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ABSTRACT
Whereas some contend that the Pastoral Epistles are a collection of miscellaneous, incohesive materials, several recent scholars are proposing a coherent, textually cohesive argument in the letters. An application of Halliday and Hasan's theory of cohesive ties to 1 Timothy supports this trend, suggesting furthermore that the person of Timothy and the problem of 'heretical' teachings are central cohesive elements in the discourse.

1 THE PROBLEM

In recent years scholarly discussion of the Pastoral Epistles (PE) has forged new paths out of deep ruts. In the early part of the nineteenth century Friedrich Schleiermacher denied Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy. Soon afterwards, Eichorn (1812:315ff.) expanded the list of pseudo-Pauline letters to include all three PE (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus). Consequently, the debate over authorship dominated the following centuries of scholarship regarding the PE. So important is one's position on this issue that Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann assert, 'Any judgment as to what the Pastorals are and intend to be depends in great measure upon the question of authorship' (1972:1).

Recently, Peter Bush (1990) has discussed the linguistic structure of 1 Timothy in light of criticisms directed at Dibelius and Conzelmann's approach to the PE. He contends that the continuing debate over authorship has hindered fruitful discussion and 'resulted in the artistry of the individual letters being ignored' (1990:152). However, Bush's own attempt to expose the structural cohesiveness of 1 Timothy has not been without its own debate. Several scholars would agree with Hanson's claim that 'the PE are made up of a miscellaneous

1 Kümmel. (1972:84). To this Guthrie (1957:15, n1) adds, 'In 1804 J E C Schmid had disputed 1 Timothy, but it was Schleiermacher's attack that had the greater effect.'

2 Although the term structure is a somewhat slippery to define, for basic purposes the term here denotes the grammaticalized organization of an author's thoughts and ideas. It is not simply his flow of thought; rather, it involves the way or manner in which he uses language to express his flow of thought.
collection of material. They have no unifying theme; there is no development of thought. The larger issue at stake, namely the structural and conceptual cohesiveness of the PE, has now generated several significant scholarly discussions. The trend is to move away from Hanson's appraisal. For example, in response to Hanson's analysis of the PE, Bush (1990:152-53) retorts:

In supposing that this is the case for 1 Timothy the scholarly community has ignored the clear indications in the text that in fact this letter has a clearly defined and well planned structure, a structure which indicates how the message of the epistle is to be understood.

Bush then goes on to argue that the parallels between 1 Tim 1:12-20 and 6:11-16, 20-21 suggest that these passages 'enclose the body of the letter'. Bush correctly points out the lack of studied attention given to the relationship between the text's structure and the text's meaning. His analysis is fairly narrow in scope but it does give stimulus for future studies of the linguistic structure of 1 Timothy. Lewis Donelson (1988:108) also disputes Hanson's view:

Recently, however, there have been a number of attempts to trace the flow of argument in these letters [PE] and to discover logical connections among the various literary types (Donelson [1988]; Fiore [1986]; Karris [1979]; Verner [1983]). It is being argued that the Pastorals are not a mindless combination of incompatible materials but are the result of a coherent and consistent view of the Christian life.

Representative of this trend to search for a coherent unity to the argument of the PE is David Verner's The household of God (1983). Verner argues that 1 Tim 2:1-6:1 presents material concerned with the church's conduct as the household of God. This conduct code was taken over from the early church's ethical codes in the household. These ethical codes are influenced by 'station code schemas', a topos on household management similar to and borrowed from Haustafeln (Verner 1983:127, 182). In this way, Verner brings together all of the diverse subjects in the discourse. The slaves, widows, leaders, husbands, wives, and children are all part of the household of God. In contrast, certain heretics oppose these ethical codes of God's household. Verner's basic thesis is convincing and his work explains one possible interpretation of the historical situation of the PE.

3 Hanson (1982:42); cf Dibelius and Conzelmann (1972:5-6). Along similar lines Guthrie (1957:12) remarks, 'There is a lack of studied order, some subjects being treated more than once in the same letter without apparent premeditation.'

4 Bush (1990:154). His analysis, however, is incomplete in that he fails to notice the threefold inclusio form of the letter: 1:3, 1:18-20; and 6:20-21.
However, by failing to treat the first and last chapters of 1 Timothy, his work falls short of explaining the entire structure of the letter.

