

**WHAT DOES
THE SCRIPTURE TEACH
ABOUT THE ORDINATION
OF WOMEN?**

Differing Views by
Three New Testament Scholars

Dr. Walter L. Liefeld
Dr. Douglas Moo
Dr. Philip B. Payne

Part II

The Interpretation of I Timothy 2:11-15:
A Surrejoinder

by Philip Barton Payne

A study
commissioned by the
Committee on Ministerial Standing
The Evangelical Free Church of America

Minneapolis, Minnesota 1986

Page numbers to Moo's work are first to
What Does the Scripture Teach About the Ordination of Women,
and after the slash to the *Trinity Journal* Vol 1 NS, No. 1 (Spring 1980) or
(my Response and Moo's Rejoinder) to *Trinity Journal* Vol 2 NS, No. 2 (Fall 1981).

THE INTERPRETATION OF 1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15: A SURREJOINDER

PHILIP B. PAYNE
GORDON-CONWELL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Douglas J. Moo is to be complimented for acknowledging several weaknesses in his former interpretation of 1 Timothy 2-3:

- p. 72/199 "It must be admitted that the verb ἐπιτρέπω ["I am not permitting" in 2:12] is not often used in Scripture of universally applicable commandments."
- p. 73/200 "Paul's use of the present indicative in exhortations and commands is also relatively rare... advice for a current situation was being given"
- p. 77/204 "the difficulties with viewing v 14 as a statement about the nature of women are real."
- p. 84/211 "it would be going too far to argue that the phrase ["the husband of one wife" in 3:2] clearly excludes women [from the office of overseer]".

These admissions do affect Moo's overall interpretation, despite his denial of this. He acknowledges that the normal use of ἐπιτρέπω is not for universally applicable commandments. His entire interpretation, however, depends on this ἐπιτρέπω being used to introduce a universally applicable commandment. If Paul intended ἐπιτρέπω with its usual temporally limited meaning ("I am not at the present time permitting . . .") then the prohibition is not universal. We cannot simply assume it to be universal any more than we can assume that the prohibition of braided hair, gold, pearls, and the wearing of expensive clothing (2:9) is universal or that men everywhere must raise their hands in prayer (2:8).

Since the normal sense of the verb which covers all of verse 12 is *not* universal, Moo's view depends on deriving the universal character of the restriction from vv 13-14. This in turn depends on vv 13-14 implying that it is universally wrong for women to teach or to have authority over men. Moo, however, rejects the view that Eve's failure was "causative of the nature of women in general," calling this a "serious case of partial quotation" which misrepresents his view. After admitting the real "difficulties with viewing v 14 as a statement about the nature of women" he states, "I am now inclined to see the reference as a means of suggesting the *difference* between Adam and Eve in the fall—he sinned openly; she was deceived." (p. 77/204) Merely "suggesting a difference between Adam and Eve," however, does not introduce a universal into the text. Nowhere does 1 Tim 2:12-14 state that this difference characterizes women in general.

Now that Moo has wisely disassociated himself from the view that Eve's deception was causative of the nature of women in general, his interpretation of this text lacks adequate evidence of the universal which his interpretation of 2:12 requires. He has acknowledged that "it is not clear how they [vv 13-14] support the commands in vv 11-12." (p. 25/68) With appropriate modesty, he refers to his own view of v. 13 as suggesting a "plausible interpretation" (p. 26/69). Nor can he import a universal prohibition of women teaching or having authority from 3:1-7 since its subject of this entire passage is defined as "anyone" (3:1,5) and since he acknowledges that "it would be going too far to argue that the phrase ["the husband of one wife" in 3:2] clearly excludes women [from the office of overseer]". (p. 84/211)

There are, however, nine exegetical indicators that this prohibition of teaching was temporary:

- 1) The overall purpose of 1 Timothy is to silence false teachers, and there is ample evidence, elaborated below, that Ephesian women at that time were especially influenced by and communicating the false teaching.
- 2) Paul's only command in this section is "let women learn". The underlying principle that learning ought to result in teaching implies that the prohibition of teaching is not universal. Compare

b. Kidd. 29a-b:

How do we know that [the mother] has no duty [to teach her children]? ... whoever is commanded to study is commanded to teach; whoever is not commanded to study, is not commanded to teach. And how do we know that she is not bound to teach herself? ... the one whom others are commanded to teach is commanded to teach oneself; and the one whom others are not commanded to teach, is not commanded to teach oneself. How then do we know that others are not commanded to teach her? - Because it is written, 'And ye shall teach them to your sons' (Deut. 11:19) -but not your daughters."

- 3) The positive connotations of ἡσυχία indicate a well-bred learning which would put women eventually in the position of being able to teach. A wealth of Rabbinic and early church citations to this effect are quoted by Aída Besançon Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry*, NY: Thomas Nelson, 1985, pp. 74-80.
- 4) ἐπιτρέπω is a verb that is only very rarely used for universal permission or prohibition, and never elsewhere to my knowledge in the first person present active indicative.
- 5) The use of the adversative δέ to introduce the prohibition indicates a consciousness of the contrast between the command to learn and the present prohibition of teaching. The adversative use is highlighted by:
 - a) the word order: "to teach, however, for a woman I am not permitting"
 - b) this is the most common inference of δέ
 - c) in both 2:14 and 15 δέ is strongly adversative.
- 6) Paul states in 3:1 that "Anyone who desires the ministry of being an overseer desires a noble task." This is surely an encouragement to all who would hear these words, including women, to aspire to be an overseer. Would Paul encourage desire for forbidden fruit?
- 7) Paul's life and writings elsewhere did not follow this rule as universal. Rather, he mentions many women among his fellow workers in the Gospel. If 1 Tim 2:12 excludes all women from teaching ministries, it is the only such verse in all of Scripture.
- 8) Timothy himself was taught by his mother and grandmother (2 Tim 1:5; 3:14-15).
- 9) Titus 2:3 commands "older women to teach what is good." Since it was written about this same time, a universal ban on women teaching cannot have been intended.

Women were particularly influenced by the false teaching

1 Tim 1:3 states the purpose of the letter, to stop false teaching. This is elaborated in the first two paragraphs detailing various results of the false teaching. Practically every verse of the letter relates to this concern, as Gordon Fee's commentary (Harper & Row, 1984) has demonstrated in detail. 1 Timothy is not a manual for church order. The closest thing in it to a church manual, 1 Tim 3:1-15, gives Timothy guidelines for screening out false teachers from church leadership in case Paul is delayed in coming.

