

A MOSAIC OF MOSAIC INFLUENCE: DEUTERONOMY AND GUARDING THE GOOD DEPOSIT IN 2 TIMOTHY

KYLE J. KEESLING JR.*

Abstract: *The Pastoral Epistles present an intriguing test case on the New Testament's use of the Old Testament. Some scholars have contended that Old Testament themes do not play a central role in Paul's argument in 2 Timothy, even though a Deuteronomy-based Moses-Joshua paradigm has been argued for. However, that Moses-Joshua paradigm, combined with other elements from Moses's instruction in Deuteronomy, push against that contention. I argue that further connections can be made, in that a cluster of words and their associated themes suggest that Paul recontextualizes several Deuteronomic themes in his exhortations to Timothy about the good deposit in 2 Timothy. Central to both Moses's speeches and Paul's instruction is for the audience of each to (1) hear the testimony of God, (2) guard it diligently, (3) pass it on to the next generation, and (4) entrust it to faithful future leaders. Paul's recontextualizing of these themes reminds Timothy of his heritage while exhorting him to persevere in suffering for Christ and his church.*

Key words: *Deuteronomy, 2 Timothy, Mosaic influence, allusion, the good deposit, New Testament use of the Old Testament*

The Mosaic influence on NT studies can hardly be overstated, given the Pentateuch's foundational influence for all of Scripture. The Pentateuch is the bedrock of the whole biblical story and message. Take the pulse of the biblical writers, and some measure of the Pentateuch will be found in their messages.¹ However, the Pastoral Epistles (henceforth PE) have historically been understood to lack evidence of this influence. The only two places where Paul uses an explicit introductory formula or quotation are in 1 Timothy 5:18 and 2 Timothy 2:19.² The limited

* Kyle J. Keesling Jr. is a biblical worldview specialist at BJU Press in Greenville, South Carolina, and a PhD student at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. He may be contacted at kylejkeesling@gmail.com.

¹ Consider the importance assigned to the use of the Pentateuch in works such as *Exodus in the New Testament*, ed. Seth M. Ehorn, LNTS 663 (T&T Clark, 2022); *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, ed. Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, LNTS 358 (T&T Clark, 2007).

² Cf. B. Paul Wolfe, "The Sagacious Use of Scripture" in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*, ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Terry L. Wilder (B&H Academic, 2010), 199–218. I agree with Towner when he states that, generally speaking, in "one way or another questions of authorship have controlled ... readings" of the Pastoral Epistles. Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT (Eerdmans, 2006), 88. Although it appears Towner has since changed his stance on Pauline authorship, his statement reinforces the importance of being clear from the beginning regarding authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Regarding Towner's apparent shift in authorship opinion, see his concluding remarks in "2 Tim 1,7, Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal: The Intersection of Intertextuality and Paranomasia," *Bib* 101.4 (2020): 601. While the question of Pauline authorship is not the

number of quotations of the OT in the PE led Gerd Häfner to conclude “that the author of these letters is no expert in Scripture-based reasoning.”³ Häfner recognizes that “formulations, motives, or themes that are found in Israel’s Scriptures” are seen within the PE, but he believes that “they are usually nonspecific to the concerns of the letters.”⁴ While the PE tend to abstain from Scripture-based reasoning that uses quotations and elaborations, Häfner’s conclusion seems to suggest something more. The portrait being painted of the writer of the letters to Timothy and Titus by several scholars is one of an imitator who does not possess a breadth or depth of scriptural knowledge.⁵

Does the OT play a crucial role in Paul’s argument in the PE? I contend that it does. As I. Howard Marshall notes, “the influence of Scripture on [the biblical writers] thinking was wide and profound, even where scriptural citations and allusions are not present.”⁶ Taking the pulse of a biblical text does not require quotation to determine life. That is, the OT influence upon a text can consist solely of thematic undercurrents and still be central to the formulations, motives, and themes of both the NT passage and the related OT passage(s).⁷ Second Timothy

focal point of the present argument, I presume the authentic Pauline authorship of not only 2 Timothy but 1 Timothy and Titus as well. For a survey on the question of the Pastoral Epistles’ authorship, see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, AB 35A (Doubleday, 2001), 55–99. See also Stanley Porter’s more current survey in *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Baker Academic, 2023), 19–55.

³ Gerd Häfner, “Deuteronomy in the Pastoral Epistles,” in Menken and Moyise, *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, 137. C. M. Nielsen has a more far-reaching conclusion, veering toward a sort of “preMarcion Marcionism” regarding use of Pauline language by the author of the PE. C. M. Nielsen, “Scripture in the Pastoral Epistles,” *PRS* 7 (1980): 4–23. For a later response using such language, see B. Paul Wolfe, “Scripture in the Pastoral Epistles: PreMarcion Marcionism?,” *PRS* 16 (1989): 5–16.

⁴ Gerd Häfner, “Israel’s Scriptures in the Pastoral Epistles,” in *Israel’s Scriptures in Early Christian Writings: The Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. Matthias Henze and David Lincicum (Eerdmans, 2023), 454.

⁵ In fact, Häfner directly states that “one does not get the impression that it is the author who brings in such thematic or linguistic allusions because of his familiarity with the Scriptures” (“Israel’s Scriptures in the Pastoral Epistles,” 454). Granted, Häfner agrees that Scripture is of high value in the view of the author, but he does not see that admiration of Scripture reflected in the letters’ actual use of it. Another example is A. T. Hanson, who argued that the style of the PE leads one to suppose “that the author of the Pastorals had no theology of his own.” Rather, “he is a purveyor of other men’s theology.” A. T. Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* (S.P.C.K., 1968), 110. Years later Hanson argued that the use of the Old Testament in the PE illustrates that “when we compare the author of the Pastorals as an expounder of Scripture with Paul, we rightly conclude that he is greatly inferior.” That is not to say the author of the PE is not learned (“he was no amateur”), but simply not *as* learned as Paul (“inferior”). Hanson, “The Use of the Old Testament in the Pastoral Epistles,” *IBS* 3 (1981): 217.

⁶ I. Howard Marshall, *Beyond the Bible: Moving from Scripture to Theology* (Baker, 2004), 49. Marshall states, “Scripture provided the framework within which they thought by offering a worldview and a ‘Godview’ that they took over without question” (49).

⁷ Admittedly, assessing thematic undercurrents must be based on the data presented, and assessing allusions and echoes has been notoriously difficult. “To make matters more complicated,” Beale notes, “most commentators acknowledge that the validity of allusions must be judged along a spectrum of being virtually certain, probable, or possible, the latter being essentially equivalent to ‘echoes.’” G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Baker Academic, 2012), 31. Such a spectrum does not negate the evidence or the importance of the allusion. “Virtually

provides an excellent case study for analyzing the use of the OT in the PE. To relate 2 Timothy more intentionally to the prior question, what function, if any, does the OT play in Paul's instruction to Timothy? Paul's instruction centers on encouragement for Timothy to guard the good deposit entrusted to him (τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, 2 Tim 1:14).⁸ Does this central instruction allude to Israel's Scriptures?