This recent interest in the structural unity of the PE supplies a refreshing breath of air into the scholarly study of these letters. More importantly, it encourages further avenues of research into neglected questions. However, further dialogue is needed before any sort of consensus is reached as to the structural composition of 1 Timothy. The purpose of this essay is to push forward understanding of the cohesive structure of 1 Timothy, employing insights from the modern linguistic field of discourse analysis as a working methodology. As part of a helpful collection of essays regarding the language of the New Testament, Louw (1990:166) notes the lack of attention Greek grammarians (and, for that matter, New Testament scholars) have given to modern linguistics, especially discourse analysis. Hence, in response to Louw's well-needed challenge, I have attempted to set forth in some detail one theory of discourse structure before applying it to the text of 1 Timothy.

2 THE METHODOLOGY

For this purview of 1 Timothy, I primarily adopt the theory of textual cohesiveness (i.e., discourse structure) set forth by Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1980:4-90) — a theory with ties in the growing linguistic field of discourse analysis.5

Halliday and Hasan (1980:31-42) suggest four categories by which to look at the functional structure of language: 1) experiential structure; 2) interpersonal structure; 3) logical structure; and 4) textual structure. Of particular interest to this inspection of 1 Timothy is the fourth aspect of language, the textual. The other categories will, nonetheless, be tangentially discussed. Halliday and Hasan go on to subdivide the textual meanings of language into two parts: 1) semantic and grammatical symmetry within the text and 2) thematic structure. These two features of textual meaning make a text a 'text'. That there is a relationship both semantically and grammatically between the various parts of a given text, and that there is some thematic element which flows through it, allows the recipient of the communication to recognise it as a cohesive text rather than a jumble of unrelated words and sentences. How is it, then, that speakers go about forming texts into a cohesive unit?

2.1 Textual cohesiveness

The structural cohesiveness of a given text should be viewed as a continuum. At

5 The following are helpful introductions to discourse analysis: W Dressler, Einführung in die Textlinguistik (1972); J E Grimes, The thread of discourse (1975); R de Beaugrande and W Dressler, Introduction to text linguistics (1980); G Brown and G Yule, Discourse analysis (1983); R E Longacre, The grammar of discourse (1983); and M Coulthard, An introduction to discourse analysis (1985).
one pole are texts with a high degree of unity and cohesiveness. At the other pole are texts which can be recognised tout de suite as a jumble of words and sentences having little textual meaning. Somewhere between these poles lie most texts — neither altogether cohesive nor altogether incohesive. The question remains: What is it about the user’s language system that allows for the construction of cohesive or incohesive texts? To explain this Halliday and Hasan appeal to the relationship between a text and its outer world (text as product) and between its inner world (text as process). On the one hand, one should know as much as possible about the relationship between a text and its context of situation (ie historical setting) in order to comprehend the cohesiveness of a text. On the other hand, the pieces of the discourse also form inter-relationships within the text. In other words, cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it' (Halliday and Hasan 1976:4). Here the text is viewed as a process in which what has been said before is tied to what is being said at a particular point in the text. These cohesive relationships — the focus of this study — may occur between words and phrases, or even between sentences and pericopes. And yet, how are these cohesive ties formed and how do they specifically point to the cohesiveness of a given discourse?

2.1.1 Cohesive ties

Cohesive ties refer to the language system’s ability to form relations between particular linguistic items. The nature of this relationship is semantic, that is, the ties are related in a meaningful way. It is helpful to view these relationships on two levels within a discourse: The first level is concerned with organic ties which bind a whole message together. This level deals primarily with the conjunctive systems of the language (e.g. particles, conjunctions). For a study of an ancient letter this might also include formal letter writing features which tie together the various parts of the letter (e.g. salutations, thanksgiving formulas, disclosure formulas). The second level is concerned with the componential ties between the various components of the text (e.g. lexical choices, choices of grammatical person), i.e., how smaller parts of the text are interrelated with one another.

Regarding componential ties, further distinctions can be made. It should be

6 The works of Verner, Donelson, Fiore, and Karris have focused on this aspect of cohesiveness in the PE.

7 It should be noted that these formal features of letter writing are not part of the language system per se. They were developed within the semiotic system of the culture and grammaticalized by linguistic forms, and, in turn, became recognized as formal letter writing features. It is in the area of organic ties that studies of epistolography and rhetoric may have their place in the field of discourse analysis as it is applied to the New Testament.
noted, however, that in contrast to a multi-faceted approach to discourse components, the demise of much New Testament scholarship has been to interpret the primary or only meaning of words (components) with respect to their referential entities. For example, in the sentence, ‘The dog ran across the street’, one finds meaning in the word ‘dog’ because it refers to a particular dog (e.g. my dog ‘Fido’), not any dog running across the street. This simplistic approach has outlived its limited usefulness and fails to account for the complexity in textual meaning. For example, if ‘dog’ does not refer to an animal, but the enemy of an adolescent (e.g. ‘Butch’), then the meaning of the word takes on an entirely different nuance. No longer does it simply refer to an object in space and time (which all words do not do, e.g. ‘love’), but it conveys personal attitudes about the individual.

