

# The Pilgrim Way Commentary on the Book of Titus



by Dr. John Cereghin  
Pastor  
Grace Baptist Church of  
Smyrna, Delaware

The Pilgrim Way Commentary on Titus

by Dr. John Cereghin

PO Box 66

Smyrna DE 19977

[pastor@pilgrimway.org](mailto:pastor@pilgrimway.org)

website- [www.pilgrimway.org](http://www.pilgrimway.org)

June 2025

## **Apology for This Work**

This commentary on Titus follows in a long line of other works by divines of the past as they have sought to study and expound this epistle.

This work grew out of over 40 years of both preaching through this epistle in three pastorates in Maryland, Delaware and North Carolina as well as teaching through them as an instructor at Maryland Baptist Bible College in Elkton, Maryland. I needed my own notes and outlines as I taught and preached from Titus, so this fuller commentary flows from those notes and outlines. Thus, the layout of this commentary is a practical one, written by a preacher to be preached from in the pulpit or to be taught in a Sunday School. It was not written from an isolated study of a theologian who had little contact with people or practical ministerial experience. There are many such commentaries on the market and they tend to be somewhat dull and not very practical in their application. It is written as something of a theological reference manual to me, filled with quotes and outlines from various books in my library. The layout and format are designed to help me in my preaching, teaching and personal study of this book. I figured there may be others out there who may benefit from this work which is why I make it available, but the work is basically laid out in a selfish manner, for my benefit and assistance. You, as the reader, hopefully can find some profit in this.

This commentary cannot be easily classified into any single theological system. I believe that no single theological system is an accurate presentation of Scriptural truth in and of itself. When Charles Spurgeon once wrote "There is no such thing as preaching Christ and Him crucified, unless we preach what nowadays is called Calvinism. It is a nickname to call it Calvinism; Calvinism is the gospel, and nothing else", he displayed a most unfortunate theological hubris. Calvinism is a human, flawed, limited and uninspired theological system, as any other human theological system. There is some truth there, as there is in any theological system, but it ranks no better than other competing systems, such as Arminianism (which is nothing more than a modified version of Calvin's teachings), dispensationalism, covenant theology, Lutheranism, Romanism, Orthodox theology, pre-wrath rapture, take your pick. All these systems are flawed as they are all the products of human attempts to understand and systematize Biblical presentations. They can all make contributions to our overall understanding of the truth but none may claim to be the only correct such presentation, at the expense of all others. Knowing the human impossibility for absolute neutrality and the human love for theological systems, I readily admit that I cannot be as dispassionate and uninfluenced by human teachings in these pages as I would like. No man can be. But I have made every attempt not to allow my own personal systems to influence my understanding of what the clear teachings of Scripture is. I do identify with premillennialism and dispensationalism, but even my dispensationalism is used mainly as an interpretative tool.

I have freely consulted a wide variety of commentaries and sermons for insights and other views of various texts that I might have missed. As the old preacher once remarked "I milked a lot of cows but I churned my own butter." Direct quotes are

attributed to their proper source to prevent that unpardonable sin of literary theft. But simply because I quoted a writer should not be viewed as an endorsement of all that he wrote or of his theological system. I selected the quote because I found it interesting and useful, not because I am in any degree of agreement regarding the rest of his teachings. In this sense, I have tried to follow the form of Charles Spurgeon's Treasury of David, where he quoted a wide variety of other writers. I consider his commentary on the Psalms to be the greatest commentary ever in reference to its format.

This commentary is based on the text of our English Received Version, commonly referred to as the King James Version or the Authorized Version. I believe that this is the most preserved English translation available to us and that it is the superior translation in English. I can see no good reason to use or accept any of the modern versions, especially the current "flavor of the month" of the New Evangelicals and apostate fundamentalists, the corrupt and mis-named English Standard Version. When it comes to these modern, critical text versions, I reject them for a variety of reasons. One major reason is that they have not been proven on the field of battle. I have liver spots older than the English Standard Version, but I am expected to toss my English Received Text, over 400 years old, and take up this new translation, whose ink is still barely dry? How many battles has the ESV won? How many missionaries have done great exploits with an NIV? What revivals have been birth and nurtured with an NASV? We will stick with the translations and texts that our fathers have used and that God has blessed. It is too late in church history to change English translations. We are also favorably inclined to the Geneva Bible, Tyndale Bible, Bishops Bible, and other "cousins" of our English text. The Greek text used is the underlying text of our English Received Text and its 1769 revision, which is the text most widely in use today by God's remnant. This is the Greek text that forms the foundation for the King James Bible.

Each verse is commented upon, with the English text. The grammatical notes are limited to the tenses of the corresponding Greek verbs, as I believe the study of the verb tenses is the most important element of the usage of the Greek text, even moreso than word studies. Not every Greek word is commented upon, only unusual or important ones. I am guilty of "picking and choosing" my word studies instead of presenting complete word studies for every word. That system would simply be too unwieldy for my purposes.

I have also decided to do some textual studies, mainly comparing the King James readings with the English Standard Version and John MacArthur's unnecessary Legacy Standard Version, which is an unnecessary revision of the 2020 version of the New American Standard Version. I also refer to the readings in the English translations that preceded the King James Bible for sake of comparison and to examine how the English Received Text readings developed from the Tyndale Bible, through the Coverdale Bible, the Geneva Bible and the Bishops Bible.

The presupposition of this commentary is that what the Bible says is so and that we will not change the text to suit our theological fancy. It says what it says and that is what we

must accept, else we will be found unfaithful stewards of the Word of God, a judgment we fear. We will not amend our text but will take it as it is the best we can.

This commentary certainly is not perfect, nor is it the final presentation of my understanding and application of this epistle. A commentary over 40 years in the making can never said to be finished. As new insights are granted by the Holy Spirit and as my understanding of the epistle deepens, additional material will be added and sections will have to be re-written. One is never truly “finished” with any theological book. As one deepens and grows in his relationship with the Lord, so does his theological understandings and that should be reflected in one’s writings.

This book was also written as a theological legacy to my four children. They will need to be mighty for God in their generation for their days will certainly be darker than the generation their father grew up in. This book is an expression not only of the heart of a preacher in the early 21st century but also of a Christian father for his children, so they may more fully understand what their father believed and preached during his ministry.

It is my sincere prayer that this unpretentious contribution to the body of Christian commentary literature will be a blessing to the remnant of God’s saints in the earth as we approach the coming of our Lord.



## Introduction to Titus

**Authorship-** The Apostle Paul. Pauline authorship has been attacked in the Pastorals than in any other of Paul's writings. Attacks started around the early 19th century by the radical Germans (who else?). Even in the 2nd century, the heretic Marcion denied Pauline authorship. Some other church fathers were critical of Pauline authorship (Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Jerome) because they admitted they did not like some of the material dealt with in 1 Timothy and the other Pastorals.

Critical objections to Pauline authorship of the Pastorals:

1. **Chronological and Ecclesiastical.** It is asserted that the church polity described in the Pastorals is too advanced for the 60s. A later date, well into the 2nd century, is required.

A. **RESPONSE-** Give the early church some credit! They weren't idiots. Church growth, apostolic leadership and continuing divine revelations regarding church administration would allow the church to develop a definite polity early. There are also questions as to whether Paul was released after Acts 28 and continued his ministry until his second arrest in 2 Timothy. If Paul was not released after Acts 28, then we do have a serious chronological problem. But there are very strong indications and traditions that he was released, ministered several more years before his second Roman imprisonment and eventual death. Also see Acts 14:23; 20:17 and Philippians 1:1 to see just how advanced church polity was in this day.

2. **Doctrinal.** This complaint is similar to that above in asserting that the doctrines dealt with in the Pastorals is too advanced for the 60s. Our response is similar to accusation number 1.

3. **Linguistic.** Paul's vocabulary and style in the Pastorals is different enough to argue for non-Pauline authorship.

A. **RESPONSE-** Paul is here writing personal letters to individuals, not to churches as in his other letters. Different audiences will call for different styles of writing and the usage of different words. A personal letter would use different words and have a different style than a more formal letter written to a church. Paul also wrote the Pastorals late in his life, after he wrote his church epistles. Maturity and continuing education and growth would allow Paul to add new words and thoughts to his vocabulary. "This phenomenon of the occurrence of new words is common in literature. The use of unusual words is a variable quantity in any author. Workman has shown that the number of new words per page in Shakespeare varies all the way from 3.4 in Julius Caesar to 10.4 in Hamlet. Even greater divergences in the occurrence of hapax legomena are found in the poetical works of Milton or Shelley. Vocabulary is greatly influenced by the material being dealt with. New ideas require new words. As an educated man, Paul had a large vocabulary at his command."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Edmond Hiebert, *Introduction to the Pauline Epistles*, page 315.

4. **Heretical.** The Pastorals deal with the gnostic heresy which did not mature until the second century, so the Pastorals must be dated into the second century.

A. **RESPONSE-** The gnostic heresy was alive and well in Paul's day, not to mention other heresies. Even if the gnostic heresy did not mature until the second century, it was a problem in Paul's day and it needed to be dealt with.

Patristic witness of Pauline authorship

1. Epistle of Barnabas c. 75
2. Clement of Rome c. 95
3. Ignatius c. 112
4. Polycarp c. 112
5. Epistle of Diognetus c. 117
6. Justin Martyr c. 146
7. Theophilus of Antioch c. 168
8. Basilides (a heretic) c. 110
9. Marcion (a heretic) c. 140
10. Heracleon (a heretic) c. 150
11. Theodotus (a heretic) c. 150
12. Tatian (a heretic) c. 160

**Date of Writing-** Probably around 62-63. Paul had been released from his first imprisonment in Rome, having been found not guilty of the charges made against him. Titus was written between his imprisonments. Paul was probably killed around 67 or 68. Extreme liberal dates range from 90-150. E. J. Goodspeed dated it 150. This is done by those who reject Pauline authorship for any of the pastorals, claiming the material contained within is too advanced for the "primitive" first century.

**Place Written From.** Possibly from Macedonia or Greece.

**Addressee.** Titus. He was a trusted companion to Paul who had been left to oversee the churches on the island of Crete.

**Purpose of Writing.** Like the first epistle to Timothy, this letter had as its purpose to give the young pastor instructions to aid him in his work. Paul was led to write to Titus because of the condition of the churches on the island of Crete, the need of Titus for help, and the fact that Zenas and Apollos were going to the island. Paul had begun to organize the work in this field but had to leave before the task was finished. The entrance of false teaching in the form of legalism necessitated a strong stand for the truth. In his task Titus needed clear instruction as well as encouragement. When Zenas and Apollos planned a journey through Crete, Paul sent Titus this letter to help and encourage him (Titus 3:13).

**Observations and Remarks**

1. 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus and Philemon are called Pastoral Epistles because they are addressed to individuals and deal with church administration.



2. I include Philemon in this group because of:

1. Its position after Titus.
2. It is addressed to an individual.
3. It deals with a relationship problem within the church.
4. There is no good reason to associate it with Colossians, as most commentators do.
5. It is a personal letter.

**Titus.** Titus was a Greek, an uncircumcised Gentile, and so remained, as Paul refused to circumcise him since he, unlike Timothy, was a full-blooded Gentile. He was a man of great grace, and large gifts, and very dear to Paul. He calls Titus his brother, his partner, and fellow helper, and says he walked in the same spirit, and in the same steps. Titus was employed by Paul much, and sent into various parts, on different occasions: he sent him to Corinth, to finish there the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and to Dalmatia, to know the state of the saints there, and to confirm them in the faith, (2 Timothy 4:10). "Lee, Parker and others conclude that Titus continued on Crete until his death at age 94 and then was buried on the island. If Humphrey's date of Titus' birth is correct, this would mean Titus died around 123-124."<sup>2</sup> There have been some suggestions that Titus was Luke's brother but there is no way to verify that.

William Kelly<sup>3</sup> mentions the idea that some have confused Timothy with Titus, that Luke thought that "Timothy" was just another name for Titus. Naturally, this "theory" has no merit at all. The fact that Timothy was a Jewish/Gentile mix and Titus was a full-blood Gentile should have ended any possibility for confusing these two men.

As Timothy was the man to go to Ephesus (as rather reliable church histories tell us), it would be Titus who would go to the rougher field of Crete. The personalities of both Timothy and Titus were probably suited for these two cities. Timothy may have been the quieter, more refined preacher where Titus was a bit "rougher" and less easily intimidated.

### **Names and Titles for Christ**

1. Jesus Christ 1:1
2. Lord Jesus Christ 1:4
3. Saviour 1:4; 3:5
4. Great God 2:13
5. Redeemer 2:14
6. The Justifier 3:7

### **Names and Titles for God**

1. Saviour 1:3
2. Father 1:4

### **Name and Title for the Holy Spirit**

Holy Ghost 3:5

---

<sup>2</sup> D. A. Waite, "Exegesis of the Book of Titus" in BFT Newsreport, December 10, 1976, page 1.

<sup>3</sup> *An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to Titus and to that of Philemon*, page 5.

## Outline of Titus

1. Introduction 1:1-4
2. Titus' Ministry on Crete 1:5
3. Qualifications For Pastors/Elders 1:6
4. Qualifications For Pastors 1:7-9
5. Titus' Congregation 1:10-13
6. Criticism of the Judaizers 1:14-16
7. Speaking Sound Doctrine 2:1
8. Commands To Aged Men 2:2
9. Commands to Aged Women 2:3
10. Commands to Younger Women 2:4,5
11. Commands to Young Men 2:6
12. Commands For The Preacher 2:7,8
13. Commands to Servants 2:9,10
14. The Lessons of Grace 2:11-13
15. The Redemption of Christ 2:14
16. These Things Speak 2:15a
17. Let No Man Despise Thee 2:15b
18. General Commands to the Cretians 3:1,2
19. Our Former State 3:3,4
20. How We Are Saved 3:5-7
21. Maintain Good Works 3:8
22. Avoid Foolish Questions 3:9
23. Dealing With Heretics 3:10,11
24. Closing Remarks 3:12-15

## Outline of Titus from W. Graham Scroggie<sup>4</sup>

Introduction 1:1-4		
1:5-16	2:1-15	3:1-11
The Rule of the Church	The Walk of the Church	The State of the Church
1. The Nature of it 1:5-9 2. The Necessity for it 1:10-16	1. The Guiding Precepts 2:1-10 2. The Enabling Power 2:11-15	1. Her Outward Duty 3:1-7 2. Her Inward Discipline

<sup>4</sup> *The Unfolding Drama of Redemption*, volume 3, page 238:

## Titus Chapter 1

### 1. Introduction 1:1-4

#### Summary of 1:1-4

1. Paul was a servant of God, 1:1
2. Paul was an apostle of Jesus Christ, 1:1
3. God cannot lie, 1:2
4. God promised eternal life before the world began, 1:2
5. God manifests His word through preaching, 1:3
6. Titus was Paul's son after the faith, 1:4

**1:1 Paul, a servant<sup>a</sup> of God,<sup>b</sup> and an apostle<sup>c</sup> of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect,<sup>d</sup> and the acknowledging of the truth<sup>e</sup> which is after godliness;<sup>f</sup>**

1a The emphasis here is on the service of the servant and of the dependence of the servant upon his lord. This service is not bound by the reason of choice by the servant for he must perform his service whether he wishes to or not. He is subject as a servant is to an alien will, that of his owner. It is never used in a disparaging or contemptuous fashion in the New Testament.

1b This is the only place in Paul's writings where he calls himself a servant of God. In other places, he calls himself a servant of Jesus Christ.

1c Paul is both a servant and an apostle. These titles are not contrary to each other. In order to be put into a position of spiritual leadership, one must first know what it means to be a servant. Paul was a servant first and an apostle second. Even the Lord came not to be ministered unto but to minister (Matthew 20:28). What irritates us are these proud and arrogant preachers who expect the world to minister to them simply because they have some sort of spiritual authority. I can think of several Independent Baptist preachers who think they have a license to boss other people around and dominate them spiritually simply because they are a pastor or because someone gave them an honorary doctorate. We can also see this in the denominations, where a "district superintendent" gets a big head when he gets his promotion and starts to throw his weight around as a big-shot. This is especially true in many black Pentacostal churches, where the pastor demands all manner of authority and respect that goes beyond the Biblical standard. The key to successful and godly spiritual leadership is humility and a willingness to do the little jobs. A man is unfit for spiritual leadership who will not empty his own trashcan, will not clean the bathrooms, will not check the mail for the church or who will not help clean up after a church fellowship dinner. Such men are not fit for spiritual leadership. They want the privileges of an apostle yet they do not want the responsibilities of a servant.

When Titus saw the word "apostle" as he opened the scroll, he knew this wasn't just a friendly letter from Paul but was an official memo from his spiritual superior with orders and procedures he needed to follow in his work in Crete.

Titus could not be apostle in the same sense that Paul was but he could be a servant of God in the same way Paul was, all can we all. Apostleship was for a select few. Servantship can be for all.

1d This is not to be understood in a Calvinistic sense, but simply a term used to describe the saved. There is no doubt that all who are saved are part of "God's elect". There is no need

here to try to expand this phrase into a full-blown spiritual dissertation on the doctrine of election, something too many Calvinists seem too eager to do.

1e The truth as revealed by God, given to the “Holy Men of Old” and preserved for us in the Scripture. This “truth” is not to be found in human traditions and teachings, nor in the exclusive possessions of certain churches and denominations.

1f A genuine salvation experience will bring an acknowledging of the truth in the context of godliness. A life of godliness and the development of a Christian walk is dependent upon a proper acknowledging of the truth. One cannot walk in a holy manner with wrong doctrine. The two simply are not compatible. Many false teachers and apostates are immoral, as their doctrine does affect their walk.

**1:2 In hope of eternal life,<sup>a</sup> which God, that cannot lie,<sup>b</sup> promised<sup>aorist middle</sup> before the world began;<sup>c-d-e</sup>**

2a We “hope” for eternal life, not because we have no Biblical assurance of it, because we do have such assurance. We “hope” for it because we do not have possession of it yet. Until we do, we “hope” until we receive that which has been promised to us. When we receive and possess that which has been promised to us, hope ends.

2b **God cannot lie.** This speaks of one of the attributes of God. Satan is a liar (John 8:44) and man lies because he has a fallen nature. But it is not within the nature of God to lie. If God lied, then He would cease to be God. He is thus incapable of lying. This truthfulness is a major attribute of God.

This inability of God to lie is repeated in Numbers 23:19 (**God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?**) where God, through Balaam, told this to Balak. It is also repeated in Hebrews 6:18.

The inability of God to lie is set in the context with the promise of eternal life. God elected those to salvation through his foreknowledge (1 Peter 1:2) and that election stands through all time. If you are elect, then you will be saved. God has promised it. This promise is manifested today through preaching. Sinners come to know of their sinful state by hearing the word of God preached. This is how faith to believe unto salvation is generated.

AV	ESV	LSV	Darby
2 In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;	2 in hope of eternal life, which God, who never lies, promised before the ages began	2 in the hope of eternal life, which the God who cannot lie promised from all eternity,	2 in <i>the</i> hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the ages of time,

The ESV weakens this as “God who never lies”. That is not the same idea as “God who cannot lie”. The ESV suggests that God simply chooses not to lie, but He could if He chose to. The traditional translations all have the idea that God cannot lie, it is not the idea that He simply chooses not to. It is against the very nature of God to lie, so He cannot. The devil does nothing but God but God cannot lie. If He did, we would sin and violate His own infinite holiness, something that is unthinkable. The ESV makes a serious theological error here.

2c This promise, with its associated hope, is an eternal one in the mind of God, as it was always His intention to grant eternal life to the saved.

2d Obviously Genesis 1 and before. Paul was a Young Earth Creationist who took the Genesis creation account as literal truth and history.

2e “In verses 1-2, we have the past, present and future brought before us:

1. The past- according to the faith of God’s elect- Christ died for our sins.
2. The present- the truth which is after holiness- the daily pursuit of the child of God
3. The future in hope of eternal life- the fullness of our redemption held forth for our inspiration.<sup>5</sup>

**1:3 But hath in due times manifested<sup>aorist</sup> his word through preaching,<sup>a</sup> which is committed<sup>aorist passive</sup> unto me<sup>b</sup> according to the commandment of God our Saviour;**

3a In the Old Testament it was the prophets to whom this hope was committed (Hebrews 1:1, **God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,**) but now, through New Testament preaching. In the “last days” (Hebrews 1:2a **Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son...**), God will speak directly through the Son.<sup>6</sup> But today, He speaks through the Scriptures and God-called men to whom the truth of the Scriptures has been committed. We see here the importance of preaching. Paul says that preaching is the instrument that God has chosen to manifest His word. God did not choose literature, films, records, “rapping”, concerts, art or seminars or anything else to manifest His word, but rather chose preaching. Here is the wisdom of God in conflict with the wisdom of man as man sees preaching to be a very poor vehicle to transmit the truth of God. The unsaved think preaching is foolish (1 Corinthians 1:18, **For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.**) but God has ordained to use the foolishness of preaching (not foolish preaching) to save them that believe (1 Corinthians 1:21, **For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.** ).

The modern church, relying upon human wisdom in its apostasy, thinks that the only way the world will listen to the gospel message is to abandon preaching in favor of “all night sings” and movies and concerts and seminars. We had better stay with that which God has ordained as the God- approved method of evangelism. We have no license to “experiment” with other forms of evangelism or worship.

3b As an apostle and a preacher. It is also committed to any God-called preacher.

**1:4 To Titus,<sup>a</sup> mine own son<sup>b</sup> after the common faith:<sup>c</sup> Grace, mercy,<sup>d</sup> and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.<sup>e-f</sup>**

4a Titus was one of Paul’s “sons in the faith” (like Timothy) who was a close associate of Paul’s. He was the “test case” as to whether Gentile believers had to undergo Jewish circumcision. He was also associated with the church at Corinth. Paul would later send him to Crete and Dalmatia. He is characterized by:

---

<sup>5</sup> James Knox, *The Book of Titus*, pages 25-26.

