instances, the references form a chiasm. Interestingly, in 2:13, all of the above vocabulary appears again. Only this time, it refers exclusively to Jesus Christ who is called both our God and Saviour:

(ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου) θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Note in the above sentence, the presence of the noun form (ἐπιφάνεια), from the verb ἐπιφαίνω. This makes the occurrence of the verb, in 3:5, another instance of paranomasia. These direct repetitions bind the letter into a coherent unit that evinces development of the Christological motif. Viewed holistically, the following outline demonstrates the Christological progression within the letter:

1:3 - God our Saviour (PAST)
1:4 - (God our Father) Christ Jesus our Saviour (PRESENT)
2:13 - our (great) God and Saviour Jesus Christ (FUTURE)

3:4 - God our Saviour (PAST)
3:6 - Jesus Christ our Saviour (PAST)

It is only in 1:1, 1:4 and 2:13 that the words *God* and *Jesus Christ* or *Christ Jesus* occur together. In the first two instances, they refer to two separate persons whereas in the last instance a single person is in view. Thus, in the presentation of Jesus Christ, there is progression. Furthermore, from the above scheme, it is interesting to note the time referents associated with these titles. The future appearance of Jesus Christ as God and Saviour appears to be a central theme in the letter. This outline confirms the scholarly consensus surrounding the soteriological character of the letter.

In v. 5, the contrast between the divine and human attitudes is also highlighted through assonance of the e-vowel in the nouns ἔργων and ἔλεος, as well as in the verbs ἐποιήσαμεν and ἔσωσεν. Furthermore, the order in which the audience would have heard the divine and human actions described also accentuates the differences:

God (v. 4): ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία
Man (v. 5): ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ
God (v. 5): ἔλεος

The aural impact is overwhelming in this section, because God is presented as the sole actor with man at the receiving end of his divine benevolence: He saved the saints, ἔσωσεν (v. 5) and poured out the Spirit richly, ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως (v. 6) upon them. The adverb πλουσίως reiterates the generous nature of divine salvation: God was not skimpy when He acted. Thus, the Cretans are without excuse, having no reason to boast or to avoid compliance to sound doctrine. Any action contrary to that stipulated in 3:1-2 would amount to flagrant disobedience or serve as proof that they do not belong to the divine family (cf. 1:4). To disobey, in the light of such divine lavishness, would be unthinkable to a true believer. The basis of their being part of the divine family lies entirely outside of themselves being saved not from ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ but κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος. The careful and deliberate structuring of the argument suggests an embedded polemic against a doctrine of works righteousness or salvation by human effort, particularly by observing the law (Johnson, 1996:248).

The repetition of the noun ἔργον, while facilitating coherence throughout the text, recalls previous appearances of the word. These are as follows:

τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται (1:16)

πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι (1:16)

καλῶν ἔργων (2:7)

ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων (2:14)

ἔργον ἀγαθόν (3:1)

οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνη (3:5)

The above list confirms the vital role of works in this letter. The repetition of the word reintroduces it in this section as a reminder of what works cannot do, namely render anyone righteous. Furthermore, while works cannot justify, believers will manifest good works and are shown to be genuine believers by their works. Works also serve as evidence that some are not part of God's family and are "worthless for any good work". Believers ought to be zealous for good works. Thus, the nature of an individual's works will reveal the existence or non- existence of the knowledge of God. In this manner, the author is rhetorically strategic in his reintroduction of this key word.

Verse 5 also contains the much discussed phrase, διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως, which emphasises the newness of those who have encountered divine grace. Rhetorically, it functions to further the notion that those who have been renewed in this way are no longer what they used to be, since they have been regenerated and renewed. Thus, the good conduct espoused in 3:1-2 ought to be manifested by those who had been regenerated and renewed. By negative implication therefore, the absence of such conduct would testify to the fact that such individuals never experienced renewal and regeneration.

The certainty and completeness of the transformation is guaranteed by the Trinitarian references within the sentence. Failure to manifest godly conduct would amount to a denial of the salvific intervention of God the Father, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

Verse 7 presents another instance of paranomasia in the participle δικαιωθέντες. Its rhetorical functions include highlighting again the contrast that is so endemic to this sentence (vv. 3-7). Other functions relate to inter-sectional cohesion since cognates of this word occur in 1:8 (δίκαιον), 2:12 (δικαίως) and 3:5 (δικαιοσύνη). Righteousness is a quality inherent to believers. Elder-overseers must manifest it (1:8) as a requirement to serve in the church. Believers must live righteously, as they are instructed by grace (2:12). Righteousness manifests after salvation and cannot be attained by human efforts (3:5). Thus, the only time this positive quality is presented negatively is when it is viewed as attainable by works of righteousness. In every other instance, the word is presented as a positive Christian trait. In 3:7, the answer or explanation is given as to how a believer comes to manifest this quality: they are *made* righteous by divine grace. Likewise, in 2:11, it is grace that instructs believers to live "godly" (δικαίως) in this present age. The paranomasia serves to highlight the endemic nature of righteousness in the life of believers. Rhetorically, this has the effect of making genuine sainthood inseparable from the quality of righteousness. Thus, where this quality is absent it can reasonably be inferred that no salvation has occurred. The Cretans were not saved by righteous works they have done (οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ), instead they have been made righteous (δικαιωθέντες). In other words, they are passive in the act of acquiring the status of righteousness. The passive participle constitutes an emphatic denial of human boasting, contrasting directly with the sentiment expressed in the first part of v. 5. The use of inclusive language employed both in verbal and pronoun forms, functions among other things, to restrain any credit from accruing to human beings. Paul is implicitly affirming that even his Jewish heritage was of no value in his salvation or in acquiring this righteousness. Titus also has nothing to boast in apart from divine grace. By implication therefore, the

Cretans are only saved by the gracious condescension of God who manifested his ἔλεος.

Inclusive language also functions to foster a sense of community and identification. Paul, by indicating his own unworthiness to be saved, as well as that of Titus, facilitates thereby a full identification with the Cretans. The presentation of a Jew as a co-recipient of divine grace must communicate powerfully against any temptations towards proud superiority. The rhetorical impact of this line of communication harnesses a sense of community and unity, while discouraging any latent allegiance to teaching and teachers that encourage the opposite.

In verse 7 we find the word χάρις which is repeated from 2:11. The rhetorical objective of this repetition is to demonstrate the relationship between grace and righteousness. Here, it also concludes a conglomeration of related terms or synonyms used in this sentence to distinguish the divine action *vis-a-vis* the human action. From 3:4-7, the following terms are employed to describe God's behaviour:

ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία (v. 4)
ἔλεος (v. 5)
χάριτι (v. 7)

This conglomeration is emphatic, highlighting the supremacy and totality of the divine action. In each of the above instances, the accompanying pronoun or modifier reiterates that with reference to the salvation of people, including the Cretans, God alone is the author thereof: *God's* kindness and love for mankind (τοῦ … θεοῦ), *His* mercy (αὐτοῦ ἔλεος), and *His* grace (ἐκείνου χάριτι). This triple emphasis stands in stark contrast to human effort with its emphatic first person plural pronoun following after the verb: οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν <u>ἡμεῖς</u>.

The next two words in v. 7 are examples of kinship and inclusive language respectively. The noun κληρονόμος evokes images of family and privilege. Together with the verb γίνομαι, it serves as a very powerful confirmation of the transformation shared by all the believers without discrimination or exception. It is reminiscent of the earlier paternal reference to God as "our Father" (1:4) and parent-sibling images in Paul calling Titus his "true child" (1:4). The verb, γενηθῶμεν, being in the passive voice, reaffirms the consistent emphasis throughout this sentence on the passivity of man and the radical activity of God. The prepositional phrase, κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου, introduces a shift in the temporal emphasis of this sentence. Hope points to that which is still to come or to be expected, thus some future event. More importantly though, this phrase repeats the reference in 1:2, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου, where the apostle ties present godliness to the future hope. The repetition has the rhetorical effect of bolstering the coherency of the discourse, particularly as it also relates to 2:13 and the μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα. The three references to hope (ἐλπίς) impact on the temporal momentum of the discourse by introducing a future dimension to it. This future perspective serves an important rhetorical function. Positively, those who embrace sound doctrine and obey it can anticipate eternal life with its implicit rewards. Negatively, those who reject sound doctrine or who embrace false teaching are "warned" by the notion of a future reckoning. In other words, the teaching about the future serves to ground or anchor adherence to sound doctrine in the present while also warning those who risk ignoring sound doctrine. The obedient ones will have something good to look forward to, while those who are reckless in this life will, by implication, also have something to look forward to, but less pleasant.

The overall rhetorical effect of this future perspective is to communicate the truth that present godliness has future implications, while present ungodliness will also have future implications. This is an ingenious way to motivate the believers to embrace sound doctrine that results in godliness (1:1-2). Furthermore, the certainty of this hope is stressed by the triple repetition thereof throughout this letter. Additionally, in each of the theological sections, 1:1-4 and in 2:11-14 and 3:4-7 there is transition in time frames – past, present and future. Each relates how God has acted and how His purposes were established. In this manner, the reader-hearers are given a "track record" or profile of God's actions. Logically, therefore, it can be deduced that if God has acted in the past and it came to fruition, then the future or ἐλπίς is certain.

Conclusion

The dominant rhetorical objective of verses 4-7, a single sentence in the original, is *to enforce compliance to sound doctrine by appealing to the divine example* through the reminder of God's salvific intervention. This section in particular, has also not escaped the pervasiveness of the authenticity debate which has contributed to a mellow appreciation for the actual content of the sentence and the intent of the author. The approach to this sentence has centred upon three central issues: a) the extent and delineation of the passage and the degree to which this passage is considered representative of authentic Pauline work; b) the interpretation of the word λουτρόν. In this regard, the evidence shows that continuity or discontinuity with Pauline theology impacts upon the interpretation of this word; c) the nature of the passage, specifically whether it is a hymn or creed. Apart from these differences in opinion, there is widespread consensus surrounding the content of the sentence, particularly its soteriological nature. Scholars also recognise the unique Trinitarian emphases of the passage as well as its essential doctrinal character. While the text hints at baptism and salvation, it has been demonstrated that these are not the primary foci of the passage and to insist that is so, does not advance our appreciation for the unique contribution of this letter.

The key aspect to appreciating this sentence is to interpret it in the order in which it appears. Such an approach reveals the intricate and powerful rhetorical argument that characterises this sentence. Paul's overall rhetorical strategy is to hold before his audience the example of no one less than God Himself. The behaviour that they ought to conform to was demonstrated in their salvation by God. The divine attitude is set up as the standard by which to evaluate their own willingness or reluctance to comply with and manifest sound doctrine. It is suggested that this is the only objective the apostle sets out to achieve in this sentence. To this task, he draws from an arsenal of rhetorical techniques which were already used earlier on in the letter, with one exception, that of anthropopathism. He uses the latter to personalise God and to present God as an example not only to the saints but also to the disobedient whose actions are showed to be glaringly inconsistent compared to that of the divine.