In order to account for the various semantic senses of discourse components, Halliday and Hasan appeal to three types of componential cohesive ties: co-reference; co-classification; and co-extension. Co-reference refers to the cohesive ties between linguistic items of the same identity. For example, in the sentence ‘John bought the suit which he gave to his brother’, the relative pronoun refers to the entity ‘suit’. Both lexical items — ‘suit’ and ‘which’ — share the same identity. Consequently, one would expect to find these types of ties grammaticalised by various pronouns and demonstratives, and at times by lexical items. In Greek this is also accomplished through the choice of grammatical person. By choosing grammatical person in the verbal form the writer is able to establish a cohesive tie with substantives in the previous or ensuing text. Co-classification refers to cohesive ties between linguistic items of the same class or genus. This is demonstrated in the following two sentences: ‘I want the children to draw with crayons’ and ‘I want the teenagers to draw with pencils.’ By substituting ‘teenagers’ for ‘children’ and ‘with pencils’ for ‘with crayons’ the two sentences form a cohesive tie of co-classification, i.e., both deal with how the drawing should be done and by whom it should be done and yet they refer to different ‘situational events’. Another method of conveying the tie of co-classification is by ellipsis. ‘I hit the ball so hard it went over the parking lot. How hard did you?’ A cohesive relationship exists between the two previous sentences because of the elided elements ‘hit the ball’. They do not refer to the same event; rather, they fall into the class of ‘ball-hitting’ even though the words used in each sentence are quite distinct. Co-extension refers to cohesive ties between linguistic items of the same semantic field, but not necessarily of the same class. In the sentences ‘John ate the pizza’ and ‘Susie gobbled down the cake’ the linguistic pairs ‘John’ / ‘Susie’, ‘ate’ / ‘gobbled down’, and ‘pizza’ / ‘cake’ do not refer to the same entities nor do they refer to the same class (e.g. pizza is not a kind of cake). Instead, these

---

8 These distinctions are similar to those of sense, denotation, and reference made by Lyons (1977).
items are part of the same semantic field. Typically lexical items grammaticalise these types of ties.

In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1980:43-59) distinguish between two types of co-extensional lexical relationships: general and instantial. Instantial relationships arise from the particular demands of the text. In other words, Paul may be referring to the specific individual Τιμόθεος (co-reference) when he uses the vocative ᾄδιστος θεοῦ in 1 Tm 6:11, but this understanding is based on knowledge derived from the larger text and/or from the shared information of the writer and original reader, and not from the language system of Koine Greek. Every speaker of Greek would not identify a relationship between the lexical phrase ᾄδιστος θεοῦ and the person of Timothy. This aspect of discourse analysis proves to be very difficult at times, because the modern reader does not share all of the information which the original writer and reader share. General lexical relationships, which are more important for this study, arise from the language system itself. The well-known linguistic principle regarding the need for choice to establish meaning is important here, since the general lexical relationships of a particular text are the result of choices by the author from his language system. Hence, it is vital to understand the Greek language system, and in this case the lexical structure, in order to understand the cohesive ties of a text. General co-extensions take five forms: reiteration; synonymy; antonymy; hyponymy; and meronymy. Reiteration (although not truly a sense relation) takes place when both members of the cohesive tie consist of the same lexical item. This is one of the more obvious forms of lexical ties. However, the simple repetition of a lexical item does not imply total synonymy nor does it leave out the possibility, among other things, that the lexical items have two quite different meanings with the same spelling (a monetary 'bank' or a dirt 'bank') and/or pronunciation ('meet' and 'meat'). With this caveat in mind, however, a text can be analysed for reiterated lexical ties, revealing cohesive structure. Synonymy refers to lexical items forming cohesive ties that are semantically similar in meaning. Antonymy refers to the oppositeness of meaning found in lexical items. At first one may

---

9 On the concepts of shared information or shared knowledge see the scattered discussions in Levinson (1983).


11 Until recently, Greek lexicons demonstrated the failure of many grammarians to realize this phenomena of language. For example, a glance at any lexicon would make one assume that words form little or no relationship with one another. By failing to deal with the lexical relationships of synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy, most lexicons provide minimal information about the author's lexical choices. Fortunately, the recent UBS lexicon by Louw and Nida (1988) is trying to break this mold.