<sup>6</sup> The context of the Hebrews 1 reference is the tribulation period. God will speak in different and more unusual ways than He is speaking in this church age.

1. A solid pastoral ministry
  - A. 2 Corinthians 8:16,17, **But thanks be to God, which put the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you. For indeed he accepted the exhortation; but being more forward, of his own accord he went unto you.**
2. A joyful attitude
  - A. 2 Corinthians 7:13, **Therefore we were comforted in your comfort: yea, and exceedingly the more joyed we for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed by you all.**
3. Tact
  - A. 2 Corinthians 8:23, **Whether any do enquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellowhelper concerning you: or our brethren be enquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ.**

4c Titus is called "**mine own son after the common faith**" as Paul had led him to Christ and had worked closely with Paul in his ministry. "Common faith" is the faith shared by all believers, as seen in Jude 3, where it is called "the common salvation". This Jew and this Gentile shared a common faith and a common salvation. This is the true "catholic" (with a little "c") faith, not a "Roman Catholic" faith. I am a "catholic" in that I hold to the universal, orthodox faith believed by all God's people, which we may call the "fundamentals".

4d Grace- getting something you don't deserve  
 Mercy- not getting something you do deserve  
 The modern versions omit "mercy".

4e Two-thirds of the trinity is mentioned here. The Holy Spirit is not mentioned here.

4f The modern versions have "Christ Jesus" omit "Lord".

## **2. Titus' Ministry on Crete 1:5**

**1:5 For this cause left<sup>aorist</sup> I<sup>a</sup> thee in Crete,<sup>b</sup> that thou shouldest set in order<sup>c- aorist</sup> the things that are wanting,<sup>d- present active participle</sup> and ordain<sup>aorist active</sup> subjunctive elders<sup>e</sup> in every city,<sup>f</sup> as I had appointed<sup>aorist middle</sup> thee<sup>g</sup>**

5a Emphatic.

5b Titus was sent to the hard field of Crete, to set up churches and ordain pastors and elders for them. This is a pioneering work, which was more difficult than Timothy's ministry. We believe Timothy settled into a pastoral charge, probably in Ephesus, while Titus was more involved in a missionary/church planting/church reclamation ministry. Titus would work in Paul's absence but with his full apostolic authority as Paul's representative on Crete.

"**I left thee in Crete**" but we do not know when Paul was on Crete as such a visit was not recorded in Acts. Could it have been after his release from Paul's first Roman imprisonment, after Acts 28? He did make a lengthy stop on the island at Fair Havens during his journey to Rome in Acts 27:7-9. But as a prisoner, Paul might not have been able to do much ministry in that area at this time.

Although Crete was only 50 miles wide and 270 miles long (3199 square miles), there were upwards to 100 cities on the island, making the need for the planting of many churches a necessity. Cretians are mentioned in 1 Samuel 30:14; Ezekiel 25:16 and Zephaniah 2:5, where they are called "Cherethites". The name is associated with "Capthor" and "Capthorim" in

Deuteronomy 2:23; Jeremiah 47:4 and Amos 9:7. There were Cretians present at the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2:11. It is very possible than some who heard Peter preach on the Day of Pentecost brought the gospel to the island and established the first churches. Paul spent some time in and near the island in Acts 27:7-9. We think most of Paul's work here, if he did much at all, would have taken place after his release from his first Roman imprisonment, after Acts 28.

5c **"set in order"** Strong's #1930 *epidiorthoō*; from *epi* (Strong's #1909) besides, above, and *diorthoō* to correct; to set in order. This is a medical term used of setting broken limbs or straightening crooked ones. It is used only here in the New Testament.

5d Paul had unfinished business on Crete, being unable to finish setting the leadership in these churches before he had to leave. He gives that task to Titus, a trusted co-worker. Titus must have been a good man and a reliable man, else Paul would not have entrusted him with this.

**"Wanting"** is an interesting word to use, showing that the Lord **wanted** some things to be done on Crete and **wanted** the churches on Crete to be set up in certain ways and to be doing certain things. The fact that they were not is what let Paul to send Titus there to deal with these things that were **"wanting"**.

5e Titus would have to see to it that elders (pastors and other spiritual leaders) were appointed in each city to oversee each local church planted. These elders would engage in the following ministries:

1. Preaching the Gospel
2. Administering the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper
3. Watching over the flock in the Lord
4. Putting the laws of Christ's house in execution, and keep up a strict discipline in it.

These elders may have been pastors but not necessarily. An elder in the church is any man with some sort of leadership position and authority in a local church. A man could be an elder without being a pastor. The "Baptist distinctives" (which are unofficial, since they are not written down anywhere nor are they even recognized by all Baptists) may only recognize two offices (pastor and deacon) but many Baptists (mainly Calvinistic ones, but not exclusively) do have elders or call their pastors elders. We see no sin in having elders in the church who provide leadership and support for the pastor, as long as the church is pastor-led. A church may have a youth pastor, treasurer, headmaster of the Christian school and other men in leadership positions in the church. These men and other older, mature, experienced men, would qualify to be elders. We do not support Presbyterian church government, which teaches church government by committee, or ruling elders. But a church ought to have elders who can assist the pastor and help guide the church in its activity, practice and doctrine.

The apostles set up the initial leadership in the churches that were established, since there would be no mature leadership in place as of yet. As the churches matured, we assume that the churches began to assume more this responsibility themselves. This is why we do not practice this "apostolic appointing" of elders in churches today. There were few, if any, organized churches on Crete so many of these congregations had to be organized from scratch. There was little, if any, spiritual leadership on that island among the Christians. Until native leadership was developed, the apostles would have to establish these churches. We still do this on the mission field and in church planting, where the church planter will establish the church and get it set up by training and developing native and local leadership. When that is finished, the church planter withdraws and allows the church to manage its own affairs as an independent congregation.

It is interesting to note that Paul never gave such a command or a charge to Timothy. Timothy also was laboring in difficult areas with weak or young churches, yet we have no record of Paul giving Timothy the same charge he gave to Titus. The situation on Crete may have

been unique enough that Titus received the charge from Paul to deal with this situation. There was nowhere in Timothy's geographic area of ministry where it would have been necessary for Paul to confer similar authority or a similar charge to him. Titus' charge may have been situational, and not a universal charge placed upon all the churches to await apostolic authority to appoint leadership for them. There were many churches and few apostles and apostolic "delegates" to undertake such a ministry. If God was involved in planting a church, He would have, by necessity, raised up an equipped such leadership by His instrumentalities, especially in the post-apostolic era, where there were no more apostles. Who today would have apostolic authority to establish elders in churches that they were not members of? After all, it is God who gives gifted men to the church, not man or the apostles! No doubt part of Paul's charge to Titus in appointing elders was due to the very poor and disorganized state of the churches on Crete, a situation that may have been unique to Crete. We have no record of who appointed elders in the churches that Paul did not start, as in Rome or Colossae. Did they do it themselves, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit?

The idea of an "elder" generally includes the idea of an older man, but he need not be an "aged" man to qualify, simply one who has wisdom, experience and dignity. We wonder about these Mormon "elders" who are 21 years old. I've met some, who are on their two-year mission service being referred to as "elders" although they have never pastored or have fulfilled any place of spiritual leadership. There is a definite problem in that, among other things in the Mormon system.

5f The ideal situation is one church in each city, not 600 Baptist churches in a city (like in Memphis or Nashville, plus who knows how many other kinds of churches). that split three ways four times. We know in a practical sense, also taking into account human nature, that this kind of situation is impossible here on earth. This would also not be practical in larger cities. Philippi may have had multiple churches (notice the plural "**bishops and deacons**" in Philippians 1:1). Can you imagine one church to serve all of New York City? We have far too many local churches today and it would be a good thing of some merged with others. No doubt there are some local congregations where nothing would be lost if they ceased operations! I am convinced we have too many churches in most areas and that most of them could and should be shut down and in so doing, that area would not suffer too much spiritual damage. Plus, the other churches (that ought to remain in operation) would benefit from larger congregations.

Homer said there were anywhere from 90-100 cities on Crete, but most must have been small towns or villages.

5g Titus, with the apostolic authority given to him by Paul (since Paul could not be on Crete), would ordain these elders. With divine aid and guidance, he would choose the proper persons for such service, and to direct, assist, and preside at the elections and ordinations of them. He was also to set in order things that were wanting. There were problems in the churches, dealing with false teachers and Judaizers. No doubt there were practical problems as well. Titus would have his hands full in ordaining elders and correcting the problems in these churches. "Here it is highly proper to observe the modesty of Paul who willingly permits another person to complete the work which he had begun. And, indeed, although Titus is greatly inferior to him, he does not refuse to have him for a "corrector," to give the finishing hand to his work. Such ought to be the dispositions of godly teachers; not that every one should. labor to make everything bend to his own ambitious views, but that they should strive to assist each other, and that, when any one has labored more successfully, he should be congratulated and not envied by all the rest."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Adam Clarke.



### **3. Qualifications For Elders/Pastors 1:6**

**1:6<sup>a</sup> If any be <sup>present</sup> blameless,<sup>b</sup> the husband of one wife,<sup>c</sup> having <sup>present active participle</sup> faithful children<sup>d</sup> not accused of riot<sup>e</sup> or unruly.**

6a I am going to make a distinction between the qualifications between elders and bishops since all bishops/pastors are elders but not all elders are pastors. Paul mentions the qualifications for elders in Titus 1:6 (carried over from Titus 1:5) and then specifically deals with the bishops starting in Titus 1:7. The material in Titus 1:6 will apply to both elders and pastors while material in Titus 1:7 and following will apply only to the pastor.

6b **“blameless”** See 1 Timothy 3:2. Strong's #410 anegklêtos; from a (Strong's #1) without and egkaleô (Strong's #1458), to come forth as an accuser; that cannot be called into account, unproveable, unaccused, blameless. The elder/pastor will not be a perfect man for he will have his faults. There will be no flagrant scandal in his life, nothing that the world can point to as an unchristian vice. Blameless does not mean sinless, for then no man would qualify to be an elder/pastor in the church. This means that there is nothing in his life that would cause a scandal and that would disqualify him from spiritual leadership. He is a steward (1 Corinthians 4:2) and the prime requirement for that is that he is to be faithful in his personal life.

6c **“the husband of one wife”** See 1 Timothy 3:2. This forbids the elder/pastor from being a polygamist. It would also disqualify a converted Jew who had two wives, which was legal under the Law. This verse does not automatically disqualify a divorced man from the pastorate.

There are three Biblical grounds for divorce:

1. Death

A. Romans 7:3, **So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.**

2. Desertion

A, 1 Corinthians 7:15, **But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace.**

3. Adultery

A. Matthew 19:9, **And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.**

If a man has suffered a divorce for any of these reasons then he is not under bondage. Since the marriage has been dissolved, the man is no longer considered to have a wife. The prohibition against multiple wives fits the context (and other passages) better than divorce and remarriage. It does not prohibit single elders/pastors. Timothy and Titus may have been single since their wives are never mentioned. Paul was single throughout his ministry. Robert Murray McChesney never married. Spurgeon started his pastorate as a bachelor. It is assumed that most men will marry, so the prohibition is in regards to men who are married or who are intending to marry. If there was a prohibition against single elders/pastors, then Paul would undercut what he wrote in 1 Corinthians 7:32-35 about single Christians being able to serve God better than married ones. That would certainly apply to the pastorate. But we realize that

many times, a married man with a family can do a better job at pastoring than a single man. I have pastored 3 churches. My first two pastorates was as a single man and my current one is with a family of 4 children. My first two pastorates were probably "failures" but my third pastorate is much more successful. I credit much of that success to my wife and children. Knowing what I know now, after two "single" pastorates, I would not support a call of a single man to a pastorate. A single man would function better in evangelism, on the mission field or on a church staff. And I certainly would not try to pastor again if I became a widower in losing my wife.

This does certainly disqualify women elders/bishops. How can a woman be "the husband of one wife" unless she was a lesbian! And then she certainly would not be blameless. There is no scriptural basis for women in positions of spiritual authority, such as in a pastorate.

**6d "having faithful children"** If a man can't run a few people in his house then how does he expect to run a church? If his own children don't respect him, how will anyone in the church follow him? Both pastors and elders are involved with church government. If his wife and children respect him so little that they rebel against his authority as a father and husband, then how can the Church put any confidence in him? If he is "Herman Milquetoast" at home, then how will he be at church? And if his wife or kids run the home, then will they also run the church- and him?

"(God) has chosen a representative agent in history. This delegated agent is man. Man alone is made in God's image. He is a true, personal reflection of God. This is why he is the agent to whom God has delegated legitimate sovereignty. In calling Adam to serve as judge, God called a perfect man in history to serve as His agent. But that perfect man was immature. This means, among other things, that he was judicially immature. He had only one law that he had been given in order to serve as a restraint against him. That law was that he could not eat from a particular tree. God set a legal boundary around that tree. In order to gain maturity, Adam had to learn self-government under God. He needed time in order to mature judicially. He needed obedience to mature judicially. He needed experience to mature judicially. Obedience is a product of self-government under God. Experience to some extent must be based on one's learning the principles of judging others in one's capacity as a judge. Adam was put at the head of a household. He was given authority to exercise judgment in history over others. There can be no development of judicial maturity in history without holding some kind of office. This is why the church requires that elders in the church must be lawful rulers over their families...What about the church? Here, there is biblical evidence that a man must be a successful ruler of his own household before being ordained by a church as a minister (I Timothy 3:1-11)...The family is a training ground in learning how to govern. There is nothing revolutionary in this observation. The church is to use the family as a surrogate.

"If a man cannot rule well in his family, Paul said, do not make him a leader in the church. The odds are against his success. That this requirement governs ordination to the pastorate is clear to everyone except seminary professors and churches that ordain unmarried seminary graduates. They have substituted term papers for family rule as the screening criteria. This has been disastrous for the church...The reason why Paul specified the family as the screening institution is that family government makes visible a man's skills of self-government in the context of a nearly universal hierarchy. There are more heads of families than heads of civil government."<sup>8</sup> If your wife went to a judge to get a divorce, she should have no Biblical grounds to obtain one. If she has a Biblical reason, then the house is not well-ruled and that man is not eligible for spiritual leadership. Children are children in Scripture until age 20, although this has been lowered to 18 in American society. As long as the children are living at home, they are to be in subjection and submission to their parents. If not, then the potential bishop is in trouble.

---

<sup>8</sup> Gary North, *Boundaries and Dominion: The Economics of Leviticus*, computer edition.

What they do after they pass the age of majority and leave the house is beyond the direct power of the bishop. Such families with faithful children may have been a distinct minority on an island like Crete so Paul emphasizes this requirement in the light of such a telling need, especially among the Christian population, as their spiritual leaders would need to set an example of godly marriages and obedient children.

6e **“riot”** Strong's #506 anupotaktos; from a (Strong's #1) without and hupotassô (Strong's #5293) to subject, sit under in an orderly manner; unsubdued, insubordinate, that is not put under, unruly, disobedient, that cannot be subjected to control.

#### **4. Qualifications For Pastors 1:7-9**

Since both Timothy and Titus were pastors and would be involved in training younger men to be pastors as in setting up new churches, Paul deals with both men about the qualifications regarding spiritual leadership.

**1:7 For a bishop<sup>a</sup> must<sup>present</sup> be<sup>present infinitive</sup> blameless,<sup>b</sup> as the steward<sup>c</sup> of God; not selfwilled,<sup>d</sup> not soon angry,<sup>e</sup> not given to wine,<sup>f</sup> no striker,<sup>g</sup> not given to filthy lucre;<sup>h</sup>**

7a Strong's #1985 episkopo; an overseer, a man charged with the duty of seeing that things to be done by others are done rightly, any curator, guardian, superintendent, elder, or overseer of a group of Christians.

7b **“blameless”** 1 Timothy 3:2. Not sinless, for none would qualify. There should be no open scandal in his life that an opponent could get a handle on to exploit.

Strong's #410 anegklêtos; from a (Strong's #1) without and egkaleô (Strong's #1458), to come forth as an accuser; that cannot be called into to account, unproveable, unaccused, blameless.

7c **“steward”** See 1 Corinthians 4:2. Faithfulness is the prime requirement for spiritual leadership.

7d **“selfwilled”** Strong's #829 authades; from autov autos (Strong's #846) himself and 'hdomai hêdomai, to please; self-pleasing, arrogant, self-willed. Pastors cannot be stubborn and bull headed when dealing with the saints and the operation of the church. He is occasionally wrong! If his staff or people have a better idea or point up a flaw in his program, then he is to have enough grace to listen to them instead of puffing up and blowing hot and cold about "pastoral authority" and "submission to your pastor." "To be self-willed is to be stubborn, surly, disregardful of others, arrogant, needing to have your own way in everything."<sup>9</sup> Your will reigns supreme, even at the expense of the brethren, of even the Holy Spirit Himself. There will be many times where a pastor or someone in spiritual leadership will not get his way and will have to learn to deal with it. This shows that a pastor is not a dictator in the local church, where his word is law and everyone must obey him- or else. He can be “thwarted” by the congregation when circumstances allow- for better or worse.

7e **“not soon angry”** Strong's #3711 orgilos, not soon angry. It is used only here, rare in the Septuagint and in Classical Greek. Patience and a good spirit are also necessary for spiritual

---

<sup>9</sup> D. A. Waite, *Bible For Today*, April 7, 1978, page 1.

leadership. Pastors who blow up at every little thing are not fit for spiritual leadership. The pastor must not be the type of man who "flies off the handle" at every little thing. He may very well get angry (if he has good cause) but not at the "drop of a hat". A man who has trouble with his anger may also be suffering from an unhealthy level of pride and certainly has trouble with his maturity and self-control.

7f **"not given to wine"** 1 Timothy 3:3. He must set the proper example in this area of moderation and self-control, including wine. The reason behind this prohibition is that the elder/bishop has ruling authority in the church and his head must be clear at all times in order to exercise his authority and judgment when he needs to. He would be unable to rule well if he were drunk. To avoid such situations, the pastor is to avoid alcoholic wine all together. Kenneth Wuest has it "one who sits long at the wine."<sup>10</sup> He must not be a "tavern sitter".<sup>11</sup>

The drinking of wine was much more widespread in Paul's day than today. In his day, there was not a wide variety of beverages of which to drink. It was water (which was not always clean) or wines. Today, we have a very wide selection of beverages (tea, coffee, hot cocoa, soda, non-alcoholic beer, non-alcoholic grape juice...) so the drinking of wine ought not to be as much of a problem for us as it would have been in this day.

"With temperance as a rule, wines were an acceptable part of the diet. Distilled liquors are a modern invention. Wines were a part of the legitimate offerings to God (Numbers 15:5,7,10). The use of wines, being governed by God, and governed by His law of temperance, was on the whole temperate. To this day, alcoholism is rare among the Jews. The New Testament warnings against intemperance are many (Ephesians 5:18; 1 Timothy 3:3,8; Titus 1:7; 2:3; 1 Peter 4:3, etc.)."<sup>12</sup>

There is a difference between wine and strong drink. Wine is from the grape, wine that has undergone fermentation and is thus alcoholic. Strong drink includes other forms of alcoholic beverages, what we today would refer to as distilled spirits, like beer or whiskey. The Bible places a distinction between them. Wine was not forbidden, only intoxication. Strong drink was never recommended or allowed, unless you were ready to perish. We summarize then that the moderate use of wine is not condemned. There are two prohibitions for wine:

1. For Old Testament priests and for those in positions of authority. But here is where the prohibition for Christians enters in! The Old Testament priest was forbidden wine as he ministered (Leviticus 10:9; Ezekiel 44:21). Every Christian is a priest (1 Peter 2:5,9) who is always "on duty". Can we then afford to drink wine? We may have the liberty to do so, but should we, in the light of our spiritual priesthood?

2. For drunkenness.

The fact that some limited use of wine is allowed is seen in Titus 3:8 under the deacons as well as in Titus 2:3, where the aged women are told to not be given to "much wine." There is no command for total prohibition to the deacon or the aged women, just to those in positions of authority and leadership. Now I just know someone is going to say that I am leaving the door open for the use of alcoholic wine. I am for abstinence, but the Bible does allow its use in some circumstances. I am not advocating the use of alcoholic wine and I never would but I will not condemn its use as long as drunkenness does not result. I am against drunkenness and the production and sale of intoxicating liquor like beer and whiskey. I see the damage these things do. My father drinks and I am personally aware of the hell that liquor and drunkenness cause. Any man who would accuse me of being soft on this issue is a slanderer.

---

<sup>10</sup> Page 56.

<sup>11</sup> Matthew Poole volume 3, page 779.

<sup>12</sup> R. J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, page 300.

7g **“no striker”** 1 Timothy 3:3. Strong's #4131 plektev plektes; bruiser, ready for a blow, a pugnacious, contentious, quarrelsome person. He must not be a troublemaker who is always looking for a fight. The servant of the Lord must be gentle and not strive (2 Timothy 2:24). You have to wonder about a man who is always in a fistfight. His pride and ego are so huge that he must answer a wrong and cannot cover a transgression. This man is a poor example of Biblical leadership. The Tyndale and Coverdale Bibles have this as a “fighter”. The ESV gives the idea of a violent person.

We would also apply this to modern-day union ‘strikers’ who walk out on their jobs if they think they are not getting paid enough or if they don’t like their working conditions. Pastors are not to do this. It is true that most pastors are not paid what they are worth (for a variety of reasons) and the working conditions and the hours are not always ideal, but we are not to “strike” God or the church for more money or for better conditions or for more appreciation or recognition. We are to go on and keep at our responsibilities regardless of the conditions or the compensation.