Paul repeatedly identifies women as especially influenced by the false teaching in the Ephesian church. 2 Tim 3:6 refers to silly women, "always learning but never able to acknowledge the truth." Some younger widows had "in fact already turned away to follow Satan", were giving the enemy opportunity for slander, and "sayings things they ought not" (5:11-15). Women were "professing godliness" (2:10; cf. 2 Tim 3:5 "a form of godliness"). This probably implies public vocal profession since the same verb is used of the false teachers "professing knowledge" (6:20-21). The intimate association of false teachers with women is explicitly stated in 2 Tim 3:4-9, "lovers of pleasure . . . They are the kind who worm their way into homes and gain control over weak-willed women, who are loaded down with sins and are swayed by all kinds of evil desires. This picture is reinforced by the false teachers' bad conscience (1:19-20; 4:2-3), sin (5:20,24), corrupt mind (6:20), and being ignoble (2 Tim 2:20), and by Paul's references to women: calling them to decency and propriety of dress (2:9,15), to be worthy of respect (3:11), "the widow who lives for pleasure is dead even while she lives" (5:6), "faithful to her husband" (5:9), "their sensual desires...judgment on themselves"

(5:11), "turned aside after Satan" (5:14). Paul's repeated concern for purity reinforces the danger of illicit sex (1:5,10; 2:8; 3:2,7,12; 4:12,16; 5:2,22; 2 Tim 2:22). The false teachers' greed (6:5-10) suggests that they targeted women who could afford to pay tutors.

Paul's description of erring women is closely parallel to his description of the persons who were false teachers (πίσ, 1:3,6,8,19; 4:1; 6:3,10,21; ἄνθρωπος, 5:24; 6:5,9, terms used inclusively for women as well as men). Just as some younger widows "turned aside after Satan" (5:15) so false teachers "turned aside to meaningless talk" (1:6). The false teaching is summarized as "profane old wives' myths" (4:7; cf. 1:4; 2 Tim 4:4; Titus 1:14, all with μῦθος.) "Profane" also describes the false teaching in 1:9; 6:20; 2 Tim 2:16. The sensual desires of some women overcame their dedication to Christ, incurring judgment because they set aside their first faith (5:11-12, cf. 15; 2:15). Similarly the false teachers had left the faith (1:4-6,19; 4:1; 6:10,21; 2 Tim 2:18; 3:8). Some women "turned aside after Satan" and gave the enemy opportunity for slander (5:12-15); Hymenaeus and Alexander were "delivered to Satan in order that they might not blaspheme" (1:20). Those who "abandon the faith follow deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy." (4:1-2). Paul urged Timothy to instruct gently those caught in "the trap of the devil, who took them captive to do his will" (2 Tim 2:25-26). This gentle instruction contrasts with Paul's harshness to Hymenaeus and Alexander, but appears to be directed to those (predominantly women) deceived by the false teachers.

Women and especially widows are the particular group most significantly influenced by the false teaching. No other book of the New Testament devotes such a high proportion of its content to problems specifically related to women as does 1 Timothy. (note especially 2:9-15; 4:7; 5:2-7, 9-16). The continuity of the problem as specifically tied to the false teachers is evident from 2 Tim 2:16-17. This passage shows that the ringleader specified in 1 Timothy 1:20, Hymenaeus, is still a key instigator: "Avoid godless chatter, because those who indulge in it will become more and more ungodly. Their teaching will spread like gangrene. Among them are Hymenaeus and Philetus, who have wandered away from the truth. They say that the resurrection has already taken place, and they destroy the faith of some."

What was the character of the false teachers' message that had such an appeal to women, especially widows? Three characteristics of their message are paralleled in 1 Corinthians:

- 1) 4:3 "They forbid people to marry." Similar is the Corinthian slogan, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman [a euphemism for sexual relations]." Evidently some Corinthian wives were rejecting marital relations, for Paul commanded, "each man should have his own wife, and each woman her own husband. The husband should fulfill his marital duty to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband. The wife's body does not belong to her alone but also to her husband. In the same way, the husband's body does not belong to him alone but also to his wife. Do not deprive each other..."
- 2) 4:3 "They order people to abstain from certain foods, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and who know the truth. For everything God created is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving, because it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer." Similar is 1 Cor 10:23-31 "The earth is the Lord's, and everything in it. If I take part in the meal with thankfulness, why am I denounced because of something for which I thank God?"
- 3) 2 Tim 2:18 "They say that the resurrection has already taken place." Similar is 1 Cor 15:12,22,29,35 "*how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? . . . But someone may ask, 'How are the dead raised? With what kind of body will they come?' How foolish! . . . So it will be with the resurrection of the dead. The body that is sown is perishable, it is raised imperishable . . .*" (cf. 2 Thess 2:2 "[false] report . . . that the day of the Lord has already come.") In both these cases it is evident that the resurrection of the body was being denied. In its place was substituted the affirmation that we are already raised with Christ spiritually (cf. 1 Cor 4:8). Hence they felt no need for a bodily resurrection.

Forbidding marriage, saying that the resurrection has taken place, and abstaining from certain foods are expressions of an over-realized eschatology. Presumably it was argued that since in heaven there will be no marriage or giving in marriage and since we have already entered the kingdom of God,

we ought even now to forbid marriage! Similarly, since things of this world are of no spiritual value, the goodness of God's created world is denied and abstinence from sex and foods is commended. At Corinth it was argued that since the body was spiritually unimportant, it did not matter what one did with one's body. Thus, Paul had to argue extensively trying to convince Christian men in Corinth that they must not go to prostitutes (pushed on by the abstinence of their wives!) or temple feasts. These two Corinthian abuses had a particular appeal to men. Similarly, although the Ephesian false teachers forbade marriage itself, they may have had intimate relations with women caught up in their teaching and justified it like some Corinthians justified going to prostitutes as irrelevant to their spiritual life.

The form of the false teaching in Ephesus, however, would appeal particularly to women, especially widows, since by their position they were on the fringe of society. They were social outsiders since they had no husband. This false teaching affirmed their dignity. Indeed, it affirmed that they were already in the ideal (eschatological) state of being single before Christ. No wonder that this new teaching attracted women. And it is likely that it attracted few men besides false teachers themselves. After all, it implied that the married state of most men was not ideal and so might have encouraged rejection by their wives. It is this peculiar appeal to women of the false teaching at Ephesus that explains why Paul specifically says he does not want *women* to teach.

Lest this seem like a stiff restriction on all women when probably not all had accepted the teaching, consider in contrast the words which Paul had for the false teachers who deceived them, "Some have shipwrecked their faith. Among them are Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I have handed over to Satan to be taught not to blaspheme." (1 Tim 1:19-20) In contrast, the command "let women learn" and the (temporary?) prohibition of teaching, (or possibly a particular manner of teaching indicated by the word ἀθηνταῖν) is gentle and contains the seeds for the eventual lifting of the restriction. The women here restricted fit the description in 1 Tim 1:6-7 "They want to be teachers of the law, but they do not know what they are talking about or what they so confidently affirm." Paul's solution is, "Let them learn so that eventually they may fulfill their teaching aspirations, but this privilege requires responsible study first." Compare Philo, *The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain* XI 48: "Ignorance is an involuntary state, a light matter, and its treatment through teaching is not hopeless. But wickedness is a willful malady of the soul, and its action is such that to remove it is hard, if indeed it is not hopeless."