Minor rhetorical techniques utilised in this section include syndeton, implicit contrast, repetition, and paranomasia. It was demonstrated how strategic the repetition of ἔργον is in this section. Paranomasia of several words occurred, the most prominent being δικαιωθέντες. Other features include highly theological and inclusive language, like χρηστότης, φιλανθρωπία, ἔλεος and χάρις. The language of inheritance calls to mind kinship, community and inclusiveness. The orientation towards the future is reintroduced in this section through the expression κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου. This orientation functions rhetorically to, on the one hand, hold before the obedient the implicit promise of reward, while on the other hand, hint at negative consequences or punishment in the future to those who disobey now. The certainty of this hope is communicated by the triple repetition thereof throughout the letter, as well as, by the recollection of God's consistency in the past. In this manner, the author uses the temporal momentum within this section as a guarantee of the future hope.

The sentence in itself, functions as a rhetorical instrument. As was shown above, this sentence is one of three that are strategically located throughout this discourse. They are unique in character revealing high concentrations of theological truths, probably known to the recipients. In the present example, scholars agree that the sentence constitutes pre-existent traditional material or shared knowledge, known to the recipients. The fact that the recipients probably knew this material significantly adds to their persuasive value.

2.2.10 Titus 3:8-11: Reinforcing the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine in order to encourage compliance to the former and rejection of the latter

In this section, beginning from 3:8-11, the author's dominant rhetorical objective is to make a final appeal for compliance to sound doctrine by *reinforcing the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine*. He sets out to achieve this objective by encouraging the adoption of the one and the rejection of the other; in this case it is false doctrine that must be rejected. As he nears the conclusion of his letter, he wants to help his audience maintain the mutual exclusivity of the opposing doctrines. Negatively, he wants to provide the congregation with some final reasons why they should forsake or not be lured to embrace false doctrine. This strategy is a repetition of that pursued in 2:1-10. To accomplish this objective, Paul again contrasts sound doctrine with false doctrine, unleashing an assortment of rhetorical techniques to this end. In fact, this small section is unusually inundated with a variety of these techniques.

Some scholars, like Quinn (1990:244), argue that this section contains the final contrast between sound doctrine and false doctrine. He goes so far as to entitle this section "True and False Instruction" (Quinn, 1990:233). Scholars are however divided on the exact demarcation of the section. Some scholars begin this section with the second part of verse 8, indicating it as 8b-11 (Quinn, 1990:233; Collins, 2002:366). Mounce (2000:434, 455) views it as comprising 3:1-11. Knight (1992:350), interestingly, includes it as part of 3:3-8. Others argue that v. 8 commences a new section (Guthrie, 1957:207; Simpson, 1954:116). The demarcation accepted in this study is based on the following arguments: Verse 8 should be viewed as separate from 4-7, because of a difference in genre. Verses 4-7 constitute some form of earlier tradition, that is, it could be a hymn or creed. Verse 8a is an observation about the preceding sentence and therefore not part of it. A final consideration, for the view that v. 8 begins a new section, relates to its function within the discourse. In this regard, consideration must be paid to the rhetorical intention behind this section.

The function of the sentence πιστὸς ὁ λόγος is multifaceted. It is one of three short sentences used in this section, together with the others being ταῦτα ἐστιν καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (8) and εἰσὶν γὰρ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι (9). Its brevity makes it conspicuous and highlights the claim that it makes about the previous section (4-7), which is one sentence. This, in itself, supports the decision for the division between the sections. The use of short sentences is one of several rhetorical techniques exploited in this section for emphatic purposes. At a basic level, the sentence serves to connect verses 8-11 with the preceding section, facilitating a degree of fluidity in this part of the apostle's argument. Later, it will be evident how it functions as an antithetic hedge with the description in verse 9 of the false teaching as ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι. Its immediate function therefore, is transitory, indicating the transition from one genre form to another, i.e. from verses 4-7 to 8-11. At a rhetorical level, this statement functions as an apostolic affirmation of the preceding section. The apostle underscores the traditional material as πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. This is an important insight, if we want to appreciate the rest of his argument. The dominant rhetorical intent behind verses 8-11 is to contrast legitimate and illegitimate teaching in order to reinforce compliance to the former. Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος therefore should be interpreted to mean: "Everything said thus far constitute legitimate teaching. I affirm that to be so, as δοῦλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" (1:1). Put in more colloquial terms, the apostle is saying: "This is the real thing". The first person singular, βούλομαι, suggests the reasonableness of such an interpretation of the text. This sentence therefore introduces the first reason why sound teaching is to be embraced as well as why it is superior to false teaching. This is an argument based on apostolic authorisation. Sound doctrine must be heeded because unlike false teaching, it is apostolically authorised. In the rest of the sentence, the apostle is going to give two more reasons why Cretan believers must comply with sound doctrine and reject false doctrine.

The second half of v. 8 builds upon the first part. Since these teachings are legitimate, the apostle proceeds to express his desire (βούλομαι) that Titus should insist or speak confidently (διαβεβαιοόμαι) about them. The strong διαβεβαιοόμαι leads Mounce (2000:452) to interpret τούτων as referring to all of chapter 3. Knight (1992:350) agrees, arguing that it refers to 3:1-7 while Hendriksen (1957:394) limits it to verses 4-7. Contextually, it is more tenable to argue that the pronoun refers to everything that has preceded thus far and not only to 3:4-7. The ensuing purpose clause includes the key expression καλῶν ἔργων which is best interpreted to include the virtues commended in 3:1-2.

Earlier, in 2:1 Titus was exhorted to "speak" (λάλεω). In contradistinction, the false teachers must be silenced, ἐπιστομίζω (1:11). Thus, sound doctrine can be spoken about confidently. This command, like the earlier ones, is an instance of apostolic affirmation or authorisation of the ministry of Titus.

The purpose clause, ἵνα … θεῷ, has a very interesting structure. The preposition, ἵνα, is followed by the verb, φροντίζωσιν. These two are separated from the infinitive, προΐστασθαι, and subject, οἱ πεπιστευκότες, by the key expression, καλῶν ἔργων. It is only at the end that the subject, οἱ πεπιστευκότες is revealed. This structure emphasises a concern or eagerness for good works. Thus, Titus must insist or speak confidently so that a concern or eagerness for sound doctrine will result or be manifested. The emphasis in the second part of this sentence is that only those who believed and continue to believe in God are able to be occupied in good works. The participle, πεπιστευκότες, is in the perfect tense and expresses the idea of a completed action perpetuated in the present. The faith allegiance of those who are careful to perform good deeds is directed towards God, θεῷ. The juxtaposition of the subject and indirect object stresses the inseparability of faith in God and good works. Put differently, those who believe in God will be those who perform καλὰ ἔργα. This is in direct opposition to the false teachers who profess to know God but deny him by their deeds, θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται (1:16). In this way, the chasm between the two groups is accentuated and the disparities are made all the more obvious. This constitutes an argument based upon the *irreconcilability of conduct.* Thus, the second reason why sound teaching is different, relates to the ensuing good works, which, in turn, confirm them as the ones who actually have come to faith in God. The substantive use of the participle supports the notion of identity. Here, the apostle uses the rhetorical technique of *honorific referencing* to encourage compliance to sound doctrine. Thus, by behaviour compliant to sound doctrine the audience will demonstrate their faith or the absence of faith in God. The Cretans must decide whether they deserve the honour of being referred to as οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ or not; only their conduct will show this.

The beneficial impact of sound doctrine and deeds consequential to it upon the rest of society is another distinctive from false doctrine. The last part of v. 8 contains the final reason for compliance to sound doctrine, namely its positive impact upon the rest of humanity. These things, i.e. all the teaching contained in chapter 3, are καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. The use of syndeton emphasises the double significance of the sound doctrine. Several words are repeated in this section and each instance is emphatic. The word καλόν repeats, within a single sentence an earlier occurrence, namely καλῶν ἔργων. The hearers would hear this double reiteration of "good", which in turn, connects this section with all the earlier occurrences of this word. The word ἀνθρώπος recalls several occurrences of this noun, some of which are positive while one or two are negative. In 3:2, the believers are called to exhibit kindness πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. Grace appeared πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις (2:11). Both of these could be classified as positive uses of this word. The first negative occurrence is in 1:14 with reference to the false teachers who adhere to the commandments of men, ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων. Within the immediate context of 3:8-11, the word appears again, but in a negative context, with reference to the opposition who are, αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον. In 3:8, the intention is surely to accentuate the positive benefits of sound doctrine to the greater humanity, similar to 2:11 with regard to grace. Rhetorically, the intention to contrast the positive effect of sound doctrine with the negative effect of false doctrine cannot be clearer. Whereas false teaching was “upsetting whole households”, ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν (1:11), this cannot be maintained about sound doctrine. The repetition of ἀνθρώπος serves the additional purpose of facilitating coherence throughout the letter or facilitating inter-sectional coherence.

Thus, in v. 8 the apostle has successfully highlighted the distinctiveness of sound doctrine. Sound doctrine is commended by the apostolic affirmation in the sentence πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. The results of sound doctrine can be seen by the good works which those who believe in God will be careful to perform. Finally, the good works will benefit the community at large. Through repetition of key words, the apostle facilitates implicit contrasts with the opposition from earlier sections of the letter. The highly positive presentation of sound doctrine is the main rhetorical intent of verse 8. In the next section, the contrast between sound and false doctrine is perpetuated, but this time through an intensely negative portrayal of the opposition.

The primary rhetorical intent in 3:9-11 is the perpetuation of the contrast between sound and false doctrine. This section is replete with rhetorical techniques employed to achieve the rhetorical objective, namely to encourage the audience to reject false doctrine. However, most commentators reveal an etymological preoccupation with the vocabulary in this and other sentences, although they sometimes cite some helpful extra–biblical occurrences of the words (Simpson, 1954:117-118; Quinn, 1990:244-248). However, as a result of this focus they do not pay much attention to the other stylistic features present in this section. Mounce (2000:453) and Knight (1992:353-354), for example, categorise μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς as merely a list of “errors to avoid”. There are exceptions, like Collins (2002:368) and Quinn (1990:245), who draw attention to the polysyndeton in this sentence. Unfortunately, they do not explain its function in the sentence. This will now be addressed.

Verse 9 opens with the adversative δέ followed by four references to the false teaching, each separated by the conjunction καί. Mounce (2000:453) correctly identifies the function of the adversative conjunction, namely to "establish … contrast". He unfortunately limits the contrast exclusively to this chapter, whereas it is best understood to perpetuate the contrast that runs consistently throughout the letter. In all fairness to him, there is definitely a contrast in the immediate context, but it exceeds the context, as the analysis of this section will show, and as the repetition of key vocabulary in verse 8 has demonstrated. The rhetorical technique employed in this verse is polysyndeton. The four descriptions of the false teaching are separated by three conjunctions: μωρὰς (δέ) ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς. The polysyndeton emphasises the false teaching. The rhetorical objective behind it is the vilification of the false teaching. The terms are largely negative, almost mocking. The false teaching must not be confronted, instead Titus must "steer clear" from or "avoid" (περιΐστασο) it. The imperative indicates that the problem is not endemic to the congregation. It was not something to get rid of; rather it was to be avoided. Rhetorically, and as far as Paul is concerned, false doctrine is invalid, unnecessary, not worthy of Titus' consideration or time. It is, by implication, an utter waste of time. This is therefore, a clear instance of vilification. Here, it is the false teaching itself that is vilified rather than its promoters (cf. 1:10-16). The polysyndeton accentuates the worthlessness and futility of the false teaching. The reason given in the second half of this verse reinforces the uselessness of the teaching: εἰσὶν γὰρ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι. The polarity between sound and false doctrine is accentuated by opposing terms used to describe both. In 8:1, sound doctrine was affirmed to be πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. Verse 9 concludes with a judgment on false doctrine being ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι. The latter expression constitutes an apostolic denunciation of the false teaching. This denunciation could be seen as an additional evidence for the distinctiveness of sound doctrine. Rhetorically, therefore, anyone who embraces false teaching would be affirming that which the apostle has judged to be "worthless and unprofitable". It would place such a person in the very awkward position of going against the judgment of a “servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ” (1:1).