7h **“not given to filthy lucre”** 1 Timothy 3:3. Strong's #146 aischêrokerdes; from aischêros (Strong's #150) indecent, dishonorable and kerdos (Strong's #2771) gain; sordid, eager for base gain, greedy for money, a person who is eager to gain even if such gain degrades his moral character. If the pastor is in it for the money, get rid of him! He will not hesitate to "shear the sheep" whenever he needs to! He is the hireling of John 10 who cares nothing for the welfare of the sheep but rather concerns himself only with lining his nest. This is the sort of bird who will also fly off to the larger church, salary and parsonage the minute one is offered to him. The preacher needs money to live (like anyone else) but must not live for the money. This is the kind of man who would never take a struggling mission church, or a church too small to support him. He demands a full salary, several weeks of vacation, a new car every two years and so on. To him, the ministry is a profession, a career, instead of a calling and a ministry.

It is not surprising that this verse is attacked! M. R. Vincent attacks it<sup>13</sup> as does the Nestle text. The reasons are obvious- someone is greedy after filthy lucre and mammon and they did not appreciate the rebuke! It's “funny” how critical texts and modern versions always seem to “revise” verses that condemn the lust for money and material gain.

**“Lucre”** is from the Latin “lucrum”, meaning “gain”. Lucre is illicit, dishonorable or unlawful gain or advantage. It is commonly applied to gain of money.”<sup>14</sup>

The ESV has “greedy for gain” but does not attach any “filthiness” to it as do the traditional translations. Greed for gain and gold is morally filthy and will defile the preacher faster than anything.

What the prosperity gospel heretics do with such a verse is easy to imagine- either change it by use of a modern version or simply ignore it! But it cannot be easily explained away.

**1:8<sup>a</sup> But a lover of hospitality,<sup>b</sup> a lover of good men,<sup>c</sup> sober,<sup>d</sup> just,<sup>e</sup> holy,<sup>f</sup> temperate;<sup>g-h</sup>**

8a The five vices of Titus 1:7 are followed by seven virtues in Titus 1:8,9.

8b **“lover of hospitality”** 1 Timothy 3:2 is similar where he is to be “given to hospitality”. Christians were often banished and persecuted and rendered homeless. In the case of traveling preachers and teachers, ministering from church to church, these servants of God were to be received and cared for by the bishop. In the early centuries of the church, the local churches

<sup>13</sup> In his *Word Studies in the New Testament*, volume 4, page 230.

<sup>14</sup> Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 216.

had no buildings, as they met in private homes. The bishop should be glad to thus open his home for this purpose. And he must love to entertain the brethren in his home, as he should not do it out of a sense of mere duty.

"Hospitality" is related to our words "hospital" and "hospice" so the word does not simply refer to entertainment but to caring for the body and soul of someone, taking a deep and personal interest in someone's needs.

"In those days, outside of Palestine inns were usually houses of prostitution as well and hence no place for Christians to stay. As a result, the duty of caring for traveling Christians was an important one."<sup>15</sup>

The Tyndale, Coverdale and Geneva Bibles all use an archaic word "herberous". The ESV drops the "lover" of hospitality. It ought to be retained. Blessed is the preacher who sees being hospitable as a delight rather than a duty.

**8c "a lover of good men"** Personal and practical separation from bad men and apostates is one thing but he must also separate himself unto good men with whom he can fellowship with and benefit from. A man who loves a good God and who is good himself will also love good men. Birds of a feather indeed flock together. People will be attracted to others who are like him- a thief to a thief, a prayer warrior to a prayer warrior. You can a lot about a man by looking at his friends. He must be a lover of that which is good in the best men. He then picks out the best men he can find spiritually to be his friends.

A "lover of good men" is not going to love the men whom the world is going to hold up. The world says to "love" Michael Jackson, Michael Jordan, John Lennon, Rock Hudson, Martin Luther King, Jesse Jackson, Bill Clinton, Eddie Murphy, Barack Obama and the like. But these are not good men for they do not (or did not) love God. A good man will not love bad men and bad men will not love good men. A safe rule of thumb would be anyone promoted by the media and *People Magazine* or the *New York Times* is not a "good" man that a "good man" would love. Rather, the "good men" that a true man of God would love would include (but certainly not be limited to) Henry Martyn, Robert Murray McCheyne, David Brainerd, George Whitefield, Edward Griffin, Asahel Nettleton, Edward Payson, John Paton, William Carey, John Newton, William Cowper, Talmadge Spence, Bob Jones Sr., and men of their "kin". The kind of men you love reveals the kind of heart you have. A man with a bad heart will love bad men. A man with a dirty heart will love dirty men. A man with a pure heart will love good men.

"Good men are rare. It is easy to find a gifted man, a great man, or even a gracious man. But a good man is more difficult to find."<sup>16</sup>

**8d "sober"** 1 Timothy 3:2. Strong's #3524 *nêphaleos* or *nêphalios*; sober, temperate, abstaining from wine, either entirely or at least from its immoderate use, used of things free from all wine, as vessels, offerings, circumspect, able to control himself. He must be moderate in all he says in does, including eating and drinking. A glutton and a winebibber is a man with no self-control, which reveals a lack of maturity and character which are essential for the pastor.

**8e "just"** Strong's #1342 *dikaïos*; right, just, someone who acts comfortably to justice and right without any deficiency or failure. The Greek had the idea of a man who is observant of custom, rule, right. Later it came to mean "rendering to each his due."<sup>17</sup> It means a man who will give you a "fair shake" and a "square deal." He is not a cheat or a fraud in his financial dealings or in his human relations in the church.

---

<sup>15</sup> R. J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, page 772.

<sup>16</sup> John Phillips, *Exploring the Pastoral Epistles*, page 239.

<sup>17</sup> D. A. Waite, *Bible For Today*, July 14, 1978, page 1.

8f **“holy”** Strong's #3741 hosios; holy, righteous, unpolled with wickedness, right as conformed to God and His laws, thus distinguished from "dikaioi" (Strong's #1342) righteous, which refers to human laws and duties. Shouldn't this be obvious? If he is a man of God (and if he isn't then he does not qualify for any spiritual leadership) and if God is holy, then the man of God is also to be holy, to be godlike in his thoughts, words and deeds. To be just is according to human law while holiness is sanctioned by divine law. To be just is to be upright before men. To be holy is to be upright before God.

8g **“temperate”** Strong's #1468 egkratês; from en (Strong's #1722) in and kratos (Strong's #2904) power, dominion, strength, government; having power over, being master of, self-control, continence. Used only here. This carries the idea of self-control or personal discipline. This has the idea of holding oneself as one would rein in a horse by means of a bridle.”<sup>18</sup>

8h **“Sober”** in body, using moderation in diet and dress; and in mind, being prudent, modest, and humble, and thinking soberly of himself, and others, as he ought. **Just**; righteous in his dealings with men, giving to everyone their due; upright and sincere in his conversation with the saints; and faithful in his counsel, admonitions, and reproofs. **Holy**; devout towards God, constant in all religious exercises in the closet, family, and church; and living soberly, righteously, and godly in the world. **Temperate**; in eating and drinking; continent from the lusts of the flesh; and even abstaining from those things which might be lawfully used, though inexpedient, for the sake of the weak, the peace of the church, and the glory of God.”<sup>19</sup>

**1:9 Holding fast** <sup>present middle/passive participle</sup> **the faithful<sup>a</sup> word<sup>b</sup> as he hath been taught,<sup>c</sup>**  
**that he may be** <sup>present subjunctive</sup> **able by sound** <sup>present active participle</sup> **doctrine<sup>d</sup> both to**  
**exhort** <sup>present middle/passive participle</sup> **and to convince<sup>e</sup>** <sup>-present middle/passive participle</sup> **the**  
**gainsayers.<sup>f-g</sup>**

9a The Scripture is given a human attribute in being referred to as “faithful”. The Scripture is the most faithful thing on earth as it is constant, consistent, always truthful and will always be candid with you in telling you the truth about things and about yourself.

9b You had better figure where this “word” is! In which translation is it? There are only 200 translations to choose from and others come on the market with annoying regularity. Is it in the Authorized Version, New King James Version, ESV, New International Version...? You can't pick them all as there are as many as 36,000 changes between the King James and modern English versions. We've never had any problem finding this “faithful word” in the Authorized Version Bible preserved for us in the English language. Other languages have it as well.

9c They must be totally loyal to the Scripture and protect it from all who would destroy it, downplay it, belittle it, revise it or pervert it. There are many of these sort of men around who would sell their own grandmother (or God's Book) down the river for a dollar. These are the gainsayers.

9d The elder must not only know where to find “the faithful word” but he must also know what constitutes “sound doctrine”. How can he teach it if he does not know what it is? He must be a teachable man and a man who is a diligent student of the Scripture.

---

<sup>18</sup> D. A. Waite, Bible For Today, August 11, 1978, page 1.

<sup>19</sup> John Gill.

9e “**convince**” Strong's #1651 elegchô; to convict, to refute, to confute, generally with a suggestion of shame of the person convicted, to expose, to find fault with, correct, to reprehend severely, to chide, to admonish, to reprove, to call to account, to show one his fault, to demand an explanation. In Classical Greek, it meant to shame or disgrace.

9f “**gainsayers**” Strong's #483 antilegô; from anti anti (Strong's #473) against and legw legô (Strong's #3004), to speak; to dispute, refuse, answer again, contradict, deny, speak against, to declare oneself against him, to refuse to have anything you do with him. This word is a combination of the Old English "gegn" meaning "against" and "say". To gainsay is to speak against, contradict, oppose or hinder.”<sup>20</sup>

9g Titus is to go head-to-head with these gainsayers, to exhort and convince them of their error and sin. Now how is he to do that unless he has the "faithful word?" The only way errorists can be successfully confronted and defeated by a faithful application of the Scriptures against them. Human philosophy or clever rhetoric will not be enough. These men are deceiving the sheep so they must be confronted and rebuked so that the sheep may be warned and protected. A man who holds fast the faithful word of God is not a man who corrects it or corrupts it, as promoters of modern versions do.

Comparison of Leadership Qualifications Between 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1:

Requirement	1 Timothy 3	Titus 1
Blameless	2	6,7
Husband of One Wife	2	6
Vigilant	2	
Sober	2	8
Of Good Behavior	2	
Given to Hospitality	2	8 (lover of hospitality)
Apt to Teach	2	
Not Given to Wine	3	7
No Striker	3	7
Not Greedy of Filthy Lucre	3	7
Patient	3	
Not a Brawler	3	
Not Covetous	3	
Ruling His Own House Well	4	
Children in Subjection	4	
Not a Novice	6	
Having Faithful Children Not Accused of Riot or Unruly		6
Not Selfwilled		7
Not Soon Angry		7
Lover of Good Men		8
Just		8
Holy		8
Temperate		8
Holding Fast the Faithful Word That He May Teach		9

<sup>20</sup> Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 159.



## **5. Titus' Congregation 1:10-13**

**1:10 For there are <sup>present</sup> many unruly<sup>a</sup> and vain talkers<sup>b</sup> and deceivers,<sup>c</sup> specially they of the circumcision:<sup>d</sup>**

10a Titus will have a rough congregation, but not very different from the average American town today.

**“unruly”** These are men who will not be ruled or who will not conform to any external authorities over them.

10b **“vain talkers”** Strong's #3151 mataiologov mataiologos; from mataios mataios (Strong's #3152) vain and legw legô (Strong's #3004) to speak; an idle, senseless or mischievous) talker, a wrangler, one who utters empty senseless things

10c **“deceivers”** Strong's #5423 frenapathv phrenapatês, a mind-deceiver, to deceive by fancies. These people deceive by flattery, by dressing error in beautiful garb, and by flattering their victims to receive their error.

10d The Judaizers were busy on Crete. They were active in both opposing Paul and spreading Jewish fables. Paul had plenty of experience with them from his dealings with the Galatians and he knew how to handle them- head on! Titus must have been especially distasteful to them, for he was an uncircumcised Greek sent by the hated Apostle Paul to undo some of the mess they were causing on the island.

1. Their mouths must be stopped. They must be put to silence by the preaching and teaching of Scripture. That is the only way to shut a false teacher up. He may not hear or heed but his hearers will be impressed that he is nothing but a windbag who was exposed by the Scripture.

2. They subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. They are active in subverting entire houses, leading people to hell by the boatload. The longer they are allowed to spread their lies, the more damage will be done that may never be undone. They must be stopped NOW before the situation gets worse. We see their motivation- filthy lucre. False teachers and Judaizers would not be half as zealous in their soul-damning ministry if it didn't pay so well. There are few apostates who are in it solely for the sake of their doctrine. Making converts and then fleecing them is the motivation for apostasy and its promoters.

**1:11 Whose mouths must <sup>present</sup> be stopped, <sup>a-present middle/passive participle</sup> who subvert<sup>b-</sup> <sup>present</sup> whole houses,<sup>c</sup> <sup>present active participle</sup> teaching things which they ought <sup>present</sup> not, for filthy lucre's sake.<sup>d</sup>**

11a Or muzzled. They must be silenced to keep theie errors from spreading, but not by use of the sword. Protestants and Catholics would have looked at this and said “the State must use the sword to punish heretics”. This is the way it was done through the Dark Ages and the Reformation and in countries that were unfortunate enough to have state churches. Naturally, Paul has no such idea in mind. The mouths of false teachers are shut by moral suasion, writings, confrontation and preaching, not by having them put to death or thrown in jail.

11b **“subvert”** Strong's #396 anatrepô; from ana (Strong's #303) again or used as an emphatic and trepw trepô, to turn; to subvert, overturn. They infiltrate and undermine the spiritual foundation of these houses, usually by means of radio, television, literature and the internet.

11c The spiritual state of entire families was in danger due to these false teachers. It is the job of the pastor to watch over these houses/families, to protect them from the false teachers.

11d Strong's #146 *aischrokerdês*; from *aischêros* (Strong's #150) indecent, dishonorable and *kerdos* (Strong's #2771) gain; sordid, eager for base gain, greedy for money, a person who is eager to gain even if such gain degrades his moral character. Their motivation is money. Error wouldn't be so popular if it wasn't so profitable.

"Filthy lucre" is mentioned 4 times in the pastorals, 1 Timothy 3:3,8; 6:5 and here. The prohibition against it is applied to both pastor/elder and the deacon.

**1:12 One of themselves, even a prophet of their own,<sup>a</sup> said, <sup>aorist</sup> The Cretians<sup>b</sup> are always liars,<sup>c</sup> evil beasts,<sup>d</sup> slow bellies.<sup>e-f</sup>**

12a "This was Epimenides, in whose poems stand the words here cited; Paul rightly calls him "one of themselves", since he was a Cretian by birth, of the city of Gnosus; it is reported of him, that being sent by his father to his sheep in the field, he by the way, at noon, turned aside into a cave, and slept fifty seven years (hence we get our story of Rip Van Winkle!). He is called a prophet, for Epimenides was thought to be inspired by the gods. He is called by Apuleius a famous fortuneteller; and is said by Laertius to be very skilful in divination, and to have foretold many things which came to pass."<sup>21</sup>

Livy and Plutarch also have little good to say about the Cretians. "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own" "This was Epimenides, who was born at Gnosus, in Crete, and was reckoned by many the seventh wise man of Greece, instead of Periander, to whom that honor was by them denied. Many fabulous things are related of this poet, which are not proper to be noticed here. He died about 538 years before the Christian era. When St. Paul calls him a prophet of their own, he only intimates that he was, by the Cretans, reputed a prophet. And, according to Plutarch, (in Solone,) the Cretans paid him divine honors after his death. Diogenes Laertius mentions some of his prophecies: beholding the fort of Munichia, which guarded the port of Athens, he cried out: O ignorant men! if they but knew what slaughters this fort shall occasion, they would pull it down with their teeth! This prophecy was fulfilled several years after, when the king, Antipater, put a garrison in this very fort, to keep the Athenians in subjection. See Diog. Laert., lib. i. p. 73. Plato, Deuteronomy Legibus, lib. ii., says that, on the Athenians expressing great fear of the Persians, Epimenides encouraged them by saying that they should not come before ten years, and that they should return after having suffered great disasters. This prediction was supposed to have been fulfilled in the defeat of the Persians in the battles of Salamis and Marathon. He predicted to the Lacedemonians and Cretans the captivity to which they should one day be reduced by the Arcadians. This took place under Euricrates, king of Crete, and Archidamus, king of Lacedemon; vide Diog. Laert., lib. i. p. 74, edit. Meibom. It was in consequence of these prophecies, whether true or false, that his countrymen esteemed him a prophet; that he was termed *anhr ageiov*, a divine man, by Plato; and that Cicero, Deuteronomy Divin., lib. i., says he was *futura praesciens, et vaticinans per furorem*: He knew future events, and prophesied under a divine influence. These things are sufficient to justify the epithet of prophet, given him here by St. Paul. It may also be remarked that *vates* and *poeta*, prophet and poet, were synonymous terms among the Romans."<sup>22</sup>

"The Cretans were classed with the Cappadocians and Cilicians (all beginning in the Greek with a "K" or kappa) as the most evil and corrupt in the Greek world."<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> John Gill.

<sup>22</sup> Adam Clarke.

<sup>23</sup> A.C. Gaebelein, *The Annotated Bible*.

12b The Cretians would be no friend to the gospel and would do what they could to oppose the spread of it. Many of the Cretians were unruly and vain talkers and deceivers. They could not be controlled and would not submit to discipline. They were windbags, especially of "religious topics." Men can talk long and loud about that which they know nothing of. They were deceivers. The Cretians had their fair share of false teachers and were guilty of spreading some of it themselves.

12c Lying was a governing vice among them. They were not only guilty of it in some particular instances, but always; not only for saying that Jupiter's sepulchre was with them, when it was the sepulchre of Minos his son, which they had fraudulently obliterated. Hence, with the Grecians, to "cretize", or speak as a Cretian, is proverbially used for lying

12d Cretians were well known for their cruelty. Cretians rejoiced in the vile mysteries of the cult of Dionysus (Bacchus). Wine was one of the island's chief exports and Dionysus was the god of wine.

"Crete was a country without wild beasts. Epimenides' sarcasm was that its human inhabitants supplied the place of wild beasts,"<sup>24</sup>

12e "**slow bellies**" Strong's #692 argos; from a a (Strong's #1) without and ergon ergon (Strong's #2041); free from labor, at leisure, lazy, shunning the labor which one ought to perform, inactive, unemployed, useless, a man who is as it were all stomach, being devoted to the belly. A very graphic term! The Cretians were intemperate and were famous for their gluttony and drunkenness. I can think of no better example of a "slow belly" than the welfare cheat who is active only at the time of the month when the check arrives. He is perfectly healthy but just can't seem to drag himself out of bed to find work. Why work when welfare pays so well? And what shall we say of people on "disability" who still are healthy enough to mow their lawns every day? Maybe they can't work a shovel but they could sit at a desk and work. They have nothing else to do than sit around all day and eat.

The modern versions have "lazy gluttons" but 'slow bellies' is so much more picturesque!

12f You talk about "hate speech!" Can you imagine Paul (or any modern preacher) saying this about some ethnic or national group? He'd be hauled into court for hate speech and the news media would crucify him! But since Paul affirms this was true in Titus 1:13, it is truth and not hate. Certain nationalities and ethnic groups seem to have "master sins" that need to be addressed by the preacher sent to them.

**1:13 This witness is <sup>present</sup> true.<sup>a</sup> Wherefore rebuke<sup>b-</sup> <sup>present imperative</sup> them sharply, that they may be sound <sup>present subjunctive</sup> in the faith;**

13a All of this witness of the Cretians is true, therefore they are to be sharply and pointedly rebuked for these sins. "What Epimenides said of them nearly 600 years before continued still to be true. Their original character had undergone no moral change."<sup>25</sup> They were to be severely reprimanded for their sin so that they might be sound in the faith. No sinner will give up his lifestyle of sin unless he is convinced that it is sin and that is not usually done without being confronted by a preacher and the Holy Spirit about it. No Christian will repent of his sin unless

---

<sup>24</sup> Jamieson, Fausset and Brown *Commentary*.

<sup>25</sup> Adam Clarke.

confronted in the same manner. You cannot dent granite with a toothbrush. If you wish to recover backsliders and the disobedient, a sharp rebuke will often be necessary. The more severe the sin, the stronger the confrontation that will be necessary. Christians do need to be rebuked like this occasionally! Cretians are bad enough, but what about professing "Cretians" in the Sunday School and in the choir? They are there and you had better sniff them out before they subvert not just a few houses but your whole church. Professing Christians are often just as bad as unsaved Cretians, so they must be treated in the same manner as an unsaved man. If you are a professing Christian yet insist on living and acting like an unsaved man, then don't complain when your pastor treats you like one and rebukes you like one. You asked for it.

13b **"rebuke"** Strong's #1651 elegchô; admonish, convict, convince, tell a fault, rebuke, generally with a suggestion of shame of the person convicted, to reprehend severely, to chide, to admonish, to reprove, to call to account, to show one his fault, to demand an explanation. In Classical Greek, it meant to shame or disgrace.

## **6. Criticism of the Judaizers 1:14-16**

Summary of the sins of the Jews from 1:16:

1. They profess to know God.
2. In works, they deny God.
3. They are abominable.
4. They are disobedient.
5. They are reprobate to every good work.

**1:14<sup>a</sup> Not giving heed** present active participle **to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn** present middle participle **from the truth.**

14a Paul expands more of his criticisms of the Judaizers, to let Titus know that there can be no compromise with them at all, lest the Gospel be defiled. Judaizers specialize not in preaching the gospel or spreading the truth of God but rather in propagating Jewish fables and the commandments of men, that turn from the truth (Titus 1:14). For a sample of Jewish fables, check out a copy of a Talmud, Kabbalah or any commentaries on these works. The commandments of men would include the "work your way to heaven" plan of salvation of the liberal. Man comes up with his own plan of salvation that is heavy on works and ritual that is more dogmatic and legalistic than anything the Bible would command. Roman Catholicism would be a good example of this.

