



A Study of 1st & 2nd Timothy

1st Timothy 3:1-7

Therefore, It's Necessary that an Overseer...

I am reading from 1st Timothy chapter three, verses one through seven. If you're using one of the pew Bibles, the passage is located on page 992...1st Timothy 3:1-7.

This is what God's Word says:

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 3:1**...The saying is trustworthy: If anyone aspires to the office of overseer, he desires a noble task. ² Therefore an overseer must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, sober-minded, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, ³ not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. ⁴ He must manage his own household well, with all dignity keeping his children submissive, ⁵ for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church? ⁶ He must not be a recent convert, or he may become puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil. ⁷ Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, so that he may not fall into disgrace, into a snare of the devil.

Father, we come to you this morning confessing to you our great need. Father we need and we desire that the Holy Spirit come now and take the things of Christ and make them real to our hearts...to come and take the written word and as its

true author and therefore its infallible teacher to instruct us in the truth of your Son. Open the book we pray to see what you have accomplished on our behalf, in Christ, in whose name, we pray, Amen.

In an article in the fall 2011 edition of the Master's Seminary Journal entitled "Authentic Spiritual Leadership," Dr. Richard Mayhue begins his discussion of what it means to be an authentic Christian leader with the following apocryphal letter supposedly written by a human resources firm to the Lord Jesus himself regarding his twelve disciples.¹

Thank you for sending the resumes of the twelve men you picked for managerial positions in your new organization. All of them have now taken a battery of tests. We have not only run the results through our computer but have also arranged personal interviews for each one of them with our psychologist and vocational aptitude consultant. It is the staff's opinion that most of your nominees are lacking in background, education, and vocational aptitude for the type of enterprise you're undertaking. They simply do not understand the team concept. Simon Peter is emotionally unstable and given to fits of temper. Andrew has absolutely no qualities of leadership. The two brothers, James and John, place personal interest above company loyalty. Thomas demonstrates a skeptical attitude that would tend to undermine morale. Matthew has been blacklisted by the Jerusalem Better Business Bureau. James, the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddeus definitely have radical leanings, and they both registered a high score on the manic-depressive scale. One of the candidates, however, shows great potential. He's a man of genuine ability and resourcefulness. He meets people well, and possesses a keen business mind. Apparently, he has a number of contacts in high places. He is highly motivated, ambitious, and responsible. As a result, we are happy to recommend to you Judas Iscariot to be your chief controller and right-hand man.

Sincerely,

Jordan Management Consultants

There is a part of me that wants to laugh out loud when I read that just as there is a part of me that wants to burst out crying. I suppose that is true because I have

seen firsthand just how hard it is to get this right...to pick the right leaders. I mean there is one sense in which the wisdom of the world is absolutely useless in picking out godly leaders. I have seen men that had all of the usually preferred attributes burst into flames under pressure and spiral helplessly out of control leaving God's sheep completely defenseless and at the mercy of wolves. On the other hand, I have seen men that seemed to possess the backbone of a jellyfish steel themselves heroically against the onslaught of the devil and dig in their toes to form an impenetrable wall around God's sheep. And the strange thing about it is that if you had used the world's wisdom to try to figure out who would do what you would have gotten it wrong almost every single time.

I bring all that up because what we saw in our last lesson was Paul making the point that taking up the office of an overseer, elder, steward, or shepherd is a noble task...a task honoring both to men and to God. In fact, the biblical text makes it clear that if a man desires to take on the office of an overseer, elder, steward, or shepherd he desires a good thing...it is a desire that aims high, and the reason it is a lofty aspiration is because the office itself is honorable. It is a noble task.

Now after Paul makes the point that the task of being an overseer is a noble task, he turns to explain the necessary conditions associated with being an elder. Starting in verse two Paul begins to layout the qualifications for any man taking up the office of overseer. He does that using the little Greek word δεῖ.² The word δεῖ is a word that expresses theological necessity. Now in order for Bible translators to actually get that idea of theological necessity across, they have to use more than one word. Instead of just using one word to translate it, they have to use a whole phrase...a phrase like **"It is necessary"** or **"It is required"** or even **"As a result, it is demanded that."** Now in many of the places where it is used in the

New Testament, it doesn't simply express necessity, it actually expresses divine necessity. That is especially true in Luke-Acts. Dr. Luke almost always uses the word $\delta\epsilon\iota$ to mean that something is necessary because God deemed it to be necessary.