The positive-negative disparity is reiterated through the employment of several smaller rhetorical techniques of which some have already been pointed out earlier. Verses 8-11 contain several antonyms: sound doctrine was considered profitable, ὠφέλιμα (8). False teaching on the other hand is condemned as unprofitable, ἀνωφελεῖς (9). Paul brands false teachings as “quarrels”, μάχας (3:9), but wants believers to be “peaceable”, ἀμάχους (3:2). Another contrast is drawn through the choice of words used to describe people in this section. In v. 8, believers are spoken of honourably as οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ, while the false teacher is labelled a αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον (10). When compared to earlier sections, a progression can be observed with regard to the increasing discrimination between the opposing parties in the letter. In 1:9, the elder-overseer must “oppose τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας”. Here, the opponents are are represented synecdochially by the reference to the singular αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον. This is an instance of the rhetorical technique of synecdoche. Furthermore, there is progression: from confrontation or ἐλέγχειν (1:9), to censuring, ἐπιστομίζειν (1:11), to avoidance of the doctrine (3:9) and, finally, shunning of the person, παραιτοῦ (3:10). There can clearly be no compromise between those who teach and adhere to sound doctrine and those who teach and embrace false doctrine. The chasm only becomes wider. The paranomasia by the use of the two words, “empty talkers”, ματαιολόγοι (1:10) and “empty”, μάταιοι (3:9) does not paint a very complimentary picture of the false teachers or their doctrine.

Through syndeton, ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι, the groundless futility of false teaching is emphasised while at the same time accentuating its distinctiveness from sound doctrine, which is also emphasised through syndeton positively as καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα. The syndeton of v. 10, μίαν καὶ δευτέραν, emphasises the specificity of the manner in which erroneous teachings must be treated. No tolerance must be entertained; just two warnings followed by shunning or rejection. The apostle seems to show great awareness of the insidiousness of false teaching to the church. This alone could justify the severe treatment advocated so emphatically here.

Verse 11 drives home the proverbial final nail in the coffin through emphatic clustering of verbs that describe the false teacher: ἐξέστραπται (ὁ τοιοῦτος) καὶ ἁμαρτάνει ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος. This is akin to the vilification section of chapter 1. In the present section, the apostle has vilified not only their teaching but also the person of the teachers and accentuates it through emphatic clustering. The description portrays a gradual downward progression from perversion, to sinning to the final state of self condemnation.

Conclusion

The dominant rhetorical objective of this section is *to reinforce the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine in order to encourage compliance to the former and rejection of the latter*. The argument is structured by way of contrast to highlight the virtues of one over the other. Thus, verse 8 contains reasons for the adoption of sound doctrine while verses 9-11 provide reasons for the rejection of false teaching. This task is accomplished through the employment of an array of rhetorical techniques. The opening sentence is one of three very short sentences in this section and is used to emphasise the resultant contrast between sound and false doctrine.

The apostle highlights three characteristics of sound doctrine, namely the apostolic commendation thereof, its association with those who have come to faith in God and finally its beneficial impact upon the rest of society.

Through repetition of key words like καλόν ἔργον, καλά and ἀνθρώπος the apostle facilitates implicit contrasts with the opposition from earlier sections of the letter. This results in a highly positive presentation of sound doctrine.

In verses 9-11, the negative aspects of the false doctrine are highlighted. This section has much in common with chapter 1, repeating similar tones and sentiments. The apostle basically vilifies the false teaching in 3:9, contrasting its negative impact with that of sound doctrine through the use of another short sentence, εἰσὶν γὰρ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι. In 10-11, he vilifies the person of the false teacher and uses name calling or labelling, like he did in 1:10. The effect of all this criticism and commendation is that the chasm between sound and false doctrine is maintained, if not reinforced. It removes any possibility for compromise between the two parties. Clearly, the intent of the author, towards the end of his letter, is to hold before his audience two pictures, one of false doctrine and another of sound doctrine, showing them why they should comply with the latter and reject the former. They cannot but choose sound doctrine and reject the other, because this puts them in community with the apostle who authorises sound doctrine. Furthermore, it confirms their identity as those who believe in God when they order their conduct in line with sound doctrine. Other rhetorical techniques employed include syndeton, polysyndeton, antonyms, repetition, synecdoche, paranomasia and emphatic clustering.

2.2.11 Titus 3:12-15: Adapting the conclusion to reinforce the notion of legitimate ministry

Scholars regard the closing section as “standard” Pauline (Demarest, 1984:331; Knight, 1992:356; Mounce, 2000:456, 459). While all the standard elements of a Pauline conclusion are present, the vocabulary and the rich network of cognate linguistic concepts suggest that Paul is adapting his normal conclusion for a more important purpose, namely to round off his overall argument for compliance to sound doctrine, especially reemphasising the notion of legitimate ministry. This is the best opportunity since he has just in the previous section (9-11) addressed illegitimate ministry and dictated procedures for the treatment of the false teacher(s). The conclusion leaves the recipients in no doubt as to what constitutes legitimate ministry.

This is a very tight unit, carefully, almost abruptly, demarcated from the preceding section through repetition and paranomasia. There is however a clear transition in terms from the perspective of the content of this section; it deals with practical and personal arrangements. Based on this, scholars like Quinn (1990:260) argue that the unit should be read exclusively with the opening verses as a "compositional envelope", instead of with the preceding sections. Paranomasia and repetition do seem to suggest some correspondence with the opening sections. Quinn points out several examples: λείπῃ (3:13) and ἀπέλιπον … τὰ λείποντα (1:5); ἐν πίστει (3:15) and κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν (1:4); χάρις (3:15b) and the same in 1:4, 5. The unity of this section is underscored by the repetition of the following words in rapid succession to each other: πέμψω (12) and its cognate πρόπεμψον (13); σπούδασον (12) and the adverb σπουδαίως (13). Quinn (1990:260) adds οἱ ἡμέτεροι (14) and ἡμᾶς (15). Verse 15 discloses an interesting repetition of the verb ἀσπάζομαι and the adjective πάς within a single verse. The repetition serves to emphasise the important function of the greetings, in particular its contribution to enhancing a sense of community. It furthermore affirms the legitimacy of the believers at Crete. Those who are far from them acknowledge them by greeting them. The same holds true for Titus, who is not serving in isolation but in community.

The emphasis of this final section recalls and rejoins the opening verses of this letter but not initially in as strong a manner as Quinn insists upon. With due respect to Quinn, there remains sufficient reasons to argue for a close connection between this section and the preceding units. The word πίστος and its cognates appear nine times in this letter, in five different forms scattered in each chapter of this letter (1:1, 4, 6, 9, 13; 2:2, 10; 3:8, 15). The word χάρις also appears elsewhere in 1:11; 2:11 and 3:7. The repetition of these words facilitates coherence within the letter rather than just establishing a link between two isolated units. Furthermore, overemphasising the abruptness of the unit suggests that there is very little relationship with the previous section. On the contrary, there is a very deliberate link between the two sections when considered from a rhetorical perspective. The abruptness facilitates a mental break from a chilling presentation of the negative consequences for rejecting sound doctrine (11). It also introduces a positive picture of legitimate ministry and ministers. It is here where the link with the opening verses is strongest and credit must go to Quinn for his observations in this regard.

The dominant rhetorical emphasis of this section is upon the notion of legitimate ministry. No overt contrasts are presented and no new propositions are introduced. In fact, this part of the letter points back to concepts introduced in the opening of the letter.

In verse 12, Paul introduces measures to ensure the perpetuation of legitimate ministry in Crete. He had just advised them to reject the false teacher (3:10). Now he is about to introduce legitimate ministry. The duration of Titus' ministry is limited and a replacement will be sent in the future. Collins (2002:370) considers the introduction of the four characters, Artemis, Tychicus, Zenas and Apollos an outstanding characteristic of this conclusion. The fact that Paul plans to send a replacement rather than transfer responsibility for ministry to the elder-overseers, is suggestive of the relative young age of the church in Crete. Hendriksen (1957:398) observes in this regard that "churches cannot be made 'indigenous' overnight. As long as leadership from the outside is necessary, it must be provided". The kind of legitimate ministry envisaged is similar to that introduced in opening portions of the letter. Whereas the ministry of Paul has divine sanction, subsequent ministry must enjoy apostolic sanction in order to prove legitimate. Such ministry must be in harmony with that taught by the apostle.

The provision of ministerial successors furthermore functions to present a positive picture of Paul. He is portrayed as one deeply concerned about the church and expresses such care through the careful appointment of sound leaders. This is what led him to leave Titus there in the first place (1:5) and now he remains unwavering in his commitment to them. Furthermore, Paul wants to ensure that the church continues to receive sound doctrine which, in turn, requires the presence of sound teachers, hence Artemis or Tychicus. The use of the first person singular verb, πέμψω, confirms that it is Paul who will be sending one of them.

Additionally, by expressing the desire for Titus' presence, the apostle says much about the latter's reputation with the apostle. The ministry of Titus has constantly been affirmed throughout this letter. Presently, this request that Titus join the apostle (σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρός με εἰς Νικόπολιν) functions in a similar manner. It affirms the present ministry of Titus while still in Crete. In the eyes of the congregation, Titus is presented as one whose company the apostle seeks. Thus, if the apostle Paul appreciates Titus, how much more should the Cretans; how privileged they are to have him minister among them. If the Cretans harboured any secret wish for a visit from the apostle, such desire is disappointed by the present arrangements as well as by the information that he will be spending the winter in Nicopolis (ἐκεῖ γὰρ κέκρικα παραχειμάσαι.)

What is very clear is that the perpetuation of legitimate ministry does not require the physical presence of an apostle, only the presence of those committed to the teaching, which would eventually include elder-overseers from their own ranks (1:9).

The list of names in this section also introduces at least four other men who uphold legitimate teaching and who are committed to that which the apostle is committed to, namely the integrity and perpetuation of sound doctrine among the believers. These are men who care about them, unlike the false teachers who teach from selfish and exploitative motives (1:11).

The list of names functions rhetorically to highlight again the notion of legitimate ministry. Proper names are only mentioned here and in the introductory parts of the letter. In this manner, the closing section functions beautifully to round off the letter. Interestingly, though, the false teachers remain nameless.