In what follows, I argue that in 2 Timothy a cluster of words and their associated themes indicate that Paul recontextualizes several Deuteronomic elements in his exhortations to Timothy regarding the gospel message.⁹ That is, Paul brings several words and their related ideas from Deuteronomy into a new context as he exhorts Timothy. Specifically, the following undergird Moses's and Paul's teachings: (1) the testimonies (τιτὺς, μαρτυρία) of God are heard (ἡκούω, ἀκούω), (2) kept (ῥησ, φυλάσσω) with zeal in the face of ungodliness, (3) passed on from generation to generation,¹⁰ and (4) entrusted (ὑποτίθημι, παρατίθημι) to future faithful leaders.

I. SITUATING THE MOSAIC

The cluster of words and their associated themes being examined in this article do not exhaust the Mosaic influence in 2 Timothy specifically nor the PE generally. Neither are these themes a novel proposal; they build upon prior scholarship on Deuteronomic themes in the PE. Some scholars have concluded, contrary to Häfner and other like-minded scholars, that the PE presents a rich OT substructure

certain" allusions might feel grander than those that are "possible," but the interpreter must nonetheless wrestle with the thematic overlaps and consider the potential exegetical function as well. A "possible" allusion can still offer worthwhile insight. For prominent voices alongside and contrary to Beale in the discussion of allusions and echoes, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale University Press, 1989); Stanley E. Porter, *Sacred Tradition in the New Testament: Tracing Old Testament Themes in the Gospels and Epistles* (Baker Academic, 2016).

⁸ References to the gospel deposit (παραθήκη) are found in both 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy. Nonetheless, there remains warrant to consider the latter apart from the former because 2 Timothy is considered in critical scholarship to contain the most undisputed Pauline influence. Moreover, scholars on both sides of the authorship debate have seen positives to treating the letters individually as well as collectively. Cf. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 29, 89; David W. Pao, *1–2 Timothy, Titus*, Brill Exegetical Commentary Series 1 (Brill, 2024), 2; Richard B. Hays, "Developments of the Pauline Tradition" in *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (HarperCollins, 1996), 61; I. Howard Marshall, in collaboration with Philip H. Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, ICC (T&T Clark, 1999), 85.

⁹ By "Deuteronomic" I do not intend the negative meanings some associate with the term. Specifically, I do not have in view Deuteronomy's occasional association with legalistic perspectives nor do I agree that "the terms 'deuteronomic' and 'deuteronomistic' have often been used pejoratively to suggest a simplistic theology of reward and punishment [in Deuteronomy]" (J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy*, ApOTC 5 [InterVarsity Press, 2002], 43). Rather, my objective in using such language is to illustrate allusive connections between language associated with Deuteronomy's themes, problems, and arguments with Paul's in 2 Timothy.

¹⁰ Though certain elements are involved in the theme of passing on testimonies from one generation to the next (to be discussed below), no single term stands out in association with this theme.

and argumentation.¹¹ Three examples of such scholarship will provide context for my argument.

First, Martin Feltham has recently argued for an allusive echo of the Shema (Deut 6:4) in 1 Timothy 2:5–6.¹² Feltham does not confine his analysis to the Shema but extends the allusive connections to their “Deuteronomic context.”¹³ Since the Shema reverberates throughout Moses’s exhortations in Deuteronomy, Feltham illustrates that the rest of the Deuteronomic context enhances his interpretive endeavor.¹⁴ According to Feltham, 1 Timothy 2:5–6 is an intentional recrafting of the Shema in order to have “one targeted effect—the christologically driven opening up of God’s people to all nations.”¹⁵ Evidently, then, the incorporation of Deuteronomic elements is not tangential to Paul’s argument in 1 Timothy; rather, it “is perfectly tailored to the polemical and rhetorical needs of the letter.”¹⁶ Although dealing with 1 Timothy, not 2 Timothy, Feltham’s article illustrates the importance of Deuteronomy’s teaching in the PE generally and thus provides initial impetus to explore potential Deuteronomic influences in 2 Timothy specifically.

¹¹ For example, Coleman argues that “the Pastor himself has utilized an extensive and sophisticated vocabulary of educational and instructional words in writing his Epistles,” contending that the PE contain a high use of wisdom literature verbiage. Theodore Hamilton Coleman Jr., “Interpretation of the Pastoral Epistles and Some Selected Old Testament Wisdom Elements” (PhD diss., Duke University, 1977), 239. Towner presents a number of insightful considerations for allusions and echoes. Philip H. Towner, “1–2 Timothy and Titus,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. D. A. Carson and G. K. Beale (Baker, 2007), 891–918. Wolfe argues that readers “could reasonably say that these letters reflect the work of a mature biblical theologian, at home in the text of Scripture and using it subtly and powerfully” (“The Sagacious Use of Scripture,” 217–18). He continues by saying the author uses Scripture “subtly and powerfully to make proclamation, to correct doctrinal error and ethical deviation, and to provide guidance for the church in transition. In doing so, Paul sets a final example for his co-workers and the churches to pay close attention to the Word and handle it carefully” (217–18). Furthermore, Köstenberger and Goswell conclude that the PE “are firmly built upon the substructure of Old Testament theology.” Andreas J. Köstenberger and Gregory Goswell, *Biblical Theology: A Canonical, Thematic, and Ethical Approach* (Crossway, 2023), 602. Kowalski likewise connects the PE with OT instruction; see Beate Kowalski, “Zur Funktion und Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Pastoralbriefen,” *SNTSU A* 19 (1994): 45–68. These examples do not exhaust the scholarship that sees similar importance of the OT in the PE, but they provide grounding for the point being made in the present study.

¹² Martin Feltham, “1 Timothy 2:5–6 as a Christological Reworking of the Shema,” *TynBul* 68.2 (2017): 241–60.

¹³ Feltham, “1 Timothy 2:5–6,” 242.

¹⁴ Similar implications follow from the four Deuteronomic connections discussed below. These instances could be grouped as a larger interplay between the Shema and its Deuteronomic context, as Feltham’s argument does. However, because such grouping at the start might cloud the contributions of each characteristic, this study diverges from Feltham’s argumentation logic and seeks to analyze each of the thematic undertones in succession. Certainly, overlaps exist among the four examples, but this does not discredit the benefits of separating them for a time. The overlaps evidence the cohesion whereas the unique contributions of each example bolster both the individual nuances and the thematic whole.

¹⁵ Feltham, “1 Timothy 2:5–6,” 256.

¹⁶ Feltham, “1 Timothy 2:5–6,” 259.

Second, an underappreciated relationship between 2 Timothy and Deuteronomy has been argued by Seán Martin.¹⁷ Martin centers his argument around *authority*, that is, the authority of Moses in Deuteronomy and the similar authority of Paul in 2 Timothy. From Martin's viewpoint, Paul fulfills the prophecy for a future prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15–18).¹⁸ While some of the connections he finds are linguistic, others are more contextual. In the beginning of his study, Martin organizes these correlations into two categories: direct and indirect references to Moses:¹⁹

Direct:

- The Lord knows who are his regarding Korah's rebellion and false teachers standing against right leaders in Numbers 16:5 and 2 Timothy 2:19.
- The magicians of Exodus 7:11 and 9:11 are noted in 2 Timothy 3:8.²⁰

Indirect:

- Moses's laying his hands on Joshua in passing on authority in Deuteronomy 34:9 is mirrored by Paul reminding Timothy of him doing similarly in 2 Timothy 1:6–7.²¹
- Language related to the servant of the Lord in Deuteronomy 34:5 comes up in Paul's discussion of the Lord's servant in 2 Timothy 2:24.
- Language related to the man of God in Deuteronomy 33:1 is reflected in 2 Timothy 3:17.
- The exhortation to be strong and courageous in Deuteronomy 31:6 (repeated to Joshua later) mimics the command for Timothy to be strong in 2 Timothy 2:1 (cf. 1:7).

