This voluminous work — almost 1,000 pages on 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy — represents the inaugural contribution to the Eerdmans Critical Commentary. It is the sequel to Quinn's Anchor Bible commentary on Titus, published posthumously (and with much additional labor) by Quinn's student William Wacker. While only published in 2000, the present study is current until 1988 — a 12-year hiatus. The volume also includes a reprint of the "Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles" and the "New Translation of 1 and 2 Timothy" from the Titus commentary.

The book constitutes an important reference for the linguistic background of Paul's letters to Timothy. The primary audience of the work, however, will be scholars, owing to the rather technical form of presentation of the material. The material is divided into "Notes," which consist of parallel linguistic usage, and "Comment" sections, which deal with exegetical and theological observations. In his introduction, Quinn contends that the Pastoral Epistles were written, not by Paul, but in the post-Pauline period (AD 70–100) in order to counter the tendency of disparaging the apostle owing to his shameful end as a purported criminal (p. 20). As to the "recipients," Quinn conjectures that "not only Titus and Timothy but also the places to which the letters are addressed may have a typical or representative function" (p. 22). Quinn presupposes that Titus was written first and that 1 and 2 Timothy are to be understood as parts 2 and 3 in the "Pastoral epistle" corpus.

As far as the "Notes" are concerned, while their documentation of word usage in a variety of writings is helpful as a general reference, the practice of undifferentiated juxtaposition of parallel references has a similar effect as the Amplified Bible and may give the wrong impression that every adduced parallel is of equal value for the interpretation of the use of a given word in a specific passage in the Pastoral Epistles (see e.g. the comments on oikonomía on p. 63, where other NT references, instances in Ignatius, and the LXX are listed in that order and without further comment or distinction). Often the comments on a given word resemble a digest of diachronic usage (though not necessarily in chronological order, which can make things even more confusing) not unlike Kittel's TDNT, which renders this work open to similar criticisms as those leveled by James Barr against Kittel (see e.g. the treatment of agape on p. 65). Another difficulty is the degree of overlap between "Notes" and "Comment" sections (note the duplication of much of the oikonomía material from p. 63 on pp. 74–78).

Quinn's translation, while doubtless original, tends toward the idiosyncratic. Thus "promote controversies" (NIV) in 1:4 is rendered as "proffer lucubrations"; "rebels" in 1:9 are "refractory persons"; "violent man" in 1:13 is rendered as "insanely arrogant." In 2:2, prayers are urged for kings and all "in high station" (NIV: "those in authority"); women are to "make themselves attractive in a becoming costume" (2:9). In 2:12, "a wife" is not to teach in public worship or "to boss her husband." The examples could continue. Sometimes it is hard to know whether these are serious attempts at translation or exercises in stylistic subtlety and linguistic elegance.

Overall, then, I would recommend using Quinn-Wacker as a supplemental reference work on terminology in the Pastoral Epistles. The present work does not, however, replace conventional commentaries in that it rarely renders theological judgments (or even seriously discusses matters of theological import). Moreover, as mentioned above, the authors' failure to adequately screen possible parallels in order to adjudicate their actual relevance leaves this work to the user of this tome, which makes the material assembled rather unwieldy and difficult to digest. Having said this, there is doubtless much valuable information contained in this massive volume that, if sifted properly, has the potential of making a valuable contribution to the study of the Pastoral epistles.
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