The reference to Eve's being thoroughly deceived and having fallen into transgression was obviously called forth by what had happened to some women in the Ephesian church. The link between false teaching and the deception of women is made explicit in 2 Tim 3:6-13, "deceiving and being deceiving." The reference to "falsely called knowledge" (6:20) also implies deception. In spite of the pervasiveness throughout 1 Timothy of Paul's concern with false teachers, Moo's insists that "the problem of the false teachers is foreign to the context [of 2:14]" (pp. 76-77) If so, why the emphasis on deception as the key reason for the prohibition? Why the restriction specifically on teaching? As Gordon Fee has so clearly demonstrated throughout his commentary on the Pastorals, the problem of the false teachers underlies everything. To deny this is not to take it seriously as a letter from Paul to Timothy with the purpose as stated in ch 1:3-7, to meet the issues raised by false teachers.

Following is an examination of a few of the more crucial points of Moo's rejoinder. The reader is encouraged to review my earlier response since I have attempted to avoid duplication of its data. All of this is of necessity very selective, but Zondervan anticipates releasing in 1987 my *Man and Woman: One in Christ*, a fairly comprehensive exegetical and theological analysis of these issues which I have been researching for the past thirteen years.

ἡσυχία

ἡσυχία indicates a manner of learning which was culturally regarded as being the appropriate attitude and deportment of a well-bred student. Paul here commands that women be permitted to learn as proper students, with a quiet and teachable spirit. If the reading "silent" is adopted, it must be clearly distinguished from its twentieth century connotation as a put-down almost as bad as "shut up and listen." In Paul's day this statement that "a woman should learn in quietness (or silence)" would be recognized as a call to be a serious student. As long as the positive connotation of ἡσυχία is understood, either "quietness" or "silence" is an adequate rendering.

Moo on p. 72/199 alleges: "ἡσυχία is the only word in his [Paul's] known vocabulary which could clearly denote silence." σιγή, however, does occur in Acts 21:40, a passage referring to Paul and written by his friend Luke. It was a common term in Greek. It is amazing that Moo would even suggest that Paul might have been unfamiliar with it. A parallel example in English would be to suggest that the noun "silence" was not part of someone's vocabulary simply because it does not happen to occur in the limited corpus of that person's extant letters. But in fact, "silence" is a part of the vocabulary of all competent speakers of English, and so was σιγή among competent Greek speakers.

Just as the presence of "be silent" in verbal forms implies a writer's knowledge of the noun form "silence", so too, Paul's use of σιγάω implies his knowledge of σιγή. Even if the noun form σιγή were so rare (it was not) that Paul might not have known it, he could have constructed his sentence using the verb σιγάω if he had wished to specify "silence". The fact that Paul chose ἡσυχία instead of σιγή in this context is evidence that "quietness" is a more appropriate translation than "silence". Its pairing with submission in v 11 further supports this translation since quietness is more closely related to submission than is silence.

ἐπιτρέπω

On p. 72/199 Moo states that Paul's use of the first person singular of ἐπιτρέπω is "not crucial, as Payne admits". I did?! As in any complex exegetical issue there are many factors to be considered, lexical, syntactical, contextual, theological, etc., but that does not mean that this evidence is not a crucial consideration.

Moo does concede, "It must be admitted that the verb ἐπιτρέπω is not often used in Scripture of universally applicable commandments. Fourteen of the eighteen NT occurrences clearly involve a temporally limited situation." (p 72/199) He should add that it is never so used in the LXX of the OT (including apocrypha), that two of his four (Mark 10:4; Matt 19:8) are clearly restricted in the immediate context, and that the only remaining case besides 1 Tim 2:12 is 1 Cor 14:34, a passage regarded as a marginal gloss by many scholars including Gordon Fee, G. Fitzler, Weiss, Zuntz, Bittlinger, Barrett, Conzelmann, Scroggs, Ruef, Murphy-O'Conner, and E. E. Ellis.

There is substantial evidence that ἐπιτρέπω carried a different semantic and connotative range of meaning than the English "I (do not) permit", and in particular that it was not as appropriate a word to choose when referring to a universally applicable permission or prohibition. Even when the subject of ἐπιτρέπω is "God" (Heb 6:3) or "Lord" (1 Cor 16:7), it does not refer to a continuing state. Practically all English versions of Acts 26:1 translate it as though it were in the second person, "You have permission to speak", but in Greek it is in the third person singular passive, "It is permitted (ἐπιτρέπεται) to speak." Thus, even in the form which most clearly indicates a continuing state in English (3rd pers. sing. passive) this implication is not necessary in Greek. How much less likely, then, is it that the *first person singular* imply a continuing state, contrary to the implication of the consequently biased English versions which read "I do not permit". Only by confusing "evidence" with "proof" can Moo allege that "the first person present of ἐπιτρέπω . . . does not constitute clear evidence for it [a limited application]." (p. 73/200) Although the verbal tense is one of many factors to consider, it clearly is evidence for the limited application of ἐπιτρέπω, evidence which is further strengthened by the undeniably dominant use of the verb for particular, not universal permissions.

Moo alleges, "In fact, of the twelve examples I have found in which Paul uses the first singular indicative to give what looks like universal advice, only two (1 Tim 2:1 and 8) have a "universalizing qualifier" (p. 73/200). Examination of these twelve shows that 4 are not singular at all, but plural: 2 Cor 5:20; 1 Thess 4:1; 5:14; 2 Thess 3:6, suggesting a wider authority than Paul's. Of the remaining eight, six, or possibly seven, do have universalizing qualifiers, namely words such as "all" or "every" in the context which show that Paul has a universal application in mind:

Rom 12:3 "to every (παντὶ) one of you", which confirms the universal nature of Rom 12:1 (cf. the γάρ connecting v 3 to the sentence of 12:1-2);

1 Cor 4:16 "imitate me" is explained in v 17 "my way of life in Christ Jesus, which agrees with what I teach everywhere (πανταχοῦ) in every (πάσῃ) church.";

Gal 5:3 "I declare to every (παντὶ) man", which also applies to

Gal 5:2 [cf. "Again (πάλιν) I declare..."];

1 Tim 2:1 "for all (πάντων) persons";
 1 Tim 2:8 "in every (παντί) place"

Note that in spite of their "universalizing qualifiers" not all of these are in fact universal: Gal 5:2-3, like 1 Tim 2:8, has not been regarded by the majority of Christians as binding today: "Mark my words! I, Paul, tell you that if you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will be of no value to you at all. Again I declare to every man who lets himself be circumcised that he is obligated to obey the whole law." Indeed, Acts 16:3 states that Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews that lived in that area". Thus we know that Paul himself did not treat this as a universal prohibition of circumcision.

1 Cor 4:16 is specifically addressed to people Paul had "fathered in the Gospel" through initial evangelism and bringing them to faith. Its content, "I urge you to imitate me", presupposes a direct personal relationship which is not universal to all Christians.