12 I am not referring here to cases of total synonymy which would be a special case of reiteration. That type of semantic overlap (often restricted to scientific language) is found in language systems to a very limited extent.
question how this type of lexical relation forms cohesive ties within the text. However, it is not that antonyms are unrelated in meaning but that the antonyms diverge in one or more semantic features and that they share others. Thus ‘dog’ and ‘car’ are not antonyms because they share nothing in common which would allow one to recognize a semantic tie between the two (except for the somewhat useless idea of ‘things’). The cohesive tie is created by means of shared features, and the opposite features allow for recognition of differences. Hyponymy refers to inclusive relationships among lexical items. One lexical item is included in the total semantic range of another item (but not vice-versa). This feature of lexical choices reveals a hierarchy to the lexical system. For example, ‘labrador’ is a hyponym of ‘dog’, ‘dog’ is a hyponym of ‘animal’, ‘animal’ is a hyponym of ‘living beings’, and so on. The one is included in the semantic range of another which in turn is included in the semantic range of another and so on. Meronymy refers to the part-whole relationships between lexical items. For example, the word ‘fur’ is a meronym of ‘dog’ or ‘cat’. The one is a part of the other.

Through the analysis of co-referential ties (e.g., pronouns, demonstratives), co-classificational ties (e.g., substitution, ellipsis), and co-extensional ties of both instantal (i.e., those tied to the situational context) and general types (i.e., those found in the language system — namely, repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy), the discourse analyst is able to linguistically demonstrate the cohesiveness of a text. One further point of discussion remains, however, before applying our methodology to the problem of 1 Timothy.

2.1.2. Cohesive ties forming cohesive chains

A nagging question remains: What makes one text more cohesive than another? For answers to this question Halliday and Hasan speak in terms of linguistic chains. A chain is ‘formed by a set of items each of which is related to the others by the semantic relation of co-reference, co-classification and/or co-extension.’

If a text, for example, contains a participant who is identified using the person’s name, pronouns, or demonstratives, these elements form a chain of co-reference. There are two sub-categories of chains: identity chains and similarity chains. Identity chains are grammaticalized by co-referentiality relations and similarity chains are grammaticalized by co-classificational and co-extensional relations.

To expose the identity and similarity chains of a text, nevertheless, proves less than adequate when attempting to discern textual cohesiveness. Some texts

---

13 It should also be noted that co-reference and co-classification are realized primarily by grammatical networks in the language and that co-extension is realized by lexical networks.

14 This discussion is dependent on Halliday and Hasan (1980:50-59) and Butler (1989:11-12).
contain several identity chains and yet remain incohesive to its readers. To determine textual cohesiveness Halliday and Hasan introduce the concepts of peripheral, relevant, and central tokens. Peripheral tokens include those items which do not take part in the chains. Relevant tokens include all linguistic items in the text which form part of one or more chains. One should not conclude, however, that a high proportion of relevant tokens to peripheral tokens necessitates a higher textual cohesiveness (although it does play some role). Textual cohesiveness is primarily determined by central tokens. Central tokens include those chains which interact with other chains. In other words, a co-extensional chain concerning supernatural beings may interact with a co-extensional chain concerning miracles (e.g., God raised Jesus from the dead). If they interact in more than one context, one can surmise that the author is 'on about' a similar topic. He is establishing a thread in the discourse. She is using her language in a cohesive manner.

2.2 A Case Study: POxy 115 (II CE)

Before turning to the text of 1 Timothy, the above methodology may be applied to a shorter, less problematic text. The following papyrus text (P Oxy 115) contains several chains of cohesive ties which hopefully help to elucidate the concept of token analysis. Only those chains which interact are said to be central. (Each chain is assigned a number for easier identification.)

Irene to Taonnophris and Philo, good comfort! I was as much grieved and wept over the blessed one, as I wept for Didymas. I did everything that was fitting and so did all of mine, Epaphroditus and Thermouthion and Philion and Apollonius and Plantas. But truly there is nothing anyone can do in the face of such things. Therefore, comfort one another.

Fare ye well. Hathyr 1.