**1:15 Unto the pure all things are pure:<sup>a</sup> but unto them that are defiled** perfect passive participle **and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.** perfect passive

15a Nothing is pure to those with defiled minds and consciences. They are offended at everything and have absolutely no grace about them. Cross their legalistic regulations or dare disagree with them and they will curse you to hell faster than a rescue mission bum. They have never read Romans 14 and do not hold to the doctrine of soul liberty, even if they are professing Baptists. But what does this mean? The best interpretation would be that the good conscience of a man about to do something sanctifies that action. Now this does not give a license to sin for it is impossible to knowingly and deliberately sin and have a good, clean and pure conscience

about it. This would cover some of these “gray areas” that may not be directly dealt with by Scripture.

“The fifteenth verse has frequently been utterly misused. This does not mean that things which to others are unholy become in themselves pure when done by those of superior mind. It means that the pure delight in purity, even as the unholy delight in that which is impure. With mind and conscience defiled such may make a great religious profession declaring that they know God, but their evil works prove that they are utter strangers to Him. It is against the behavior of such that Titus is called upon to warn the people of God.”<sup>26</sup>

**1:16 They<sup>ab</sup> profess<sup>present</sup> that they know<sup>perfect active infinitive</sup> God; but in works they deny<sup>present middle subjunctive</sup> him, being<sup>present participle</sup> abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.<sup>c</sup>**

16a By context from Titus 1:14, this would apply to the Jews. We would expect the heathen Cretians to act like this, but God’s covenant people? Paul would repeat much of these condemnation of the Jews in Romans 2 and 3.

16b Sins of the Jews:

1. They profess they know God.
2. In works, they deny God.
3. They are abominable
  - A. “**abominable**” Strong’s #947 *bdeluktos*; detestable, idolatrous.
    - i. Apostasy and disobedience is never nice and pretty but is always detestable.
4. They are disobedient
5. They are reprobate to every good work
  - A. “**reprobate**” Strong’s #96 *adokimos*; unapproved, rejected, worthless, castaway, rejected, that which does not prove itself as it should: unfit for, unproved, spurious. It is used only here in the New Testament.
  - B. They themselves are not called reprobate in Titus 1:16, but their works are reprobate in that they are worthless and vain spiritually. Their works do not measure up to their profession and are rejected. When their works are put to the test, they fail every time and expose them as the religious frauds that they are.
  - C. “Adulterate; like bad coin, deficient both in the weight and goodness of the metal, and without the proper sterling stamp; and consequently not current. If they did a good work, they did not do it in the spirit in which it should be performed. They had the name of God’s people; but they were counterfeit. The prophet said; Reprobate silver shall men call them.”<sup>27</sup>

16c Many of the wickedest men in history professed to know God. Hitler was a Roman Catholic all his life<sup>28</sup> and he looked at his “mission” in life to be the will of God! What about “Bloody” Mary, Idi Amin, Bill Clinton, Stalin (who studied for the Orthodox priesthood in his younger days) and others like them? A mere profession of the knowledge of God is meaningless. Works is the

---

<sup>26</sup> Harry Ironside, *Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, page 263.

<sup>27</sup> Adam Clarke.

<sup>28</sup> He was never excommunicated. Some of the worst men in history were Romanists and hardly any were ever excommunicated. Even today, most Romanist politicians, like Nancy Pelosi and Joe Biden, are rabidly pro-abortion yet have never been disciplined by Rome. Ted Kennedy was never disciplined, either, They would condemn men who left the Church over doctrinal issues. As long as I stayed loyal to the Church, they would tolerate anything, including murder, abortion and all manner of crimes and sin. Just don’t leave the Church...!

acid test of profession, as is the theme of the book of James. You prove your profession by your works. These Cretian false teachers and Judaizers will make an impressive religious profession to try to get on your good side. But when their works begin to manifest themselves (and they will in time), you can measure just how genuine that profession is.

Anyone can talk a good religion, but the acid test is the outward, physical manifestation of that faith. This was the burden for the book of James, especially James 2. Even the devils believe and they will give a profession of the deity of Christ, but that “belief” does not translate into a holy life. If the grace of God really has gotten into the heart, then it will eventually be manifested outwardly in their works. Thus, a Christian should have good works to back up his verbal profession of faith.

## Titus Chapter 2

### 7. Speaking Sound Doctrine 2:1

**2:1 But speak** <sup>present imperative</sup> **thou the things which become** <sup>present</sup> **sound** <sup>a-present active participle</sup> **doctrine:**<sup>b</sup>

1a The pre-Authorized Version translations all have 'wholesome'. The ESV reads as the Authorized Version, although the ESV unnecessarily complicates the reading of the verse.

1b Titus is to avoid the Jewish fables and the false teachings of the false teachers and dedicate himself to speaking right things, the truth, sound doctrine. It is all you can do to concentrate on the truth. You do not have the luxury of time to waste years on studying error. You must study it so you know what the enemy is saying, but your primary ministry is the proclamation of truth, not necessarily the constant refutation of error. That has its place but it is not first place.

### 8. Commands To Aged Men 2:2

**2:2<sup>a</sup> That the aged men<sup>b</sup> be** <sup>present infinitive</sup> **sober,<sup>c</sup> grave,<sup>d</sup> temperate,<sup>e</sup> sound** <sup>present active participle</sup> **in faith,<sup>f</sup> in charity,<sup>g</sup> in patience.<sup>h</sup>**

2a Chapter 1 dealt mainly with godliness in the church. Chapter 2 will deal with godliness in the home. Chapter 3 will deal with godliness in the world.

2b Among the heathen, older men often gave themselves up to drunkenness and gluttony. Titus was combat these vices of age with the gospel and stress to the older men their responsibility to be the proper examples in faith, virtue and charity to the younger men and that they were to provide the proper leadership in their areas. You can often discern the vices of a person or of a group of persons by the commands that are directed toward them regarding certain sins and practices.

2c **"sober"** Strong's #3524 *nêphaleos*; circumspect, temperate, abstaining from wine, either entirely or at least from its immoderate use. The Geneva and Bishops Bible have this as "watchful" or "watching".

2d **"grave"** Strong's #4586 *semnos*; august, venerable, reverend, honorable, honest. The older men are to be grave in their behavior, speech, and dress, for levity of conversation, frothy language, and airy dress, are very unbecoming to these elder saints.

"Gravity is not only a simple word but a highly descriptive one. One need only to think of the earth's gravity and the effect thereof and relate the concepts to the gravity produced by God's word and its effect upon one's life. Gravity is that which holds a man in place, it keeps him from floating away. The constancy of the law of gravity gives a certain knowledge upon which to base our actions- if I drop this, it will fall, etc. Thus, grave speaks of and pictures one who is well grounded (Colossians 1:23), stable (Ephesians 4:14) and fixed (Psalm 112:7)."<sup>29</sup>

2e **"temperate"** Strong's #4998 *sôphrôn*; from "sôos, sound and phrên (Strong's #5424) understanding; discreet, sober, temperate, of a sound mind, self-disciplined in one's freedoms, self-restrained in all passions and desires. They are to be temperate in eating and drinking, and

---

<sup>29</sup> James Knox, *The Book of Titus*, page 80.

in their other physical needs which must be satisfied. A temperate man will not eat too much or too little, oversleep or undersleep, overwork or underwork and so on. The Bishop's Bible uses "sober" here.

2f **"sound in faith"** If they have been saved any length of time (as they would be if they were to be appointed as elders), then it is to be expected that they would be sound in the faith. Because of their age and status in the church, they tend to provide leadership to the younger members. Since they are examples by virtue of age and experience, they are expected to be sound in the faith so they can provide this necessary leadership.

AV	ESV	LSV	Darby
2 That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience.	2 Older men are to be sober-minded, dignified, self-controlled, sound in faith, in love, and in steadfastness.	2 Older men are to be temperate, dignified, sensible, sound in faith, in love, in perseverance.	2 that the elder men be sober, grave, discreet, sound in faith, in love, in patience;

2g Only the Authorized Version uses **"charity"** here. The other translations, including the pre-Authorized Version Bibles, use "love". The word here is "agapê" which is used for divine love, the highest form of love, love as a verb and not just the mere emotion. The Authorized Version usually translates this as "charity" to distinguish it from mere "love". We find no fault in the Authorized Version translation here as it does make the distinction between "love" and "charity" and is quite precise in so doing.

2h "Abraham's impatience brought Ishmael into the world and with him problems that have lasted to this day (Genesis 16). Impatience cost Saul his kingdom (1 Samuel 13). Young David, on the other hand, having learned patience through suffering, refused to take matters into his own hands and waited for God to give him the kingdom (1 Samuel 14-16)."<sup>30</sup>

## 9. Commands to Aged Women 2:3

**2:3 The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness,<sup>a</sup> not false accusers,<sup>b</sup> not given <sup>perfect passive participle</sup> to much wine,<sup>c</sup> teachers of good things;<sup>d</sup>**

3a For the same reason for the older men.

"Holiness (see Psalm 29:2; 96:9) is a beautiful thing according to the Psalmist. The **"beauty of holiness"** (see Psalm 110:3) is that it *magnifies* God, acts as an *antidote* to the Adamic nature, *suppresses* sin and thereby saves the sinner from reaping a 'bountiful crop', *attracts* sinners who are tired of sin and 'want something better', and it *reinforces* the promises of God, showing that such a thing is possible. The things that '**become holiness**' are listed in verses 3 and 4."<sup>31</sup>

3b **"Accusers"** is Strong's #1228 diabolos; prone to slander, slanderous, accusing falsely, applied to a man who, by opposing the cause of God, may be said to act the part of the devil or to side with him. This is a gross sin that women seem to suffer from more than men, although

<sup>30</sup> John Phillips, *Exploring the Pastoral Epistles*, pages 268-269.

<sup>31</sup> Peter Ruckman, *Pastoral Epistles*, page 349.



the men (especially preachers!) are not immune to. Gossip is absolutely forbidden. Slander, passing lies and second-hand stories, working the grapevine and character assassination via use of the tongue are prohibited by divine commandment.

3c See remarks under Titus 1:7. What is more abominable than seeing a drunk woman, especially a drunk elderly woman? Seeing a drunken man is bad enough, but how much worse for a woman, especially a professing Christian woman!

**“Much wine”** Drunkenness was a besetting sin on Crete. Paul does not seem to be calling for total abstinence, else he would be stronger here. Wine was widely drunk in Bible days as the water was not as clean as it is today, but the alcoholic content of this wine (if it was fermented) was quite low, so it would take a lot of drinking to bring on drunkenness. Moderation and an avoidance of drunkenness is called for here.

3d The younger women, whom the elder women are to teach, can pick up the bad things on their own, but they will need a godly woman to steer them in the right paths. Women can certainly teach other women in the church, so this does not contradict Paul’s earlier admonitions that women were to keep silent in the churches. The young Cretan girls, knowing their backgrounds, would need much instruction in these areas.

The Tyndale, Coverdale and Geneva Bible has “honest things”.

## **10. Commands to Younger Women 2:4,5**

**2:4 That they may teach the young women<sup>a</sup> to be** present infinitive **sober,** present subjunctive **to love their husbands, to love their children,**

4a The elder women are to be teachers, of good things (and sound doctrine and practice) generally and of the younger women especially. Who better to teach the young women in the church than the older women? And who better to teach a daughter than a mother or grandmother? What the older women are to teach the younger is listed under Titus 2:4,5, which follows.

“Observe that Titus is not told to instruct the young women personally in regard to their behavior. That might not always be discreet, and might compromise him as a servant of Christ. He is to address himself to the aged women and they are to “train” the younger.”<sup>32</sup>

Titus is to instruct these Christian women to live such a life as to make them stand out among their Cretians countrymen. Such it should be today. A Christian woman ought to stand out like the proverbial green thumb among the 21<sup>st</sup> century Western woman.

This is another reason why the pastor should be married. His wife can instruct and counsel women in the church who might be hesitant to go to the pastor. Women understand the needs and problems of women better than men. I was a single pastor in my first two pastorates and I did not do very well in them. In my third, and current, pastorate, I have been much more successful since I am married and had four children.

What are the older women to teach the younger?

1. To be sober

A, **“sober”** Strong's #3524 *nêphaleos* circumspect, temperate, abstaining from wine, either entirely or at least from its immoderate use.

B. Not to be “silly”

---

<sup>32</sup> Harry Ironside, *Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, page 267.

- i. 2 Timothy 3:6, **For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts,**
  - ii. Young women tend to have issues in this area.
- 2. To love their husbands
  - A. How odd to have to command a wife to love her husband! But as we approach the end of the age, the natural affection which should exist in the marriage will become a rarity.
  - i. 2 Timothy 3:3, **Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,**
  - B. This love that a woman is to manifest toward her husband includes her necessary and Biblical submission to her husband. A woman who hates her husband will not submit to him. If she doesn't respect him, she will not submit to him. But if a woman loves her husband with divine love, then she will have no problem submitting to his headship.
- 3. To love their children
  - A. It is even stranger that a woman must be commanded and taught to love her children, but the spirit of the end of the age has also violated this natural maternal love.
  - B. The love of many is waxing cold. (Matthew 24:12, **And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.**)
  - C. We are hearing more and more of mothers abandoning their children in trashcans, abusing them, getting them hooked on drugs and alcohol and even killing them. And what shall we say of abortion? Is this not the ultimate in child abuse? And this situation will get worse as the depravity of the heart of man continues to intensify.
  - D. This command is needed in a day where some women prefer poodle-dogs (or their careers) to children.
  - E. Such a command shows that family life among the Cretians left much to be desired, as it usually is among the heathen.
- 4. Be discreet
  - A. "discreet" Strong's #4998 *sôphrôn*; from "sôos", sound and "phrên" (Strong's #5424) understanding; discreet, sober, temperate, of a sound mind, self-disciplined in one's freedoms, self-restrained in all passions and desires.
  - B. A meek and quiet spirit is called for.
    - i. William Kelly, in his commentary on Titus, has this as "right-minded".
    - ii. Nothing is more irritating than a bossy, loud-mouth woman, even if she is a professing "Christian".
      - a. John R. Rice had their number when he wrote a booklet entitled *Bobbed Hair, Bossy Wives and Women Preachers*.
- 5. Be chaste
  - A. "chaste" Strong's #53 *hagnos*; exciting reverence, venerable, sacred, pure, modest, immaculate, clean.
  - B. Quiet, pure and holy! They are to be such in dress and attitude. Christianity in dress (women not wearing male clothing) is something that is to be taught to the younger women because it is something that is under attack today.
  - C. Women have forsaken Christian modesty in dress in order to go along with the world or because they have been infected by the world. There is nothing more upsetting than a "Christian" woman in any form of immodest attire. But "chastity" is certainly out of style today, even among Christians.
  - D. Why are women so insistent on dressing like men? I heard an unsaved fashion designer on Canadian television in 1996 explain that pants on women are popular because it makes them feel "empowered". Women who are rebelling against the headship of their husbands or men in general must find some way to express their rebellion and express their "power". They do so by dressing like the men whose

authority they are attempting to usurp. A woman who follows Deuteronomy 22:5 and the Biblical principles of dress is a woman who is under submission to both Christ and her husband. Women who wear bikinis, shorts or halter tops or who expose their belly button or who wear any other kind of immodest attire are saying through their clothes that they fear neither God or man but are rebels against everything God has ordained. It has been well said that the average American woman of today, if she went out on the street, would have been arrested 50 years ago for dressing in an obscene manner. Most American women dress like common prostitutes. Such is condemned by Scripture.

E. A woman should dress modestly in public for two reasons:

1. To protect herself from unregenerate men, who once aroused, have no control over their passions.
2. As an expression of love for Christ.

#### 6. Be keepers at home

A. "keepers at home" Strong's #3626 oikouros; from oikos (Strong's #3624) house and ouros a keeper; a stay-at-home, domestically inclined, a good housekeeper, caring for the house, working at home.

i. They stay home. They don't wander all over town as gossips and busybodies.

B. Younger women are to mind their own family affairs, not gadding abroad and inspecting into, and busying themselves about other people's matters.

C. The Jews had the following requirements for these women, according to John Gill: "A woman may go to her father's house to visit him, and to the house of mourning, and to the house of feasting, to return a kindness to her friends, or to her near relations--but it is a reproach to a woman to go out daily; now she is without, now she is in the streets; and a husband ought to restrain his wife from it, and not suffer her to go abroad but about once a month, or twice a month, upon necessity; for there is nothing more beautiful for a woman, than to abide in the corner of her house; for so it is written **"the king's daughter is all glorious within"** (Psalm 45:13)". The tortoise, which carries its house upon its back, and very rarely shows its head, or looks out of it, was, with the ancients, an emblem of a good housewife.

D. Women are to stay home and administrate the domestic affairs. The men are to go out and earn the living while the wife is to stay home, raise the children and provide for things of the house. Today, families want that extra paycheck so off the wife goes to work. Now if there are no children at home for her to raise or if they are school age and are out of the house all day, then the wife could do something during those hours when she is alone at the house. She could teach at the Christian school or baby-sit or help out at the church or something honorable like that. But the "career woman" who dumps her kids off at some government-sponsored day care center and then feeds her family TV dinners because she was too busy to cook a decent meal is ungodly and this woman is also in rebellion against both God and the natural order of things. Better to cut back on your expenses and ask God to provide for your needs than to send Mom out to work. The kids need her home during the day. She is the Queen of the Home and should concentrate on making it a little bit of heaven on earth. This is her God-given place. A woman can raise the kids and administrate the home better than a man playing "Mr. Mom". God has gifted her with the skills necessary to run the household and she is better suited to it emotionally and psychologically than a man is.

E. Another reason why women are to stay out of the work force is to free up jobs that men need to support their families. Here is a man who needs work to support his family. He is ready, willing and able to work. But someone's wife has the job that she doesn't need but he does. More men would be employed and more families would be better off financially if women left those jobs and let the heads of other households occupy them so that they may honorably support their families. We have no problem with single

women working or older women whose children are all grown or a woman with no children. But a mother must be at home to care for her children. This is her God-ordained place. But the “current distress” of economics and high taxes has forced more and more women out of the home because few families can make it on only one paycheck in this current generation.

7. Be good

A. If they are godly, then they should be good. Their walk must match their profession.

8. Be obedient to their own husbands

A. “obedient” Strong’s #5293 *hupotassô*; from *hupo* (Strong’s #5259), under and *tassô* (Strong’s #5021), to order, to arrange under, to subordinate, to put in subjection, to obey, a Greek military term meaning “to arrange [troop divisions] in a military fashion under the command of a leader.” In non-military use, it was a voluntary attitude of giving in, cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden.

B. They are to be obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. To disobey the headship of her husband and to rebel against him is to blaspheme God. We can blaspheme God through rebellion and disobedience, without ever uttering a word of blasphemy. A disobedient Christian woman who refuses to submit to the divinely-ordained headship of her husband is a blasphemer. She would then fall under the same Old Testament penalty for blasphemy- stoning. If the Gospel made women into worse, instead of better, wives, it would have nothing to commend it to the heathen. The Gospel would have no higher morality than heathen philosophies and ethics.

C. Colossians 3:18, **Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.**

D. 1 Peter 3:1, **Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives.**

1. If a Christian woman has an unbelieving husband, the best way to win him is to submit to him in the Lord.

9. No one can teach a younger Christian woman these virtues better than an older Christian woman.

Why these exhortations regarding women? Like today, the women on Crete had been corrupted by the gnostic philosophies of the day. John MacArthur describes this philosophy: “With the Fall and its curse came the distortion of woman’s proper submissiveness and of man’s proper authority. That is where the battle of the sexes began, where women’s liberation and male chauvinism came into existence. Women have a sinful propensity to usurp men’s authority, and men have a sinful propensity to put women under their feet. The divine decree that man would rule over woman in this way was part of God’s curse on humanity, and it takes a manifestation of grace in Christ by the filling of the Holy Spirit to resolve the created order and harmony of proper submission in a relationship that has become corrupted and disordered by sin.

“The core ideas of feminism, including reversal of sexual roles, are found in virtually all ancient religions, including the mother-god legends of Babylonian and Persian mythology. By New Testament times, the foremost proponent of feminism was Greek gnosticism (from the Greek *gnôsis*, “to know”), a general philosophical belief system that prided itself in its unique and superior knowledge about all matters of importance. Despite the attempts of some gnostics to incorporate their beliefs into Judaism and later into Christianity, gnosticism was a malevolent system designed by Satan that was anti-God, anti-Christ, and anti-biblical. In his outstanding book *The Gnostic Empire Strikes Back*, Peter Jones observes that “Gnosticism is a broad term to describe false anti-God religion developed before the birth of Christianity—as the meeting of

the mysticism of the Eastern religions and the rationalism of the Greek west” (p. 15). The gnostics combined the humanistic musings of man’s mind and the esoteric and fanciful notions of eastern mysticism to produce a hybrid, and purportedly superior, system of truth. But they succeeded only in developing a more sophisticated, and especially deceptive and dangerous, form of paganism.

“In all genuinely gnostic literature, the creation of the physical universe is portrayed as an act of arrogant, foolish pride by a powerful but subordinate god who tragically corrupted the heretofore perfect universe of the spirit. A recently discovered ancient gnostic text depicts the creator god as being blind, ignorant, arrogant, the source of envy, and the father of death. Much ancient gnostic literature mocked the Creator God of Scripture with a disdain that bordered on contempt. But that sub-god, or demiurge, also somehow managed to endow the men he had created with a spark of divinity, which, when properly fanned, makes a person fully divine.