Thus, of Moo's twelve examples the only one remaining is Eph 4:1, which by its content could be nothing other than universal: "I urge you to live a life worthy of the calling you have received." Moo's list does not claim to be exhaustive, but the fact that of all the examples he found only one is clearly a case where the first person singular is used without a universalizing qualifier to indicate advice that applies universally contrasts sharply with the twelve examples I gave from one chapter alone (1 Cor 7:6, 7, 8, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 35, 40) of the first person singular to indicate advice which is not universal.

Moo alleges on p. 72/199 that "Payne . . . gives the impression that Paul consistently distinguished his personal advice from 'permanently valid instruction'." Nowhere in my article did I state or intimate that Paul *consistently* so distinguished his personal advice. What I did say was that "Paul more than any other NT writer distinguished his personal advice for a particular situation from permanently valid instruction from the Lord" (42-43/170-71, citing examples). Paul frequently wrote advice or instructions for particular situations, instructions which were never intended to be universal commands. The very nature of his epistles as letters to particular situations is vital to their proper interpretation. Moo states that "It is only rarely that Paul makes such a differentiation" (between personal advice from permanently valid instruction) (p. 72/199). The fact that Paul gives his advice for a particular situation twelve times in 1 Corinthians 7 using the first person singular present active indicative--advice which he clearly does not intend to be permanently binding commands--proves that this is not so rare.

Moo goes on further to distort my position on p. 72/199 "and when he does, it is precarious to infer any less *authority*" (he is the one making this inference, I did not imply it). I agree with Moo that "the words are still the words of the Apostle Paul, writing inspired Scripture." The question is whether the text was inspired by the Holy Spirit to meet the particular needs at Ephesus, needs which may or may not be pertinent in other places and times, or whether the text is given as a universally binding prohibition. It is a question of exegesis and hermeneutics, not a question of inspiration or authority. Principles, some of them universally valid principles, lie behind most of what Paul said and guided his actions and advice (as they should ours). Careful study can detect the presence of such principles underlying his statements. But this does not mean that the majority of Paul's statements are giving "universally valid principles", as Moo alleges on p. 72/199. Most of Paul's statements are not in and of themselves universally valid principles.

Moo further alleges, "The point to be made here is that ἐπιτρέπω is never used of a permission or prohibition which *could* be universal but is restricted." His statement is false as shown by Mark 10:4 and Matt 19:8-9, "Moses permitted you to divorce your wives . . ." Not only could this permission be treated as universal, it was so treated by the school of Hillel and by Akiba and Josephus. But this permission of divorce was specifically restricted in both of these texts and by the school of Shammai.

διδάσκω

By not comprehending what I had stated, Moo concludes on p.73/200 "Syllogistically, Payne's argument can be represented thus:

No false teaching possesses "inherent" authority for the church

Some teaching is false teaching

Therefore no teaching possesses "inherent" authority for the church

Nowhere did I write that *no teaching* possesses inherent authority. The truth, and similarly, true teaching, does by the nature of its truth content possess inherent authority. I specifically stated on p. 45/173 that "Paul at times used various forms of the word διδάσκω to express authoritative Christian teaching". Although true teaching does have authority, I cited over 20 examples which make it obvious that Paul did *not* consider authority to be *inherent* in the teaching in the church, much less in human teachers. This is why Paul insisted that "even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned!" (Gal 1:8) Even Peter had to be opposed, and Barnabas was led astray (Gal 2:11-13). Moo concludes: "That no human teacher possesses authority over the church no matter what he says is of course true; but I would continue to maintain that the teacher who is faithfully transmitting the will of God to the church possesses authority in that activity." I agree! Unless a teaching "faithfully transmits the will of God" neither Moo nor I regard it as having "inherent" authority. The necessity for such qualifications shows the danger of asserting that authority is inherent in church teaching. This is why even the severely restricted official view of the Roman Catholic church that the Pope's utterances when speaking *ex-cathedra* possess inherent authority has been rejected by non-Roman Catholic churches (and many Roman Catholics).

Moo asserts on p.80/207 that "the authority of the prophet, far more than that of the teacher, is a *derived* authority. . . prophesying . . . involves an authority relationship between the prophet and his hearers less personal than is the case with teachers. This greater personal authority of the teacher ..." But surely, insofar as the teacher's authority is derived from careful study of the tradition, the teacher's authority is more derived than the prophet's, for the prophet proclaims a word directly from the Lord. The personal nature of prophetic application of God's truth to specific life situations is in general if anything a more personal authority relationship than a teacher's.

On p.73/200 Moo wrote that in the NT "teaching is restricted to particular individuals [delimited to "the elder-overseer" in the Pastorals] and that the NT nowhere depicts women as teachers of men." Below we consider four passages or clusters of passages in which women *are* encouraged to teach, two from the Pastorals and one each from 1 Corinthians and Colossians.

#1. Paul himself in Titus 2:3, in a letter written about the same time as 1 Timothy, commanded elder women to be "*teachers of what is excellent*" Cf. Walter Lock, *The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924) 140; Hendricksen, I, 364. It is arbitrary to assert as many have that "the word cannot refer to public teaching. . . but must refer to ministry in the home," Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 193; cf. J. H. Bernard, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1899 reprint) 166; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963 reprint) 240; Homer A. Kent, Jr., *The Pastoral Epistles* (Chicago: Moody, 1982) 222. or that "no formal instruction is implied, and perhaps no instruction put into words" E. F. Scott, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Moffatt, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936) 164. or that what is referred to is "teaching by example." William Hendricksen, *Commentary on I & II Timothy and Titus* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1959) 364; cf. A. T. Handon, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 180.

An examination of all the the words Paul uses with the root "teach" shows that in every other instance the teaching had verbalized content. Thus, those who would interpret Titus 2:3 as teaching solely by example do so in opposition to Paul's universal use of this word in any form (noun, verb, participle, compound, root derivative) in every other context. The reason regularly given for stripping the meaning of "teach" of its central core of meaning (conveying a message in words) in only this one instance is simply that women are the subject. Hence, it is said, it must refer to something other than what Paul means by "teach" in every other instance.

It cannot be validly argued that the teaching root had some other connotation in this particular compound simply because this particular derivative of the root "teach" is not attested elsewhere. The component parts of this compound seem to indicate a particularly sound and well-thought-out message: "A teacher of what is excellent or good." If it is true, as is frequently stated, that this compound word was a linguistic innovation by Paul to convey this particular idea, then he intentionally created this impressive noun for a good teacher specifically to apply to women.

There is no sufficient reason to reject the normal meaning of "teacher" in Titus 2:3, one ministering "not so much by example as by exhortation and teaching". Joh. Ed. Huther, *The Epistles to Timothy and Titus* (Meyer's, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884) 296; cf. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, trans. by William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) 312; C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963) 134. Indeed, this normal meaning seems to be required by what Paul delineates in Titus 2:4 as a result of the elder women being "teachers of what is excellent." Paul chose "a classical verb for indoctrinating ... and... of schooling someone in a needed lesson", E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London: Tyndale, 1954) 104. "... so that they can train the younger women. . ."