Verse 14 is rhetorically significant since the apostle includes a final exhortation for good works. This reiterates the lesson of the entire letter that sound doctrine results in a healthy ethic. The opportunity that is presented to them is to provide practical help to those committed to legitimate teaching, Zenas and Apollos. The verb, μανθάνω, is one of four synonyms used in the letter to refer to teaching and or learning: διδασκαλία (1:9, 11; 2:1, 7, 10); καλοδιδασκάλος (2:3), σωφρονίζω (2:4); and παιδεύω (2:12). The word implies the existence of an attitude that responds to teaching and results in the performance of good deeds. Those who respond positively to teaching are described as "our ones/people", οἱ ἡμέτεροι. This is an instance of *honorific referencing* or classification and is rhetorically significant, because anyone who refuses to practise good deeds demonstrates by that refusal that he or she does not belong to the people of Paul and his delegates. The expression, καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι, repeats an earlier occurrence (3:8). In the latter appearance, those who performed good works were described as οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ. Here, they are *honorifically referenced or classified* as οἱ ἡμέτεροι. Thus, legitimate teaching results in sound doctrine that results in good deeds by those who submit to it, demonstrating by it that they believe in God or are in community with the apostles, the delegates and the rest of the churches. The honorific reference serves to reinforce their identity and to distinguish them from the false teachers and their followers. More importantly, it serves as a final reinforcement of the inseparability of sound doctrine and good deeds. The purpose clause, ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν ἄκαρποι, uses an agricultural metaphor, and restates in the negative (ἄκαρποι) the necessity to bear fruit. The believer's good works are his or her fruit. A fruit tree benefits others when it does what a fruit tree does, namely bear fruit.

The closing greetings in verse 15 reinforces a sense of community and functions as an encouragement to the recipients. Interestingly, Titus receives a separate greeting from the rest of the congregation. Perhaps this serves again to reiterate the prominence of Titus to other believers, οἱ (μετ' ἐμοῦ) πάντες and hence to affirm him in the eyes of the Cretan believers, in line with the endearing manner in which he is referred to in the salutation (1:4). The closing greeting to the Cretans involves another instance of *honorific referencing or classification*. They are called τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει. This expression serves a vicarious function, firstly as a term of endearment; an affectionate reference to the congregations in Crete. The verb φιλέω is an instance of paranomasia at this late stage in the letter. The cognate words were used in the context of family relationships in 2:4 and with reference to elders-overseers in 1:8. Wives must love their husbands and children, φιλάνδρος and φιλοτέκνος respectively, while local leaders must demonstrate φιλόξενον and be φιλάγαθον. Seen from this perspective the word, φιλέω positively reinforces the idea of family love, community and intimacy. It serves to draw Paul and the others with him relationally closer to the believers at Crete. The second and negative nuance relates to the limitation that is set through the expression ἐν πίστει. In other words, it excludes those who are not "in (the) faith". Paul's greeting is therefore limited to those who are in the faith and to no one else; only to those who are of the same family – who are οἱ ἡμέτεροι (14). The Cretans are again forced to recognise that one can be "in (the) faith" or negatively "out of (the) faith". This kind of eradication of grey areas is consistent with Paul's argument throughout the letter. He remains uncompromising to the very end – although it must be added that the choice of vocabulary "softens" the reality of what he is saying in this concluding part of his letter.

This gentle tone culminates in the final sentence where it takes the form of a blessing directed to all the believers: Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. The rhetorical function of this blessing is to encourage them as recipients of divine favour (Tolmie, 2005:223-224). The blessing represents the final appearance of the key word, χάρις, used first in the salutation and scattered throughout the letter. The blessing concludes this letter in a positive tone and brings together the opening and conclusion of the letter.

Conclusion

The dominant rhetorical objective of this section is *to reinforce the notion of legitimate teaching*. This is accomplished through the use of a list of workers that are representative of sound doctrine. The legitimacy of their ministry stems from the apostolic mandate or affirmation thereof. Titus is also affirmed, on the basis of the value the apostle attaches to his company. The list of workers furthermore demonstrates the apostolic concern and care for the congregation. Through *honorific referencing*, the congregation is referred to in different ways such as “our people”, those who are “in faith” and “those who love us”. The legitimacy of the teaching will be evident by their readiness to perform good deeds to meet urgent needs. This is a point raised by way of reminder. There is also the regular use of repetition and paranomasia. The particular repetition of key words from the introductory portions of this letter adds to the feeling of an argument that has gone full circle. The final rhetorical technique is the concluding blessing, which functions as an encouragement to all the saints with the emphatic employment of the adjective πάς.

SECTION 3

CONCLUSION

In Section 1, the research hypothesis on which this study was based was outlined as follows: *A thorough text-centred rhetorical approach to the Letter of Titus (i.e. without relating it to the other two Pastoral Letters or approaching it in terms of the authenticity/inauthenticity debate) will yield new insights for its interpretation.*

Guided by this research hypothesis, this rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus was, accordingly, an endeavour to firstly, investigate the uniqueness of this letter based upon the assumption that it stands independently from the Timothean correspondence. Secondly, it involved an attempt at analysing Paul's rhetorical strategy from the letter itself. The methodology employed to achieve this was a *minimal theoretical framework methodology for rhetorical analysis,* which was developed by Tolmie (2005) for a text-centred rhetorical analysis by which the persuasive strategy in a text can be identified and described.

The important question to be asked now is: "Did this study indeed yield new insights, as foreseen in Chapter 1?" To begin, it should be pointed out that this study is the only comprehensive, as well as the only text-centred, rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus currently existing – in itself a contribution to New Testament scholarship. As I have indicated in Chapter 1, the rhetorical interest in the Pastorals is generally rare and in the case of Titus it is virtually non-existent. With regard to Titus, this it has been suggested that this is attributable, firstly, to the relative novelty of the rhetorical critical approach and, secondly, to the brevity of the letter in comparison to the other two letters. Titus often appears to be treated as a footnote within the greater discussion of the Timothean corpus. The only recent work that focuses exclusively upon the rhetoric of the Letter to Titus is that of Joachim Classen.

While having much to commend, the work unfortunately has several shortcomings: It does not really investigate *persuasion* in the letter; it is exegetical rather than rhetorically oriented; and it does not provide a *comprehensive* rhetorical treatment of the letter. Compared to that of Classen, this study focuses specifically on the issue of persuasion, is much more comprehensive, and is, furthermore, based on a totally different rhetorical approach. Of course, these claims are open for evaluation by other scholars.

Furthermore, I trust that the detailed rhetorical analysis presented in Section 2, also provided new insights with regard to the details of the rhetorical strategy in particular sections in the Letter to Titus, both in terms of the way in which the dominant rhetorical strategy of a particular section could be described, as well as the discussion of the detailed issues relating to this. These will not be repeated here. Instead, the focus will now fall on the *overall rhetorical strategy* in the letter. This can be approached from different angles:

On the one hand, the *step-by-step development* of the overall argument should be summarised. Based on the analysis provided in Section 2, the broad persuasive strategy in the letter (in terms of the changes in dominant rhetorical strategy) can now be outlined as follows:

1. Titus 1:1-4: Adapting the salutation to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry
2: Titus 1:5-9: Outlining the criteria for legitimate local leadership
3: Titus 1:10-16: Discrediting the illegitimate teachers
4: Titus 2:1: Distinguishing Titus as a minister of sound doctrine on the basis of apostolic authorisation
5: Titus 2:2-10: Persuading the Cretans that personal conduct compliant with sound doctrine is compulsory and should characterise all believers
6: Titus 2:11-15: Emphasising the divine basis of obedience to sound doctrine

7: Titus 3:1-2: Persuading the Cretans of the compulsory treatment of all unbelievers in a manner consistent with sound doctrine

8: Titus 3:3: Evoking disgust with past sinful behaviour in order to reinforce behaviour in the present that complies with sound doctrine

9: Titus 3:4-7: Persuading the Cretans that displaying good works to those considered undeserving demonstrates conformity to the divine example

10: Titus 3:8-11: Reinforcing the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine in order to encourage compliance to the former and rejection of the latter

11: Titus 3:12-15: Adapting the conclusion to reemphasise the notion of legitimate ministry

The above outline evinces certain thematic repetitions or emphases. For example, the opening and closing units both emphasise legitimate teaching. Units 5 and 7 raise the issue of compliant behaviour while units 1, 6 and 9 evince a distinctly theological character. It raises the question, whether these apparent thematic commonalities are deliberate creations, part of the author's overall rhetorical strategy or whether they are incidental, a random expression of unrelated ideas. More importantly, is the question whether any coherent pattern suggestive of an overall rhetorical strategy is discernible from these summaries. In response to the latter question, I suggest that a deliberate overall rhetorical strategy can be indicated in the letter. The three theological sections (Units 1, 6 and 9), each made up of one long sentence, are complimented by three sections, that describe or relate to certain behaviour. The complimentary sections include 1:5-16, 2:1-10 and 3:1-3 respectively. Within their respective contexts, the three theological sections are programmatic for identifying a step-by-step development of Paul's overall rhetorical strategy in the letter.

Let us first consider the overall rhetorical objective. The apostle opens the letter giving a very clear indication of his mandate as a servant and an apostle (1:1), namely that he serves in this capacity κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν. The objectives of his ministry relate to the divinely elect ones who are characterised by very particular behaviour. This initial emphasis therefore, is suggestive of the problem that the Cretans were being confronted with, namely the threat of compromising the high standard of living in the present life, κατ' εὐσέβειαν. Thus, in 1:16 the key characteristic of the agitators is their paradoxical profession of God and their denial of Him by their deeds or works, θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται. The objective of the apostle therefore, relates to the *maintenance or restoration of the following balance: deeds that affirm and correspond to the testimony of faith in God.* Behaviour, however, does not happen in a vacuum but is influenced, if not determined by doctrine. In the letter, we have two groups of teachers with opposing doctrines competing for the same audience. Paul, in 1:1, informs the audience that he is a minister "for the knowledge of the truth", ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας. The overall rhetorical objective is thus related to the notion of doctrinal quality. The congregation must be persuaded to embrace healthy doctrine, while rejecting unhealthy doctrine based upon the submission of convincing evidence. In the light of these considerations, I submit that the following three-stage overall rhetorical strategy underlies the letter.

First stage: 1:1-16: *Convince the audience of the transcendent character of the origin of legitimate teaching and of those who teach it*

This stage in the overall rhetorical strategy underlies the first three units identified in the rhetorical analysis:

1. Titus 1:1-4: Adapting the salutation to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry

2: Titus 1:5-9: Outlining the criteria for legitimate local leadership

3: Titus 1:10-16: Discrediting the illegitimate teachers

The first thing the apostle needs to do is to persuade the Cretans to distinguish between "doctrine" and "doctrine", as well as between "teachers" and "teachers". Legitimate teaching is "the truth" (1:1), it comes from God through designated office bearers that includes apostles, delegates of the apostles and lay leaders appointed by the apostolic delegate (1:1-9). The conduct of the lay leaders combined with a thorough commitment to the "faithful word" (1:9) is what sets them apart from the illegitimate teachers who are vilified and ultimately shown to have no relationship with God (1:16). In other words, the false teachers are shown to be illegitimate by their conduct as well as by the absence of divine legitimisation of their persons. In this way, the transcendent character of legitimate teaching is emphasised and attempts to counter an attitude that seems to reason that teaching is teaching and teachers are teachers. This transcendence relates to the origin of the teaching and the authorisation of the teachers. A relationship is set up between legitimate teaching and the theological origin thereof. Thus, this section attempts to show that sound doctrine is legitimate. It is transcendent, because its origin is divine. Those who are authorised to teach sound doctrine, derive their authorisation from its transcendent source, namely God. Conversely, teaching and teachers that are not divinely authorised or theologically justifiable are invalid and of no benefit to the church. Where that transcendent source or divine link between the teaching and the teachers is absent, both must be rejected.