The direct and indirect references are merely the starting point to Martin's argument. He continues by noting the similarities between Deuteronomy/Moses and 2 Timothy/Paul in that, according to Martin, they are both works in the testimony genre. Martin analyzed various texts through a typological lens, using the categories of prophet, lawgiver, and sufferer. Luke Timothy Johnson and I. Howard Marshall critique this categorization, focusing primarily on Martin's suggestion of the letter

¹⁷ Seán C. Martin, *Pauli Testamentum: 2 Timothy and the Last Words of Moses*, TGST 18 (Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1999). See also the similar work of Michael Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition*, FRLANT 146 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988).

¹⁸ Martin is not alone in understanding Paul to be the New Testament Moses. For example, see the concluding remarks in Daniel I. Block, "Recovering the Voice of Moses: The Genesis of Deuteronomy," *JETS* 44.3 (2001): 408.

¹⁹ Martin, *Pauli Testamentum*, 19–43.

²⁰ Although the Exodus narrative does not name the magicians, later tradition names them "Jannes" and "Jambres." For information in addition to Martin's work, see Dale C. Allison Jr., "Jannes and Jambres (Book and Persons)" in *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*, vol. 13 (de Gruyter, 2016), 753–58; Lester L. Grabbe, "The Jannes/Jambres Tradition in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Its Date," *JBL* 98.3 (1979): 393–401.

²¹ Through a sequence of similar words, Graham characterizes this indirect reference as a likely echo, drawing similar connections to the Moses-Joshua paradigm seen in Paul-Timothy. However, he does not engage with Martin's *Pauli Testamentum*. Brett Martin Graham, "Echoes of Scripture and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in the Pastoral Epistles: Including a Method of Identifying High-interest Parallels" (PhD diss., University of Sydney, 2018), 170.

as a testimony genre.²² That is, although 2 Timothy contains elements associated with Paul's life, teaching, and suffering, the letter's structure and focus remains that of a paraenetic letter rather than a last testimony. Johnson brings attention to the account of Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20 as reflecting the testimony genre more accurately.²³ The focus of Johnson's and Marshall's critiques took exception to the fundamental direction of Martin's argument rather than discussing it part by part.²⁴ However, Martin's analyses nonetheless provide data to reinforce the Deuteronomic, and specifically Mosaic, material in Paul's second letter to Timothy.²⁵

Third, Philip Towner argued that 2 Timothy 1:7 contains a double intertextual connection: first with Romans 8:15 and second with a "web of texts related to the tradition of Joshua succeeding Moses."²⁶ The latter connection contains several elements related to the mosaic of Mosaic instruction in 2 Timothy, though Towner does not explore them all in great detail, opening the door for the further development this essay provides.

The foundational connection Towner elaborates is Paul's instruction for Timothy to be strong and to avoid cowardice, reinforcing the Moses-Joshua paradigm. Towner notes three additional lexical connections to this concept: (1) φυλάσσω with the "observance/keeping of the authorized teaching" in 2 Timothy 1:14, (2) σύνεσις corresponding with the Moses-Joshua transition (Josh 1:7; 23:6; Deut 4:2; 30:10, 16; 32:46), and (3) ἐγκαταλείπω with the "fundamental sin of forsaking God and going after other gods."²⁷ These lexical connections tie in with the reminder against fear to "create a harmony of echoes of the Moses-Joshua transition, presenting positive exhortation and models, on the one hand, and shadowy alternative consequences on the other."²⁸ Towner's analyses connect the prior notions of the Shema in the PE (Feltham) with the Moses-Joshua paradigm in 2 Timothy (Martin) and develops them further. However, it would be a mistake to discuss φυλάσσω in 2 Timothy 1:14 without acknowledging its relationship to παραθήκη. Each of the three instances of παραθήκη have φυλάσσω as their verbal connection. Furthermore, not going toward other gods is part of the larger picture in Deuteronomy of not veering from faithfulness, interrelated with the guarding

²² I. Howard Marshall, "The Pastoral Epistles in Recent Study," in Köstenberger and Wilder, *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul's Theology in the Pastoral Epistles*, 285–86; Cf. Johnson's discussion of the question of genre in *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 321–24.

²³ Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 321.

²⁴ Collins also locates 2 Timothy in the genre of testimony, though he does not draw out this identification in the same way as Martin nor does he interact with Martin's work. Raymond F. Collins, *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary*, NTL (Westminster John Knox, 2002), 181–85.

²⁵ Towner has likewise drawn positive contributions from Martin's work. Although Towner focuses primarily on Wolter's *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition*, Martin and Wolter are analyzing a similar phenomenon.

²⁶ Towner, "2 Tim 1,7, Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal," 577.

²⁷ Towner, "2 Tim 1,7, Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal," 579–80.

²⁸ Towner, "2 Tim 1,7, Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal," 580.

(φυλάσσω) of God's commands (e.g., Deut 5:32–33). These connections do not detract from Towner's argument or contribution. There simply appears to be more "harmony of echoes" than what Towner brings up.

While OT quotations rarely occur in the PE, Deuteronomic elements appear to be intertwined with the instruction of 1–2 Timothy. The influence of Deuteronomic and Mosaic material in the PE generally, and 2 Timothy specifically, aligns with criteria for establishing allusions. At present, the connections are sporadic and semi-related. They are pieces of a mosaic placed out of order and apart from one another. Moses's influence on those pieces of the mosaic is evident, but what sort of picture the mosaic shows when put together has not been discussed. So, while the Mosaic influence noted by prior scholarship comprises an intriguing amount, the influence of Deuteronomy on and in 2 Timothy does not stop there.²⁹

II. A MOSAIC OF MOSAIC INFLUENCE

The existence of Deuteronomic evidence warrants further investigation. What follows will compare the previously mentioned four themes in Moses's speeches in Deuteronomy with the same four in Paul's instruction in 2 Timothy. The evidence for cohesion between Moses's speeches and Paul's instruction is cumulative, focusing on a cluster of lexemes and their related themes as fundamental to both texts. The context for each of the four themes will be briefly laid out, discussing the problems Moses is addressing and his related argumentation in Deuteronomy.³⁰ Then each of the four themes is explored in 2 Timothy and connected to the prior Deuteronomic evidence. Again, the following elements are present in both Moses's and Paul's instruction: (1) the testimonies of God are heard, (2) kept with zeal in the face of ungodliness, (3) passed on from generation to generation, and (4) entrusted to future faithful leaders.