It is sometimes mistakenly asserted (74/201) that "the teaching activity of these women is explicitly restricted to the younger women (2:4-5)." The text does enumerate some of the results of these elder women "teaching what is excellent," but it does not restrict their teaching either in scope or audience. Paul commanded Titus to teach the elder women to be teachers of what is excellent. An important result of this, but not necessarily the only result, is that they will be able to train the younger women.

#2. In his second letter to Timothy Paul gave the beautiful pattern for personal discipleship: "the things which you have heard from me in the presence of many witnesses, these entrust to faithful persons who will be able to *teach* others also." (2 Tim 2:2) Although many translations have "faithful men," the Greek term used is the generic term *ἄνθρωπος* which includes all human beings, women as well as men. This pattern is beautifully exemplified in this very letter by Timothy's own mother and grandmother: "I have been reminded of your sincere faith, which first lived in your grandmother Lois and in your mother Eunice and, I am persuaded, now lives in you also (2 Tim 1:5). . . continue in what you have learned and have become convinced of, because you know those from whom you learned it, and how from infancy you have known the holy Scriptures. . ." (2 Tim 3:14-15). Paul praised these two women for their part in making the sacred writings known to Timothy "from infancy" (NIV), a phrase expressing when their teaching began but giving no indication that it stopped at any point in Timothy's life.

This letter (2 Timothy) closes with a list of greetings, and heading the list is Prisca. Prisca is the formal respectful equivalent of Priscilla. Her name is listed before that of her husband, contrary to Greek and Hebrew custom, and not just here but in each of the NT references where reference is made to their active ministry in the church. She it was who with her husband Aquila took aside Apollos, "an eloquent man... mighty in the Scriptures... instructed in the way of the Lord... fervent in spirit ... speaking and teaching accurately the things concerning Jesus ... speaking out boldly in the synagogue" (Acts 18:24-26a) "and *explained to him the way of God more accurately*" (Acts 18:26b NASB). The plural form of the verb "explained" proves that she was involved in explaining to Apollos the way of God more accurately, and the fact that her name is listed first before her husband's makes it virtually certain that she played a significant role in teaching him. In light of these three women (Lois, Eunice, Prisca) specifically referred to by name in this letter, all of whom did active teaching in personal discipleship, it is surely mistaken to think that women are excluded from the "faithful persons who will be able to teach others also" in 2 Tim 2:2.

#3. In 1 Cor 14:26 Paul writes, "whenever you come together, each one has a psalm, a *teaching*, a revelation. . .". Three chapters earlier in 1 Cor 11:5 prayer and prophesying by women is specifically allowed. Two verses earlier in 1 Cor 14:24 Paul writes approvingly of a situation where "all prophesy." Five verses later in 1 Cor 14:31 he writes "For you can all prophesy one by one so that all may learn and all may be encouraged", using the same word for "all" three times. Just as the "all" who may learn and the "all" who may be encouraged are inclusive of all believers in the church, including women, so, too, the "all" who may prophesy cannot rightly be interpreted as excluding women. Since this is true of the higher gift of prophecy, Cf. Acts 21:9; 1 Cor 12:28,29; 14:1-5,24; Eph 4:11 certainly we should not interpret the "each one" who has a teaching just five verses earlier as excluding women. Since this passage does not restrict any member of the congregation from participating in any of these ministries, but rather uses inclusive language (*ἕκαστος*), how utterly foreign to the context it is for Moo to exclude all members of the majority of the church (women) from teaching. 1 Cor 11:5 shows that it would be contrary to Paul's intent to exclude women from those who may have a psalm or a revelation. "Teaching" has the same grammatical subject and in no way is qualified in this passage. This passage, then, clearly encourages women as well as men to share a teaching.

4. Similarly in Col 3:16 Paul commanded the whole church, including women, ^{This is required by Col 3:11 in light of Gal 3:28, and women are specifically included in Col 3:18-19.} "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly as you *teach* and counsel one another with all wisdom, and as you sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs with gratitude in your hearts to God". The word Paul used for "one another" is used three verses earlier in the command "forgive one another". This is addressed to the entire congregation, and just as it would be wrong to exclude any particular group from those who may sing psalms, so it is wrong to exclude any group such as women from those who may "teach and counsel". Eduard Lohse appropriately comments, "The functions of 'teaching' (διδάσκειν) and admonishing' (νουθετεῖν) ... are not bound to a distinct office, but were exercised by members of the community because of the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon them (1 Cor 12:28; 14:26)." *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 150-51. In some churches today only a few are allowed to teach, and the teaching is virtually all one way, teacher to learner, without any reciprocal element. But that is not what Paul advocates in Col 3:16. While this verse does not teach that all believers have the *gift* of teaching or require that every member minister in each of the ways here listed, it does describe a situation in which the teaching ministry is widely shared and not restricted to particular individuals.

Clearly then, in Paul's vision of the church women were encouraged to teach, and in his word usage "teaching" was not necessarily an activity restricted solely to particular individuals. Repeatedly Paul implies that women are to be involved in the teaching ministry of the church, a ministry open to all believers. Paul also teaches that particular individuals are specifically gifted by the Holy Spirit as teachers. He often stresses the importance of the office of teacher. We find no convincing evidence that women are excluded either from the gift or the office of teacher. The Spirit is free to bestow the gift on whomever He pleases and to appoint whomever He wills. Thus, unless we are willing to accuse Paul of contradicting himself we cannot interpret 1 Tim 2:12 as a universal prohibition of women teaching men. Rather, we should expect if Paul is here making a universal prohibition that it is a particular type of teaching that he prohibits.

This study of Paul's use of words like "teach" and "teacher" in contexts applying to both men and women shows not simply that women as well as men are exhorted to "teach one another" in the body of believers but also shows that men may be included in the scope of those taught by women. Some have alleged in order to account for the apparent approval of Priscilla's part in teaching Apollos that teaching one man is permitted by Paul, but not the teaching of men (plural) in a group. This view is contradicted, however, by 1 Tim 2:12 since here "man" is grammatically singular, not plural. Thus this verse does not support the view which prohibits the teaching of men in groups yet allows a woman to teach a man in a private setting. If the interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 were correct which treats as a separate and universal prohibition, "I do not permit a woman to teach a man"; then Paul should have opposed Priscilla's teaching of Apollos and all of the other fine teaching which women have given men in the church over the centuries, whether in a church meeting or not. But in fact Paul consistently gave Priscilla high praise without a hint of censure.