Second stage: 2:1-15: *Convince the audience of the transcendent character of behaviour accompanying legitimate teaching*

This stage in the overall rhetorical objective underlies units 4-6 identified in the rhetorical analysis of the letter:

> 4: Titus 2:1: Distinguishing Titus as a minister of sound doctrine on the basis of apostolic authorisation
>
> 5: Titus 2:2-10: Persuading the Cretans that personal conduct compliant with sound doctrine is compulsory and should characterise all believers
>
> 6: Titus 2:11-15: Emphasising the divine basis of obedience to sound doctrine

This stage begins with the authorisation of Titus' ministry in unit 4 (2:1), which really distinguishes it from what was said of the illegitimate teachers (1:10-16).

Unit 5 (2:2-10) contains descriptions of behaviour by various categories of believers that constitute manifestations of compliance to sound doctrine. The next unit (2:11-15) explains the specified conduct in theological terms. This has the effect of elevating the behaviour to a divine level, which highlights the transcendent character of the behaviour. At one level, the required behaviour is what society in general would commend. However, the conduct of believers becomes a manifestation of a divine reality, namely the appearance of grace in the life of believers. If believers were asked to explain their conduct, they would respond something like this: “Our teacher is grace who teaches us to conduct ourselves in this manner. In other words, believers are not merely manifesting behaviour that society deems good.” The behaviour of believers is thus motivated by a transcendent cause or motive, namely the appearance of grace and the complete transformation that they have experienced (2:11-15). They are behaving like God’s people, living in anticipation of the appearing of Jesus Christ (2:12), a redeemed people, a cleansed people, zealous for good works (2:13). Thus, the believers are not simply practising good manners, instead their behaviour is explicable by theological reasons; there is a theological basis to explain why believers conduct themselves the way they do. Thus, there is nothing “ordinary” about the way Christians ought to behave.

Third stage: 3:1-7: *Convince the audience of the transcendent character of their relationships with secular society*

This stage in the rhetorical strategy underlies units 7-9 identified in the rhetorical analysis:

> 7: Titus 3:1-2: Persuading the Cretans of the compulsory treatment of all unbelievers in a manner consistent with sound doctrine
>
> 8: Titus 3:3: Evoking disgust with past sinful behaviour in order to reinforce behaviour in the present that complies with sound doctrine
>
> 9: Titus 3:4-7: Persuading the Cretans that displaying good works to those considered undeserving demonstrates conformity to the divine example

In unit 7 (3:1-2), the relationship of believers to their secular environment comes under the spotlight. It appears as if the false teaching encouraged a withdrawal from or even hostility towards secular society. Based upon the existence of prior knowledge, Paul argues that the Cretans already know how to conduct themselves towards secular authorities. In unit 8 (3:3), the apostle uses the rhetorical technique of *self-vilification* to inspire disgust in order to persuade the Cretans to behave properly towards secular society. The transcendent motivation for their behaviour is provided in unit 9 (3:4-7). God acted kindly towards the Cretans when they were least deserving of it. Their attitude towards secular society is therefore, more than just decent citizenship; it follows the transcendent example of God.

3:8-15: *Concluding phase*

In units 10 and 11 the concluding stage in the rhetorical strategy follows. This comprises units 10 and 11:

> 10: Titus 3:8-11: Reinforcing the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine in order to encourage compliance to the former and rejection of the latter
>
> 11: Titus 3:12-15: Adapting the conclusion to reemphasise the notion of legitimate ministry

In summary: The overall rhetorical objective relates to the use of theological motivations for the adoption of sound doctrine and the practice of sound behaviour by the Cretans. Sound doctrine and corresponding behaviour are inseparably connected to a theological basis, namely the manifestation of "God's word" (1:3), "God's grace" (2:11), and "God's kindness and love for mankind" (3:4). Thus, the doctrine is portrayed as transcendent, because it comes from God; the required behaviour is motivated transcendentally, because it is taught by God; the manifestation of kindness to non-Christians is motivated transcendentally, because God first demonstrated his kindness towards the Cretans when they were unsaved. There is therefore, nothing "ordinary" about what is required from the Cretan believers. On the contrary, the false teaching encourages behaviour that makes no real distinction between believers and unbelievers.

The overall rhetorical strategy may also be approached from another angle, not in terms of the chronological development of the argument as outlined above, but *in terms of the commonalities between the dominant rhetorical objectives*. In terms of this approach, four different (but related) rhetorical objectives can be identified:

Paul's first objective is to persuade the Cretans of the need to recognise legitimate ministry. This he does in units 1 (1:1-4), 2 (1:5-9), 4 (2:1) and 11 (3:12-15). He begins by trying to convince the audience of the legitimacy of teachers and their teaching. In unit 1 (1:1-4), he presents himself as a legitimate teacher by arguing on the basis of *divine authorisation*. To this end he *adapts the salutation to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry*, which includes the legitimisation both of the doctrine and the teacher. The same unit also includes *apostolic authorisation* of the ministry of Titus. Unit 2 (1:1-4) sees the delegation of authority to Titus who is authorised to appoint local leaders. The dominant rhetorical objective of this unit is to *specify the criteria for legitimate local leadership*. In unit 4 (2:1), the dominant rhetorical objective is *to distinguish Titus on the basis of apostolic authorisation, as a minister of sound doctrine* from the illegitimate teachers of unit 3 (1:10-16). In unit 11 (3:12-15), Paul adapts the conclusion *to reemphasise the notion of legitimate ministry* by the introduction of Tychicus, Artemis, Zenas and Apollos who are examples of apostolically authorised ministers of the church. Thus, in these four units we have three levels of authorisation of legitimate ministry: of Paul by God; of Titus, Artemis or Tychicus, Zenas and Apollos by Paul and of the elder-overseers by Titus. These units, collectively, convey the notion that the teaching ministry in the church is not for any ambitious Tom, Dick and Harry: There are clear guidelines that must be satisfied with respect to those who teach as well as regards the content of their teaching.

The second objective is to highlight God's central role as the Author of sound doctrine, the Teacher of sound doctrine and the Model of good deeds. Three key units express this objective, namely units 1 (1:1-4), 6 (2:11-15) and 9 (3:4-7). Each of these units consists of a single sentence and each one focuses almost exclusively on the role of God. In unit 1 (1:1-4), the dominant rhetorical objective involved *adapting the salutation to emphasise the divine basis of legitimate ministry.* At one level, the unit introduces the notion of the legitimisation of ministry. At another level, it also introduces the notion of the divine authorship of sound doctrine which is presented as the manifestation of "His word", ἐφανέρωσεν .... τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ (1:3). In this way, Paul establishes from the outset the following notion: "What I'm presenting to you is God's word. Titus, the elder-overseers and other legitimate teachers will do the same. Sound doctrine is sound, because sound doctrine is God's word". In Unit 6 (2:11-15), the dominant rhetorical objective was described as *emphasising the divine basis of obedience to sound doctrine*. It communicates the following notion: "When you adjust your behaviour, so that it complies with sound doctrine, you are really showing your obedience to God rather than to man, because God is the real teacher of sound doctrine". The dominant rhetorical objective of Unit 9 (3:4-7) is *to persuade the Cretans that displaying good works to those considered to be undeserving demonstrates conformity to the example of God.* It communicates the following notion: "What are you doing? Don't you understand you are most like God when you practise good deeds to those whom you do not consider worthy? Then you are following his example. Decide whose example you want to follow!"

The third objective is to alienate the Cretans from any apparent or potential allegiance to unhealthy doctrine and its propagators. This is addressed in units 3 (1:10-16) and 10 (3:8-11). In the prior unit, the dominant rhetorical objective is *to discredit the illegitimate teachers* through the rhetorical technique of *vilification*. It communicates the notion that illegitimate teachers must be avoided since they are neither divinely nor apostolically authorised to minister to the church. Unit 10 (3:8-11) reemphasises the notion of illegitimate teaching by contrasting it with sound doctrine. The dominant rhetorical objective can be summarised as *reinforcing the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine in order to encourage compliance to the former and rejection of the latter*. The rhetorical technique of *vilification* is utilised again, but this time the emphasis is upon the vilification of *both* the unsound doctrine as well as the promoter thereof.

The fourth objective is to emphasise the relationship between sound doctrine and behaviour consequential to the doctrine. This happens in units 5 (2:2-10), 7 (3:1-2), 8 (3:3) and 10 (3:8-11). In unit 5 (2:2-10), the dominant rhetorical objective is *to persuade the Cretans that personal conduct compliant with sound doctrine is compulsory and should characterise all believers*. The notion the apostle seems to communicate can be summarised as follows: "Sound doctrine from sound teachers should manifest as sound behaviour among all believers". This unit follows the description of the illegitimate teachers who "profess to know God but deny Him by their deeds" (1:16). Unit 7 (3:1-2) expresses the following dominant rhetorical objective, namely *to persuade the Cretans of the compulsory treatment of all unbelievers in a manner consistent with sound doctrine.* It conveys the following notion: "Sound doctrine ought to make model citizens of you. Even the rest of society expects this from you". In unit 8 (3:3), the dominant rhetorical objective was summarised as follows: *evoking disgust with past sinful behaviour in order to reinforce behaviour in the present that complies with sound doctrine*. The notion it conveys can be summarised as follows: "Expecting you to behave in a civil manner towards those whom you consider unworthy is not unreasonable. In fact, it is but another opportunity to manifest the doctrine we believe. Don't forget, we were all once undeserving brutes". In unit 10 (3:8-11), the dominant rhetorical objective is described as *reinforcing the differences between sound and illegitimate doctrine in order to encourage compliance to the former and rejection of the latter*. It conveys the following notion: "This doctrine is proven. I, Paul confirm this to be true and if you obey it you can only benefit. It will prove that you really believe in God".

These four objectives may be summarised as follows:

First objective: Convince the audience of the need to recognise legitimate forms of ministry – units 1 (1:1-4), 2 (1:1-4), 4 (2:1) and 11 (3:12-15).

Second objective: Convince the audience of God's central role as the Author of sound doctrine, the Teacher of sound doctrine and the Model of good deeds –units 1 (1:1-4), 6 (2:11-15) and 9 (3:4-7).

Third objective: Convince the audience to alienate themselves from any apparent or potential allegiance to unhealthy doctrine and its propagators – units 3 (1:10-16) and 10 (3:8-11).

Fourth objective: Convince the audience of the relationship between sound doctrine and behaviour consequential to the doctrine – units 5 (2:2-10), 7 (3:1-2), 8 (3:3) and 10 (3:8-11).

The discussion above shows how this study contributes a unique and distinct description of the overall rhetorical strategy of the Letter to Titus. It differs from other studies of this letter by presenting a comprehensive analysis of the letter, utilising a text-centred rhetorical approach. This approach presupposes the existence of rhetorical strategies within the text and seeks to identify and describe the author's rhetorical strategy from the text itself, not only section by section, but also in terms of overall strategy and recurrent objectives. There is, to my knowledge, no other study of this nature that utilises this methodology and applies it in particular to the Letter to Titus. This study therefore, presents an opportunity for other scholars to scrutinise this contribution and to agree or disagree with the findings contained therein.