1. *The testimonies of God are heard.* As the Israelites approached the Promised Land, Moses delivered his last written sequence of speeches to Israel. He reminded them of how God had saved them, the necessity of God remaining central in their lives then, and the faithfulness of God to keep his promises in the future. At the

²⁹ The language of "mosaics" is not just a word play with Moses's name. The language brings to mind P. N. Harrison's argument in *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford University Press, 1921), where he contends that "[the writer's] first page is a wonderful mosaic of phrases from the genuine Paulines, most carefully and skillfully fitted together. As he proceeds, and the necessity arises to make the Apostle speak still more clearly and directly to the heart and to the condition of this new time, he begins to compose more freely, and in doing so falls inevitably out of the Pauline style and phraseology into his own looser, less nervous, and less rugged style, and into the current vocabulary of his own day" (11–12). Harrison was arguing from a more positive pseudepigraphy; in fact, his argument grounds some of the thinking of I. Howard Marshall's positive spin on pseudepigraphy coined "allepigraphy" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 83–84). While Harrison contended that the opening sections of 2 Timothy offered a mosaic of *Pauline* ideals, the shift argued in the present treatment is that the opening sections offer up a mosaic of *Mosaic* ideals.

³⁰ This approach echoes Beale's reminder of the importance of connecting the "theme, argument, [and] problems" when analyzing potential allusions (*Handbook*, 46).

center of Deuteronomy's theology is the command for Israel to listen (שָׁמַע; ἀκούε, LXX) to the words of the Lord through his servant Moses.³¹ The most famous of the occurrences of this command, the Shema, comes near the beginning of the stipulations in chapter 6.³²

Believed by most scholars to be leading into a great call for monotheism in Israel,³³ Moses starts Deuteronomy 6:4 with the command "Hear, O Israel" (שָׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל).³⁴ The verb שָׁמַע, central to the teaching that follows, occurs several times throughout Moses's speeches (Deut 4:1; 5:1; 6:4; 9:1; 20:3; 27:9), and the triconsonantal root occurs many more times in the discourse.³⁵ Moses urges the people of Israel to listen, be attentive, and give their ears to the teachings of God. Subsequently, he declares that love must characterize their entire dedication as they lived out what God told them through him (Deut 6:5–6). Obedience was not meant to be an emotionless ritual.

Just as Deuteronomy is a collection of Moses's last speeches to Israel, Paul's address in 2 Timothy is his end-of-life charge to Timothy. As such, Paul is characterized in 2 Timothy as looking toward the future of Christ's church, seeing the need to pass the torch to future leadership.³⁶ Between the two instances of

³¹ Scholars have proposed several ideas regarding the structure of Moses's speeches in Deuteronomy, from focusing on chiasms to comparing Deuteronomy with suzerain-vassal treaties. For example, see Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9*, rev. ed., WBC 6A (Nelson, 2001), lviii; Meredith G. Kline, *The Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary* (Eerdmans, 1963), 62–120.

³² While there are disagreements over where the stipulations occur (or even whether that is a proper designation), the idea that chapter 6 is located near the beginning of the stipulations follows Meredith Kline's proposal that the stipulations are 5:1–26:49 (Kline, *The Treaty of the Great King*).

³³ Scholars disagree over the proper interpretation of the four Hebrew words that follow the Shema's exhortation. While scholars on all sides tend to recognize Scripture as calling for monotheistic religion overall, they disagree over whether Deuteronomy 6:4 has that in mind. For examples of those focusing on the unity of God, see Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Eerdmans, 1976), 168–69; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 141. For examples of those focusing on the Shema as calling for singular devotion, but not necessarily universal monotheism (that is, devotion to one god among many rather than only one God existing), see Jeffrey Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary (Jewish Publication Society of America, 1996), 76; Daniel I. Block, "How Many Is God? An Investigation into the Meaning of Deuteronomy 6:4–5," *JETS* 47.2 (2004): 211. For a mixed approach geared toward the Shema's application to Christianity today, see R. W. L. Moberly, "'Yahweh Is One': The Translation of the Shema," in *Studies in the Pentateuch*, ed. J. A. Emerton (Brill, 1990), 209–15; Moberly, "Toward an Interpretation of the Shema," in *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*, ed. Christopher Seitz and Katheryn Greene-McCreight (Eerdmans, 1999), 124–44; Moberly, "A Love Supreme," in *Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture* (Baker Academic, 2013), 7–40.

³⁴ Translations are the author's own.

³⁵ Deut 1:16, 17, 34, 43, 45; 2:25; 3:26; 4:6, 10, 12, 28, 30, 32, 33, 36; 5:23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28; 6:3, 7:12; 8:20; 9:2, 19, 23; 10:10; 11:13, 27, 28; 12:28; 13:4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 19; 15:5; 17:4, 12, 13; 18:14, 15, 16, 19; 19:20; 21:18, 20, 21; 23:6; 26:7, 14, 17; 27:10; 28:1, 2, 13, 15, 45, 49, 62; 29:3, 18; 30:2, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17, 20; 31:12, 13; 32:1; 33:7; 34:9.

³⁶ Luke alone accompanies Paul as the letter is penned (2 Tim 4:11), likely bringing another familiar face to Timothy as Paul encourages him forward. Luke's inclusion and several Lukan-like uses of language led some to believe Luke wrote the PE, or at least 2 Timothy, with different variations of a Lukan writer having been proposed. For further research generally on amanuensis or secretarial hypotheses, see

παραθήκη, Paul engages the key Deuteronomic verb ἀκούω as he exhorts Timothy to “follow the model of sound words that you have heard from me” (ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων ὧν παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας, 2 Tim 1:13). Like the Israelites in Deuteronomy, though, Timothy is not being called to hear and follow vague words from Paul. The good deposit contains those sound words (ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων).³⁷

Some scholars contend that the reference here is solely to Pauline words and sayings—that is, to an explicitly Pauline tradition being passed along.³⁸ Others focus their attention on the centrality of the gospel message (sometimes viewed *in addition to* tradition) in all the ways Paul lived, thought, and taught as evident in 2 Timothy’s teaching (e.g., 2 Tim 2:8).³⁹ Either way, Towner puts his finger on something when he notes,

This *paratheke* language reflects some development in the notion of “tradition” as compared with other Pauline discussions. Elsewhere reflections on “tradition” focused on “accepting” and “maintaining” the apostolic gospel (1 Cor 11:2; 15:1; Gal 1:14; Col 2:6; 2 Thess 2:15; 3:6). However, in the letters to Timothy, and particularly in 2 Timothy where the imminence of the apostle’s departure and the threat posed by heresy are in view, the accent shifts to the idea of the secure transmission of “the deposit” to the next generation. The concept is absent from Titus.⁴⁰

Both suggestions appear interrelated. The words Timothy has heard from Paul, namely that which consists of the gospel in all its facets, were central to everything Timothy was to live out in response to Paul’s guidance in 2 Timothy. Second Timothy 3:14–17 reinforces the importance of heeding what Timothy had heard from his family and Paul and how the teaching ought to shape his heart and actions.

William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, WBC 46 (Nelson, 2000), cxxvii–cxxxix. Concerning research on the purely Lukan amanuensis, see C. F. D. Moule, “The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal,” *BJRL* 47.2 (1964–1965): 430–52; Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Pastorals* (London: SPCK, 1979); Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1–2 Timothy, and 1–3 John* (IVP Academic, 2006).

³⁷ Collins explicitly connects them together, saying that “the ‘model of sound words’ *is* the precious treasure that had been entrusted to Timothy. That treasure, whose import is emphasized by the adjective ‘precious,’ appropriate to the metaphor ‘treasure,’ is the treasure that had been entrusted to Paul (v. 12). Acting to ensure the proper transmission of the treasure for safekeeping from one generation to the next is the Holy Spirit” (*1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 213, my emphasis).