For instance, in Luke 19:5 in the story about Zacchaeus, Luke writes this:

^{ESV} **Luke 19:5**...And when Jesus came to the place, he looked up and said to him, "**Zacchaeus, hurry and come down, for I must stay at your house today.**"

You can see what I mean. It wasn't simply that Jesus wanted to eat with Zacchaeus. Rather it was that he had to.

Why?

It was because God demanded it. He ordained to be.

The same sort of thing happens in Acts 1 where Peter addresses the gathered disciples and begins to talk about replacing Judas. He says this:

^{ESV} **Acts 1:16**..."**Brothers, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spoke beforehand by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus.**"

Peter's point is that Judas' betrayal had to happen. It had to happen as a result of the prophetic word. It wasn't simply necessary; it was actually demanded by the foreordained plan and counsel of God.

Now I don't mean to belabor the point, but let me show you just one more. In Acts chapter 9, right after the Lord Jesus confronts Paul on the road to Damascus, he tells Ananias to go meet Paul. Ananias responds to the Lord that he is deeply concerned about meeting Paul because of Paul's reputation for persecuting the church. So the Lord responds to Ananias in verse 15.

^{ESV} **Acts 9:15...But the Lord said to him, "Go, for he is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel. For I will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of my name."**

The word δεῖ is used near the very end of the verse and is translated "**must**" as in "**must suffer.**" What the Lord Jesus is saying of course is that Paul is his chosen instrument to go before Gentiles and king and even the children of Israel and that he intends to show Paul all that it is necessary for him to suffer in order to fulfill his ministry.

Paul seems to be trying to make that same sort of point here in 1st Timothy 3:2. He seems to be arguing that the noble office of overseer demands certain qualifications. That is, he is saying that it's not just a good idea for an overseer to be above reproach. Rather, he is saying it is an absolute necessary. He is saying that God demands as a point of theological necessity that an overseer to be a certain kind of man.

The way Paul uses the term is a little like a Navy recruiter saying, "**Look, Mr. Browning being a Navy Seal is a demanding thing. You simply would not fit in. You are too old and too soft and too sentimental. It is necessary for a man who wants to be a Navy Seal to be physically and mentally hard as nails. It is not a**

point really that we can concede. Rather, by definition that's just what a Navy Seal is. I'm sorry but you are out."

Paul seems to be making much the same kind of point regarding overseers in the church. That is, he is saying that being an overseer has its own set of demands. And then to make point abundantly clear, he starts off his list with this little word δεῖ...**"it is necessary."**

Now one more thing before we look at the list of behaviors that Paul says are either necessary to possess or necessary to avoid. The word δεῖ, that little word that implies divine necessity, is used twice in this short section. It is used twice in this section and it is implied at the beginning of the next section. In this section, it is used both at the beginning of the section and at the end.

Now the fact that the word is used at all is important, but the fact that it is used twice in the same section is quite emphatic.

I think we might do well to ponder that fact for a moment.

You see the point the text is making is not simply that it is good idea for an overseer to be beyond reproach. It is not simply preferable if he can manage it. Rather, it is an absolute necessity that he be beyond reproach.

That having said that, it does not mean, of course, that such men are to be sinless. In that regard, John Stott is exactly right when he says that if being sinless were required no son of Adam would ever be qualified to hold such an office.³

Rather the idea that Paul is trying to get across is that such men are to be blameless with regard to their observable behavior. There must not be any sort of readily observable flaw in their character or makeup. That is, they are not to have any seriously observable flaw of character or life that disqualifies them from undertaking the noble task of being an overseer.

I think there is implicit in this command an obvious contrast between the kind of good men Paul has in mind to fulfill the roles of leadership there in Ephesus and the false teachers who were already there subverting the cause of the gospel. I think the implication is that the false teachers there in Ephesus had such obvious character flaws that their lack of suitability to hold office should have been obvious to anyone and everyone willing to actually observe their lives.

And that is where Paul starts. A number of commentators make the observation that Paul does not seem to be aiming particularly high. Still, he does argue that the men that hold the office of overseer in the church must in fact be men above reproach. Now in case there is any doubt about what Paul means by the command to be beyond reproach he quickly turns next to spell out exactly what he means by being beyond reproach. He does that by giving a list of thirteen different attributes.⁴ He breaks that list into three categories made up of six positive attributes that ought to be displayed, four negative attributes that ought to be shunned, and then three positive traits that ought to be displayed along with the accompanying reason as to why they matter. If you will look at the handout I've provided, it might make easier to follow along.