“Ancient gnosticism also elevated women, considering Eve to have been a spirit-endowed woman who actually saved Adam from the bungling male deity called God. Similarly, salvation for all of mankind will be brought through female power. Dame Wisdom, the Heavenly Eve, was a mystical goddess who was the source of all wisdom. She was presumed to have entered the serpent in the Garden of Eden and instructed Eve in the ultimate wisdom of self-actualization and self-fulfillment, a wisdom she passed on to Adam. As Peter Jones observes, gnosticism took redemptive history and stood it on its head, like an upside-down satanist cross in a black mass. Although gnosticism has taken many forms during its long history of deception, its core doctrine is the consubstantiality of the human self with God. Man’s purpose is to make himself fully God, and the means to that end is elevation of self through developing self-esteem, self-knowledge, and self-realization. “It follows,” comments Jones, “that part of self-redemption is the rejection of biblical norms and the promotion of the distortion of biblical sexuality” (p. 26). In the mythology of gnosticism, the supreme deity is androgynous, that is, both male and female. But the female role is always supreme. Consequently, biblical sexual roles for mankind are reversed, and female dominance and lesbianism are exalted.

“The modern heir of gnosticism is the New Age movement, which, like its ancient progenitor, has many forms and facets. But it has the same disdain for Scripture and the God of Scripture and the same elevation of self. As just noted, it also is characterized by female domination and lesbianism. Although Hinduism has many forms and countless gods and goddesses, many of its basic tenets are gnostic, and its supreme deity is a goddess. Radical feminism, with its homosexuality, sexual freedom, and assault on gender differences and definitions of family, has strongly influenced major Christian denominations, as seen in the rapidly growing practice of ordaining women to the priesthood and pastorate and in the publishing of gender-neutral, and even female-deity, versions of the Bible. As already noted, such unbiblical ideas are not primarily the contrivance of women to make them feel better about themselves but are no less than satanic religion. (For a more complete treatment of this subject, see Jones, *The Gnostic Empire Strikes Back*, pp. 19-72.)<sup>33</sup> And yes, this hellish philosophy has infected the Church.

**2:5 To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient<sup>present passive participle</sup> to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.<sup>h-i-present passive subjunctive</sup>**

5h “**blasphemed**” Strong’s #987 blasphemeô; to vilify, to speak impiously, to rail at, to revile. You can blaspheme by actions as well as by words and you can blaspheme and never open your mouth.

---

<sup>33</sup> John Macarthur, *Titus*.

5i Regarding women:

<b>The World's View</b>	<b>God's View</b>
1. Home is a boring drudgery.	1. Home is a haven to come to from the world and is to be a heaven on earth.
2. Homemaking and children are a burden.	2. They are God's good gifts and children are a sign of God's blessings.
3. Value material success and self-gratification NOW.	3. Value character and godliness, and invest in the future.
4. Place children in childcare for strangers or the public schools to raise.	4. Parents should teach and fulfill their responsibilities to train their children.
5. Children, homemaking, and marriage get in the way of self-achievement.	5. Raising godly children is one of the ways to fulfill God's purposes.
6. Demand your rights to fulfillment.	6. Give up your rights and become a servant.
7. Who needs a man?	7. Women ought to marry
8. Men and women are equal	8. The woman is the weaker vessel.
9. A woman needs a career just like a man.	9. Women are happiest in the home.
10. I don't need children.	10. It is natural for a woman to be a mother.
11. Small families are best.	11. The larger the better. Psalm 127:5, <b>Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate.</b>

Nothing elevates the true worth and value of a woman than does Christianity. Feminism is designed to destroy women while claiming to help them.

## **11. Commands to Young Men 2:6**

**2:6 Young men likewise exhort** <sup>present imperative</sup> **to be sober minded.** <sup>a-b-present middle/passive participle</sup>

6a This is similar to the earlier commands to be sober. The young men are to have a sober and mature mind. It includes two main ideas:

### **1. Be modest.**

A. Young men tend to get a full of themselves at times and are weighted down with pride. Humility is to be developed in the minds of these young men.

### **2. Control the passions.**

A. Young men have more trouble keeping their glands under control. Keep yourself under control sexually and don't allow your passions to drive you into a sin that you will be sorry for later.

6b **"sober minded"** Strong's #4993 *sophroneô*; to be of sound mind, to be in one's right mind, to be "right-minded", to exercise self-control, to put a moderate estimate upon oneself, to think of oneself soberly, to curb one's passions.

## **12. Commands For The Preacher 2:7,8**

**2:7<sup>a</sup> In all things shewing** <sup>present middle participle</sup> **thyself a pattern<sup>b</sup> of good works:<sup>c</sup> in doctrine shewing uncorruptness,<sup>d</sup> gravity,<sup>e</sup> sincerity,<sup>f-g</sup>**

7-8a What of Titus and the other preachers? Show yourself a pattern of good works in:

1. **Doctrine**

A. In what you believe, teach and practice.

2. **Uncorruptness**

A. In your character and godliness.

3. **Gravity.**

A. Strong's #4587 *semnotêti*; decency, dignity, seriousness.

i. Aristotle defined it as the average of virtue that lies between two extremes. It is the ability not only to perform well one's duties as a citizen but also to adhere to the highest principles and ideals of earth and heaven, and thus drawing respect and approval.

ii. In earlier English it signified "becoming deportment, decency, decorum."

iii. The adjective signifies "reverend" or "venerable", exhibiting a dignity which arises from moral elevation and thus invites reverence.

B. Live and minister so that they will respect you! Respect is never freely given but always must be earned. They may respect your office and ministry but will they respect you personally? Why should they? What reason should anyone respect you?

4. **Sincerity.**

A. Strong's #861 *aphtharsia*; incorruption, perpetuity, purity, unending existence, genuineness, immortality, sincerity.

B. This should be obvious as it is natural in the life of any Christian.

C. You ought to be genuine, honest and sincere by simply being born a Christian. Yet how many frauds, cheats, liars and bums do we have in our churches and in the ministry?

5. **Sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you.**

A. The speech of the preacher must also be pure, genuine, seasoned with grace, that we cannot be reproached or our Master shamed by what we have said. In other words, be very careful what you say! It may come back to you if you are not careful. Someone will always condemn it, especially if a sermon "rings the bell." But their criticisms are to be groundless. They are to be put in a position where they expose their rebellion and hatred of God by their condemnation of your sound speech.

7b Titus is to be a pattern for the Cretians. He was to show the Cretians (especially the men) how it was done and how to live the Christian life. They were to look at him and see an example of a genuine Christian and Christian minister. The locals would certainly need a strong moral and spiritual example. Titus was to be the mold that other Christians could be shaped in and by. All preachers are to be as Titus was commanded to be. A pattern is also an image that represents something else. How else can we study Christlikeness unless we are able to see a pattern and example of it in the life of another, especially in the life of our pastor and spiritual leadership?

7c "**good works**" The idea of doing good works figures prominently in Titus (mentioned here, in 2:14; 3:8,14). It is a spiritual fruit that is to be manifested by all Christians as an evidence of their regeneration, obedience and spirituality. Titus is to affirm constantly the need for a practical, visible type of Christianity.

Mere verbal profession with no James-type outward manifestation to back it up amounts to nothing. The faithful Christian will maintain good works, not to get saved or to stay saved, but because he is saved.

We continue to be amazed by some who continue to try to find some contention between Paul and James. Of course there is no contention, for James' emphasis is these "good works" which Paul stresses constantly and told Titus to emphasize. Just because Luther couldn't handle the paradox or understand how Paul and James were complimenting each other is no excuse for you to make the same mistake. Why try to separate friends and why try to reconcile friends?

7d **"uncorruptness"** Strong's #90 adiaphthoria; from a (Strong's #1) without and diaphtheirô (Strong's #1311) to corrupt; incorruption, freedom from corruptible mixtures or adulterations, soundness. It is used only here in the New Testament.

7e Paul was not one to use lightness or levity in his preaching or in his ministry. Souls were dying and the need was too great to act the fool before the people (2 Corinthians 1:17, **When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea yea, and nay nay?**). We think of many modern "youth pastors" who act no more mature than the young people they are supposed to be guiding. Many senior pastors are not "grave" in their preaching or ministry as they stuff their sermons full of jokes and stories.

7f **"sincerity"** The Geneva and Bishops use "integrity".

"Men will forgive a preacher if he is not eloquent or highly cultured; they will forgive him if he lacks in personal attractiveness, or even in wisdom; but they will never forgive him if he is insincere."<sup>34</sup>

7g The Tyndale and Coverdale Bibles run the last part of verse 7 into verse 8.

**2:8 Sound speech,<sup>b</sup> that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed,** aorist passive subjunctive **having** present active participle **no evil thing to say** present middle/passive participle **of you.**<sup>c</sup>

8b Sound speech is a natural by-product of sound doctrine (Titus 2:1).

AV	ESV	LSV	Darby
8 Sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you.	8 and sound speech that cannot be condemned, so that an opponent may be put to shame, having nothing evil to say about us.	8 sound <i>in</i> word which is irreproachable, so that the opponent will be put to shame, having nothing bad to say about us.	8 a sound word, not to be condemned; that he who is opposed may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say about us:

8c The modern versions have "us" instead of "you".

<sup>34</sup> Harry Ironside, *Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, page 268.



### **13. Commands to Servants 2:9,10**

**2:9<sup>a</sup> Exhort servants<sup>b</sup> to be obedient<sup>c-present middle infinitive</sup> unto their own masters, and to <sup>present infinitive</sup> please them well in all things; not answering again; <sup>present active participle</sup>**

9-10a Commands for servants and those under the yoke:

**1. They are to be obedient unto their own masters.**

A. They are to honor the servant-master relationship. It is a type of our relationship with our heavenly Master.

B. Most Christian servants and slaves served in pagan households so it was important that they be obedient and productive for the sake of their testimony and witness for Christ.

**2. They are to please their masters well in all things.**

A. It is a good testimony to be a good servant or employee.

**3. They are not to answer again.**

A. Strong's #483 antilegw antilegô; from anti (Strong's #473) against and legô (Strong's #3004), to speak; to dispute, refuse, answer again, contradict, deny, speak against, to declare oneself against him, to refuse to have anything you do with him.

B. No talking back or smart responses to those who are in authority over you. Do what you are told in the best way you know how, even if you don't understand what you are doing or why. The master or boss-man knows what he is doing. That is why he is the master! If you were so smart, then why are you the servant instead of the master?

**4. They are not to purloin.**

A. Strong's #3557 nosphizomai; embezzle, keep back, to withdraw covertly and appropriate to one's own use.

B. Applied by Greek writers to embezzlement of public treasures.

C. The word comes from the French "purloigner", meaning to prolong, retard or delay. It then came to mean conceal, detain or steal."<sup>35</sup>

D. Servants and employees are not to steal off their employers, either in money, material or time! No taking paper clips home from the office. No taking 20 minutes for a 15-minute coffee break or sneaking home 5 minutes early every day. This is also good stewardship and lends to a good testimony.

**5. They are to show all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.**

A. It is a good testimony to be a good servant. It shows that you are faithful in a "little" things. In so doing, you adorn the doctrine of God by your faithful life and obedience.

i. Luke 16:10, **He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much.**

AV	ESV	LSV	Darby
9 Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters,	9 Bondservants are to be submissive to their own masters in	9 Urge slaves to be subject to their own masters in	9 bondmen to be subject to their own masters, to make

<sup>35</sup> Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 274.

<i>and</i> to please <i>them</i> well in all <i>things</i> ; not answering again;	everything; they are to be well-pleasing, not argumentative,	everything, to be pleasing, not contradicting,	themselves acceptable in everything; not gainsaying;
---	--	--	--

9b The LSV uses “slaves” instead of “servants”. The ESV and Darby have “bondservants”, which is okay, better than the LSV and it’s continual mistranslation of “doulos” as “slaves”.

9c **"obedient"** Strong's #5293 hupotassô; from hupo (Strong's #5259), under and tassô (Strong's #5021), to order; to subordinate, to obey, a Greek military term meaning "to arrange [troop divisions] in a military fashion under the command of a leader." In non-military use, it was "a voluntary attitude of giving in, cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden".

**2:10<sup>a</sup> Not purloining,<sup>b</sup> present middle participle but shewing present middle participle all good fidelity; that they may adorn<sup>c</sup> present subjunctive the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.**

10b The pre-Authorized Version translations all have “pickers” here, obviously an obsolete idea for stealing or being a thief.

10c **"adorn"** Strong's #2885 kosmeô; to put in proper order, decorate, to snuff a wick or trim a lamp, adorn, garnish. We get our English word "cosmetic" from this.

## **14. The Lessons of Grace 2:11-13**

**2:11<sup>a</sup> For the grace<sup>b-c-d</sup> of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared<sup>e</sup> aorist passive to all men,<sup>ef</sup>**

11a Verses 11-13 are listed by O. Talmadge Spence in his *Quest For Christian Purity* that he lists as a “guiding verse” for that quest. This is a verse that deals with some aspect of the Christian’s growth and pursuit of God.

11b The Calvinist John Gill calls Paul a liar here in saying that the grace of God has appeared to all men. Gill disagreed. Consider this quote from Gill: "By which is meant, not the free love and favour of God, which lies in his own heart; for though that is productive of salvation, and is the source and spring of it, and what brings it forth, and is far from encouraging licentiousness, but instructs in real piety, and constrains to obedience to the will of God; yet this does not appear, nor has it been, nor is it made manifest unto all men, but is peculiar to the Lord's own people; nor does it design the grace of God wrought in the hearts of believers; for though salvation is strictly connected with it, and it powerfully influences the lives and conversations of such, who are partakers of it; yet it has not appeared to, nor in all men; all men have not faith, nor hope, nor love, nor any other graces of the spirit..." No! Paul SAID it appeared to ALL men. The Calvinist Gill said it did not. If Paul had meant to limit the extent of the atonement as Gill insists that he does, then Paul would have written in language to clearly demonstrate that. Gill limits the “grace of God” to appearing to all of the elect, not to all men. Who are you going to believe, an uninspired Calvinist or an inspired apostle? And notice all the philosophical contortions Gill must put himself through to maintain his own theological system at the expense of clear Biblical teaching.

11c What is **grace**? It is a good old word, well studied through the ages. It is Strong's #5485 xaris charis; graciousness, of manner or act. It is unmerited favor. This favor was not bestowed

upon Christ's friends but upon His enemies. The classical understanding of the word was just the opposite, as this favor was always bestowed upon friends and not on enemies. But Jesus died for us while we hated Him. Grace is also God not giving me what I deserve (hell) but giving me what I do not deserve (eternal life).

11d Why Grace is So Important

1. **We are saved by grace.**  
A. Ephesians 2:8,9, **For by grace are ye saved...**
2. **Grace is the source of our salvation.**  
A. Acts 15:11. **But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they.**  
B. Acts 18:27 **And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him: who, when he was come, helped them much which had believed through grace:**  
C. Ephesians 2:8,9 **For by grace are ye saved, through faith...**
3. **Workers are called by grace.**  
A. The example of Paul, Galatians 1:15, **But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace. Any preacher knows that he is only in the ministry by the grace of God and not through any merit of his own.**
4. **Grace is the source of our justification.**  
A. Romans 3:24, **Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.**
5. **It is the source of our redemption and forgiveness.**  
A. Ephesians 1:7, **In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;**

11e The Activities of Grace- What does it do in our lives?

1. **What Grace Brought- Salvation** Titus 2:11.  
A. This is true since we are saved by grace. It is only through the grace of God that there is a plan of salvation to start with.  
B. I am a grace preacher and I preach and emphasize the free grace of God in salvation and I don't have to subscribe to a single point of Calvinism to do it.
2. **What Grace Sought- all men**, Titus 2:11.  
A. The Grace of God has appeared to all men (1 Timothy 2:4).  
B. God wants all men saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth, not just the "elect". On this basis, no man can ever plead ignorance of the grace of God for it has appeared to all men.  
C. Why would the grace of God appear to all men and seek all men out if the Calvinistic doctrine of limited atonement were true? What a waste of grace! Grace sought all men because God desires all men to be saved! Naturally, the idea of limited atonement, where Christ died only for the elect instead of for all men, is a gross and devilish heresy which limits the infinite love of God and the extent of the blood atonement. Comparing this with 1 Timothy 2:1-4 is also good, as Paul makes frequent use of the word "all" in relation of God desiring all men to be saved, as well as in 2 Peter 3:9, where God does not want any to perish.
3. **What Grace Taught**, Titus 2:12.  
A. To deny ungodliness. You will be offered ungodliness and worldly lusts in your life. It is up to you to refuse the evil and to cling to the good. This is only possible if you love the things of God more than the things of the world.

- i. "Ungodliness" is Strong's #763 asebeia; impiety, wickedness. Anything that is sin or is a result of disobedience or that it opposed to the things and the spirit of the gospel. This is acting without reference to God. It is living as though God were not to be respected or revered (Hebrews 12:28, **Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear:**). It is the absence of the "fear of the Lord."
- ii. An "ungodly man" is wicked, perverse, irreverent, and without value. His outstanding characteristic is the lack of "God-reference" in his thoughts, conversation, and conduct. He is a practical atheist.

B. To deny worldly lusts.

- i. Quit desiring the things of the world and of sin that you are not allowed to have as a Christian.
- ii. Deny all three categories of worldly lusts:
  - a. Lust of the flesh
  - b. Lust of the eye
  - c. The pride of life

C. To live soberly.

D. To live righteously.

- i. We cannot understand a Christian who lives unrighteously, who cheats in business, who steals from his employer, who is not truthful to his friends, who does not tithe. All this involves unrighteous living which is to be avoided.

E. To live godly in this present world.

- i. "World" here is not "kosmos", this world system but Strong's #165 aion; an age, the world. Paul would add "evil" to this world in Galatians 1:4.
- ii. We are to live godly in this day, among these people, in this, our generation. To be godly is to be godly, to live as Jesus would if He were still walking physically on the earth. To live "godly" is the opposite of living "ungodly". A godly man has God in his thoughts and his actions. If a man is "godly," he consults God before he does anything and tries to look at any person, problem, book, idea, action, decision, institution, religion, or sin as God looks at it. This involves a study of God's word that amounts to a daily poring over (and over) the Scriptures. No man can know anything about the mind of God.

F. The blessed hope.

- i. For the rapture.
- ii. To go without dying and going through the valley of death.
- iii. To be delivered from this present evil world.
- iv. To receive our glorified bodies, never to sin again.
- v. To be with Christ forever.

G. The right kind of living will produce the blessed hope and where the blessed hope is burning in the heart, it will produce the right kind of living.

4. **What Grace Wrought** 2:13:

- A. Salvation
- B. A genuine Christian life
- C. Hope in the second coming

11f To all men, not just the elect, but reprobates are also included as there is no good reason to limit the scope of "all" here.

**2:12 Teaching** <sup>a-present active participle</sup> **us that, denying** <sup>aoist passive participle</sup> **ungodliness and worldly lusts,** <sup>b</sup> **we should live** <sup>aoist active subjunctive</sup> **soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;** <sup>c-d</sup>

12b Is there any other kind of lust other than worldly ones?

12c Right now, in this age, in your generation. Grace will teach you how to live in your generation and how to confront it with the claims of the gospel. Grace will also give you the necessary discernment about the peculiar and unique sins of your generation to help you to live as you should in it.

12d None of these things can be learned in any Bible college or book, but only through a right relationship with God through the new birth.

**2:13 Looking for** <sup>present middle/passive participle</sup> **that blessed hope,** <sup>a</sup> **and the glorious appearing** <sup>b-c</sup> **of the great** <sup>d</sup> **God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;** <sup>e-f</sup>

13a **"blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ"**. Here is an example of the Granville Sharp Rule that is used to prove the deity of Christ using Greek syntax. This rule states that when we have two or more nouns in the same case connected by "kai" (and), the first noun having the article and the second noun not having the article, the second noun refers to the same thing as the first and is a further description of it. Thus, the blessed hope is the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour Jesus Christ. The rule applies to both phrases.

We reject any and all accusations that the Authorized Version text somehow downplays the deity of Christ in 2:13. It is wrongly claimed that the grammar in the text somehow separates Christ from being the "great God." These complaints come from hypocrites who do the exact thing they accuse the Authorized Version translators of doing. The Bibles they recommend (NJKV, NIV, NASV, ESV...) all attack the deity of Christ in verses like Matthew 12:6, Luke 2:33 and 23:42, John 3:13, Acts 4:27 and 20:28 and 1 Timothy 3:16. The Authorized Version reading is accurate and maintains the full deity of Christ. It should be obvious to anyone with even half a brain that Jesus is both our "great God" and "Savior." Any controversy or misunderstanding of the verse is unnecessary.

13b The **"blessed hope"** and the **"glorious appearing"** are similar but different. We have the glorious appearing of the Lord in the rapture and second coming but that is not all that is contained in the blessed hope. The blessed hope includes this but also involves our glorified body, deliverance from sin, our heavenly mansion, the Millennium and many other things. We thus reject Wuest's criticism of the Authorized Version on page 195 of his *Word Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* when he complains about the Authorized Version separating them into two different things. Wuest's retranslation of the verse clarifies nothing. The ESV also mangles the verse into "the appearing of the glory", thus eliminating the "glory" from the appearing, the Second Coming. The coming is not glorious, but the glory of God is. But how can the coming of Christ not be glorious?

13c **"appearing"** Strong's #2015 epiphaneia; a manifestation, the advent of Christ, often used of the glorious manifestation of the gods, and especially of their advent to help; in the New Testament the advent of Christ, not only what has already taken place and by which his presence and power appear in the saving light he has shed upon mankind, but also his illustrious return from heaven to occur in the future.

13d **"great"** Strong's #3173 megas; great, large, particularly of physical magnitude. "This is the only place in the New Testament in which megas is applied to the true God, although it is a constant predicate of heathen gods and goddesses, e.g., Acts 19:28."<sup>36</sup>

13e This is one of the clearest expressions of the deity of Christ in the Bible.