(On the verso)

(On the verso)

This text, a letter of consolation, contains an identity chain involving the per-

---

15 See the example in Halliday and Hasan (1980:52-53).
16 Cf the helpful introductory and exegetical comments on this text by Milligan (1910:95-96) and Deissmann (1978:176-78), with bibliographies.
17 = 28 October.
son 'Irene' who is grammaticalised through the choice of person and lexical items (1). A similarity chain is recognisable in the lexical items 'Irene', 'all', 'Epaphroditus', 'Thermouthion', 'Philon', 'Apollonius', 'Plantas' (chain 2; those participating in Irene's sympathy for Taonnophris and Philo). There is also a similarity chain composed of words within the semantic field best described as 'weeping' (3). If 'Didymas' represents a different person than the 'blessed one', there is also an identity chain of co-classification in the second sentence (4). There is another similarity chain discernable in the semantic relations of 'one another', 'Philo', and 'Taonnophris'. 'One another' is a repetition of 'Taonnophris' and 'Philo' (5) who are all related as the addressees of the letter. Finally, there is a similarity chain of verbs meaning 'to do' (6). These, then, are the relevant tokens (ie those that form a chain).

Central tokens are those chains which interact with one another. Are there any in this papyrus text? An obvious interaction exists between identity 1 and similarity 3. There is also interaction between chains 1 and 5 (1 addresses 5), 1 and 6, and 5 and 3. These central tokens lead one to conclude that the author is talking about how I is attempting to deal with the sorrow of 5. This is what the author is 'on about'. However, the peripheral items of this text — 'good cheer', 'goodbye', 'blessed one', 'Didymas', and 'such things' — present new problems for the analysis. These are all part of the shared information of the speakers which is not immediately accessible to the secondary reader. And even though one may conjecture that the term for 'such things' involves the death of a loved one, it is part of a historical background which is not explicitly stated in the text. In other words, 'such things' are the cause of chain 3, but it is difficult to definitively state what exactly 'such things' refer to (e.g. death of son, loss of income, exile from city). However, the structural meanings of the language system offer clues for reasonable conjectures. Lexical words such as 'comfort' and 'weep' often have particular experiential (ie sorrow) and interpersonal (ie concern for one another) aspects of meaning. The word ἐυπορεῖν ('fare ye well') in place of the customary salutation χαίρετευ ('greetings') also points to the types of contexts in which this text may have been written. One may reasonably conjecture that the term for 'such things' refers to a grievous event for the husband-wife pair 'Taonnophris' and 'Philo'.

18 For a very similar example, see the model of a letter of consolation in Pseudo Demetrius Τύποι Επιστολικά 5.
19 She is an experienced letter writer and probably a landed proprietress as her other letter (P Oxy 116), a letter to the same recipients as here, demonstrates.
20 Perhaps this is her husband or more likely her son.
21 Although the editors of P Oxy 115 take ἐὑρομοιον as a proper noun ('Eumoeus'), Milligan (1910:96) and others rightly argue that the word is probably a substantival adjective.
This brief text reveals how Halliday and Hasan’s criteria for detecting textual cohesiveness provide one methodological framework for analysing discourse structure. When approaching a text such as 1 Timothy one must be prepared to ask the correct questions of the text when attempting to understand the cohesive clues within it. What should be apparent from the above case study is the difficulty of applying the concepts of central, relevant, and peripheral tokens to a larger text such as 1 Timothy. Exegetes can no longer enjoy the ease of counting up words in the concordance and then claiming, ‘Here’s the focus of the text. Here is what the letter’s structure is centered around.’ Besides reiteration, many other cohesive ties can be found within a text.

3 THE DISCOURSE: 1 TIMOTHY

The following analysis treats the tokens in 1 Timothy which are related co-referentially, i.e., lexical items which have the same referent and thus form an identity chain (e.g., Παῦλος, ἔγω, με). It also involves tokens which are part of the same class and/or extension and thus form similarity chains. However, as noted above, similarity and identity chains by themselves do not establish cohesiveness. Cohesiveness is established by the textual functions of language when two different chains interact with one another (central tokens). Halliday and Hasan claim that for two chains to be considered as interacting at least two of the tokens of each chain must interact with one another (1980:56). All of this suggests that authors compose texts which are ‘about similar kinds of things’ (Halliday and Hasan 1980:57). In other words, cohesive texts talk about the same things in similar ways. In contrast, incohesive texts do not continue to describe the same things long enough to establish some sense of continuity. Of course this should all be viewed as a continuum of cohesiveness.