Let me repeat that: Paul lists six positive traits, and then four negative traits, and then caps that off by three positive traits along with the reasons why they matter.

Alright, let's start with the six positive traits.

The first trait listed in this group of positive traits is far and away the most controversial phrase in the whole passage...not because the words Paul uses are complicated in and of themselves but rather because the words as given can be understood to mean any number of different things. Look at verse one.

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 3:1**...The saying is trustworthy: If anyone aspires to the office of overseer, he desires a noble task. ²Therefore an overseer must be above reproach, the husband of one wife...

The reason the text is ambiguous is because the underlying Greek in the passage is so simple. In Greek, the phrase **"husband of one wife"** is simply three little words *μῑᾱς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*, a one woman man or one wife husband. The problem is that it is not entirely clear exactly what that means. And because it is not entirely clear, because it is rather ambiguous, it has been understood a number of different ways.

For example, it could mean simply that an overseer needs to be a married man.⁵ That is, he needs to be the kind of man that has his own woman...that has own wife. In other words, he ought not to be a single. Instead, he ought to be married. I personally think that that is the least likely meaning of the text, but still I have to admit it certainly one possible meaning. And I have to admit that it lends credence to the whole argument that a man ought to manage his family well have real meaning. It's hard to see how such a man can properly manage his family if he's not even married. It is hard to see how he could manage a family he doesn't have. Still, as I said, I think that that particular interpretation...that an overseer has to be

married...is really the least likely meaning of the passage. I think that both because of the word **“one”** in the text and because of several reasons given in a number of other texts.

Here’s what I mean. Had the author wanted to say that an overseer needed to be married, he could have just said that he simply needs a wife. There was no need to attach the adjective **“one”** to the word **“wife.”** If Paul simply means that an overseer must be married the use of the word **“one”** is redundant.⁶

Secondly, if Paul is arguing that a man must in fact be married to be an overseer, it more or less contradicts his point elsewhere about the advantages of being single when it comes to doing the work of the ministry. Listen to 1st Corinthians 7:32.

^{ESV} **1 Corinthians 7:32**....I want you to be free from anxieties. The unmarried man is anxious about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord. ³³ But the married man is anxious about worldly things, how to please his wife, ³⁴ and his interests are divided. And the unmarried or betrothed woman is anxious about the things of the Lord, how to be holy in body and spirit. But the married woman is anxious about worldly things, how to please her husband. ³⁵ I say this for your own benefit, not to lay any restraint upon you, but to promote good order and to secure your undivided devotion to the Lord.

You can see the gist of Paul’s argument in 1st Corinthians 7. To be unmarried means that person is free to give himself wholly over to the service of the Lord. It is hard to imagine that Paul would be opposed to any overseer giving himself wholly over to the service of the Lord.

Allow me to make one additional point. It looks very much like Paul himself was unmarried. It is possible he may have been a widower, but it seems most likely

that he was a bachelor. I think that is the conclusion to be drawn from both 1st Corinthians 7:7 and 1st Corinthians 9:5. In the first passage, Paul seems to make it quite clear that he is single. He does that in the same passage that he argues for the continued celibacy of those that are unmarried at Corinth.

^{ESV} **1 Corinthians 7:7**... I wish that all were as I myself am. But each has his own gift from God, one of one kind and one of another. ⁸ To the unmarried and the widows I say that it is good for them to remain single as I am.

In the second passage, 1st Corinthians 9:5, Paul seems to be arguing that if he wanted a wife he would could have taken one simply because he had all the same rights that Peter and the rest of the apostles had.

^{ESV} **1 Corinthians 9:5**...Do we not have the right to take along a believing wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?

I think the implication is that he had the right to marry but had not.

I hope you can see my point. To be a one woman man or one wife husband could mean that an overseer ought to be married but in light of what Paul says elsewhere about marriage probably does not. It is problematic to argue that an overseer had to be married and that the Apostle Paul was not. That would mean that Paul was qualified to be an Apostle but not an overseer. That seems rather unlikely.