13f Would an amillennialist or a postmillennialist, who is not looking for the any-moment return of Christ in either the rapture of the second coming be said to have this mind-set? A premillennialist would! We believe He could come at any time and live like it but we work as if He is not coming back for another hundred years. What about someone who is looking for the church to go through the tribulation? He would be looking for the wrath of God or for the revelation of the Antichrist, not the "any moment" coming of the Lord in the rapture.

## **15. The Redemption of Christ 2:14**

**2:14 Who gave<sup>aorist</sup> himself for us,<sup>a-b</sup> that he might redeem<sup>aorist middle subjunctive</sup> us from all iniquity,<sup>c</sup> and purify<sup>d-aorist active subjunctive</sup> unto himself a peculiar<sup>e</sup> people, zealous of good works.<sup>f-g</sup>**

14a John Gill sins against the text by trying to limit the extent of the redemption of Christ. "Not for all mankind, but for many; for us, for all the elect of God, for the church; and who are represented when he gave himself, or died for them, as ungodly, sinners, and enemies." Such is what hyper-Calvinism does to a man's doctrine in attempting to limit the love and redemption of Christ as well as trying to convince us that we ought not to preach to sinners but only to the elect. Such is hyper-Calvinism, in denying that we should preach to the lost. If you have to "re-interpret" the text or have to tell us what the text "means" instead of what it clearly says, that exposes a serious flaw in your theological system.

14b Christ gave Himself for us. The blood atonement and redemption provided by His death is for all the world but is only active for those who put their faith in Christ. All men may be saved potentially in the death of Christ, but only those who believe are actually saved. He gave Himself on the cross for us, in our place, so that we would not have to go to hell ourself and suffer for our sins. He suffered our death, hell and judgment in our place so that we would not have to. He gave Himself to redeem us from all iniquity, not just some of it. Christ's redemption is not a partial one. We are totally and wholly forgiven through the redemptive work of Christ on the cross for all of our sins; past, present and future.

14c All iniquity, all sins, not just some! Christ is no half-Savior. What He does on behalf of His people He does correctly and thoroughly.

The pre-King James translations (except the Geneva) all use "unrighteousness" which might be better than "iniquity" here.

14d **"purify"** Strong's #2511 katharizō; to make clean, to cleanse, to free from defilement of sin and from faults, to purify from wickedness

14e **"peculiar"** Strong's #4041 periousios; from peri (Strong's #4012) beyond and ousia (Strong's #1511) substance, being; being beyond usual, special, what is one's own, belonging

---

<sup>36</sup> *Expositors Greek New Testament* volume 4, page 196.

to one's possessions; a people selected by God from the other nations for his own possession, a private purse, a special acquisition of a member of a family distinct from the property administered for the good of the whole family. Christians are thus the private and unique possession of God.

14f The goal of His giving Himself for us was to purchase unto Himself, through His own blood, a peculiar people who would be zealous for all good, Godly works. Christ desired a people that He could call His own Who would love Him and be zealous for Him and His interests. This body of people is called the New Testament Church. We, of course, are not saved by good works but they play a vital role in our future judgment as a Christian. Our position in the Millennium will no doubt be largely determined by our ministry, or good works, as a Christian. We will not fall into the error as to say that since we are saved by grace then good works after salvation are not a necessity. They will not add to our salvation but they will certainly make it if a higher quality. A professing Christian who is devoid of good works has suffered a grave spiritual defect somewhere. The entire epistle of James tells us of the necessity of good works as a visible, outward sign or our inward regeneration. They are the spiritual fruit that others can see, inspect and hopefully imitate.

14g But what of the sinner and his good works? Augustine was right when he called the "good works" of the unregenerated nothing more than "splendid sins." They are but varnished sins. Why is this? Why are good works by sinners so vain? Because as water cannot rise higher than its source, good works cannot rise higher than its source, a heart that is sinful and depraved. Sinners who do good works do them for all the wrong reasons, not to honor and glorify God but to honor and glorify self.

## **16. These Things Speak 2:15a**

**2:15a These things<sup>a</sup> speak,** present imperative **and exhort,** present imperative **and rebuke<sup>b-</sup>**  
present imperative **with all authority.**

15a What things? All these things Paul made mention of throughout this chapter. Titus is to speak, preach and teach all these things to his congregation.

## **17. Let No Man Despise Thee 2:15b**

**2:15b Let no man despise<sup>a-</sup>** present imperative **thee.<sup>b</sup>**

15b Titus is to both rebuke (negative) and exhort (positive) these things, either as a condemnation for the wayward and disobedient or as an encouragement to the godly. It all depends upon the audience!

**"rebuke"** Strong's #1651 elegchô; admonish, convict, convince, tell a fault, rebuke, generally with a suggestion of shame of the person convicted, to reprehend severely, to chide, to admonish, to reprove, to call to account, to show one his fault, to demand an explanation. In Classical Greek, it meant to shame or disgrace. It can be an unpleasant thing to do but it is occasionally necessary as the disobedient, rebellious, heretical and apostate will seldom respond to kind words

15b This is similar to the exhortation to Timothy (1 Timothy 4:12) on the account of his youth. Nothing is made mention of Titus' age, but his subject material and the type of people he would be going to and ministering to would be enough cause for Paul to encourage him to not let

anyone despise him or his message. Don't let their opposition or persecution make you cut back on the message or in your ministry. Titus is to use and exert all the authority he has and is not to let anyone intimidate him out of doing what must be done or saying what must be said.

15a **"despise"** Strong's #4065 periphroneô; from peri (Strong's #4012) around and phroneô (Strong's #5426) to think; to think beyond, depreciate, to consider or examine on all sides, despise. It is used only here in the New Testament.



## Titus Chapter 3

### 17. General Commands to the Cretians 3:1,2

**3:1<sup>a</sup> Put them in mind<sup>b-</sup> present imperative to be subject<sup>c</sup> present middle infinitive to principalities<sup>c</sup> and powers,<sup>d</sup> to obey<sup>e</sup> magistrates,<sup>f-</sup> present middle/passive participle to be present infinitive ready to every good work,<sup>g</sup>**

1-2a Paul gives more general commands that Titus was to lay before his congregations are given here.

1. **They are to be in subjection to the authorities and powers that were over them.** "Principalities" is Strong's #746 archê; a commencement, beginning, magistrate, the first person or thing in a series, the leader. "Principalities" is from the French word "principalite" meaning the government of a prince. A principality is a kingdom, state, country or realm that is ruled by a prince."<sup>37</sup> Obey rulers and those in authority over you, both spiritually, politically, paternally. These are earthly principalities, not the same ones mentioned in Romans 8:38, Ephesians 3:10; 6:12, Colossians 1:16 and 2:15, which are heavenly. The Cretians were a restless lot and for them to subject themselves to the authority of anyone would require a large application of the grace of God to their hearts. But aren't most people like this anyway?

2. **They were to be ready to every good work.** The idea of doing good works figures prominently in Titus. It is a spiritual fruit that is to be manifested by all Christians as an evidence of their regeneration, obedience and spirituality.

3. **They were to speak evil of no man.** They are not to blaspheme man. We may criticize for that is often necessary, especially in polemics. But we are to always make sure that our criticisms are truthful and not personal or inaccurate.

A. **"speak evil"** Strong's #987 blasphemeô; to speak reproachfully, to rail at, to revile, to calumniate, to blaspheme.

4. **They were not to be brawlers.** They are to be peaceable and not to be troublemakers. Christians will often be accused of being troublemakers when their only sin is preaching the gospel and attempting to bring about a moral reformation of society, based on Scriptural commands. But isn't it funny how no one accuses the drug dealers or the pornographers or the rock musicians or the booze peddlers of being troublemakers? But the Man of God is always being accused of being the troubler of Israel.

A. **"no brawler"** Strong's #269 amachos; from a (Strong's #1) without and machê (Strong's #3163) battle, controversy; not disposed to fight, peaceable, not to be withstood, invincible, not contentious, abstaining from fighting.

5. **They were to be gentle.** This is tied into point 4 above. Again, we are not to be going about strong-arming people to be saved. We are not Moslems who evangelize at the point of a sword. If trouble is going to start in the community, let the enemies of the gospel be responsible for starting it. You do what the Lord commanded you to do. If they don't like it and respond wrongly to it, let the blame and the burden be on their shoulders, not yours.

6. **They were to be meek.** This is defined as being gentle and humble. It is a controlled strength that is manifested only when all other recourses have been exhausted. The meek man "stoops in order to conquer."

**"meekness"** Strong's #4240 prautes; mildness, humility, gentleness of spirit.

---

<sup>37</sup>(Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 270.

1b This also has the idea of warning people to do this, else there will probably be severe consequences!

1c **"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities"** "By principalities, we are to understand the Roman emperors, or the supreme civil powers in any place. By powers, we are to understand the deputies of the emperors, such as proconsuls, etc., and all such as are in authority-under the supreme powers wherever we dwell. This doctrine of obedience to the civil powers was highly necessary for the Cretans, who were reputed a people exceedingly jealous of their civil privileges, and ready to run into a state of insurrection when they suspected any attempt on the part of their rulers to infringe their liberties."<sup>38</sup>

1d **"Powers"** is Strong's #1849 *exousia*; power of choice, liberty of doing as one pleases, permission, physical and mental power, the ability or strength with which one is endued, which he either possesses or exercises, the power of authority and of right, the power of rule or government, the power of judicial decisions. These would be the higher governmental officials. Obey your government when you can without sinning against God. No provision is made for those who find themselves under a government that may not be biblical or that may be oppressive. Jesus and Paul and the early Church lived under a harsh and brutal government of the Roman Empire yet neither of them ever advocated revolution. Christians who suffered under seventy years of Communism resisted the unlawful and unbiblical commands of their government (which is allowed) but never sought to overthrow their government by force. They sought to reform legally, from within while they prayed, lived and ministered.

1e **"obey"** Strong's #3980 *peitharcheô*; from *peithomai* (Strong's #3982) to obey and *aechê* (Strong's #746) to rule, beginning; to be persuaded by a ruler, to submit to authority, to conform to advice.

1f The **"magistrates"** are the lower governmental officials and judges, elected or appointed, like mayors or governors. They are to be obeyed as they fulfill their duties. It is not always easy to obey some heathen District Court judge or Supreme Court justice or some infidel tax assessor. As long as their rulings would not force you to sin or go beyond the realm of the State, they are to be obeyed. When their laws would cause you to sin in order to obey them or when the State attempts to usurp the headship of Christ over the churches, then they are to be resisted. I did not say "overthrown". God put that infidel or atheist in that position and God will remove him. Who are you to try to undo what the Lord has done in that situation? You vote for him, campaign against him and do all you can lawfully do to oust him from office, but armed rebellion and overthrow are out of the question. I have always said that it is a good testimony to be a good citizen. The last thing we need are more Jehovah Witness-types who refuse to recognize any human government. That is just another reason why they are so despised. No one respects rebels, not even the unsaved.

1g The question naturally arises regarding the duty of the Christian to his government. Are Christians to obey every government, regardless of what it does or what sort it is? Are Christians to obey a Communist government, a Socialist government, a Moslem government or a Humanist government? We need to see what Romans 13 says. *"1 Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. (2) Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. (3) For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to*

---

<sup>38</sup> Adam Clarke.

*the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: (4) For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. (5) Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. (6) For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. (7) Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour."* Let's briefly summarize this passage.

1. *"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers."* Every soul is to be subject to the powers that are ordained over it.

2. *"For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God."*

Government is of God. A people have the kind of government that God has decreed for them, or that they deserve!

3. *"Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."* Political rebels are rebelling against the will of God in terms of that government.

4. *"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."* This is what the ruler, or magistrate is supposed to be doing- rewarding the good and punishing the evil. If the magistrate is not doing this, then he is an unfaithful minister and should be removed.

5. *"For he is the minister of God to thee for good."* The magistrate is a minister, or a deacon (the same Greek word is used) of God unto the citizenry. He must then acknowledge God and be oath-bound to execute the law of God in his duties. If he does not, then he is an unfaithful minister and should be removed. This is why I would support religious tests for government officials. How can he be a good minister of God if he does not know God, and is ignorant or indifferent to his law? Would you put a deacon like that on the deacon board in your church? Of course not. Then why put a civil "deacon" into political office who was unsaved and ignorant of the law of God? In order to qualify as a Biblical civil magistrate, he must acknowledge God, the deity of Christ and the trinity. He need not be a Baptist, just a Christian.

6. *"Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake."* It is a good testimony to be a good citizen and our conscience will not condemn us if we fulfill our duties as citizens.

7. *"For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour."* Pay your taxes and your tribute. Jesus did in Matthew 17:24-27 and 22:15-22.

But what qualifies as Godly government? When is civil government so constituted that Christians may obey it without sinning? A Christian is to obey an unchristian government but they need not necessarily swear allegiance to it. We are to obey an unchristian government as long as we do not have to sin in so doing (Acts 4:19; 5:29). When that government demands a loyalty that we cannot give it or an obedience that would conflict with my obedience with God, then I am to obey God rather than man. Here is where we have to consider our duty to our current American government, which is non-christian (technically, America was never a "Christian" nation but was rather a Masonic one. I know that is heresy in Independent Baptist circles but history does not lie!). If it was Biblical to rebel against England in 1776, then why is it wrong to rebel now in 2025, since our current government is much worse and more oppressive than King George III's ever was? Why does everyone say that we had a Christian duty or

license to rebel from England in 1776 but that we today are to obey antichristian Washington? People are not thinking consistently on this issue today. If rebellion could be Biblically justified in 1776 then we should have no problem justifying it even more today (or even in 1861!).

When can we support and swear allegiance to human government? When it is Biblical. We of course oppose the concept of State churches and Established churches but we can have a Biblical commonwealth without either. If our political leaders, from the local dog catcher up to the President, were to acknowledge the gospel of Christ and their obligations to enforce and promote Biblical law and Biblical principles in government and human affairs, and if our code of laws and structure of government was Biblical, then we could give total support and allegiance to it. But not until then. The early church obeyed Rome but never swore allegiance to it. They fulfilled their legitimate duties as Christians and Roman subjects but they did not support it. Eventually they managed to bring it down, although what they replaced it with was not much better.

The general principle then is that we are to obey government and the magistrate unless we must sin in so doing. When placed between the "rock and the hard place", we always obey God rather than man. Naturally, we want to obey both God and man if man agrees with God, but if that is not possible, then we obey God instead of man.

**3:2 To speak evil of** present middle/passive participle **no man,<sup>b</sup> to be** present infinitive **no brawlers,<sup>c</sup> but gentle,<sup>d</sup> shewing** present middle participle **all meekness unto all men.<sup>e-f</sup>**

2b If you criticize or attack a man, make sure you are not lying about him or slandering him. That is what is meant by "speaking evil". We occasionally have to attack, criticize or rebuke a man for legitimate reasons. That is not "speaking evil" if we are telling the truth as to why we are attacking him.

2c Paul was a fighter but he was no brawler, always starting trouble or physically assaulting his opponents. He did not retort "tit for tat" but was patient in dealing with his opponents.

2d "Gentleness was not reckoned a virtue among the Greeks; I do not suppose that the people in Crete had ever heard of it before Paul wrote this Epistle to Titus. Among the Romans and the Greeks, it seemed to be a virtue to stand up for your own, to be like a gamecock, who is always ready to fight, and will never miss a chance of fighting; but this Christian virtue of gentleness is a most amiable one, and greatly adorns the doctrine of Christ. The world has run away with this word gentle, and now calls many a person a gentleman who has no right to the name. I wish that every gentleman were indeed a gentleman. It is very significant that Moses, the type of the Lord Jesus under the law, was the meekest of men; should not Christians therefore excel in gentleness under this milder dispensation?"<sup>39</sup>

Christ was surprisingly gentle in His dealings with the Roman government and Pilate. He was respectful and honored them as the divinely-appointed magistrates, even if they were heathen. Christ showed much less patience with the hypocritical religious rulers of His day as if they were not worthy of the same honor. Paul followed this pattern in his dealings with Felix and Agrippa. We must be very careful in our attitudes toward The Power That Be, even if they are persecuting us to the death.

2e All men, not just believers or pleasant men, but to even the heathen, the hate-filled and the difficult.

---

<sup>39</sup> Charles Spurgeon.

2f Verses 1 and 2 show seven things that mark Christian conduct:

1. Being subject to powers
2. Obeying magistrates
3. Ready to do good works
4. Speaking evil of no man
5. Not brawling
6. Gentleness
7. Meekness. This is a great Christian virtue. It is a patient submission to the will of God and is the practice of patient in our dealings with other people. He is not one who is easily frustrated or provoked. It takes a great inner strength and discipline to manifest meekness, so it is not a virtue exhibited by the weak.

### **18. Our Former State 3:3,4**

Summary of our former state:

1. We were sometimes:
  - A. Foolish
  - B. Disobedient
  - C. Deceived
  - D. Served divers lusts
  - E. Served divers pleasures
  - F. Living in malice
  - G. Living in envy
  - H. Hateful
  - I. Hating one another

**3:3<sup>a-b</sup> For we ourselves also were** <sup>imperfect</sup> **sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived,** <sup>present passive participle</sup> **serving** <sup>present active participle</sup> **divers lusts<sup>c</sup> and pleasures,<sup>d</sup> living** <sup>present active participle</sup> **in malice<sup>e</sup> and envy, hateful, and hating** <sup>present active participle</sup> **one another.<sup>f</sup>**

3a Paul says that we were once in the same spiritual condition that these Cretians are now in but since we have now been saved and born again, we are different, or are at least supposed to be. The Cretians were not alone in their sin and darkness and Paul wasn't "dumping" on them. He says that we were just as bad, before the kindness and love of God our Saviour appeared unto us. And if the grace of God could redeem and renew us, then it can do the same with the Cretians. This reads much like Romans 1.

3b The Cretian's current condition and our past one before our salvation:

1. **They are foolish.**

- A. Strong's #453 anoetos; from a a, (Strong's #1) not and noeo (Strong's #3539) to comprehend, unintelligent; sensual, foolish, one who does not govern his lusts.
- B. No unsaved man can qualify as being wise, for the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord (Proverbs 1:7). He may be "educated" and somewhat "intelligent" but he is foolish because he cannot be wise. A "foolish" man is one who watches "Dancing With the Stars" or "American Idol", who lives and dies by whether his favorite sports team wins or loses, thinks the Republicans or Democrats can "save the nation" or who follows the "Top 40" or who puts a lot of stock in "Oscars" and "Grammys".

**2. They are disobedient.**

A. They are disobedient because they are yet unsaved and in their sins. God commands all men to repent (Acts 17:10). Until they do, every unsaved man on earth, no matter how "religious" he is, is disobedient against God.

B. The disobedient man is one who knows what God says in the Scripture and openly rebels against it.

**3. They are deceived.**

A. Strong's #4105 *planô*; to cause to stray, to lead astray, to lead aside from the right way, to wander, to roam about, to lead away from the truth, to lead into error, to be led aside from the path of virtue.

B. "He thought the Catholic Church was Pro-Jewish during World War II. He thought Einstein was a brilliant intellect. He thought science and philosophy would solve man's problems. He thought computers would help man out. He thought Mary was sinless...He thought he would go to purgatory when he died. He thought a 10 o'clock newscast was giving him the truth. He thought the Bible was full of myths and legends and had contradictions in it. He thought sprinkling babies had something to do with salvation...He was deceived."<sup>40</sup>

**4. They serve lusts and pleasures.**

A. If a man will not serve God then he will serve self and do all he can to gratify self. His god is his belly and he never misses a worship service.

**5. The live in malice and envy.**

A, "**Malice**" is Strong's #2549 *kakia*; badness, depravity, malignity, ill-will, desire to injure, wickedness that is not ashamed to break laws, a special form of vice, not viciousness in general. Malice is a special form of vice, not viciousness in general.

B. They hated Christians and were envious of their rich neighbors. They wanted government to "soak the rich" at tax time. They kissed the feet of the person ahead of them on the ladder of success and kicked the head of the man below them. They had no love for man because they did not love God. Their envy was just a manifestation of their lusts and covetousness, mixed with a bad heart and a rebellious attitude.

**6. They are hateful.**

A. They lie, slander and gossip. They would literally murder someone if they could get away with it. They do not hesitate to "damn" someone to hell if they crossed them. The unsaved hate everyone, including their own kind.

3d This has a generally negative connotation in Scripture. It involves carnal and fleshly pleasures that war against the soul.

3e "Malice" goes right along with "**envy, hateful, and hating**". These are all related sins.

3f This summation of negative attitudes (especially the "foolish" and "deceived" parts of it) would have been very offensive to the proud and educated Greek mind. Proud man hates to have the truth told about his natural state with God as Paul does here.

**3:4<sup>a</sup> But after that the kindness<sup>b</sup> and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared,** aorist passive

---

<sup>40</sup> Peter Ruckman, *Pastoral Epistles*, pages 376-377.

4a What brought about the change from this old manner of life to the one now enjoyed by Christians? The kindness and love of God toward us is what made the difference. The death of Christ on the cross and the plan of salvation that was made possible by the death of Christ made it possible for we spiritual Cretians to be made new creatures in Christ. This is exactly what the Cretians needed and it would be Titus' responsibility and charge that they were made aware of it. God's love and goodness are sharply contrasted with the wickedness of man. This love of God appeared toward "man", not just the Calvinistic "elect."

4b **"kindness"** Strong's #5544 *chêstotês*; benignity, kindness, gentleness. This word has the harmlessness of the dove but not the wisdom of the serpent.