οὐδέ

Perhaps the single most crucial question for a proper interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 is whether the conjunction οὐδέ was intended to separate two distinct prohibitions or to join together two parts of one interrelated prohibition. Does it separate two distinct prohibitions, first teaching, and second domineering men (or "having authority over men," etc.)? Or does it join together two parts of one interrelated prohibition such as: "to teach a man in a domineering way"? Surprisingly this crucial question has not been directly addressed in any of the studies with which I am familiar. It generally seems to be assumed to be either two separate prohibitions or an interrelated prohibition, but I have not seen any studies of Paul's use of this conjunction which defends the correctness of either assumption.

All together Paul's epistles contain 35 ^{36 if the text variant in Gal 1:12 is included} occurrences of this conjunction. 7 occurrences of this word do not join separate words or phrases and so are not comparable to the occurrence in 1 Tim 2:12. Each of these 7 is a statement introduced by οὐδέ which can stand meaningfully by itself. These are found in: 1 Cor 11:14; 14:21; 15:13,16; Gal 2:3,5; 6:13. Every other occurrence of οὐδέ in Paul's epistles joins two *closely related* items. The only possible exception is 1 Tim 2:12, and then only if it is regarded as giving two separate prohibitions. The Lexicon by Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich appropriately describes this conjunction as one which "joins negative sentences or clauses to others of the same kind." ^{BAG 595} The grammarian Nigel Turner states "οὐδέ ... may

resume and emphasize a previous negative"^{Syntax, 340} BDF §445 calls οὐδέ a "correlative" and a "connective" indicating "correlation" of members and contrasts its use with "independent continuation."

Paul typically used οὐδέ to join together elements which reinforce or make more specific a *single coherent idea*. In the following examples the English equivalent to οὐδέ is italicized:

Rom 2:28 "For the true Jew is not the man who is outwardly a Jew, *and* true circumcision is not that which is outward and bodily." (Weymouth; cf. Goodspeed, Jerusalem Bible [JB], Williams, also translating οὐδέ "and"). The meaning is beautifully conveyed by Today's English Version [TEV]: "After all, who is a real Jew, truly circumcised? Not the man who is a Jew on the outside *whose* circumcision is a physical thing." Following this translation pattern for 1 Tim 2:12 gives: "I am not permitting a woman to teach in a way *which* domineers a man."

Rom 3:10 "There is no one righteous, *not even one*." (NIV)

Rom 4:15 "where there is no law *there is no* transgression." (NIV) This verse parallels 1 Tim 2:12 since in both, οὐδέ indicates a close relationship between a positive thing (law, teach) and a negative thing (transgression, domineering), one occurring with the other and both included in a single coherent idea.

Rom 8:7 "They do not submit to God's Law, *and* indeed cannot." (Weymouth; TEV, Living, also translating οὐδέ "and")

Rom 9:7 "For not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel, *and* not all are children of Abraham because they are his descendants..." (RSV; cf. Beck, also translating οὐδέ "and")

Rom 9:16 "It does not, therefore, depend on man's desire *or* effort, but on God's mercy" (NIV). It is grammatically possible that Paul here is conveying two separate ideas, that mercy does not depend on desire and that mercy does not depend on effort. However, this statement parallels and is exemplified by vv 31-32 "Israel, who pursued a law of righteousness, has not attained it. Why not? Because they pursued it not by faith but as if it were by works." "Desire and effort" in v 16 parallels "pursued" in vv 31-32. It is thus more likely that "desire and effort" in v 16 was not intended by Paul to convey two separate ideas, but rather the single idea "the effort motivated by desire." This whole chapter argues the theme so common in Paul's epistles that God's mercy does not depend on works: v 4 "temple worship", v 5 "the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ", v 11 "had done anything good or bad", v 12 "not by works", v 30 "did not pursue righteousness", v 31 "pursued a law of righteousness, has not attained it", v 32 "Why not? Because they pursued it not by faith but as if it were by works." Paul did not criticize Israel for *pursuing* righteousness. He criticized Israel for pursuing it not by faith but *by works*. It is difficult to defend either grammatically or theologically that Paul intended "desire" and "effort" in Rom 9:16 as two separate ideas. ^{Even though some might be tempted to use this verse to argue against Karl Rahner's concept of "baptism of desire"}

1 Cor 2:6 "a wisdom unknown to the world today *and* to its rulers who pass away." (Beck; cf. Living, also translating οὐδέ "and")

1 Cor 5:1 "incest so unnatural *that* it does *not* exist *even* amongst the Gentiles..." (Arthur Way) The element following οὐδέ narrows down the specific kind of illicit sex to which Paul is referring, just as in 1 Tim 2:12 it may narrow down the specific kind of teaching to which Paul is referring, "teaching *that* domineers a man".

1 Cor 11:16 "Your view is against all usage, alike of our own *and* of the churches of God." (Way, deleting his insertion of "all other" since this is not in the Greek text; cf. Goodspeed, LB, Williams, also translating οὐδέ "and") Clearly there is a close interrelationship between "we" and "the churches of God" since Paul and all those he includes with himself are part of "the churches of God". Here, the second member may specify the extent included in the less specific "we", just as "to domineer a man" in 1 Tim 2:12 may specify the sort of teaching Paul intended to prohibit.

1 Cor 15:50 "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God: *and* the perishable cannot inherit what lasts for ever." (JB; cf. Goodspeed, New American Bible [NAB], TEV, also translating οὐδέ "and")

Gal 1:1 "Paul, an apostle, not by human appointment *or* human commission..." (NEB)

Gal 1:12 "the Good News I preached is not a human message *that* I was given by men..." (JB) Following this translation pattern for 1 Tim 2:12 gives: "I am not permitting a woman to teach in a way *that* domineers a man."

Gal 1:17 "instead of consulting with any human being, *instead of* going up to Jerusalem to see those who had been apostles before me, I went off to Arabia..." Acts 9:15-19 tells how Paul met with Ananias and with the disciples in Damascus for several days, following Paul's divine commission to

the Gentiles (cf. Acts 26:12-20). Thus, the element following οὐδέ specifies what Paul is particularly concerned about in the preceding clause. He is not denying that he talked with Ananias and the other disciples in Damascus about the Christian faith right after his conversion. Rather, using οὐδέ Paul specified the particular human consulting he had in mind, namely with the Jerusalem apostles. Similarly οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2:12 may specify the particular sort of teaching Paul had in mind, namely teaching "which domineers a man."

Gal 3:28 "There is no such thing as Jew *and* Greek, slave *and* freeman, male and (καί) female..." (NEB; cf. Fenton, Goodspeed, JB, TEV, Way, Weymouth, also translating οὐδέ "and"). Here οὐδέ parallels καί ("and"), and in Col 3:11 (and Rom 10:12) it is replaced by καί: "In this new relation there is no Greek and (καί) Jew, no circumcised and (καί) uncircumcised..." (NASB). Paul viewed each pair as a single unified group in Christ, not as two separate groups. Each pair functions together to convey a single coherent message.