A second interpretation of the phrase "**one woman man**" contends that what Paul is arguing for is that an overseer ought to have only one wife over the course of his lifetime. That is, it is arguing that if his first wife dies, he ought not to remarry,

but ought instead to remain a one woman sort of man with the emphasis falling on the adjective “**one.**”

That interpretation does lend a kind of weight to the word “**one.**” That is, it eliminates the concern that the word “one” is redundant...or unnecessarily repetitive. Still, the view has its own problems. Paul argues clearly elsewhere that when a person’s spouse dies that spouse no longer holds any sort of claim over the surviving spouse.

^{ESV} **Romans 7:1**...Or do you not know, brothers-- for I am speaking to those who know the law-- that the law is binding on a person only as long as he lives? ² For a married woman is bound by law to her husband while he lives, but if her husband dies she is released from the law of marriage.

Along the same lines, Paul actually recommends remarriage for younger widows in 1st Timothy 5:14. Now admittedly he is talking specifically about women in the text and not men, the word for widows in the text is feminine. Still, it seems to me that the principle would be the same for men as for women. Look a 1st Timothy 5:14.

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 5:14**...So I would have younger widows marry, bear children, manage their households, and give the adversary no occasion for slander.

You see what I mean.

Now to be fair, it is true that many of the early church fathers believed bishops, elders, and deacons ought not to remarry after the death of a spouse. They believed that choosing not to get remarried after losing a spouse was meritorious in and of

itself and reflected a sort of ongoing covenantal faithfulness. In a discussion of this very passage, Bible teacher S. Lewis Johnson says this:

Hermas, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and among later followers, Chrysostom, Epiphanes, and Cyril all write disparage second marriages, not as sin, but as weakness. To marry again was to fall short of the high perfection set before them in the gospel. Athenagoras goes so far as to call a second marriage a sort of respectable adultery, "He that severs himself from his first wife even if she is dead wife is really not much more than a cloaked adulterer." Now, that's wrong, of course, but it illustrates the attitude of the early church to men who married more than once. Respecting the clergy Origin says plainly, "**Neither a bishop nor a Presbyter, nor a deacon can be twice married.**"⁷

Dr. Johnson drives his point home by quoting 1st Timothy 5:9.

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 5:9**...Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age, having been the wife of one husband...

You see the construction in 1st Timothy 5:9 is almost exactly the same as the construction 1st Timothy 3:2 except it is reversed.

In 1st Timothy 3:2 it says *μῖς γυναῖκος ἄνδρα*...one woman man while in 1st Timothy 5:9 it says *ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή*...one man woman. Dr. Johnson's point is that the phrase is used in 1st Timothy 5 of widows which seems to support the view that that is what is in view is in 1st Timothy 3:2 as well...that an overseer who is a widower must not remarry. Another way to say that is that an overseer ought to only have one wife his whole life.

Dr. Johnson believed that that is the proper interpretation of the passage. He believed it to the degree that when his first wife died and he decided to get

remarried later on he felt compelled to resign as a teaching elder at Believer's Chapel in Dallas. His session disagreed with him and insisted that he continued to preach and teach on Sunday morning. He submitted to their authority.

Most modern exegetes haven't paid this argument all that much attention. That is, they have tended to focus not on the question of whether men should serve after the death of a spouse, but rather whether such men should be allowed to serve after having been divorced. But really, in many ways, it is the same argument I think. Our own denomination has struggled with the question of whether a divorced man should ever serve in an elected office in the church. It has done so just as many other denomination has. In the end, the PCA has ruled that divorced men may serve as church officers so long they were determined to be innocent with regard to their divorce or even if they were not innocent if they have been sufficiently rehabilitated and have made proper restitution and repentance where necessary.⁸ It has come up with an interpretation that what Paul really means here is that such men should be one-woman kind of men...serial monogamists. The position argues that such men may be divorced but divorce doesn't characterize their nature. It argues that such men are inherently loyal and covenantally faithful...one woman kind of men. The focus in this view is not really the overseer's marital status but rather his general character.

I understand the position, but I don't think that position would have fared very well in the first century church. I think in the first century divorce would have very likely disqualified a man from office.