### **19. How We Are Saved 3:5-7**

**3:5<sup>a</sup> Not by works of righteousness that we have done<sup>aorist</sup> but according to his mercy he saved<sup>aorist</sup> us, by the washing<sup>b</sup> of regeneration<sup>c-d</sup> and renewing<sup>e</sup> of the Holy Ghost;**

5a Here is a summation of the doctrine of salvation, or soteriology.

**1. We are not saved by works of righteousness.**

A. No man is justified by works of the law.

B. Believing on Christ is not a work according to Romans 4:4,5, **Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.**

C. The only "work" (the "work of God") that God accepts is that we believe on Christ.

i. John 6:28,29, **Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.**

**2. We are saved by the mercy of God.**

A. God, in His infinite mercy, has saved us who believe.

B. Mercy, kindness and love (Titus 3:4) are all elements in our salvation.

**3. We are saved by the washing of regeneration.**

A. "Regeneration" is the act of making alive the dead or granting life unto the dead or energizing the dead.

B. When we believe on Christ<sup>41</sup> we then are regenerated from spiritual death unto spiritual life and are born again and thus, saved. We are saved by the washing that accompanies this regeneration.

C. This "washing" is not water baptism for that is not mentioned anywhere in Titus. This verse cannot be used as a proof text for baptismal regeneration without doing great violence to the text. Baptism does not save for it is merely an act of obedience and identification with the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Romans 6). Regeneration washes the sinner when he believes on Christ.

D. This regeneration is an act of the Holy Spirit (John 3:5-8) where He applies the blood of Christ (Revelation 1:5) to the sin account of the sinner.

**4. The "renewing" is linked with regeneration.**

---

<sup>41</sup> Not when we "pray a prayer" like the so-called "sinner's prayer". We are not saved by prayer..

A. The regeneration gives us spiritual life at salvation while the renewing deals with the moral and spiritual element of the man.

B. The Holy Spirit renews the sinner, changing him (2 Corinthians 5:17, **Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.**) and allowing him to start bringing forth spiritual fruit. The old Adamic nature and his deeds need to be renewed by the Holy Spirit (not by self-reformation, psychology, religion or baptismal regeneration).

**5. This regeneration and renewal is shed on us abundantly.**

A. We are the recipients of both the regeneration and its attendant washing, as well as the renewal of our spirits by the Holy Spirit.

**6. We are justified by the grace of Christ** in Titus 3:7.

A. We are not justified by our works or anything that we do, but rather by the grace of Christ.

5b The Tyndale, Coverdale and Bishops Bibles other modern versions will use "laver" here, trying to tie this verse to water baptism in their attempt to make water baptism a requirement for the new birth.

5c Titus 3:5 will not allow for an interpretation of baptismal regeneration. Didn't Paul just get finished saying "not by works of righteousness?" If there was ever a "work of righteousness", baptism was it! But the "work of baptism" cannot save anymore than any other religious work or rite can. Some ritualistic commentators and some translations will suggest the rendering "laver of regeneration" but there is no textual support nor theological support for such a reading.

5d **"regeneration"** Strong's #3824 paliggenesia; from palin (Strong's #3825) again and genesis (Strong's #1078) generation, nation; new birth, reproduction, renewal, recreation, the production of a new life consecrated to God, a radical change of mind for the better, restoration. The word is often used to denote the restoration of a thing to its pristine state, its renovation, as a renewal or restoration of life after death. It is more than just "being born again". It is an entirely new creation, a total renovation of all things and all compartments of the life, a total and radical transformation of all things. "Regeneration" is used by the Lord in Matthew 19:28 to refer to the millennium, so it can refer to an individual and to all creation. Water baptism regenerates nothing, which is why water baptism cannot be the meaning implied in this verse. Water baptism gets the body wet but does nothing to the inner man spiritually.

The Tyndale, Coverdale and Geneva Bibles all have "new birth" for "regeneration".

5e **"renewing"** Strong's #342 anakainosis; renovation, complete change for the better. Its only other use is in Romans 12:2 in the New Testament.

**3:6 Which he shed <sup>ao</sup> on us abundantly<sup>a</sup> through Jesus Christ our Saviour;<sup>b</sup>**

6b Salvation is not shed on us through any sort of baptismal laver or practice of water baptism, but it was shed on us through the grace of God apart from any and all of our religious works. And water baptism would certainly qualify as a religious work!

**3:7 That being justified by <sup>ao</sup> his<sup>a</sup> grace, we should be made heirs<sup>b</sup> according to the hope of eternal life.**

7a Emphatic.



7b As a result of all this, we are made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Heirship implies an inheritance and one part of our spiritual inheritance is eternal life.

## **20. Maintain Good Works 3:8**

**3:8 This is a faithful saying, and these things I will** present middle subjunctive **that thou affirm constantly,** present middle/passive infinitive **that they which have believed** perfect active participle **in God might be careful** present subjunctive **to maintain** present middle infinitive **good works.** a-b-c **These things are** present **good and profitable unto men.**

8a Good works again! Titus is to affirm constantly the need for a practical, visible type of Christianity. Mere verbal profession with no James-type outward manifestation to back it up amounts to nothing. The faithful Christian will maintain good works, not to get saved or to stay saved, but because he is saved.

8b We continue to be amazed by some who continue to try to find some contention between Paul and James. Of course there is none, for James' emphasis is these "good works" which Paul stresses constantly and told Titus to emphasize. Just because Luther couldn't handle the paradox or understand how Paul and James were complimenting each other is no excuse for you to make the same mistake.

## **21. Avoid Foolish Questions 3:9**

**3:9<sup>a</sup> But avoid** present middle imperative **foolish<sup>b</sup> questions,<sup>c-d</sup> and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are** present **unprofitable and vain.<sup>e</sup>**

9a Titus is to separate himself unto good works but is to separate himself from certain things:

### **1. Foolish questions.**

A. Religion is full of this. Stick to the main topic of salvation and don't let anyone sidetrack you on questions like "Where did Cain get his wife?" or "Can God make a rock so heavy that He couldn't lift it?" The Man of God has more important things to do than bandy about with idiots who major in stupid questions or deal with questions that have no answer. These questions can be asked by honest seekers looking for honest answers but mainly they are asked by troublemakers looking to start strife or to discredit the gospel.

### **2. Genealogies.**

A. The Jews were always wondering about their family trees and proving their tribal backgrounds. Why would a Christian need to worry about such things?  
B. Here come the Jews again, or more accurately, the Judaizers, as Paul warned about in chapter 1, showing that they had an influential ministry (in a negative sense) on Crete that Titus would have to confront and deal with. They do have an honorable place in theology as God certainly spent a lot of space on them in 1 Chronicles 11, Matthew 1 and Luke 4, but emphasizing them can be an unprofitable pastime.

### **3. Contentions.**

A. Most polemics are good, profitable and necessary. There are many controversies that must be entered into. But do we need to get all wound up over stupid and unimportant questions? Before you enter into the arena of controversy, ask yourself "Is this really worth my time? Is this really important?"

#### 4. Strivings about the law.

A. Here come the Judaizers (Seventh Day Adventists) again, trying to get the grace preacher and believer to get all wrapped up over their legalistic interpretations and ceremonial law that the Christian has been delivered from. Don't waste too much time debating about the Sabbath observance or the dietary law. But you ought to make much of the moral law of God for that is still in effect and very important for the Christian!

These four things that Paul told Titus to avoid are all unprofitable and vain. To dwell on these is to waste your time and God's time. You will derive no spiritual profit from any of this and neither will your hearers and life is too short to be dealing with these questions and those who ask them. A Christian is only too happy to deal with the sincere questions of a genuine inquirer but fools and their contentions are simply wastes of time.

9b **"foolish"** Strong's #3474 moros; impious, godless, dull, stupid, heedless, blockhead, absurd. We get our English word "moron" from this,

9c **"Avoid foolish questions, and genealogies"** "In these the Jews particularly delighted; they abounded in the most frivolous questions; and, as they had little piety themselves, they were solicitous to show that they had descended from godly ancestors. Of their frivolous questions, and the answers given to them by the wisest and most reputable of their rabbins, the following is a specimen:

"Rabbi Hillel was asked: Why have the Babylonians round heads? To which he answered: This is a difficult question, but I will tell the reason: Their heads are round because they have but little wit.

"Q. Why are the eyes of the Tarmudians so soft? A. Because they inhabit a sandy country.

"Q. Why have the Africans broad feet? A. Because they inhabit a marshy country.

"But ridiculous and trifling as these are, they are little in comparison to those solemnly proposed and most gravely answered by those who are called the schoolmen...These, with many thousands of others, of equal use to religion and common sense, may be found in their writings. See the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, passim. Might not the Spirit have these religious triflers in view, rather than the less ridiculous Jews?"<sup>42</sup>

9d "questions" Strong's #2214 zêtêsis; a searching, a dispute or its theme, debate, matter of controversy, a word used by the Greeks to indicate philosophical inquiry.

9e The Tyndale Bible uses "superfluous".

## **22. Dealing With Heretics 3:10,11**

**3:10 A man that is an heretick<sup>a</sup> after the first and second admonition reject;<sup>b-c-</sup>**  
present middle/passive imperative

10a A heretic is either one that makes choice of an opinion upon his own judgment, contrary to the generally received sense of the churches, and prefers it to theirs, and obstinately persists in it; separates from them, forms a party, and sets himself at the head of them, whom he has drawn into the same way of thinking with himself: or he is one that removes and takes away a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and draws away disciples after him.

---

<sup>42</sup> Adam Clarke.

**"heretick"** Strong's #141 *hairetikos*; fitted or able to take or choose a thing, schismatic, factious, a follower of a false doctrine, pertaining to choice, capable of choice. He is a false teacher and is a sect-maker, as he tries to make proselytes of believers to his position. They never do any soulwinning but instead seek to raid churches and steal their membership to their group. This is an archaic spelling of our modern word "heretic".

"The heretic is really a factious person, more concerned about gathering adherents to himself and maintaining some sectarian view of truth, than falling into line with the entire body of revelation, seeking the blessing of all the people of God. His particular hobby may or may not be true, but he uses it to form a school of opinion."<sup>43</sup>

10b The heretic, after the necessary but unsuccessful admonitions, we are to reject. We are to separate ourselves from him for he will probably not separate himself from us. This is not necessarily church discipline but it certainly may be involved. Nothing is said of removing him from the local church as he probably is not a member of a local church. He is starting trouble from outside the church and is thus not subject to church discipline. Even if the church has not or cannot take any disciplinary action against the man, we may still be compelled to separate ourselves from him. We are to have nothing to do with him. We are to have no fellowship with him as long as he is continuing in his troublemaking and dissention.

How is Titus to deal with these people? Sooner or later, he would have to (as will we).

**1. Admonish him for his sin.**

A. Confront him with his error.

**2. If he does not respond to the first admonition, do it again.**

A. This is similar to the situation under Matthew 18 where the offending brother is confronted first in private then again with witnesses, before bringing him before the church. But this heretic is not a "brother" because the church is not mentioned in this admonition. Nothing is mentioned about going to him with two or three witnesses as related in Matthew 18. The procedures are different because the heretic is not in the same relationship as the wayward brother.

**3. If he will not admit his error and turn from it after two admonitions, then he is to be rejected.**

A. Do not employ any more effort to reclaim him. Leave him to the Lord (or even Satan, for the destruction of his flesh in 1 Corinthians 5:5). After you have rejected him, then mark him to warn others (especially the weaker sheep and younger converts) that he is a heretic who could do great damage to their faith.

"A man that is an heretic-One who really turns aside from the truth, and sets up something contrary to the Word of God; what is to be done with him? "Burn him," says the Church of Rome. "Fine him, put him in prison," say other churches; but the inspired apostle says only this... Just exclude him from the church that is all. Leave him his utmost liberty to go where he likes, believe what he likes, and do what he likes; but, at the same time, you as Christian people must disown him, that is all you ought to do, except to pray and labor for his restoration."<sup>44</sup> That is all well and good, but we wish Calvinists like Spurgeon would have been more consistent in this. Spurgeon is correct in this remark, but one of his spiritual mentors, John Calvin, certainly didn't believe in this attitude, nor did the Protestants and Catholics of that era in their dealings with Baptist peoples and other so-called "heretics".

---

<sup>43</sup> Harry Ironside, *Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, page 273.

<sup>44</sup> Charles Spurgeon.

10c "Two things make up a heretic according to the common acceptance of the term now: an error in some matters of faith or stubbornness and contumacy in the holding and maintaining of it."<sup>45</sup>

**3:11 Knowing** <sup>perfect active participle</sup> **that he that is such is subverted,** <sup>a- perfect passive</sup> **and sinneth,** <sup>present</sup> **being condemned** <sup>present participle</sup> **of himself.** <sup>b</sup>

11a The problem with the heretic is that he is subverted. He subverts his own faith (which is bad enough) but also injures the faith of others (which is even worse). He must be confronted and marked to limit the amount of damage he might inflict upon others. The heretic is suffering from mental illness in that he thinks he is greater and wiser than God. If he wasn't suffering from this insanity, then why is he guilty of elevating his thoughts and opinions above the eternal revelation of God. The heretic is a man who has elevated his own vain and pea-brained opinions and doctrines above that which God has laid down. His ultimate problem is final authority- he refuses to acknowledge God's and elevates his own!

11b This idea is that he condemns himself by his heresy.

### **23. Closing Remarks 3:12-15**

**3:12<sup>a</sup> When I shall send** <sup>future</sup> **Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus,** <sup>b</sup> **be diligent** <sup>aorist middle subjunctive</sup> **to come** <sup>aorist infinitive</sup> **unto me to Nicopolis:** <sup>c</sup> **for I have determined** <sup>perfect</sup> **there to winter.** <sup>aorist infinitive</sup>

12a Paul takes care of some housecleaning here. Paul had sent Titus to Crete but he also wanted Titus to visit him at Nicopolis, where Paul was planning to spend the winter.

12b "Tychicus" is called a "beloved brother" and a "faithful minister" in Colossians 4:7. He accompanied Paul from Corinth to Asia Minor (Acts 20:4), carried Paul's letter to the Colossian church (Colossians 4:7) and probably Paul's letter to the Ephesian church (Ephesians 6:21).

12c "Nicopolis" There are several cities by this name, one in Cilicia, one in Thrace and one in Epirus. We do not know which one is meant. The name means "city of victory", possibly because some battle was fought in that area.

**3:13 Bring Zenas the lawyer<sup>a</sup> and Apollos<sup>b</sup> on their journey** <sup>aorist middle subjunctive</sup> **diligently, that nothing be wanting** <sup>present subjunctive</sup> **unto them.**

13a "**Zenas the lawyer**" was not like the modern-day lawyer. Lawyers in this day were men who were trained in secular law but also who were trained in Biblical law, who spent time studying and applying the Law of Moses. What then does this say about modern lawyers who are as ignorant of the Law of God as any heathen would be? They may be educated in the laws of man but no man can rightly be referred to as a "lawyer" (in an honorable sense) until he has mastered his understanding of the divine Law of God, on which all laws of man must be based. May we all be Biblical lawyers! All of God's people should be expert in the law of God! Why Paul needed a lawyer is not given. He was in jail at this time but he may have been anticipating a future trial. Was Zenas also trained in Roman law? If so, Paul would have needed him in

---

<sup>45</sup> Matthew Poole volume 3, page 804.

preparation for a possible trial before Caesar. Paul was in and out of jail so often that he could have used good legal counsel!

13b "Apollos" We saw him in Acts 18:24-28, who developed into a powerful preacher and was a companion of Paul. I have always liked Apollos because he had a teachable spirit despite his education and oratorical skills. He allowed Aquila and Priscilla, who probably had far less education than he had, to instruct him more perfectly in the gospel (Acts 18:26). For an educated man to submit himself to the instruction of a less-educated teacher is a rarity when you consider just how proud (educated) human nature can be.

Apollos was a very educated man with obvious gifts and talents. Yet Paul never felt threatened by him that he might "usurp" his ministry or was jealous of him. This is how it should be in the ministry. There is no place for pride or ego among the brethren and we are all workers together for the glory of God, not for the glory of self. Paul and Apollos always had a good working relationship between them and there was never any suggestion of a rivalry or a competition between them.

I don't see any significance in Paul mentioning Zenas before Apollos, as if Zenas was "superior" to Apollos or that Paul liked Zenas better than Apollos. Some commentators try to read too much in the text.

**3:14 And let ours also learn <sup>present imperative</sup> to maintain <sup>present middle infinitive</sup> good works<sup>a</sup> for necessary uses, that they be <sup>present subjunctive</sup> not unfruitful.**

14a Paul hits the theme of "good works" again in 3:14. We will here review the verses in the Pastorals where Paul deals with the theme of "good works":

1. 1 Timothy 2:10 But (which becometh women professing godliness.) with **good works**.
2. 1 Timothy 5:10 Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every **good work**.
3. 1 Timothy 5:25 Likewise also the **good works** of some are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.
4. 1 Timothy 6:18 That they do good, that they be rich in **good works**, ready to distribute, willing to communicate;
5. 2 Timothy 3:17 That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all **good works**.
6. Titus 2:7 In all things shewing thyself a pattern of **good works**: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity,
7. Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of **good works**.
8. Titus 3:8 This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain **good works**. These things are good and profitable unto men.
9. Titus 3:14 And let ours also learn to maintain **good works** for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful.

Nine times in the Pastorals and 4 times just in Titus! And we could include Ephesians 2:10 "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto **good works**, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Again, we demand of those who imagine that there is a contradiction between Paul and James, how do you account for this emphasis on the necessity for good works by Paul, the ultimate preacher of grace? We say again and will until we die that there is no contradiction between Paul and James. On the contrary, they compliment each other. A man who can't (or won't) see that simply needs to study more and believe what he is reading.

**3:15 All that are with me salute** present middle subjunctive **thee.**<sup>a</sup> **Greet** aoist middle imperative **them that love** present active participle **us in the faith.**<sup>b</sup> **Grace be with you all.**<sup>c</sup> **Amen.**<sup>d</sup>

15a Paul does not mention who his companions were at the time of this writing but Titus probably knew who they were and who was with Paul at this time.

15b Greet those who are in fellowship with us and who love and practice the truth as we do.

15c This epistles begins (Titus 1:4) and ends with grace.

15d The modern versions omit the “amen”.

## **Bibliography**

Bullinger, Ethelbert, *The Companion Bible*  
Clarke, Adam, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*  
Gaebelien, A. C., *The Annotated Bible*  
Gill, John, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*  
Ironside, Harry, *Timothy, Titus, Philemon*  
Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*  
Kelly, William, *An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to Titus and to that of Philemon*  
Knox, James, *The Book of Titus, The Christ-Honoring Commentary Series*  
MacArthur, John, *Titus*  
North, Gary, *Boundaries and Dominion: The Economics of Leviticus*  
Phillips, John, *Exploring the Pastoral Epistles*,  
Poole, Matthew, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*  
Ruckman, Peter, *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*  
Rushdoony, R. J., *Institutes of Biblical Law*  
Scroggie, W. Graham, *The Unfolding Drama of Redemption*  
Vance, Laurence, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Versio*  
Vincent, M. R. *Word Studies in the New Testament*  
Waite, D. A. *Bible For Today* newsletter  
Wuest, Kenneth, *Word Studies in the Pastoral Epistles*  
*Expositors Greek New Testament*





### **About the Author**

Dr. John Cereghin was saved on February 9, 1978 at the age of 13 after being raised in the Roman Catholic church. He was saved after listening to a program on missionary shortwave radio station HCJB from Quito, Ecuador. He left the Catholic church in 1983 and joined Maranatha Baptist Church in Elkton, Maryland in 1985. In 1986, he transferred from the University of Maryland to Maryland Baptist Bible College, earning the first doctor's degree awarded by the school in 1995. Dr. Cereghin also earned his Master of Theology degree from Foundations Theological Seminary in 1994.

Dr. Cereghin's ministry background includes working at Radio Station WOEL in Elkton, Maryland (1986-1998), teaching in various capacities at Maryland Baptist Bible College in Elkton, Maryland from 1988-1998, also serving as Dean of Men, Registrar and Academic Dean, and pastoring Queen Anne's Baptist Church, Centreville, Maryland (1989-1990), Charity Baptist Church, Mebane, North Carolina (1994-1995) and Grace Baptist Church in Smyrna, Delaware (1998-present). He and his wife Teresa have four children and four grandchildren.



## **Booklist on Titus**

The following reviews are taken from the following sources:

# *Biblical Viewpoint*, Bob Jones University  
\$ *Commenting and Commentaries*, by Charles Spurgeon  
% *The Minister's Library*, by Cyril Barber  
\* *An Introduction to the New Testament*, by D. Edmond Hiebert  
^ *Tools for Preaching and Teaching the Bible*, by Stewart Custer  
& *New Testament Commentary Survey*, by D. A. Carson  
! Ligonier Ministries blog at <http://www.ligonier.org/blog>  
@ The Master's Seminary Journal  
? *Commentaries for Biblical Expositors* by James Rosscup  
*Entries italics are by the author, Dr. John Cereghin*

Comments are that of the reviewer and not necessarily those of the author nor are such reviews automatically endorsed. Not all commentaries are that useful despite these reviews. As always, discernment in choosing commentaries is required. Recommended commentaries are in **bold**.

# Barclay, William, *The Letters to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, 1956, 142 pages. A liberal exposition that is strong in historical background and vocabulary. He thinks a later editor pieced I Timothy together from fragments of Paul's writing (17); contrasts Christianity with Gnosticism (33-35); often gives word studies; lists multiple marriages of the first century (90); defines a saint as someone "in whom Christ lives again" (95); attacks total abstinence from alcoholic beverages (139); defends the immortality of the soul (201); discusses 2:13 without any comment at all about whether Jesus is "our great God" (293-295).