The following diagram presents in a graphic way the various kinds of central tokens found in 1 Timothy. Similarity and/or identity chains are placed in each box. The arrows between boxes represent chain interaction. In this way, the

---

22 In the case of 1 Timothy the author diverges into several different discussions within the framework of his letter. The bodies of Graeco-Roman letters did not always consist of one topic of discussion; and it would be naive to insist that every letter must have one unifying thread in the discourse. Therefore, two aspects of the discourse should be kept in mind when trying to use the methodology of token analysis. On the one hand, entire texts often contain a consistent topic throughout, or at least a primary purpose. On the other hand, a text is composed of smaller sections which often diverge into more specific topics. Central tokens will primarily be found throughout various sections (pericopes) of the text and thus reveal some of the major concerns of the letter. However, one may discover central tokens within a particular section which do not exist globally in the letter. In an analysis of 1 Timothy both of these phenomena need to be differentiated, so as to prevent one from pointing to central tokens which are not really central tokens in the entire text but are tokens for a particular section.

23 Discussions of peripheral and relevant tokens are omitted due to the extensive nature of
central tokens represent the gist of a text's message. They manifest the text's cohesiveness. Within some of the major boxes are smaller subdivisions of similarity chains. At times the interaction between chains only includes these smaller boxes. Each major box is numbered and will be discussed subsequently.

Fig. 1. Central Tokens

such a task. Central tokens are the focus here because they directly demonstrate textual cohesiveness.
The Pauline identity chain (1) is grammaticalised by means of naming (1:1), pronouns (2:7), grammatical person (3:14), and occasionally by means of other lexical terms (1:1 ἄπόστολος). It is a fairly straightforward chain in that all linguistic elements refer to the same individual, 'Paul'. This identity chain interacts with other chains in primarily two manners: by language which I term *direction* and *assertion*. The term *direction* refers to language which basically serves to command or exhort the reader. Paul directs his message specifically to Timothy with 2d person singular imperative forms. Thus, chain 1 interacts specifically with the identity chain concerning 'Timothy' which is part of the entire similarity chain concerning 'believers' (2). Paul also makes *assertions* (ie statements, appraisals) about certain events and people in the text. This includes assertions about 'believers' (2) and 'unbelievers' (3). The major difference between chains 2 and 3, and the primary reason why apparent assertions about believers are treated here as directions, not assertions (ie as chain interaction between 2 and 3, and 2 and 4), is one of degree. Whereas some have totally left the church (1:6-7, 11; 1:19-20; 4:1-5; 5:15; 6:20-21), others, even though their behavior is often similar to apostate behavior or is at least viewed negatively, are pictured by Paul as capable of reform. This is the case in 5:11-14, where Paul details the dangerously heretical behavior of young widows but proceeds in verse 14 to give them specific directives. His desire then becomes the responsibility of Timothy to carry out. In verse 15 he notes the urgent nature of his directives in light of those who have already turned to Satan. Although Paul suggests the possibility of reform for some apostates (1:20), he relegates this task to the supernatural realm. In cases where reform is within the scope of Timothy's responsibility, assertions about negative (and positive) behavior serve as background information to the specific directives. I am not confusing the forms and functions of language by stating that some assertions are actually directives and others are not; rather, I am pointing to the complexity that occurs when language is actually used in context. Some assertions, although still primarily functioning as assertions, take on the semantics of directives when used in the context of individuals who are not total apostates. One final chain interaction concerning assertions, although limited to 1:12-17, is between 'Paul' (1) and 'vice' (4). Paul, in his pre-conversion days, was a blasphemer, persecuter, and insulter. The function of Paul's assertion is to demonstrate the mercy of Christ to those who will believe in the future. Overall, then, the chain concerning 'Paul' directly interacts with every major chain. His authority and example play a vital role in the discourse.