A further benefit of the approach followed in this rhetorical analysis is that it allows one to identify *the type of arguments* employed in the letter. In this regard, the following can be identified:

- Arguments based on the notion of divine authorisation

  Arguments based on the notion of divine authorisation are foundational for the apostle's rhetorical strategy in this letter. It is by far the most frequently used type of argument in this letter (followed by arguments based on shared knowledge – see next section). In a letter of this nature that deals with issues of legitimacy and the challenge of illegitimacy, it is important to establish the basis of legitimacy. It is, therefore, significant that the apostle's first objective is to convince the Cretans of the divine basis of legitimate ministry. Since the church is God's elect, ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ, He has a right to prescribe who may or may not minister to them. Equally important, is the second dominant rhetorical objective, which sets out to convince the Cretans of God's central role as the Author of sound doctrine, the Teacher of sound doctrine and the Model of good deeds. Related to this, is the concept that God expects a particular behaviour from those who profess to believe in Him. Hence, any failure to behave in a manner compliant to sound doctrine is presented as tantamount to a denial of God (1:16). Also, in 2:2-10, the negligent behaviour of believers can either be a cause for God's word to be maligned, or God's doctrine can be adorned by sound conduct. Similarly, the reference to Cretans as "those who believe in God", οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ, is another variation of this kind of argument that God expects a particular behaviour from those who believe in Him. Following on from this, is a further variation of the divine authorisation argument, namely *the divine prerogative* or *the right of the divine*. This argument is closely related to the argument of the divine expectation of a particular behaviour. According to 2:11-15, God has a right over those whom He has redeemed (λυτροόμαι) and cleansed (καθαρίζω) from all lawlessness (ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας). Since God is the one who purchased and cleansed the Cretan believers, they belong to Him; hence the prerogative to prescribe the appropriate behaviour belongs to Him.

Furthermore, this line of argumentation is foundational for the past-present-future momentum characteristic of this letter. There is a hope, ἐλπίς, but only those who behave in the divinely expected manner can look forward to it. Negatively, this implies that those who deviate from the expected behaviour can anticipate the opposite of what the obedient ones are expecting.

- Arguments based on shared knowledge

  Arguments based on shared knowledge employ accepted societal norms regarding proper and acceptable behaviour as a legitimate yardstick of behaviour. The virtue and vice lists pertaining to elder-overseers and illegitimate teachers respectively (1:5-9, 10-16) are examples of this kind of argument. It is also used in 2:2-10 with regard to the conduct of believers as well as in 3:1-3. Paul uses these arguments to convince the Cretans of the necessity to behave in a manner compliant with sound doctrine, which will reflect behaviour considered admirable by society. Negatively, this kind of argument serves to present the false teachers in a bad light by highlighting the extent to which their conduct contradicts the positive behaviour that society in general upholds. This line of argumentation makes it very difficult for the Cretans not to conduct themselves in a manner compliant with the sound doctrine. Its persuasive power also lies in the fact that the commendable conduct is obvious and known to all.

- Arguments based on the existence of prior knowledge or based on the appeal to memory

  Paul uses an argument based on the appeal to the memory or prior knowledge of his audience in 3:1-3. This kind of argumentation presents the audience with an opportunity for a subjective evaluation of the information presented to them. They can evaluate the consistency of the doctrine because they are not expected to comprehend new information. They are called to act in ways they have known to be consistent with sound doctrine. On the negative side, a refusal to act consistent with what they have known to be true would amount to a moral paradox, thus making this line of argumentation very persuasive.

- o Arguments based on the notion of irreconcilable conduct

  The salutation lays the groundwork for this line of argumentation when the church is referred to as ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ, whose faith and knowledge of the truth must be for the goal of conforming to godliness, εὐσέβεια. Thus, godliness will characterise the ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ. An ungodly ἐκλεκτός θεοῦ would be unthinkable or irreconcilable.

  In 2:11-14, Paul describes the Cretans as God's own possession, zealous for good works, … ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον, ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων. The argument is as follows: Those who belong to God are zealous for good works, Cretans believers belong to God, and therefore the Cretans believers are zealous for good works. Negatively, this argument contends that the absence of a zeal for good works is tantamount to not belonging to God. It is thus a form of irreconcilable conduct to belong to God and not to be zealous for good works.

  The reference to the believers in 3:8 as φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ is another instance of this line of argumentation. To believe in God, and not engage in good deeds would also constitute irreconcilable conduct.

e. Arguments based upon identification with the audience

   In 3:3, the apostle argues on the basis of *identification with his audience* in order to achieve his objective of engendering a compliant attitude. This technique provides the apostle with a platform from which to address his audience, effectively reinforcing his authority over or right to speak to them with great liberty and confidence.

f. Arguments based on the use of vilification of the opposition

Vilification is a technique that Paul uses very effectively to influence the perception of his audience regarding the opposition. In units 3 (1:10-16) and 10 (3:8-11), he sets out to persuade his audience concerning the illegitimacy of the doctrine of the opposition. The intention is to get the audience to change their minds about the false teachers and their teaching by raising doubts concerning their character and their teaching. For example, he refers to their teaching as "things", ἃ (1:11) while the quote in 1:12 is used to cast doubt upon the character of the false teachers, being ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

Lastly, attention should be focused on the *wide range of rhetorical techniques employed* in the Letter to Titus. Most of these techniques are well known and are listed here for reference purposes. (In the rhetorical analysis in Chapter 2 their function has already been discussed.) Furthermore, four additional techniques have been pointed out in this study, which seem not to have been identified by scholars thus far. They will be highlighted briefly in the second half of this review.

1. Rhetorical techniques used most often in the letter, include:

   a. Paranomasia: for example κοσμικὰς (2:12) and κοσμῶσιν (2:10).

   b. Implicit contrasting:

   An example of this technique occurs in chapter 1 with the positive description of the elder-overseers (5-9) followed by a description of the false teachers (10-16). The contrast between the two groups is implicit rather than explicit since, there are no indications of a simile being drawn. A more subtle example is the comparison between the character of God and that of the false teachers in 1:2 and 1:12 respectively. God is described as being "unlying", ἀψευδὴς, while the false teachers are called "always liars", ἀεὶ ψεῦσται.

c. Personification: For example, in 2:12 grace is said to instruct the believers, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς.

d. Asyndeton: For example, in 3:1-2 a variety of nouns and infinitives are paired without the use of conjunctions: ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, πειθαρχεῖν, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἑτοίμους εἶναι, μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, ἀμάχους εἶναι, ἐπιεικεῖς, πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους.

e. Syndeton: For example, in 3:4: ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία.

f. Polysyndeton: For example, in 3:9, μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς.

g. Repetitions: For example, in 1:9 one finds τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ, and 2:1 τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλία.

h. Metaphor: For example, in 1:4 Titus is called Paul's "true child", a metaphorical reference to family life. In 3:14 we find an agricultural reference to fruitlessness, ἄκαρποι.

i. Inclusive language: For example, 3:3, Ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς.

j. Synonyms: For example, in 1:16 we encounter ἔργον <u>ἀγαθὸν</u>. In 2:7 we find <u>καλῶν</u> ἔργων.

k. Antonyms: For example, in 1:2, ἀψευδής and in 1:12, ψεῦσται.

l. Them-us language: For example, 1:12, τίς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης.

m. Example. For example, in 3:4-7 God is presented as an example of one who shows kindness to those who do not deserve it. According to 1:2, God does not lie. Paul, as a servant of God (1:1), is also an example to others, who are in master-servant relationships (2:9).

n. Chiasm: For example in 1:3-4 we find the following references to God and Jesus Christ:

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (1:3)
Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (1:4)

In 3:4 and 3:6 we find the same:

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ (3:4)
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (3:6)

In 1:15 we find another example:

πάντα καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς
τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν

o. Transitional devices: For example, section 1:5-9 deals with the elder-overseers, but in verse 9 which describes the responsibility of the elder-overseers the false teachers are introduced as τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας, just before the next section (1:10-16) in which they are fully dealt with. This small word, in 1:9, thus functions as a transitional device that introduces the next section.

p. Anaphora: For example, in 1:8 φιλόξενον and φιλάγαθον, and in 2:4 φιλάνδρους … φιλοτέκνους.

q. Assonance: For example, in 2:11 the rhyming and repetition of the ως- sound in σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς.

r. Thematic progression: For example, the theme of servanthood is developed starting with Paul as a servant of and obedient to God, while slaves must submit to their own masters (2:9). Related to this is the theme of submission to authority: wives to their husbands (2:5); servants to their masters (2:9) and believers to secular authorities (3:1). Thus, starting in the home, then to the place of employment and finally within secular society.

s. Alliteration and rhyme: For example, in 3:3 δουλεύοντες … διάγοντες.

t. Anthropopathism: For example, in 3:4-7 the reference to God's χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία (4) and ἔλεος (5).

u. Unusually long sentences: For example, 1:1-4, 2:11-14, and 3:4-7.

v. Synecdoche: For example, in 3:10 the reference to the opposition in the singular as αἱρετικός ἄνθρωπος.

2. New rhetorical techniques that have been identified are:

Emphatic clustering

This technique is used in several places in the letter. There are variations of the technique namely asyndetic (1:12; 2:2) and polysyndetic clustering (1:16; 2:12, 15).

It involves the grouping together or clustering of related concepts or words in groups of three. Clustering serves an emphatic purpose. In chapter 1, it is employed as part of the apostle's vilification campaign in 1:10, 12 and 16 highlighting the "badness" of the false teachers. In 2:2, it is used to emphasise the sound behaviour expected of older men. In 2:7, it is used to impress upon Titus what is required from him as an example to the believers. In 2:12, the conduct of those who are instructed by grace is emphasised by the words, σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς. In 2:15, it is used to impress upon Titus the urgency with which he must approach his ministry, λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε. A final instance of this technique appears in 3:11, which constitutes a final instance of vilification.

Self-vilification

This rhetorical technique is used in 3:3 with reference to the pre-salvific conduct of the believers. The list of vices is used to instil disgust. Here, it is not the opponents that are being vilified, but Paul and the believers, by Paul. It highlights the odiousness of their past life and is used to enforce compliance to behaviour that corresponds to sound doctrine.

Honorific referencing or classification

This technique is the opposite of vilification or more specifically, self-vilification. Paul refers to believers in ways that emphasise their privileged status, thus bestowing honour upon them. This strategy is utilised to build relationships. Thus, believers are called ἐκλεκτοί θεοῦ (1:1), οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ (3:8), οἱ ἡμέτεροι (3:13), and τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει (3:15).

Networks created by the repetition of associated concepts

In the analysis section, it has been pointed out how various related words or concepts are repeated in different units and in different contexts. This technique makes several processes possible. One of these is implicit contrasting, which is facilitated merely through the repetition of a cognate word within a different context. This technique also facilitates the remarkable coherency that is evident within the letter. An outstanding example is the instance of paranomasia associated with the following words: ἀνυπότακτα (Christian children of elder-overseers); ἀνυπότακτοι (false teachers); ὑποτασσομένας (Christian young women); ὑποτάσσεσθαι (Christian slaves).The word ὑποτασσω and its cognates contrast the opposing groups within the letter and establish a network of positive behaviour shared by those who are associated with sound doctrine.

This study has led me to a new appreciation for the rhetorical genius of the apostle Paul. Furthermore, it offers, almost serendipitously so, fresh perspectives beneficial for the authenticity debate. The implications of the cumulative-complimentary reading principle certainly have potential for further investigtion. In terms of practical theology, the homiletical benefit of rhetorical critical analysis is another area that holds rich dividends for further study. Indeed, anything that will help the church with the persausive proclamation of the gospel warrants our attention.