³⁸ For example, see E. Earle Ellis, “Traditions in the Pastoral Epistles,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, Homage Series 10 (Scholars Press, 1987), 252–53; Hays, “Developments of the Pauline Tradition,” 69–70; Nick Needham, “Tradition in 2 Timothy,” *Evangel* 17.1 (1999): 6–9; Philip Towner, “Pauline Theology or Pauline Tradition in the Pastoral Epistles: The Question of Method,” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 287–314.

³⁹ For example, see Pao, *1–2 Timothy, Titus*, 408. Lau, from whom Pao draws, describes the deposit as “legal binding of the delivered tradition by the depositor.” Andrew Y. Lau, *Manifest in Flesh: The Epiphany Christology of the Pastoral Epistles*, WUNT 2/86 (Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 27. For a survey of the general topic of teaching in the PE, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *Commentary on 1–2 Timothy and Titus*, Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation (Holman, 2017), 386–412.

⁴⁰ Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 55.

In summary, Timothy was to follow these words “in the faith and love that are in Christ Jesus” (ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 2 Tim 1:13). That is, his response was to be in such a way that faith and love accompanied it.⁴¹ Both were to characterize Timothy’s response to the words heard. Just as Israel was to love the Lord in response to the Shema’s call (Deut 6:5–6), Timothy was likewise to respond in love in Jesus Christ to Paul’s call (2 Tim 1:13). On the one hand, Israel’s devotion was directed toward God while, on the other hand, Timothy’s derived from God and moved toward others. In both cases, the hearing of commands was central to the instruction, and love was expected to flow out from obeying that which was heard.

2. *The testimonies of God are kept with zeal in the face of ungodliness.* While the verb שמע itself encapsulates obedience to what is heard, it is not the extent of the verbiage Moses uses to call for an obedient Israel. The expectation was not set upon them without Moses following it up with instruction. “The obedience that is called for,” Peter Craigie observes, “will not be blind obedience, but an obedience based on understanding.”⁴² Another verb that occurs in several places close to שמע is שמר (“keep, guard,” φυλάσσω, LXX). Both *bear* and *keep* function together to beckon Israel toward faithfulness. Careful and diligent care was to categorize their entire lives.⁴³ The Israelites were to be careful not to veer to the left or to the right (Deut 5:32). In every step, God’s word was to be the standard for their lives (as evident in the sequence of Deuteronomy 6:4–9).

At each stage in Moses’s speeches, the testimonies, statutes, and rules were explained (e.g., Deut 4:45).⁴⁴ Oftentimes the latter two, statutes (טְּשֻׁבָּה, δικάϊωματα,

⁴¹ This combination is not unique to 2 Timothy 1:13; rather, the combination is typical for the PE to such an extent that Towner concludes that they are “a summary of Christian existence” and “encompass the vertical relationship of trust in God and the horizontal outworking of this in service to others” (Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 142). For backdrop to some of the research regarding “faith and love” in the PE, I am indebted to Charles Bumgardner, “Salvation in the Letters to Timothy and Titus” (unpublished paper, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018).

⁴² Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, 129. After all, “the verb *bear* ... carries with it the sense ‘obey’: hearing that leads to obedience is demanded of the people” (147).

⁴³ McConville connects Deuteronomy, in at least one way, with wisdom material. In every corner of their lives, the word was to direct their feelings, actions, and words. Regarding Deuteronomy “as wisdom, the book offers training in the right way to live, and in this respect is closer to Proverbs than to anything else. Like Proverbs, it is open to the objection of theological simplicity, appearing to offer material blessing in return for a good life. This is unfair to both books. The training of wisdom insists that what is right is also useful, because of the claim that there is order in the universe, moral as well as natural. Both books, in their separate ways, know that life cannot be reduced to simple equations, however; Deuteronomy’s theology of mercy for an errant people is the clearest illustration of the point. And yet the claim about a divine order in the creation is still entered. And people are called to be trained in what is right, not merely to avoid retribution, but because a full and joyful human experience depends on the acknowledgment that life is a gift of God” (*Deuteronomy*, 43–44).

⁴⁴ אֵלֶּה הָעֲדוּת וְהַחֻקִּים וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים, ταῦτα τὰ μαρτύρια καὶ τὰ δικάϊωματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα, LXX, “These are the testimonies, the statutes, and the rules.”

LXX) and rules (ῥῆ, κρίματα, LXX), occur together as synonyms.⁴⁵ Scholars disagree over what the third, testimonies (ἑκτεῖς), means. Some scholars, such as J. G. McConville, lean toward it being close to a third synonym wherein in some cases “they refer to individual commands” and in others “they stand for the body of law as propounded in Deut. 5–26.”⁴⁶ On the other hand, it can also reflect the written or verbal witness of one’s words and actions.⁴⁷ The commands of God and the acts of God are both important to be kept on the minds and hearts of Israel. They cannot be divorced or substituted; they reinforce one another. When questioned on the meaning of the testimonies, statutes, and rules, Moses instructs the people to answer that the meaning behind them is the power of God in his saving them from Egypt (Deut 6:20–25). The hand of God brought them out of Egypt (6:21), and God sustains Israel with their best in mind (6:24).

Hearing the words and obeying in love were not to be the extent of Timothy’s response, either. The παραθήκη is always accompanied with a command for someone to guard it (φυλάσσω, 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:12, 14).⁴⁸ False teachers were leading the church astray, steering people away from true knowledge (1 Tim 6:20–21; 2 Tim 2:14–18). In light of these circumstances, Paul reminds Timothy that God’s word had to be the standard (2 Tim 2:19), the paradigm that Timothy must follow. While tradition and holy Scripture have a high level of authority throughout the PE, the supremacy of God’s word is most evident in the instruction of 2 Timothy. Timothy was to hear, remember, guard, and hold fast to what he had learned from the Scriptures and those who taught him from it so that he would hold fast to his salvation (2 Tim 3:14–15). Similar to the Israelites in Deuteronomy, Paul calls Timothy to remember he cannot do it on his own, but the Holy Spirit indwells him, empowering and sustaining him (e.g., 2 Tim 1:5–7, 14).

Paul’s teachings remind Timothy of his continual need in a way similar to Moses’s calls to Israel in Deuteronomy. This time, however, it is within a NT context. Before Paul exhorts Timothy in 1:13–14, he urges Timothy not to be ashamed “of the testimony of our Lord” (τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 2 Tim 1:8). Timothy was to keep Paul’s teachings close and stand firm regarding the testimony of Christ and Paul. The testimony was not lists of rules but rather “publicly observed

⁴⁵ See Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, 129n2; Tigay notes that “in actual usage, Moses employs the terms without distinction,” but “in traditional Jewish exegesis, *hukkim* and *mishpatim* are understood as referring to two broad categories of commandments” (*Deuteronomy*, 43).

⁴⁶ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 103. See also Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 43.

⁴⁷ Tigay specifically notes that this view is more “homiletically attractive in its own right,” but he still leans toward the word referring “to the terms or stipulations of a treaty (*‘edut*) imposed by a suzerain on a vassal” (*Deuteronomy*, 43).