24 These terms have been adapted from Stanley E Porter's study of verbal aspect in the Greek of the New Testament (1989:esp 163-78). Cf Grimes (1975:235) who speaks in terms of three performative functions of language — declarative (= assertion), interrogative, and imperative (= direction). The first and third functions are prevalent throughout 1 Timothy, but only one interrogative appears (3:5), and it is a rhetorical question.
Two other human participants form major chains: 'believers' (2) and 'unbelievers' (3). The semantically broad terms πιστοί (4:10) and ἀπιστοί (5:8) are part of these chains (i.e., every other term in the similarity chain is hyponymous to these two tokens). The first chain (2) may be broken down into the following lexical categories: 'Timothy' (1:2); 'men' (2:8); 'women' (2:9-15); 'bishops' (3:1); 'deacons' (3:8); 'church' (3:15); 'widows' (young and old; 5:3ff.); 'deaconsesses' (3:11); 'presbyters' (5:17); 'slaves' (6:1); 'masters' (6:1); 'wealthy ones' (6:9); 'children' (5:4); 'brethren' (6:3); 'recent converts' (3:6); 'old men' (5:1); 'old women' (5:2); 'young men' (5:1); and 'young women' (5:2). Within chain 2, two minor subdivisions may be distinguished: believers who are specific leaders [leadership] and believers who are not [-leadership]. And even within the +leadership category Timothy is further distinguished from other (local?) leaders. This list does not imply that each of the above lexical categories are always used with respect to the believing community; it does point to cases where certain chains do refer to the believing community. Accordingly, chain 2 reveals to a certain extent that 1 Timothy is a church manual (i.e., it involves church-related things). However, as the diagram graphically demonstrates, the interaction between chain 1 and 3 more specifically concerns 'Paul' and 'Timothy'. This interaction of chains primarily involves language of directions. These directions toward Timothy serve two purposes. On the one hand, Timothy is directed to do certain things that particularly involve himself (4:1; 4:13-16; 5:23). On the other hand, Timothy is directed to command, teach, and entrust the brethren to do certain things (5:7). Timothy is most certainly directed to assert many of the assertions Paul has made. These assertions include Paul's reaction to apostate behavior (4:1-5) and behavior that more specifically involves believers (both positive and negative assertions of behavior). Thus, there is a recursive interaction within the text. Paul directs Timothy to direct the church about certain behavior. Within this multi-faceted interaction, a possible third recursion is added. If 4:6 speaks of Timothy's responsibility to pass on Paul's directives and assertions about church conduct to church leaders, then these leaders too become involved in the task of directing the church towards certain conduct.

Chain 2 interacts with both the chains concerning 'virtue' (4) and 'vice' (5)

---

25 Of course Paul is also part of the 'believer' chain as it pertains to all Christians, but he is not part of the specific community in Ephesus to which he writes.

26 See, for example, the differentiation between believing and unbelieving masters in 6:1-2.

27 Verner's discussion (1983:83-186) is very helpful for understanding the roles and actions of believers. He admits 'that at some point in the development of the station code schema, exhortation addressed to a particular leading individual in the community became a regular feature of the schema' (1983:101). 'Timothy' appears to be the leading individual in the community of the PE. Thus, Verner's analysis appears to account for both the role of 'Timothy' and the believers in the text. However, Verner does not analyze...
which, at a general level, typify positive behavior and negative behavior from the perspective of the author (i.e., the lexical items are hyponyms of ἀναστρέφεσθαι; 3:14). Interaction with chain 4 proceeds along two lines. First, each subgroup of chain 2 may be directed to live in a manner which is particular to the group. For example, women are instructed in appropriate behavior — namely, bearing children (2:15) — which does not apply to men. Indeed, one of the apparent problems with women, according to the epistle's author, is that they were taking over the appropriate behavior of men — teaching and exercising authority (2:11-12) — and inappropriately applying it to themselves. Thus, certain directives only apply to certain similarity chains in chain 2. Second, chain 2 as a whole interacts with certain general behavior in chain 4. Multiple references to virtuous behavior such as 'love' (1:14, 19), 'good conscience' (1:19), 'faith' (1:19), 'holiness' (2:15), 'moderation' (2:15; 3:2), 'endurance' (6:11), 'meekness' (6:11), 'truth' (2:7), 'godliness' (2:2), 'propriety' (2:2), and 'good works' (2:10), are not only applied to individual groups in chain 2 (2:15) but to the church as a whole (1:19). Chain 2 not only interacts with chain 4, but also with chain 5. This chain is further subdivided into two categories: general negative behavior and apostate behavior. (Again it should be remembered that these chain interactions form the basis of Paul's directives to Timothy who in turn gives these directives to the church.) The former category includes behavior which is not only characteristic of apostates and unbelievers, but behavior which is to be avoided by believers. Thus, believers interact with the chain concerning negative behavior in that they are to avoid it. At times, their behavior is even dangerously comparable to that of the apostates. For example, the apostates of 1:20 and false teachers of 6:4 as well as the pre-converted Paul (1:12ff.) are characterised as 'blasphemers'. In 6:1 slaves are to honor their masters so that the name of God and the teaching are not blasphemed. In other words, a believer's actions may result in wicked behavior. Indeed, if a believer does not care for his own family, he is worse than an unbeliever (5:8). In contrast to general wicked behavior, some behavior is particular to apostates (e.g., 1:19; 6:21).