Finally, there are a few scholars that believe that what Paul is addressing here is the issue of polygamy. They argue that in the first century wealthy people alone

tended to have multiple wives...that it was not common among the middle class or lower classes. They argue that what is in question here is wealthy men being converted and thinking they can bring their multiple wives into the church and automatically take up leadership just because they are wealthy and successful. They argue that Paul opposed that idea not because such men were wealthy but rather because they were unchaste. John Chrysostom held the view as did John Calvin. Most modern scholars reject the view on the basis that first century polygamy was rare.⁹ I'm not so sure.

Still, I think the best way to understand the passage...at least from the general context of the passage...may be to think in terms of widowhood or divorce.

Now fortunately the other attributes are less complicated. Verse two continues...

ESV 1 Timothy 3:2...Therefore an overseer must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, sober-minded, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach,³ not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money.

An overseer must be serious minded...not given over to frivolity. That doesn't mean he has to be a sourpuss. Rather, it means, I think that he is not to be a frivolous man. He is not to be a man that is constitutionally unable to ever be serious. You know the kind of person I mean...a person who makes light of everything. Rather, he is to be a serious minded man. He is to be self-controlled with regard to diet and to drink just as he is to be self-controlled with regard to his temper.

He is to be hospitable. It ought not to be so private a person that he is afraid to have guests in his home.

Verse three continues the list and is bit surprising. A man who desires the office of overseer is not to be a drunkard which of course points back to being self-controlled. He is not to be violent. Rather, he is to be gentle. He is not to be quarrelsome. That is, he is not to be a scrapper. He is not to be the kind of person who is ready to fight at the drop of a hat.

Such a man is not to be a lover of money. He is not to be driven by a lust for either money or possessions. He is not driven by the need to possess the latest thing.

I suspect that this whole last list is given in the text to implicitly contrast Paul's vision of a good overseer with the false teachers that plagued Ephesus. That is, I suspect the false teachers in Ephesus were men who tended to excess, who were violent, who were quarrelsome, who were driven by a love of money. I say that because I think that little phrase "**apt to teach**" forms a bit of a hinge point in the text.

You see, I think Paul is arguing that good overseers are teachers just like the false teachers in that they too are apt to teach with the one important distinction that they do so with lives that are consistent with the message they proclaim. Their orthodoxy is reflected in their orthopraxy while the false teacher's heretical doctrine is reflected in their scurrilous living.

Still, it does mean, I think, that an overseer should actually be able to teach. That is, they ought to be able to communicate the truth of the gospel both privately and publically.

Finally, Paul ends the section with three final overarching traits that every overseer ought to possess. Only in this last section Paul appends reasons why overseers ought to be such men. Look at verse four.

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 3:4**...He must manage his own household well, with all dignity keeping his children submissive, ⁵ for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church?

If a man's family is a mess, it is likely his flock will be a mess. That doesn't mean that his family has to be perfect. It doesn't mean that his family won't occasionally be chaotic. Rather, Paul's point is that if he cannot manage his own household, he probably won't be able to manage his flock. Notice it does not say that such a man has to keep his family under his thumb. It is not necessary that a man oppress his family or bend it relentlessly to his will. Paul's word is kinder than that. An overseer is to manage his family...not beat his dogs.

Look at verse six.

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 3:6**...He must not be a recent convert, or he may become puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil.

An overseer in the church is not to be an overseer come lately. He is not to burst on the scene as Charles Finney did as a flaming star in the sky. He is not to be viewed as the instant solution to all the church's problems. Rather than lay hands on a man quickly, the church is to watch and observe and pray for the man they are considering calling to serve. That which is in the well will eventually come up in the bucket.

Surprisingly, Paul finishes off his list of qualifications for an overseer by adding the fact that an overseer not only has to survive the scrutiny of the church but also that of the unbelieving world. Look at verse seven.

^{ESV} **1 Timothy 3:7**...Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, so that he may not fall into disgrace, into a snare of the devil.

Paul's point is not that such men have to win the world with their doctrine, but rather than their lives must be lived in such a way that they win the reluctant respect of the outside world. They simply cannot do those things that can be misrepresented or scoffed at by unbelievers. They are to strive to be blameless before the world...more like Mordecai and much less like Haman. They simply cannot respond to the world in a way that seeks their own self-interest. Rather they are only and always to see the interest of the gospel.

Chuck Swindoll includes this wonderful little story in his book *The Tale of the Tardy Oxcart*. It helps illustrate Paul's point.