The message of this letter to Titus may not be unique, but the way in which it is communicated certainly is. Indeed, this little letter does not need to stand in the shadow of the Timothean correspondence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aageson, J. W. (1997). "2 Timothy and its Theology: In Search of a Theological Pattern." Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers **36**: 692-714.

Achtemeier, P. J., J. B. Green, et al. (2001). Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology. Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B Eerdmans Company.

Bailey, M. L. (1994). A Theology of Paul's Pastoral Epistles. A Biblical Theology of the New Testament. R. B. Zuck. Chicago, Moody Press**:** 333-367.

Barrett, C. (1963). The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Bauckham, R. (1988). "Pseudo-Apostolic Letters." Journal of Biblical Literature **107**: 469-494.

Bauer, F. C. (1835). Die Sogennanten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus. Stuttgart and Tübingen, J G Gottaschen Verlagshandlung.

Beker, D. J. C. (1991). Heirs or Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today. Minneapolis, Fortress.

Bernard, J. H. (1980 [1899]). The Pastoral Epistles. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Book House

Bitzer, L. (1968). "The Rhetorical Situation." Philosophy and Rhetoric **1**: 1-14.

Botha, P. J. J. (1993). The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters:Rhetoric, Performance and Presence. Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht. Sheffield **90:** 409-428.

Brox, N. (1989). Die Pastoralbriefe. Regensburg, Pustet Verlag.

Carson, D. A. and D. Moo (2005). An Introduction to the New Testament Leichester, England, Apollos.

Carson, D. A., D. J. Moo, et al. (1992). An Introduction to the New Testament Leichester, England, Apollos.

Childs, B. S. (1984). The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction. Philadelphia, Fortress Press.

Clark, D. (2002). "Discourse structure in Titus." Bible Translator **53**(1): 101-117.

Classen, C. (2002). Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament. Boston, Bril Academic Publishers, INC

Collins, R. F. (2000). "The Theology of the Epistle to Titus." Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses **Tomus LXXVI** (76): 56-72.

Collins, R. F. (2002). 1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary. Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press.

Credner, K. A. (1836). Einleitung in das Neue Testament Halle, Waisenhaus.

Demarest, G. (1984). 1, 2 Thessalonians, 1, 2 Timothy, Titus. . Waco, Texas, Word Books.

Dibelius, M. and H. Conzelmann (1972). The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles Philadelphia, Fortress Press.

Donelson, L. R. (1986). Pseudipigraphy and ethical argument in the Pastoral Epistles Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck. **22:** viii-221.

Dunn, J. D. G. (2000). The First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus. Nashville, Abingdon Press.

Du Toit, A. B. (1994). "Vilification as a Pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography." Biblica **75**(3): 403-412.

Eichorn, J. G. (1812). Einleitung in das Neuen Testament. Leipzig, Weidemannischen Buchhandlung.

Ellis, E. E. (1979). Paul and his recent interpreters. Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Eusebius, P. (1955). The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus: Bishop of Cesarea, in Palestine. Translated from the original with an introduction by Christian Fredierick Cruse and an Historical View of the Council of Nice. Twin Brooks Series. I. Boyle. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Bake Book House.

Evanson, E. (1805). The Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists, and the evidence of their respective Authenticity examined; with that of some other scriptures deemed canonical Gloucester, D. Walker for J. Johnson.

Everts, J. M. (1993). Hope Dictionary of Paul and his Letters. G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Reid and D. G. Martin. Leichester, England, Inter Varsity Press**:** 415-417.

Faber, R. (2005). "*Evil Beasts Lazy Gluttons*. A Neglected Theme in the Epistle to Titus." Westminster Journal of Theology **67**: 135-45.

Fee, G. D. (1988). 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus. Massachusetts, Hendrickson Publishers.

Fiore, B. (1986). The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles. Italy, Rome Biblical Institute Press.

Fitzmeyer, J. A. (2004). "The Structured Ministry of the Church in the Pastoral Epistles." Catholic Biblical Quarterly **66** (4): 582-596.

Goulder, M. D. (1996). "The Pastor's Wolves: Jewish Christian Visionaries behind the Pastoral Epistles." Novum Testamentum **38** (Jl): 242-256.

Guthrie, D. (1957). The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary. London, The Tyndale Press.

Guthrie, D. (1990). The New Testament Introduction. Leichester, England, Apollos.

Hagner, D. A. (1998). Titus as a Pauline Letter. Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers Part Two. Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press. **37:** 546-558.

Hanson, A. T. (1968). Studies in the Pastoral Epistles. London, SPCK.

Hanson, A. T. (1982). The Pastoral Epistles: Based on the Revised Standard Version. Grand Rapids, WM.B. Eerdmans Publishers.

Harding, M. (1998). Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles. New York, Peter Lang Publishing.

Harris, M. J. (1980). Titus 2:13 and the Deity of Christ. Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F F Bruce on his 70th Birthday. D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris. Grand Rapids, William B Eerdmans Publishing Company**:** 263-273.

Harrison, P. N. (1921). The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles London, Oxford University Press.

Harvey, J. D. (1998). Listening to the Text: Oral Patterning in Paul's Letters. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Books.

Hendriksen, W. (1957). 1 & 2 Timothy and Titus. London, Banner of Truth Trust.

Hiebert, D. E. (1978). Titus and Philemon. Chicago, Moody Press.

Holtzmann, J. (1880). Die Pastoralbriefe. Leipzig, Wilhelm Engelmann.

Houlden, J. (1976). The Pastoral Epistles Middlesex, England, Penquin Books.

Hultgren, A. J. (1984). I-II Timothy, Titus, II Thessalonians. Minneapolis, Minnesota, Augsburg Publishing House.

Jeremias, J. (1963). Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Johnson, L. T. (1996). Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, Trinity Press International.

Karris, R. J. (1979). The Pastoral Epistles. Wilmington, Delaware, Michael Glazier, Incorporated.

Karris, R. J. (1996). A Symphony of New Testament Hymns. Commentary on Phillipians 2:5-11, Colossians 1:15-20, Ephesian 2:14-16, 1Timothy 3:16, Titus 3:4-7, 1Peter 3:18-22, and 2Timothy 2:11-13. Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press.

Kelly, J. N. D. (1960). A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus. London, A&C Black.

Kennedy, G. A. (1984). New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press.

Kidd, R. M. (1999). "Titus as Apologia: Grace for Liars Beasts and Bellies." Horisons in Biblical Theology **21**(2): 185-209.

Knight (III), G. W. (1979). The Faithful Sayings in the Pastorals. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Book House.

Knight (III), G. W. (1992). The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text. . Grand Rapids, Michigan, W B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Köstenberger, A. J. (2003). " Hermeneutical and Exegetical Challenges in Interpreting the Pastoral Epistles." The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology **7** (3): 4-17.

Lambrecht, J. (1994). Pauline Studies: Collected Essays. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. **CXV:** x-xi.

Lea, D. and H. P. Griffin (1992). 1, 2 Timothy Titus. Nashville Tennessee, Broadman Press.

Lenski, R. C. H. (1961). The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and Philemon. Minneapolis, Minnesota, Augsburg Publishing House.

Lightfoot, J. B. (1893). The Date of the Pastoral Epistles. Biblical Essays. London, Macmillan**:** 397-410.

Lock, W. (1924). A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (1 & 2 Timothy and Titus).Edinburgh T & T Clark.

Luther, M. (1960). Preface to the Epistle of St.Paul to Titus. Luther's Works: Word and Sacrament I. E. T. Bachmann. Philadelphia, Fortress Press. **35**.

Mappes, D. A. (2003). "Moral Virtues Associated with Eldership." Bibliotheca Sacra **160**(April-June): 202-218.

Marshall, I. H. (2006). "Some Recent Commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles." The Expository Times **117**(4): 140-143.

Marshall, I. H., S. Travis, et al. (2002). Exploring the New Testament: A Guide to the Letters and Revelation. Downers Grove, Ilinois, InterVarsity Press.

McArthur (Jr), J. (1996). Titus. Chicago, Moody Press.

McKnight, S. and G. R. Osborne (2004). The Face of New Testament Studies: A survey of recent research Grand Rapids, Michigan Baker Academic.

McRay, J. (2003). Paul: His Life and Teaching. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Academic.

Meynet, R. (1998). Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.

Miller, J. D. (1997). The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents Society for New Testament Studies: Monograph Series. R. Bauckham. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Moule, C. F. D. (1965). "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library **47**: 430-452.

Mounce, W. D. (2000). Pastoral Epistles. Nashville, Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Oden, T. C. (1989). First and Second Timothy and Titus. Louisville, John Knox Press.

Porter, S. and T. H. Olbricht, Eds. (1996). Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference. Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplent Series. London, Sheffield Academic Press.

Porter, S. and D. L. Stamps, Eds. (2002). Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. London, Sheffield Academic Press.

Porter, S. and L. Stamps, Eds. (1999). The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. London, Sheffield Academic Press.

Quinn, J. D. (1990). The Letter to Titus: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary and an Introduction to Titus, 1 Timothy, and the Pastoral Epistles. . New York, Doubleday.

Richards, E. R. (1991). The secretary in the letters of Paul Tübingen Möhr.

Roller, O. (1933). Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe. Stuttgart, Köhlhammer.

Roloff, J. (1988). Der erste Brief an Timotheus. Zurich, Benziger Verlag.

Schleiermacher, F. E. D. (1897). Über den ersten Brief Pauli an Timotheus. Braunschweig/Leipzig, Gerhard Reuter.

Schmidt, J. E. C. (1804). Historical Critical Introduction to the New Testament.

Simpson, E. K. (1954). The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. London.

Stamps, D. L. (1993). Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualising of the Situation in New Testament Epistles. Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Helderberg Conference. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht. England, Sheffield Publishers: 193-210.

Stott, J. R. W. (1997). The Message of Timothy and Titus. Leicester, England, Inter-Varsity Press.

Strobel, A. (1968). "Screiben des Lukas? Zum sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe." New Testament Studies **15**: 191-210.

Sumney, J. L. (1996). “A Reading of the Theology of 1 Timothy without Authorial Presuppositions” (paper presented to the Theology of the Disputed Paulines Group at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Orleans, November).

Tertullian (1919). Tertullian's Treatises concerning Prayer, concerning Baptism. Translations of Christian Literature: Latin Texts. London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Thurston, B. B. (1999). "The Theology of Titus." Horisons in Biblical Theology **21** (2): 171-184.

Tolmie, D. F. (2005). Persuading the Galatians. A Text-Centred Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter. Tübingen, Möhr Siebeck.

Towner, P. H. (1989). The Goal of our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles. Sheffield, England Shefield Academic Press.

Towner, P. H. (1994). 1-2 Timothy and Titus. Leichester, England Intervarsity Press.

Van Neste (2002). "Structure and Cohesion in Titus: Problems and Method." The Bible Translator **53**(1): 118-133.

Van Neste, R. (2003). "The Message of Titus: An overview.” The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology **7** (3): 18-30.

Verner, D. C. (1983). The Household of God: The social world of the Pastoral Epistles. Chicago, California, Scholars Press

Wallace, D. B. (1997). Crisis of the Word or A Message to Pastors and Would-Be Pastors (2Timothy 2:15). Dallas Seminary. Biblical Studies Press.