Chain 3, 'unbelievers', primarily interacts with chain 5, 'vices'. However, that leaders are to have a good testimony from the outside (3:7) points to one area in which chain 3 interacts with chain 4. But to be a central token, two elements from both chains must interact with one another. Thus, in this case, there is no central token. Regarding chain 3 one can distinguish between 'unbelievers', in the first and last chapters of 1 Timothy. It appears, then, that his basic thesis helps explain the roles of believers (chain 2), but an analysis of other chains must be included in any discussion dealing with the overall cohesiveness of the letter.

28 See Barrett (1963:56-57) who rightly takes 'women' as the subject of θελευωςυν.

29 For a scholarly debate over several interpretive questions surrounding these passages and the more important point that heresy was a critical problem in the church at Ephesus see Moo 1980:62-83; Payne 1981:169-97; and Moo 1981:198-222.
general and 'unbelievers' involved in heretical teachings. Whereas one would expect to find unbelievers in the latter category, 1 Timothy focuses on unbelievers who have apostasised from the faith (1:19-20; 6:20-21). They have moved from chain 2 to chain 3. That there is some outside influence is likely, but it is difficult to trace in the text. The interaction of the apostates in chain 3 and the 'vices' in chain 5 is fairly straightforward. The apostates 'do' negative things.

All of the above chains (1-5) are hyponymous to chain 8 (ALL MEN).

The final two chains involve 'God' (6) and 'Satan' (7).30 Chain 6 has as its main subchains 'God the father' and 'Jesus Christ'. Both interact with the entirety of humanity, including believers and unbelievers alike. God is the 'savior of all' (4:10) and he demonstrated this when Jesus Christ gave himself as a ransom on behalf of all (2:3-6). More specifically, however, the Lord gave Paul mercy in his conversion. This positive interaction with mankind is contrasted by the general negative impact that 'Satan' and his agents have on the world. On the one hand, these evil forces interact with chains 2, 3, and 5 by providing the underlying influence behind evil behavior (ie the demons and deceptive spirits are the source of evil teachings and evil behavior [4:1ff.]). On the other hand, Satan may positively interact with church members who behave wickedly. In some way he is used to lead them to repentance (1:20). Although this action may bring about their reform, it is doubtful that he desires their reform, even though his work instructs the apostate in the error of his ways. It is even possible that the real agent behind the reform is God. In this way chain 6 interacts with chain 7 suggesting the latter's subordinance to the former. But the text is not explicit enough to verify such a conjecture.

The above analysis of central tokens and their interaction with various chains reveals fundamental cohesive relationships in 1 Timothy. Although several more peripheral chains could be discussed, the central chains reveal, so to speak, 'what the author is on about'.

4 CONCLUSION

Two observations from the above analysis prove significant for our inquiry of the cohesive nature of 1 Timothy. First, the interaction of central tokens with their chains reveal the primary participant structure of the text: Paul and Timothy. The second member of this duo, Timothy, provides a unifying thread to the discourse, solving or at least significantly diminishing the problem of the letter's cohesiveness. As Timothy deciphers the respective pericopes concerning various ecclesiastical issues, their cohesiveness becomes conspicuous: he is the unifying factor. He is to see to it that Paul's assertions and directions are communicated and carried out in Ephesus. Second, those chains involving event struc-

30 'God' is used here in a general sense to refer to all of God's 'good' entourage and 'Satan' to all of Satan's 'evil' entourage.
ture expose a central purpose of the letter: to combat heretical movements within the church. These two thematic threads combine to give a textual flavor to the letter.

Scholarship of the PE has typically emphasised that 1 Timothy is centrally directed to the theme of church government, a theme supposedly revealing its pseudepigraphical nature. Furthermore, the various ecclesiastical issues addressed in the letter are supposedly scattered and broken, that is incohesive. By moving the spotlight back on Timothy and his role in combatting the ‘heresy’ which is infiltrating the church, the letter’s cohesiveness is brought to light. Moreover, claims that the letter is a jumble of thoughts piecemealed together will be exposed for the simplistic, linguistically uninformed appraisals that they are. More importantly, this treatment of the cohesive structure of 1 Timothy is grounded in principles of modern linguistics — a theoretical framework still awaiting widespread application in NT studies. I have attempted to set forth the more relevant features of one theory of cohesiveness, and then applied it to a complete text. Theoretical justification will remain important as more scholars begin applying the insights of modern linguistics to NT texts, especially in this early stage of the discussion. Analysis of cohesive ties, the model set forth by Halliday and Hasan, is often complex and time-consuming, especially with lengthy texts. The benefits, I hope, will stimulate New Testament scholars’ interest in this theoretical approach to the cohesive nature of texts.
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