Charles H. Spurgeon, the famous Baptist minister of London, England, had a pastor-friend, Dr. Newman Hall, who wrote a book entitled *Come to Jesus*. Another preacher published an article in which he ridiculed Hall, who bore it patiently for a little while. But when the insulting article gained popularity; Hall sat down and wrote a letter of protest. His answer was full of retaliatory invectives that really went far beyond in the article which attacked him. Before mailing the letter, Hall took it to Spurgeon for his opinion.

Spurgeon read it carefully then, handing it back, asserted it was excellent and that the writer of the article deserved it all. "But," he added, "it does seem to just lack one thing? After a pause Spurgeon continued, "Underneath your signature you ought to write the words, Author of *Come to Jesus*."

The two godly men looked at each other for a few moments. Then Hall tore the letter to shreds.¹⁰

I love that story. I love it because it seems to capture the essence of what Paul is arguing in arguing that men called to be overseers have to be certain kind of men. Not supermen, but faithful, real flesh and blood men who are driven along not by self-promotion but rather by both the gospel and the implications of the gospel and that is fitting, I think, because the office of an overseer is a noble task.

Let's pray.

¹ Richard L. Mayhue, "Authentic Spiritual Leadership" in the *Master's Seminary Journal* 22 no 2 Fall 2011, p 213-224. Cf. <https://bible.org/seriespage/lesson-9-what-does-elder-look-1-timothy-32-7> On the opposite side of this is an apocryphal letter included by Bob Utley at bible.org in his lesson on this passage. It goes like this:

I am looking for an opportunity for ministry and wondered if your church has a position available. I am a single man in my fifties, short of stature, slightly built, balding, with a beard. My health is not the best. I have difficulty with my vision. But in spite of my physical limitations, I have seen the Lord use me in many ways. I have never been able to stay in full-time ministry for long because of repeated problems with my financial support. But I have always continued serving the Lord, even when I've had to take a secular job. I used to have a violent temper, but the Lord has given me victory over that problem.

As my resume shows, I've been involved in the founding of a number of churches, although I have never stayed in one place for much over three years. I admit I am not a persuasive or eloquent public speaker--in fact I've been criticized over this matter--but I do maintain that the Lord uses me in this capacity and I would like to have opportunities to speak regularly in your church. Some have complained about my speaking because at times I get carried away and forget about the clock. I must also warn you that my teaching has often stirred up controversy, even to the point of causing riots in some towns. I don't want to hide the fact that I've been sent to prison several times for my part in causing such disturbances. My life has been threatened on numerous occasions and I have been physically attacked several times. A number of evangelical churches are divided in their opinions about me. Even some of the churches I helped found have turned against me.

I have done some writing on various theological and church-related topics, although a well-known Christian leader complained that I am hard to understand in places. I am not particularly strong at administrative details, being somewhat forgetful. But I am a hard-driving, zealous, dedicated man. I believe I could be useful in the ministry of your church, especially in disciplining any young men who want to follow the Lord. Please let me hear from you.

² For a lengthy discussion on this topic see the journal article by Charles H. Cosgrove, “The Divine $\delta\epsilon\iota$ in Luke Acts” in *Novum Testamentum* XXVI, 2 (1984), pp. 169-90. See also, Kenneth Bass, “The Narrative and Rhetorical Use of Divine Necessity in Luke-Acts” in the *Journal of Biblical and Pneumatological Research* 1 Fall 2009, p 48-68.

³ John R.W. Stott, *1 Timothy & Titus* (BST). (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 92.

⁴ Depending on whether or not some are connected to one another or should be view individually.

⁵ Ed Glasscock, “The Husband of One Wife Requirement in 1 Timothy 3:2” in the journal *Bibliotheca Sacra* in July-September issue, pp.244-257.

⁶ S. Lewis Johnson, “The Office of Elder-2” at <http://sljinstitute.net/pauls-epistles/1timothy/the-office-of-the-elder-ii/>.

⁷ Ibid. I have smoothed out the Johnson quote with a better translation of the Athenagoras quote from Athenagoras, *Plea for the Christians* 33 (Schaff).

⁸ <http://www.pcahistory.org/pca/divorce-remarriage.pdf>

⁹ Glasscock, , p. 254.

¹⁰ Charles Swindoll, *The Tale of the Tardy Oxcart* (Nashville: Word Press, 1998), 41.