# Barrett, Charles Kingsley, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1963, 60 pages. A liberal exposition based on the New English Bible. He holds that the Pastorals have merely fragments of Paul's writings (10); clearly distinguishes the Pastorals from genuine Pauline letters (94); thinks the author borrowed ideas from pagan moral philosophy (115); admits 2:13 calls Jesus "God and Saviour" but holds that this is post-Pauline (138).

& Bassler, Jouette, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Abington New Testament Commentary, 1996. Not noteworthy and with a marked tendency to dance to agendas other than Paul's.

? Bernard, J. H., *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1980. Earlier this was published in *The Cambridge Greek Testament*. It is one of the finest older works which grapples seriously with the Greek. Bernard was a fine scholar in his day.

# Blaiklock, E.M., *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1972, 48 pages. A study guide. Defends Pauline authorship (13); suggests reading the Bible in 27 different editions (16); holds to inspiration (115).

? Blaiklock believes in Pauline authorship. This is a good brief discussion for a quick survey, by a good scholar. He handles some of the problem verses even if very concisely (Timothy 2:15, etc.), and skips over others (Titus 3:5, etc.). Stimulating questions for discussion are given at the end of each chapter.

! Calvin, John, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. I would recommend John Calvin's commentaries on every book of the Bible for which he wrote a commentary. He is a master exegete, and even after 500 years, his works are worth consulting by all serious students of Scripture. Crossway has put together a series of classic commentaries in an affordable paperback format. The work by Calvin on the Pastorals is particularly interesting because of the insight it gives us to the Reformation understanding of church leadership. A must-read.

? Publishers shortened and brought older writing up to date. One will not go wrong here, but find considerable insight on what verses mean. He will, however, be wise to go to several commentaries which offer even more on exegetical concerns, views, reasons, etc. while being enriched by this perceptive mind.

# Dibelius, Martin, and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1972, 61 pages. A Form-critical interpretation. They attack Paul as author (1-10); refer to the genuine Pauline epistles distinct from the Pastorals; deny the idea that Christ was called Savior by Jews (101); deny that Christ is called God in 2:13 (143).

\* The work of two liberal German scholars. Contains a mine of technical information for the advanced student in the extensive footnotes and bibliographies. Of great value for the discerning student but barren for those seeking spiritual nurture from these epistles.

? A technical, critical commentary referring the more advanced student to a plethora of scholarly literature and leading him through various form-critical positions. The writers say the Pastorals are not by Paul. Copious footnotes, as in other Hermeneia volumes, refer to recent literature, and the commentary frequently quotes ancient extra-biblical writings that might relate to the language and ideas in the epistles. For slow technical study the work offers some help, but very little along the line of spiritual stimulation from the emphases of the epistles.

? Draper, James T., Jr. *Titus: Patterns for Church Living*, 1978. A 119-page evangelical work with popular expositions of a practical character. Draper was pastor of First Baptist Church, Euless, Texas at the time he wrote this.

? Ellicott, Charles J., *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles with a revised translation*, 1865. Though brief, Ellicott is outstanding in the Greek and very helpful.

# Erdman, Charles, *The Pastoral Epistles of Paul*, 1923, 79 pages. Brief exposition. Defends Pauline authorship (11); attacks idea of prayer for the dead (107); thinks that Paul did not regard the Second Coming as imminent (122); teaches inspiration (125); attacks the idea of soul sleep (129).

\$ Fairbairn, Patrick, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1874, 196 pages. What a good translation, full defense of the apostolic authorship of the epistles, fruitful comments and profitable dissertations, this volume is as complete a guide to the smaller epistles as one could desire.

% This old, standard treatment shows how pastors may use the Greek text to aid their exposition. A fine work in spite of its age.

\* Uses Tischendorf's Greek text.

^ Holds that Christ was a substitutionary ransom for sin (117); stresses the divine inspiration of Scripture (379); concludes with three appendixes on problem passages (405ff).

# Very thorough commentary on the Greek text. Defends Pauline authorship (1-19); favors view that Jesus Christ is called "our great God and Saviour" (283); attacks the idea of baptismal regeneration (295); has a special appendix on the treatment of slavery in the New Testament (432).

# Fausset, A. R., "Titus" in Volume 6 of *A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical*, 1869, 20 pages. A brief conservative exposition. He defends Pauline authorship; argues for plenary inspiration but denies that verbal inspiration means mechanical dictation (511); defends the deity of Christ from 2:13 (520).

& Fee, Gordon D., *The Pastoral Epistles*, Good News Commentary, 1995. One of the better commentaries. Despite a number of points where I find his exegesis unsatisfying, Fee has worked hard at building a more or less believable "life setting" that ties the contents of these three epistles together.

? This is a reworking of his 1984 work in the Good News Commentary. As in his work on I Corinthians, Fee is clear in most cases (not easy to follow when he gets too terse), capable on Greek grammar and local setting, unity and integrity of the books. Each section has a summary. He aims to be of help to teachers, preachers and students. His belief is that Paul authored the books and wrote to meet specific situations in the churches, not to give a manual for the church as some have held. The work has switched from the GNT to the NIV. Fee is evangelical.

? Getz, Gene A., *A Profile for a Christian Life-Style. A Study of Titus*, 1978. Getz has authored several books on character studies and life-style principles in biblical books. Here again he has much practical helpfulness as he points out traits that believers today can emulate in the enabling of the Spirit. The book is simple, well-organized, and contributive for a leader or any Christian in a devotional series day by day.

\$ Graham, W., *Titus*, 1860. Dr. Graham endeavors to make criticism intelligible and the results of learning really edifying. We have our doubts as to some of his criticism and he is quite dogmatic enough, but on the whole good.

! Guthrie, Donald, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, 1990. For those seeking an accessible, introductory level commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, the work by Donald Guthrie in the Tyndale series is probably the best place to begin. Guthrie takes a conservative approach to the books. He addresses all of the

objections to Pauline authorship and finds them unconvincing. This is a very helpful verse-by-verse commentary.

? A recent work, this has a good introduction, but the commentary lacks detail. The author is better known for his three-volume work on New Testament introduction. This book is helpful, especially for an up-to-date conservative answer to critical views concerning introductory matters. The revisions are not extensive since the 1957 edition.

% Hiebert, D. Edmond, *Titus and Philemon*, 1957. A careful blending of exegesis with a capable exposition of the text.

? Hughes, R. Kent and Bryan Chapell. *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, Preaching the Word, 2000. Hughes does the Timothys, Chapell Titus, both giving survey expositions along homiletically useful, applicational lines for pastors, teachers, students, and laity. Illustrations occur often, and solid explanation in between is not always present (cf. 1 Tim. 2:1-2; and v. 8, the significance of raised hands). On some texts basic explanation is quite good (2:11-15), yet on v. 15 the light hint at a meaning does not give much to go on (cf. also on 4:10, 16, or 2 Tim. 4:8, in the latter a vagueness on the New Testament "crown" concept). Overall, the treatments help mostly on often choice illustrations and pastoral applications, and this is well worth the time.

? Huther, J. E., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 1873-85. This work, with that of Bernard among older efforts, deals with the Greek text in a thorough manner and offers the student much help. It is one of the more valuable commentaries on the Greek.

# Ironside, Harry Allen, *Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, 1947, 117 pages. Popular expositions. He defends the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible (221-229); attacks feminism (218); holds that Christ is our great God and Saviour (269).

& Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Pastoral Epistles*, New Testament in Context, 1996. The work is both a model of clarity and packed with useful information.

\* Johnson, Philip C., "The Epistles to Titus and Philemon" in *Shield Bible Study Series*, 1966. A concise, well-outlined interpretation intended as a study guide.

# Kelly, John Norman Davidson, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 1963, 106 pages. A critical, thoughtful commentary. He discusses the problems of authorship very carefully (1-34); gives a rather hesitant defense of Paul's authorship (33-34); calls the fragmentary theory "a tissue of improbabilities" (29); decides that Paul did not call Jesus God (246).

\* Author's own translation.

? A thorough explanation which usually deals with problems perceptively and mentions differing views. This is one of the better commentaries of recent decades. Held in high respect by scholars, the effort concludes for authenticity of the epistles and carries on a judicious exegesis while often being quite instructive in reasoning.

\* Kelly, William, *An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to Titus and of that to Philemon, With Translation of an Amended Text*. A careful exposition by a voluminous Plymouth Brethren scholar of the 19th century.

# Kent, Homer A. Jr., *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1958, 211 pages. Conservative exposition from a Brethren perspective. He gives a suggested itinerary of Paul's final travels (15); carefully discusses authorship (24-71), concluding that Paul did write it (69-71); stresses the substitutionary atonement (105); defends inspiration (290); concludes with a very thorough bibliography (315-320).

^ He treats Titus and 2 Timothy much more briefly than 1 Timothy.

? This is a fairly detailed exposition that usually gives various views on many of the larger interpretive problems and provides reasons for the view favored. Kent uses his own translation. The outline is very clear, and the evangelical exposition is geared for Bible college students, pastors desiring a brief, knowledgeable survey that comes right to the point without being technical, and laymen wanting a commentary that will satisfy them without losing them.

! Knight, George W. III, *The Pastoral Epistles*, New International Greek Testament Commentary, 1999. The best contemporary commentary on these books. Knight takes a thoroughly conservative and orthodox approach to the interpretation of the letters, rightly attributing them to Paul. The only drawback is that this commentary is technical and assumes a working knowledge of Greek. For those with such a knowledge, it will prove to be very valuable.

@ *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. New International Greek Testament Commentary, 1992. 514 pages. *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* is a scholarly critical commentary written by George W. Knight, III, professor of New Testament at Knox Theological Seminary in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The author begins with a list of sources consulted to acquaint the reader with the abbreviations used, but this also is impressive as to the serious nature of the volume. The style is weighty but lucid, scholarly yet readily accessible to those with a limited knowledge of the original languages. This makes it helpful for the diligent pastor or preacher, a feature this reviewer looks for in a book of this type. The treatment of the text is thorough with a rich display of textual and syntactical research. The author treats the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles extensively, and ends by saying, Our conclusion is that the Pastoral Epistles were indeed written by the apostle Paul to his colleagues. This conclusion is based not only on the clear self-testimony of the letters to Paul as their author, their frequent personal references to Paul, their basic Pauline teaching, and their basic Pauline vocabulary and style, but also on the satisfactory resolution of the perceived or real differences, which in the end point toward rather than away from that authorship (52). He dates the epistles somewhere after Paul's release from the first imprisonment in Rome (Acts 28) and the death of Nero, "from the latter part of the early 60's to the mid-60's" (54) The exposition follows the order of writing of the three: 1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy. There are two excursuses, the former on "the Bishops/Presbyters and Deacons: 3:1-13" and the latter on "Motivation for Appropriate Conduct: 2:1-10." The latter shows that Paul's instructions in Tit 2:1-10 do not arise from cultural

appeasements, but from the rule of righteousness prescribed for all believers. This is a timely section in light of current pressures on the church to water down its stand on righteous living by conforming to a changing culture. The treatment of 1 Tim 2:11-15 reinforces the traditional interpretation of the role of women in ministry. The author states, "Here he prohibits women from publicly teaching men, and thus teaching the church" (141), and concludes, "It is noteworthy, however, that Paul does not use 'office' terminology here (bishop/presbyter) but functional terminology (teach/exercise authority). It is thus the activity that he prohibits, not just the office" (142). All in all, this is a commendable commentary, extremely helpful in dealing with the difficult passages in the text. It deserves to be added to any preacher's library as a primary source on the study of the Pastoral Epistles. The Bible student will be satisfied with this investment.

***Knox, James, The Book of Titus, The Christ-Honoring Commentary Series, 2001, 2004, 191 pages. Word-by-word in some places commentary, based on the King James Bible by a Baptist pastor in DeLand, Florida. Lively and interesting. He has an appendix on election. Recommended, but there are a few areas that are a bit unorthodox, such as his positions on certain aspects of church government. It will be ignored by the Scholar's Union.***

? Lea, Thomas and Griffin, Hayne Jr. J., *1, 2 Timothy, Titus*, New American Commentary, 1992. 352 pages. Lea who does the epistles by Timothy is Professor of New Testament, Southwestern Baptist Seminary, Fort Worth. Griffin, writing on Titus, has a Ph. D. in New Testament from King's College, University of Aberdeen, Scotland. The authors give seven arguments for Paul as author of the epistles (23-49). They have good discussions on doctrinal themes, significance of the Pastorals and surveys of each. They follow clear outlines, devote good space to verses, deal with problems in a survey fashion without depth, etc. Sometimes explanations do not go very far to satisfy, as on the law not being made for the righteous in 1 Timothy 1:9, and on the spiritual status of the two in 1:20. "Husband of one wife" is resolved to mean a one woman man, free of sexual promiscuity and laxity (110), but discussion covers only about two-thirds of a page. The work has a fairly adept survey of views and some of the vital arguments on some texts, such as women being saved through child bearing (2:15), and is disappointingly vague and brief on some, such as Timothy saving himself and others (4:16), the status of the unfaithful in 2 Timothy 2:20, etc. Sometimes it states bare views but does not give arguments to grapple with matters, such as on what "crown of righteousness" means in 2 Timothy 4:8. Excursuses appear at times, as on biblical evidence and Baptist practice on ordination (141-44). Some good explanations and sources in footnotes add to the value.

# Lenski, Richard Charles Henry, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, and to Philemon*, 1966, 209 pages. An exhaustive Lutheran commentary. He defends Paul's authorship (473-484); corrects the KJV (501); discusses the Greek words for prayer (538); disagrees with Calvinists (802); defends the verbal inspiration of the Bible (851-59); argues for baptismal regeneration (946); applies "our great God and Saviour" to Jesus Christ (934-936).



? Litfin, A. Duane. *I and II Timothy and Titus*, in Bible Knowledge Commentary, 1985. An evangelical survey championing authorship by Paul and dealing with much of the material in a concisely helpful fashion, assisting at times on problem texts, following a good outline, etc.

# Lock, Walter, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1924, 82 pages. A critical commentary on the Greek text. He defends Pauline authorship; discusses the theology of the Pastorals; evaluates the evidence for Pauline authorship but in the text treats it as Paul's; prefers the translation "All Scripture is inspired by God and therefore useful" (110); thinks that washing refers to baptism (154); argues that "our great God and Saviour" refers to Jesus Christ (144).

\* Lock leans to the conservative view but makes no pronouncements on the vexing critical problems. The notes on the Greek text are rather thin.

& Hopelessly outdated, but contains a number of perennially relevant observations.

? MacArthur, John, Jr. *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus*, MacArthur New Testament Commentary, 3 volumes, 1995-1996. One of the world's most widely-known pastors gives articulate and rather detailed, basic expositions of verses with arresting illustrations. He deals with word meaning, flow of context, background, and sometimes mentions other views. The works are especially profitable for pastors, students, and lay readers aroused to read about main expositional issues and to grow.

? Marshall, I. Howard. *Pastoral Epistles*, International Critical Commentary, 1999. This may be the best technical exegetical work of recent years. Mounce is close, and Knight explains many points with rich diligence. Marshall is much like Cranfield on Romans (also ICC) in looking with clarity at issues, views, and reasons, and sifting things with insight. The work's vigorous effort to understand the meaning is not hindered by Marshall's hedging about Paul being the author, yet even there he covers a lot of bases to help readers be more informed on arguments. The well-organized comments offer much on most verses (cf. on I Tim. 2:1-2, 15; 3:1-12; 4:16; 2 Tim. 1:7, 16-18; 2:1-2; 3:5-6, for examples). Marshall has great skill in pulling together a broad library of learning to furnish insight, yet retain lucidity and come to the point.

# Moellering, H. Armin, *Concordia Commentary*, 1970, 93 pages. A commentary on the RSV on the Pastorals. He discusses authorship (1-25); argues for Pauline authorship (20,24); criticizes Calvin's doctrine of election (52); attacks the idea of prayer for the dead (136); teaches the divine, plenary inspiration of the Bible (163); recommends the wording of the New English Bible (168, 186); argues that "bishop" and "elder" were interchangeable terms (190); teaches baptismal regeneration (212); holds that Jesus is called the "great God and Saviour" (205).

! Mounce, William D., *Pastoral Epistles*, Word Biblical Commentary, volume 46, 2000. Many will recognize William D. Mounce as the author of the widely used *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar*. His commentary on the Pastoral Epistles in the Word series is very helpful. Mounce thoroughly discusses all of the important issues raised by Paul

(whom he believes wrote these epistles), and when dealing with controversial parts of the letters, he fairly represents those with whom he disagrees. All in all, a very good commentary.

& Mounce's judgments, whether one agrees with them or not, strike the reader as mature and fully considered, making the commentary worth reading (if your sanctification can endure the irritating format of the series).

& Oden, Thomas C., *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1989. A remarkable work. It is up to date, well written and defends Pauline authorship. But it is not a traditional commentary; it organizes the pericopes topically, with the preacher in mind. This makes it harder to follow the flow of the text, but has some advantages for the preacher trying to group some of the material Paul treats.

\* Patterson, Paige, *Living in Hope of Eternal Life. An Exposition of the Book of Titus*, 1968. Uses author's own translation. An exegetical verse-by-verse treatment from a conservative viewpoint by a Southern Baptist. Breathes the practical insights of an effective witness for the Lord.

***Phillips, John, Exploring the Pastoral Epistles, 2004. Phillips is always a good read and is useful, especially his outlines.***

? Plummer, Alfred, *The Pastoral Epistles in the Greek New Testament*, 1964. The author is lucid in his statements and has written a fair commentary based upon the Greek. Among older works it is not as helpful as Bernard and Huther, however.

& Quinn, J. D., *The Pastoral Epistles*, Anchor Bible, 1990. Full of excellent exegesis, even though he thinks that the Pastoral Epistles "as we have them" probably stem from AD 80-85.

*Ruckman, Peter, The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Conservative and generally useful paragraph-by-paragraph expositions based on the King James. Ruckman then goes after several "apostate Fundamentalists" in the appendixes who he believes have abandoned the King James Text. These appendixes detract from the commentary and are not needed here. Is also antagonistic toward Greek scholars, Greek scholarship or anyone who would use Greek in their study of any Bible book (iv). His continual whining about the apostasy of "the scholars" wearies us and grates the nerves after a few pages. We wish Ruckman would spend more time on his interpreting and applying the text than telling us what is wrong with other commentators. He strongly defends Pauline authorship (4,5), is dispensational and premillennial. It will be ignored by the Scholar's Union.*

# Scott, E. F., *The Pastoral Epistles*. New York, n.d., 96 pages. The voice of unbelief. He attacks Pauline authorship (51); criticizes the writer's Greek constructions (61,62); portrays Jesus' death as that of a martyr rather than a supernatural Savior (78); denies verbal inspiration (126).

\* Uses the Moffatt translation.

% Simpson, Edmund Kidley, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1954. Ably defends the Pauline authorship, carefully examines the external and internal evidence that bears on the authenticity of these letters, draws on an extensive knowledge of classical literature and expounds the text in a scholarly, satisfying way.

# A commentary on the Greek text. He has a special note on prepositions (110-112); concludes with a short bibliography (169-70); attacks Romanism (65); teaches the doctrine of the invisible church (139); argues that the "great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" denotes one and the same person (108); tends to use untranslated Greek and Latin.

& Has valuable linguistic comments and numerous parallels, but the commentary is stodgy and fails to grapple with the theological thrusts of these epistles.

*Stam, C. R., The Pastoral Epistles, 251 pages, 1983. Written from a hyper-dispensational viewpoint. There are some useful and interesting things in the work, but the doctrinal presupposition will mean that Stam will be in error more times than he is not.*

\$ Taylor, Thomas, *Commentary on Titus*, 1619, 325 pages. The title page calls Taylor "a famous and most elaborate divine." He was a preacher at Paul's Cross during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I and a voluminous writer. The commentary will well repay the reader.

! Towner, Philip H., *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, New International Commentary on the New Testament, 2006. Less technical than Knight's, but it is still an imposing work at over 900 pages. Despite its length, it remains accessible to most educated readers. Like Knight, Towner rejects the conclusions of critical scholars who deny Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.

? Favoring authorship by Paul (30-32), Towner provides a succinct, lucid commentary that sometimes explains verses or parts of them, sometimes ignores things (as "especially those who believe," 4:10; "save both yourself and your hearers," 4:16; or 2 Tim. 4:8, where the words do not really resolve Towner's idea that a faithful life is necessary for receiving a crown, final righteousness, with this being of grace and not earned). Overall, the work seems below average, a mixture of being of some help and of little help, this depending on which verse. It will be of mediocre benefit only to those wanting a cursory, yet easily flowing guide. It grew out of Towner's Ph. D. dissertation under I. Howard Marshall at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, but does not approach Marshall's usual kind of serious explanation

# Van Oosterzee, Dr. "II Timothy and Titus" in *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, 1867, 23 pages. Conservative Lutheran commentary. He defends Pauline authorship (77); teaches the divine inspiration of the Scriptures (109); stresses that "our great God and Saviour" applies to the Lord Jesus Christ (167).

# Ward, Ronald A., *Commentary on 1 & 2 Timothy & Titus*, 1974, 153 pages. A careful commentary on the RSV. He discusses authorship, concluding that Paul is the "ultimate

author" (9-13); teaches inspiration of the Bible (199-201); concludes with an annotated bibliography (281-284); defends translation "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ (261).

& Worth scanning, but not of first choice.

# White, Newport, "II Timothy and Titus" in volume 4 of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1951, 50 pages. A critical commentary on the Greek text. He defends Pauline authorship (57); teaches the reality of the Second Coming (179); defends a divine doxology to Christ (183); teaches baptismal regeneration (198); although he defends the deity of Christ, he does not think that Christ is called "our great God and Saviour" (195-196).

? Wuest, Kenneth S., *The Pastoral Epistles in the Greek New Testament*, 1964. This work is helpful to the serious student because of its Greek word studies and verse by verse clarity in exposition and frequent application.