⁴⁸ While many scholars interpret 2 Timothy 1:12 as between Paul and God—with 1:14 being between Paul and Timothy—Krauter has recently argued that it is better to understand it as Paul reaffirming *Timothy* as the one who can guard the entrusted material. Stefan Krauter, “Ich weiß, wem ich mein Depositum anvertraut habe” (2 Tim 1,12), *BZ* 68.1 (2024): 131–44. Nonetheless, the point being made here is that *guarding* (φυλάσσω) the teaching is continuously in view surrounding the deposit (παραθήκη).

phenomena.”⁴⁹ Greg Couser has argued that a more dynamic understanding would render the phrase as follows: “the testimony the Lord bore, in his words and life, to the saving plan of God.”⁵⁰ What Couser has subtly illustrated for the present discussion is the interrelation of the teachings of God and the actions of God in the world. They cannot be divorced. Certainly, Christ’s words and life were “observed phenomena,” but they were likewise heard, repeated, written down, and spread.

In summary, Israel was supposed to keep the testimonies, speaking every moment of their lives about them and the commandments and statutes of God. Likewise, Timothy was supposed to keep the good deposit, not being ashamed of the Lord’s testimony. He was to be strengthened so that he could share in the suffering for the gospel’s sake, relying on God alone (2 Tim 1:8–10). Just as the testimonies reminded Israel that everything they received was by the strong hand of God rather than themselves (e.g., Deut 6:10–25), likewise Timothy is reminded that all of this is by the power of God (2 Tim 1:8; cf. 1:9–10).

3. *The testimonies of God are passed down from generation to generation.* While Israel was supposed to faithfully keep God’s words, spoken through Moses, it was not just an individual or corporate concern. It was also familial. That is, while Israel’s various tribes represent the growth of a family broadly speaking, God’s commands were also meant to be kept and fostered within the immediate family. Moses instructs Israel at several places in Deuteronomy to pass on the faith to their children (Deut 4:9; 6:7; 11:19; 32:46). This instruction finds its origin in God’s command to Abraham in Genesis 18:19. Scripture was to permeate every aspect of their lives, whether sitting, walking, rising, sleeping, talking, or writing—every aspect of their lives was called to be faithful to God’s word. No domains of life were neutral to devotion to God. Neither was the passing on of faith a passive; it involved questions and answers with one’s offspring (e.g., Exod 12:26–27; 13:8, 14; Deut 6:20–25; Josh 4:6–7; cf. Ps 76:4–6; Joel 1:3).⁵¹

Certainly, the covenantal context of Deuteronomy reinforces the importance of educating one’s children. Adult Israelites were reminded continuously how forgetful they were (Deut 4:9, 23; 6:12; 8:11, 14, 19; 9:7; 25:19; 26:13).⁵² The faithful-

⁴⁹ Robert W. Yarbrough, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, PNTC (Eerdmans, 2018), 358.

⁵⁰ Greg A. Couser, “‘The Testimony About the Lord,’ ‘Borne by the Lord,’ or Both? An Insight into Paul and Jesus in the Pastoral Epistles (2 Tim. 1:8),” *TynBul* 55.2 (2004): 295–316.

⁵¹ While discussing Deuteronomy 6:1–9, Brueggemann notes that “if [the commandments, statutes, and testimonies are] kept so focally, then [they] will be effectively transmitted to the children. Deuteronomy always has its eyes on the children, on the coming generation.” Walter Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, AOTC (Abingdon, 2001), 85. Brueggemann later concludes that “Israel has always known that the claiming of the next generation is no automatic process but requires great intentionality” (93). Additionally, he connects this conclusion with Jan Assman’s argument for memories being traded from one generation to the next if instruction is ignored, typically exchanging the older generation’s tradition or part of culture for “something else.” “In Deuteronomy, the ‘something else’ was ‘Canaanite religion’ in its many forms” (93). Cf. Jan Assman, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung, und politische Identität in früher Hochkulturen* (C. H. Beck, 1992).

⁵² For example, Moberly concludes that “it is teachability for Israel generally that Moses in Deuteronomy 8 portrays as the purpose of the manna.” R. W. L. Moberly, *Old Testament Theology: Reading the*

ness of their progeny was likewise a constant reminder (Deut 4:9; 6:7; 11:19; 32:46; cf. Gen 18:19; Judg 2:6–10; Ps 78:4–6; Prov 22:6). In the context of Deuteronomy, the blessing and curse language reminds the Israelites of the consequences for unfaithfulness. The faithlessness of one's children, for example, is lamented in Moses's song as Israel is described both as God's children and a perverse generation (Deut 32:20; cf. 1:34). The children, like the adults, were not to trade faithfulness to God for idolatrous service of other gods. This is a paramount concern as they look toward the Promised Land. Moses sets an example for them of the repercussions as he continuously reminds them throughout Deuteronomy that he will not be going with them (Deut 1:37; 3:23, 27; 32:52; 34:4).

Similar emphases underline Paul's instruction in 2 Timothy. The strength Timothy received from God was only part of Paul's encouraging reminder; Timothy's own family informs the letter's tone from the start. Paul also initiates the letter by describing his relationship with Timothy in a parental manner, calling him his "beloved child" (2 Tim 1:2, cf. 1 Tim 1:2). In Paul's thanksgiving prayer, he thanks God, comparing himself with his ancestors (2 Tim 1:3). As Paul remembers Timothy in his prayers and recalls Timothy's tears, he is reminded of Timothy's family. His mother and grandmother, Lois and Eunice, not only serve as affectionate reminders to Paul of their sincere faith, but also encourage Paul's confidence in Timothy's sincerity of faith (2 Tim 1:5). Thanksgivings in Paul's letters often clue in readers regarding important facets of his letter.⁵³ The inclusion of Lois and Eunice, as well as Paul's own ancestry, is, however, atypical of his thanksgivings.⁵⁴ Although scholars tend not to point to intentional allusion as the reason, several connect the inclusion with the larger picture of 2 Timothy. The influence of parents and grandparents coheres with OT teaching and reinforces the importance of "generational continuity in God's service."⁵⁵ Paul often undergirds his thanksgivings with OT

Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture (Baker Academic, 2013), 96. The teachability for Israel was not because they were apt at remembering. Rather, so many times it could be said, as Moberly notes, that it is "a truth that is in danger of being unlearned and forgotten in the promised land, where life is easier" (96).

⁵³ Peter Arzt-Grabner, "Paul's Letter Thanksgiving," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, *Pauline Studies* 6 (Brill, 2010), 156.

⁵⁴ Köstenberger, *Commentary on 1–2 Timothy and Titus*, 211–12.

⁵⁵ Köstenberger, *Commentary on 1–2 Timothy and Titus*, 211. Bumgardner notes, "Though Paul does not appear to be making any direct allusion to the OT in either 2 Tim 1:5 or 2 Tim 3:15, the religious instruction of children by Jewish parents is consistent with OT teaching. Grounded in texts such as Deut 6:6–7 and Prov 1:8, primary education (at least) in ancient Israel seems to have been a home-based and Torah-focused affair.... The instruction Lois and Eunice provided for Timothy in the sacred writings stood in continuity with such education [as described by Josephus], and Paul's approval indicates that he did as well." Charles Joseph Bumgardner, "Family Relationships in the Letters to Timothy and Titus" (PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2020), 229–30. The distinction being made in the present treatment, however, is that the culmination of various allusive aspects makes it probable that Paul is making an *indirect* allusion to Moses's instruction and example in Deuteronomy.

concepts; so the inclusion here makes sense even though the generational focus is an outlier.⁵⁶

The faithfulness of one's children was also a concern Paul had already voiced to Timothy. In his first letter to his protégé, he specified that one of the characteristics required of elders and deacons is the managing of their household (1 Tim 3:4–5, 12).⁵⁷ Faith is one of the central concerns of the PE; the basis for Paul's exhortation to guard the deposit is the faith that resides in Timothy—a faith first seen in Lois and Eunice but that now also dwells in him.