Wendland, E. R. (1999). Let no one disregard you! (Titus 2:15): Church Discipline and the construction of Discourse in a Personal, 'Pastoral' Epistle. Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press**:** 334-351.

Wolter, M. (1988). Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wuellner, W. (1987). "Where is rhetorical criticism taking us?" Catholic Biblical Quarterly **49**: 448-463.

Wuellner, W. (1991). The Rhetorical Genre or Jesus's Sermon in Luke 12.1-13.9 Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy D. Watson. Sheffield, JSOT Press**:** 93-118.

Young, F. (1995). The Pastoral Epistles and the Ethics of Reading. The Pauline Writings. S. Porter and C. A. Evans. Sheffield Sheffield Academic Press. **The Biblical Seminar 34:** 268-282.

Zahn, T. (1953). Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Kregel.

Zodhiates, S. (1992). The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament. Chattanooga, Tennessee, AMG Publishers.

ABSTRACT

This study has been conducted upon the presupposition that the Letter to Titus still has to benefit from a thorough rhetorical critical analysis that will demonstrate its uniqueness as a coherent, comprehensive portion of New Testament literature that can be interpreted independently from the two letters to Timothy. Accordingly, a review of existing scholarship on the Pastorals generally and Titus specifically was conducted (Section1) followed by a comprehensive text-centred rhetorical analysis of the Letter to Titus (Section 2). Finally, a summary of the results of this study was presented (Section 3).

In Section 1, the review of existing scholarship on the authorship, theology, structure and coherency, and rhetorical approaches to Titus revealed how, due to the pervasiveness of the authenticity or authorship debate about the Pastorals, the Letter to Titus has been marginalised and interpreted in the light of the Timothean correspondence. In all the above categories, the individuality and uniqueness of Titus have been compromised. The authenticity of the Pastoral Letters went unchallenged until the turn of the nineteenth century when German scholars expressed their doubts about the alleged Pauline authorship of this corpus. The key dispute issues related to theological, ecclesiological, stylistic and historical inconsistencies that New Testament scholars observed in their analysis of the three letters. In response to these apparent inconsistencies, various theories were developed to account for the origin of the three letters. The first was the pseudonymous or fiction hypothesis according to which it is argued that the Pastorals were authored by someone other than Paul, but who used his name, probably some time after his death. Scholars who defend Pauline authorship of the Pastorals have challenged pseudonymity on the basis of ethics, history, hermeneutics, and apostolic objections. The origin of the letters have also been explained by the following theories: fragment hypothesis, secretary or amanuensis hypothesis and the allonymity or allepigraphy hypothesis. Theology, Christology, pneumatology and soteriology are central emphases in

the theology of Titus, but tend to be interpreted in relationship with the other two letters. Structurally, the Letter to Titus, when compared to the other Pastorals, has been described as not having any structure, being incoherent. This position has been proposed by James Miller. In defence, Ray van Neste has argued for the coherence of the letter. Rhetorical studies devoted exclusively to Titus have been found to be severely lacking. The exception has been the work by Joachim Classen entitled "A rhetorical reading of the Epistle to Titus". While having much to commend it, the article has been shown to have several serious shortcomings: although the article deals with *what* is there, it does not address the issue of persuasion; in other words, it does not evaluate *why* the author says things in the way he does; it is more exegetical than rhetorical; it is not a comprehensive treatment of the whole letter; it is silent about the obvious theological emphases in the letter. There have been increasing calls for an appreciation of the three letters individually. This study attempted to respond to that call on the basis of the following hypothesis: *A thorough text-centred rhetorical approach to the Letter of Titus (i.e. without relating it to the other two Pastoral Letters or approaching it in terms of the authenticity/inauthenticity debate) will yield new insights for its interpretation.*

In Section 2 the rhetorical situation was presented followed by a comprehensive rhetorical analysis of the letter, using a text-centred, minimal theory framework approach, formulated by D.F. Tolmie (2005). The objective was to investigate and analyse the rhetorical strategy of the author from the text, which was divided into 11 rhetorical units. Each unit was demarcated and described in terms of the dominant rhetorical objective of the author. This was done based on a verse-by-verse analysis of the text. This approach yielded much insight into the unique rhetorical structure of the letter as a whole and provided rich insights into the coherence of the letter. A variety of rhetorical techniques revealed the intricate rhetorical structure that characterise this short letter. Some techniques have been observed that may not yet have been categorised by scholars to date.

In Section 3 the results of the study have been summarised. It sets out the rhetorical objective of the text in terms of the chronological development of the author's argument as it develops from unit to unit. A second way to describe the rhetorical strategy of the author has been described in terms of the overlap between the various units which revealed several controlling rhetorical objectives. Furthermore, the rhetorical techniques used in the letter have been summarised in this section. New techniques have also been defined and listed in the concluding section. The study concludes with the conviction that the Letter to Titus can stand independently from the rest of the Pastorals and makes a significant contribution in our understanding and appreciation of Paul's use of rhetoric.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie is gebaseer op die voorveronderstelling dat die Brief aan Titus nog moet baat vind by ’n deurdagte, retories-kritiese analise, wat die uniekheid daarvan as ‘n samehangende, gehele deel van Nuwe Testamentiese literatuur, wat onafhankilik van die briewe aan Timotheus geinterpreteer kan word, sal demonstreer. Gevolglik is ’n oorsig van bestaande navorsing oor die Pastorale Briewe in die algemeen, en Titus spesifiek onderneem (Deel 1) gevolg deur ‘n volledige teks-gesentreerde, retoriese analise van die Brief aan Titus (Deel 2). Laastens is ’n opsomming van die resultate van hierdie studie gemaak (Deel 3).

In Deel 1 het ’n oorsig van bestaande navorsing oor die outeurskap, teologie, struktuur en samehangendheid en retoriese benaderings tot Titus blootgelê hoe, te wyte aan die deurdringendheid van die egtheidkwessie of die debat rakende die outeurskap van die Pastorale, die Brief aan Titus gemarginaliseer en in die lig van die Timotheus korrespondensie geinterpreteer word. In al bogenoemde kategorieë is die uitsonderlikheid en oorspronklikheid van Titus misken. Die egtheid van die Pastorale Briewe is nooit bevraagteken voor die negentiende eeu nie, totdat Duitse akademici die Pauliniese outeurskap van hierdie werke in twyfel begin trek het. Die sleutelkwessies waaroor die dispuut gehandel het is verwant aan teologiese, ekklesiologiese, stilistiese and historiese ongerymdhede wat Nuwe-Testamentiese navorsers, in hul analise van die drie briewe bevraagteken het. In reaksie op hierdie oënskynlike ongerymdhede, het verskeie teorieë die lig gesien om vir die oorsprong van die drie briewe verantwoording te doen. Eerstens was daar die vervalsing- of fiksiehipotese waarvolgens daar aangevoer word dat die Pastorale deur iemand anders, in die naam van Paulus geskryf is, waarskynlik ná sy dood. Navorsers wat die Pauliniese outeurskap van die Pastorale verdedig, het die vervalsing- of fiksiehipotese bevraagteken op grond van etiese, historiese, hermeneutiese en apostoliese oorwegings. Die oorsprong van die briewe is ook verklaar deur die volgende teorieë: die fragmenthipotese, sekretaris- of amanuensishipotese en die allonieme- of allepigrafiesehipotese. Teologie, Christologie, pneumatologie en soteriologie is sentrale aspekte in die teologie van Titus, maar skyn geinterpreteer te word in verhouding met die ander twee briewe. In terme van die struktuur is die Brief aan Titus, in vergelyking met die ander Pastorale, beskryf as ontbrekend aan enige struktuur, en onsamehangend. Dit is die argument soos aangevoer deur James Miller. Ter verdediging, het Ray van Neste geargumenteer vir die samehangendheid van Titus. Geen retoriese studies wat eklusief toegewy is aan Titus is gevind nie. ’n Uitsondering was die artikel van Joachim Classen getiteld “A rhetorical reading of the Letter to Titus”. Alhoewel dit ’n bydrae lewer, is die volgende tekortkominge uitgewys: die studie behandel die teks in terme van *wat* daar is sonder om die oorreding aan te spreek, met ander woorde dit behandel nie *waarom* die outeur sy inligting op ‘n spesifieke manier organiseer nie; dit is meer eksegeties as retories; dit in nie ‘n volledige behandeling van die hele brief nie; dit behandel ook nie die duidelik teologiese aspekte van die brief nie. Daar was toenemende oproepe vir ’n waardering van die drie briewe op ’n indiwiduele grondslag. Hierdie studie het gepoog om te reageer op daardie oproep op grond van die volgende hipotese: *‘n Deeglike teks-gesentreerde retoriese benadering tot die Brief aan Titus (d.w.s. sonder om dit in verwantskap te bring met die ander twee Pastorale Briewe of dit te benader in terme van die egtheid/onegtheid-debat) sal nuwe insigte vir die interpretasie van die brief bydra.*

In Deel 2 is die retoriese situasie behandel gevolg deur ’n volledige retoriese analise van die brief, deur gebruik te maak van ’n teks-gesentreerde, minimale teoretiese raamwerk, wat deur D.F. Tolmie (2005) geformuleer is. Die doel was om die skrywer se retoriese strategie uit die teks self, wat opverdeel is in 11 retoriese eenhede, te ondersoek en te analiseer. Elke eenheid is afgebaken en beskryf in terme van die skrywer se oorkoepelende retoriese doelstelling. Dit is gedoen volgens ’n vers-vir-vers analise van die teks. Hierdie benadering het veel bygedra tot insigte in die unieke retoriese struktuur van die brief as ’n geheel en het ook bygedra tot ryk insigte in die samehangendheid van die brief. Verskeie retoriese tegnieke het die geïntegreerde retoriese struktuur, wat hierdie brief kenmerk, blootgelê. Sekere tegnieke is waargneem wat nog nie tot op die hede deur navorsers geidentifiseer was nie.

In Deel 3 is die resultate van hierdie studie opgesom. Dit bevat 'n uiteensetting van die retoriese doelstelling van die teks in terme van die kronologiese ontwikkeling van die skrywer se argument soos dit van eenheid tot eenheid op bou. 'n Tweede manier om die skrywer se retoriese strategie te beskryf, was om dit te sien in terme van die oorvleueling wat bestaan tussen die verskeie eenhede wat weer op sy beurt verskillende retoriese objektiewe blootgelê het. Die retoriese tegnieke wat in die brief gebruik word, is in Deel 3 opgesom. Nuwe retoriese tegnieke is ook in die laaste gedeelte gekategoriseer en opgesom. Die studie is afgesluit met die oortuiging dat die Brief aan Titus onafhanklik kan staan van die res van die Pastorale en dat die brief 'n aansienlike bydrae lewer tot ons insig en waardering vir Paulus se gebruik van retoriek.

KEY TERMS

1. Pastoral Letters
2. Rhetorical criticism
3. Rhetorical strategy
4. Pauline
5. Titus
6. Dominant rhetorical objective
7. New Testament
8. Rhetoric
9. Rhetorical technique
10. Persuasion
11. Vilification
12. Sound doctrine

TREF WOORDE

1. Pastorale Briewe
2. Retoriese kritiek
3. Retoriese strategie
4. Paulinies
5. Titus
6. Dominante retoriese doelstelling
7. Nuwe Testament
8. Retoriek
9. Retoriese tegniek
10. Oorreding
11. Vilifikasie
12. Gesonde leer