Gal 4:14 "what must have tried you in my physical condition, you did not scorn *and* despise, but you welcomed me like an angel of God..." (Goodspeed; cf. Living, also translating οὐδέ "and")

Phil 2:16 "I had not run in the race *and* exhausted myself for nothing." (JB; cf. Goodspeed, TEV, also translating οὐδέ "and") The LB expresses these two verbs joined by οὐδέ as expressing the single idea "my work."

1 Thess 5:5 "We have nothing to do with night *and* darkness." (Beck; cf. LB, also translating οὐδέ "and")

2 Thess 3:8 "We were not idle when we were with you *and* took no free meals from anyone but worked hard and struggled day and night..." (Beck)

1 Tim 6:16 "whom no man has seen *and* no man is able to see..." (JB). Here as in 1 Tim 2:12, οὐδέ joins two infinitives making a single coherent idea.

In each of these 20 occurrences Paul used οὐδέ to join together two elements which reinforce or help to make specific a single coherent idea. Apart from our text in question, 1 Tim 2:12, this leaves only 7 occurrences where Paul may have used οὐδέ not to convey a single coherent idea but to convey two separate ideas. Yet a close examination of these shows that in each of them οὐδέ joins closely interrelated elements, not two separate elements with as little interrelationship as "to teach" and "to domineer" (or "to have authority"):

Rom 11:21 "For if God did not spare the natural branches, he will *not* spare you *either*" (NIV).

1 Cor 3:2 "I gave you milk, not solid food, for you were not yet ready for it. Indeed, you are *still not* ready" (NIV).

1 Cor 4:3 "I care very little if I am judged by you or by any human court; indeed, I do *not even* judge myself" (NIV).

2 Cor 7:12 "So even though I wrote to you, it was not on account of the one who did the wrong *or* of the injured party, but rather that before God you could see for yourselves how devoted to us you are."

1 Thess 2:3 "For the appeal we make does not spring from error *or* impure motives, *nor* are we trying to trick you" (NIV).

1 Tim 6:7 "For we brought nothing into the world, *and* we can take *nothing* out of it" (NIV).

In each of these occurrences οὐδέ joins very closely related pairs: natural branches/ingrafted branches, you were not yet ready/you are still not ready, judged by you/judge myself, the one who did the wrong/the injured party, error/impure motives/guile, we brought nothing into the world/we can take nothing out. The ideas "to teach" and "to domineer" (or "to have authority") in 1 Tim 2:12 are not nearly as closely interrelated as any of these pairs. Thus the interpretation that οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2:12 separates two such distinct prohibitions as "to teach" and "to domineer" (or "to have authority") is without parallel in any of its other 34 occurrences in the Pauline corpus.

Οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2:12 ought to be translated in harmony with Paul's use elsewhere. Its translation should indicate that it joins together two elements in order to convey a single coherent idea, or if it conveys two ideas these should be very closely interrelated. Since the two elements joined by οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2:12 are not nearly as closely interrelated as any of the other such pairs of separate ideas in the Pauline corpus, it would be appropriate to translate them as a single coherent idea.

It is difficult to find an English equivalent for οὐδέ, one which typically joins together two elements in order to convey a single coherent idea, and when referring to two separate ideas joins very

closely related pairs. Perhaps the closest equivalent is the English colloquial use of "'n" as in "hit 'n run", "nice 'n easy", "spic 'n span", or "good 'n drunk". In practically every case 'n joins two words which are thought of together as a single idea. The statement, "Don't eat 'n run!", prohibits leaving the host immediately after eating. It does not prohibit either eating or running by itself. The statement, "Don't hit 'n run.", prohibits driving your car away after you have hit someone with it. It does not refer to instances of hitting someone unless it is followed by running away. Similarly Paul's statement may fairly be translated, "I am not permitting a woman to teach 'n domineer a man." This prohibition does not prohibit teaching in itself, nor does it prohibit domineering in itself (though like "hitting" in "hit 'n run" it is something that obviously is not approved). It prohibits that kind of teaching which domineers.

We conclude, therefore, that Paul's typical use of οὐδέ to join together two elements in order to convey a single coherent idea favors an interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 such as "I am not permitting a woman to teach 'n domineer a man", namely "to teach in a way that domineers a man." Conversely, this study shows that interpretations of 1 Tim 2:12 which treat it as conveying two separate prohibitions, one against teaching and the other against domineering a man (or having authority over a man), do not conform to Paul's customary use of οὐδέ. In fact, as we have seen, they interpret οὐδέ in a way which has no close parallels in the entire Pauline corpus. This pattern does not exclude the possibility of two distinct prohibitions in 1 Tim 2:12, but does lessen its likelihood.

Is it natural to interpret the first part of 1 Tim 2:12 as a *separate* prohibition against women teaching men? The majority of traditional commentators seem to have made the implicit, although unexpressed, assumption that Paul here gives us two conceptually distinct prohibitions, but that part of the first distinct prohibition is imbedded in the second prohibition. The two prohibitions, they say, are 1. that women are not to teach men and 2. that women are not to domineer (or alternatively something like, "to have authority over") men.

The word "man", however, is included only in the second half of the prohibition. In fact, it is at the exact opposite end of the clause from the infinitive "to teach". The word order in Greek is: "To teach by a woman I am not permitting οὐδέ to domineer a man". If Paul had intended to prohibit two separate things, the first being "to teach a man", why didn't he include this with the rest of the first prohibition? If he intended us conceptually to join the word "man" and only this word from the second half of the clause, why didn't he join it syntactically to the first half of this clause? Those adopting this interpretation might plead that Paul was just being concise and expected his readers to make this transfer even though he did not make it explicit. Yet if that was his intent, why did he put this vital specifier "man" as far away in this clause as possible from "to teach"? He could hardly have chosen a word order less conducive to such a conceptual transfer.

On page 75/202 Moo argues that Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 is restricting women from teaching *men*. He states that "the construction is a perfectly natural one; in Greek, objects and qualifiers of words which occur only with the second in a series must often be taken with the first also (cf. Acts 8:21)". However, none of the other 27 occurrences of οὐδέ joining two elements in Paul's letters parallels in degree of difference between the two elements the kind of transfer he believes should be made in 1 Tim 2:12. And the Acts 8:21 case he cites is not parallel at several crucial points:

1. In Acts 8:21 the first element "you have no part" requires the additional "in this ministry" in order to make sense. But in 1 Tim 2:12 "I am not permitting a woman to teach" makes good sense grammatically without anything additional.
2. In Acts 8:21 the syntactical structure places the two interrelated elements as close together as possible in the clause. But in 1 Tim 2:12 they are as far apart as possible in the clause.
3. In Acts 8:21 the two elements joined by οὐδέ are synonymous, "part" and "lot" "in the matter." But in 1 Tim 2:12 the two elements joined by οὐδέ are not synonymous, "teach" and "act autonomously/have authority".
4. The grammatical form of the transferred element in Acts 8:21 is in exactly the form that is appropriate to complete the first element as well as the second element. But the grammatical form of the element ("a man") which Moo proposes to transfer to the first element to provide a qualifier for "to teach" is not in the case which is required in that context. It is genitive rather than accusative (cf. Rom 2:21; 1 Cor 11:14; Col 1:28; 3:16). Each of these differences makes it unlikely that Paul intended only the word "man", but not the rest of the second element, to restrict the meaning of "to teach".