In summary, both Moses and Paul emphasize the importance of passing on the testimonies of God from generation to generation. In Deuteronomy, generational faithfulness held high expectations, and faithlessness brought with it dire consequences (cf. Deut 32:20).⁵⁸ Although a specific precursor text does not stand out, Paul roots the following paraenetic material in the blessing of Timothy's generational faith as a gift of God, something not foreign to Mosaic instruction in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 4:9; 6:7; 11:19; 32:46).⁵⁹ Where 2 Timothy diverges is in the difference between Moses and Paul; while Moses reminded Israel that he could not come with them in the future, Paul hopes he will see Timothy soon (2 Tim 4:9, 13).

4. *The testimonies of God are entrusted to future faithful leaders.* Further still, special people were to be held in high regard for the safe keeping of tradition and the Scriptures, too. Moses sets (עֵשׂ; παρατίθημι,⁶⁰ LXX; e.g., Deut 4:44) the words

⁵⁶ “The literary environment that determined the shape of Paul's letters was that of the Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Jewish letters. The thanksgiving-prayer portion of such letters was typical. In the case of Paul's letters, the appearance of the section compares with the broader milieu, *but the content of his thanksgiving-prayers was inspired by OT concepts*” (Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 445, my emphasis).

⁵⁷ Widows were also called to show godliness to their household (1 Tim 5:4).

⁵⁸ Moses's teaching in Deuteronomy functioned as generational instruction toward faithfulness to God, as it “was to result in coming generations worshipping the Lord.” James M. Hamilton Jr., “That the Coming Generation Might Praise the Lord,” *Journal of Discipleship and Family Ministry* 1.1 (2010): 16. For a survey of the importance of education throughout Scripture, encircling some of the texts discussed here and with an eye toward faithfulness in the family and outside it, see D. A. Carson, “A Biblical Theology of Education,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 47.3 (2023): 199–210. For an analysis of the relationship between individual families (natural family) and the church (spiritual family) as taught in the PE, see Bumgardner, “Family Relationships in the Letters to Timothy and Titus.”

⁵⁹ Block notes that “the New Testament includes exhortations to pass on the faith from generation to generation” but, interestingly, he cites 2 Timothy 2:2 as an example rather than than citing the example of Lois and Eunice or 2 Timothy 3:15. Daniel I. Block, “The Grace of Torah: The Mosaic Prescription for Life [Deut 4:1–8; 6:20–25],” *BSac* 162.645 (2005): 3–22. Similarly, Bartholomew and O'Dowd also note 2 Timothy 2:2 as a connection among Deuteronomy, 2 Timothy, and Proverbs: “Like Moses's teaching on the great commandment (Deut 6:4–9), and like Paul's instruction to Timothy (2 Tim 2:2), proverbs are memorable ways for parents and teachers to pass wisdom on to children and students (e.g., Prov 1:8–10; 2:1; 3:1). Those who dare to venture out on their own, apart from the counsel of the family, community and church, stray away from wisdom into folly and thus away from God's orderly design for humanity and into the interest of selfish desire.” Craig G. Bartholomew and Ryan P. O'Dowd, *Old Testament Wisdom Literature: A Theological Introduction* (IVP Academic, 2011), 28.

⁶⁰ An additional connection, not developed in depth below, could further relate LXX Deuteronomy and 2 Timothy. Specifically, the LXX παρέθετο in Deuteronomy 4:44 is etymologically connected to παραθήκη in 2 Timothy 2:14. The aorist indicative verb “entrusted,” from παρατίθημι (both in LXX

before Israel that they were to listen to and keep (Deut 4:2, 44–45), but he also gives authority to the Levites to continue putting these commandments, statutes, and testimonies before the Israelites in preparation for his death (Deut 33:10). The succession of authority given to Joshua likewise highlights this concept. Towner connects this heavy burden with Paul and Timothy.⁶¹ There is great weight being placed upon the shoulders of Joshua and the Levites, hence the recurring exhortation from the Lord to “be strong and courageous” (ἰσχυρὰ ἰστη, Deut 31:23⁶²).

The occasion of 2 Timothy involves the empowerment of Timothy to receive the baton of leadership from Paul. Yet that which Paul entrusts to Timothy was never meant to become stagnant in Timothy’s hands. He was to mimic Paul by entrusting it further to faithful men (2 Tim 2:2). It bears repeating here that the leadership transition focus of 2 Timothy aligns with a Moses-Joshua paradigm. Paul emphasizes his laying of hands on Timothy as authorization, empowerment, and initiation (2 Tim 1:6; Deut 34:9; cf. Num 27:18, 23; Acts 6:6; 1 Tim 4:14). Paul exhorts Timothy to “be strong by the grace that is in Christ Jesus” (ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 2 Tim 2:2). Fear was an unnecessary response because God gave them a spirit of power and love and self-control (δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ) rather than of fear (δειλίας, 2 Tim 1:7). Joshua and Timothy were emboldened against the trials associated with leadership. Towner connects this call as a “δειλίας topos” wherein “cowardice [is] unbelief and disobedience in the face of God’s enemy, despite full knowledge of the presence and the promises of God.”⁶³ Seán Martin analyzes 2 Timothy 2:2 as Timothy entrusting his *ordination* to others—that is, his authority. Martin’s conclusion is likely influenced by his focus on Moses’s authority in the Moses-Joshua paradigm. However, this misses the letter’s notion of the *παράθῃκη*.

In summary, while the text places authority on a high level, the context more appropriately refers to the content of the deposit being the trustworthy sayings regarding the gospel message—the testimony of the Lord. Moses laid his hands on Joshua as part of passing on his authority (cf. Num 27:20).⁶⁴ While Moses set (*παρέθετο*) the words of the Lord before Israel (Deut 4:44), he also empowered others to take on authority to lead the people after him—Joshua and the Levites (Deut 33:9–11; 34:9). Both are similarly seen in what and how Paul instructs Timothy. Timothy should be bold (2 Tim 1:7), be strong (2 Tim 2:2), take on leadership in imitation of Paul (2 Tim 1:8–14; 2:2; 3:10–15), *and* continue passing things on to future faithful leaders (2 Tim 2:2).

Deuteronomy 4:44 and as the aorist imperative “entrust” [*παράθου*] in 2 Timothy 2:2) relates to that which is entrusted: the “deposit,” *παράθῃκη* (2 Tim 1:12, 14).

⁶¹ Towner, “2 Tim 1,7, Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal.”

⁶² See the same exhortation given to Joshua again in Joshua 1:6, 7 and to the Israelites more generally earlier in Deuteronomy 31:6.

⁶³ Towner, “2 Tim 1,7, Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal,” 598.

⁶⁴ Tigay notes that in addition to authority, the laying on of hands “may serve to identify Joshua as the subject of the investiture *or* to transfer some of Moses’ spirit of wisdom to him” (*Deuteronomy*, 339, my emphasis).

III. THE MOSAIC PIECED TOGETHER

In summary, several keywords and ideas comprise the instruction in Deuteronomy: “testimonies” (תִּיּוֹצָא, μαρτυρία), “hear” (שמע, ἀκούω), “keep” (שמר, φυλάσσω), and “entrust” (סִיּוֹ, παρατίθημι), along with several implied concepts associated with them such as love and faith (both individually and generationally). Moses’s final spoken words to Israel, written down thereafter (Deut 1:1; 31:24), constitute a reminder of the words God spoke to him on Mount Horeb.⁶⁵ Israel was to listen attentively and follow suit with active obedience just like they were supposed to at the base of Mount Horeb. Israel was to live every day saturated in these words and pass them on to their children, and Moses entrusts them not just with Israel as a whole but also to faithful leaders. But how do these relate to Paul’s themes, problems, and arguments in 2 Timothy? Are they associated with the letter’s concerns? The four proposed themes—along with the problems Moses and Paul were facing and their associated teachings—have been laid out, so we can now turn our attention to piecing together the mosaic of Mosaic influence that Paul incorporates into his exhortation to Timothy and consider why he does so.

The PE come with an array of intertwined and complicated issues concerning authorship, occasion, intention, and more. While there is merit to discussing the whole corpus together, there is likewise warrant for discussing the books individually. Paul’s encouragement to Timothy in his second letter is reminiscent of the heartbeat of ministry: protecting and proclaiming the gospel message and pursuing alignment with it in one’s life. This is evident, namely, in the exhortation to guard the good deposit. That deposit, when viewed as the gospel message and/or tradition, is a heavy weight for Timothy to bear. Yet it is not responsibility specific only to the New Testament. The cohesiveness of Scripture’s message beckons us to recognize the interrelated principles and how they compare with past instruction in the OT.

Although the use of the OT in the PE and the authorship of the PE (no matter where a scholar lands on authorship) has a complicated past in scholarship, a mosaic has begun to form. While some scholars have concluded that the data does not paint the picture of a writer closely attuned to the biblical narrative, others have drawn attention to the wisdom and Mosaic elements throughout the letters. Second Timothy stands out among the PE as being the last of the letters and constituting a different kind of paraenetic letter than the others. While not necessarily a “testimony of Paul,” as Martin argued, 2 Timothy nonetheless contains language and themes that allude to Moses. The cluster of words and themes, when pieced together, form a mosaic of Mosaic influence within the letter.

The generational faith that was passed down to Timothy and instilled by the Holy Spirit was developed not only from Timothy’s childhood but also from what he heard, obeyed, and mimicked from and of Paul. Going into Timothy’s own min-

⁶⁵ Since Deuteronomy consistently uses Mount Horeb in place of Mount Sinai, the present article does likewise for the sake of clarity.

istry, that core, good deposit needed to be kept from false teachers who would steer him and fellow believers away from the sound words, the standard of God's truth. Timothy was not alone either; the good deposit was intended to be entrusted to faithful others so that the message and protection could continue onward. Each of these thematic points latch onto Deuteronomic contexts and Mosaic ideals, bringing them into the NT context in light of Christ's death and resurrection for Timothy to emulate. Looking at 2 Timothy with Deuteronomy's teachings, problems, and arguments in mind shows a mosaic of Mosaic allusion in Paul's exhortation for Timothy to guard the good deposit. Contrary to Häfner's conclusion, the Mosaic themes are not "nonspecific to the concerns of the [letter]." ⁶⁶ The Mosaic allusions pulse throughout Paul's exhortations to Timothy from the very start.

IV. CONCLUSION

Deuteronomy's second presentation of the law exposed the people's idolatrous living and called for them to be devoted solely to God. Daniel Block puts it well when he says, "The book of Deuteronomy is the heart of the Torah, which the priests were to teach and model, which psalmists praised, to which the prophets appealed, and by which faithful kings ruled and righteous citizens lived."⁶⁷ The first and last sentiments—that the Torah was to be taught and modeled and that righteous citizens were to live by it—could be expanded given the analyses presented in this treatment. The Torah was to be heard by all, guarded diligently, passed on from generation to generation, and entrusted to future, faithful leaders. This array of instruction from God through Moses evidences itself not just in Deuteronomy, but later through the writing of Paul to Timothy as well. Paul recontextualizes Deuteronomy's instruction not by altering it but by bringing it into context for Timothy's situation. Timothy was to be encouraged, after hearing the words of Paul and growing up in the Scriptures, to guard the gospel message and entrust it to others.

Although the Mosaic influence in 2 Timothy is subtle, the idea of a "mosaic of Mosaic influence" is also cumulative. Certainly, there are overlaps in themes, problems, arguments, and the language that Moses and Paul use in their respective contexts. Each of the examples, taken by itself and isolated from the others, would likely lead to a conclusion that Deuteronomy's teaching is important but that no allusion is intended by Paul. However, a more probable intention is reinforced by considering the cluster of examples as evidence of Mosaic influence and the already present scholarly interest in a Moses-Joshua paradigm.⁶⁸ The cluster of thematic

⁶⁶ Häfner, "Israel's Scriptures in the Pastoral Epistles," 454.

⁶⁷ Block, "Recovering the Voice of Moses," 407.

⁶⁸ This is akin to Towner's aim in connecting 2 Timothy and Romans when he says, "Some of the intertextual contacts presented above, taken on their own, may seem less likely than others. But when taken together, and considered in relation to the text's structural features and persuasive aims, they suggest that the resonance with Romans is motivated, not random—an intentional 'consciousness' of Romans that is amply confirmed for the text of our interest, 2 Tim 1,3–14" ("2 Tim 1,7 Cowardice, and the Specter of Betrayal," 589).

ties points to several important notions for the theology seen in Pauline literature generally, the PE specifically, and all of Scripture canonically. For example, the theology of 2 Timothy illustrates an intimate relationship between OT teaching and the NT writers. The argumentation does not possess the stereotypical function of quotations leading into the explicit points of the argument, but rather the OT narrative and concerns permeate the substructure of the letter. The paraenetic material in 2 Timothy is not just mirroring Pauline theology from other books; instead, the letter contains themes, problems, and arguments connecting with Moses's teaching in Deuteronomy. The context surrounding Paul's exhortation to guard the good deposit steps alongside the authority of Moses and reminds Timothy of the blessing of his upbringing and the critical importance of his calling.

Furthermore, Paul's instruction reminds present-day believers of the continuation of OT teaching. Moses instructing the Israelites regarding the importance of attentive listening to God's word, obeying it and protecting truth, passing it on to the next of kin, and entrusting authority to faithful leaders was not meant to end when Christ came. After all, Moses was not the first to instruct it (Gen 18:19). Rather, this teaching continues with renewed avidness. Although these actionable steps appear to be common sense to some, Paul reminds believers through his second letter to Timothy that staying true to the foundation of God's word is difficult. Along the road there are those who try to steer believers to the right or to the left. There are those who forget their roots and abandon the faith of their family for worldliness. There are those who put down their faith when suffering comes. Moses's and Paul's exhortations urge readers to connect their heart with their hands, living out their faith relying not on their own actions but in God's power (Deut 6:20–25; 2 Tim 1:7–10).