Why do those who interpret this verse as giving two separate prohibitions find it necessary to import the qualifier "a man" from the second half of the clause? The reason is practical. There are probably no Christian groups today where women are prohibited from teaching *per se*. We do let women teach in Sunday School, in missionary work, and so forth. So unless Paul's prohibition of women teaching is qualified, all churches, including ours and Paul's, regularly break this command.

The interpretation which insists that Paul is here giving two separate prohibitions and tries to evade the practical and exegetical problems of prohibiting teaching *per se* by allowing women to teach other women but prohibiting them from teaching men in groups is found to be highly improbable for three key reasons:

1. Most of the Pauline occurrences of the conjunction οὐδέ which join two elements communicate one single coherent idea, not two. The few which do communicate two ideas invariably join closely interrelated elements, natural pairs which fit together. None of the latter separate two elements with as little interrelationship as "to teach" and "to domineer" (or "to have authority").

2. The word order and syntax of 1 Tim 2:12 are not conducive to interpreting "man" from the second element as restricting the meaning of "to teach" in the first element while also maintaining that the two elements are separate prohibitions. If, however, the two elements are understood as conveying a single coherent idea such as "teaching which domineers a man," then the whole of the second element modifies the first, not just an arbitrarily selected part of it.

3. 1 Tim 2:12 prohibits domineering a "man" (singular), and although its generic use can certainly apply to groups, it cannot be interpreted as prohibiting only the teaching of men (plural) in groups while permitting instruction to "a man" (singular), such as in the case of Priscilla and Apollos. The attempt to avoid this by interpreting "teach" as an activity applying only to "the official teaching assembly" does not square with 2 Tim 2:2 or the other verses encouraging all believers to *teach* one another.

Thus, lexically, syntactically, and grammatically 1 Tim 2:12 should not be interpreted as two separate prohibitions, part of the first being embedded in the second element. But if, as we have argued, the two halves are understood to be parts of one interrelated prohibition, then it is natural to understand the entire latter element as modifying the former.

αὐθεντεῖν

The crucial question in one's assessment of the meaning of αὐθεντεῖν is whether its meaning is elucidated only by verbs having the αὐθεντ- root or also by nouns using the same root. Verbs with this root prior to the time of Paul are rare, but the noun forms of this root are plentiful. Virtually all of the meanings of the verb have corresponding meanings in noun forms, so their interrelationship in range of meaning can be established beyond reasonable doubt. The study by George Knight III, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in Reference to Women in I Timothy 2:12," *NTS* 30 (Jan 1984) 143-57, to which Moo appealed in support of the meaning "have authority over," examined only the verbal occurrences and downplayed the meanings of the verb other than "to have authority over." Because of the paucity of these verbs before Paul's time, Knight's study omits the overwhelming majority of the evidence.

Knight defends his elimination of the noun forms of αὐθεντ- on the possibility of a separate etymology for the meaning "to murder." The particular meaning "murder" does have the possibility of a separate etymology, but the etymology for the other meanings of αὐθεντ- root is agreed upon by Pierre Chantraine, P. Kretschmer (in *Glotta* iii. 1912, p. 289ff.), LSJ, 275, and Moulton Milligan (p 91) to be αὐτ-έντης, meaning "to thrust oneself." Thus, etymology provides no basis for isolating the αὐθεντ- verbs from its nouns in investigating its range of meanings. Further methodological errors and erroneous citations in Knight's study have been identified both by Catherine Kroeger, "A Critique of George Knight's 'ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ In Reference to Women in I Timothy 2:12'" (unpublished), portions of which appear in her essay on 1 Timothy 2:12 in *Women, Authority & the Bible* (Naperville, Ill.: IVP, 1986) and by Leland Edward Wilshire of Biola University, "The LTG Computer and Further Reference to αὐθεντέω in I Timothy 2:12" (unpublished).

How one interprets αὐθεντεῖν is determined by one's evaluation of three questions. First is the question, "Is the passage a limited prohibition or a universal prohibition?" Second is the question, "Does this verse state two distinct prohibitions (against teaching and against whatever αὐθεντεῖν means) or one interrelated prohibition (teaching a man in a manner characterized by whatever αὐθεντεῖν means)?" Third is the question, "What does αὐθεντεῖν mean here?"

It is possible to come to different conclusions on any one of these issues and still give an internally consistent and viable exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 which affirms the total equality of women and men. This includes interpretations which treat verse 12 as a universally valid prohibition and regard *αὐθεντεῖν* as qualifying the meaning of "to teach" in such a way that only a bad sort of teaching is prohibited. Five such lexically valid alternatives are listed below. The first three of these can be clearly supported in the immediate context and seem more viable than the last two.

1) "to teach *autonomously*" The root meaning of *αὐθεντεῖν*, "thrust oneself," may have been intended by Paul. If so, the thrusting forward of oneself may refer to autonomous teaching done independently of authorized doctrine or "to instigate teaching." Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 262, cites five examples of the verb *αὐθεντέω* meaning "be primarily responsible for, instigate, authorize," seven meaning "assume authority; act on one's own authority," and another meaning "presume on one's own authority." Moulton-Milligan cites *αὐθεντιζῶ* as meaning "take in hand" (see *Chrest.* I. ii. p. 160., LSJ 275: BGU 103.3). The second century grammarian Moeris (p. 58) states, "*αὐτοδίκη (l.—εἶν) Ἀττικοί, αὐθέντην (l.—εἶν) Ἕλληνες. αὐτόδικος* means "with independent jurisdiction, with a free constitution of rights, free". (Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, *A complete Concordance to Josephus*, Vol. I, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, p. 268; cf. Dibelius Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, p. 47, "to have one's own jurisdiction.") Similarly, the Atticist Thomas Magister (p 18, 8) warns his pupil to use *αὐτοδικεῖν* because *αὐθεντεῖν* was vulgar (*κοινότερον*). LSJ lists the meaning "perpetrator, author" for *αὐθέντης* in Polybius (2c BC) 22.14.2 and Diodorus Siculus (1c BC) 16.61. *αὐθεντία* gives the similar sense "with his own hand" Dio Cassius (2/3c AD) *Fr.* 102.12. Lampe, p. 263, cites many examples of the noun form *αὐθεντία* conveying a bad sense: one example meaning "irresponsibility, licence," four meaning "arbitrarily, on one's own responsibility, unauthorized," and another meaning "private notion, personal view." Any one of these nuances fit naturally with the following reference to Eve's deception, and they all fit the problem of false teaching which is the overarching concern and purpose for the writing of 1 Timothy.

2) "teach in a *contentious* manner" BGU 1208 (27 B.C.) "when I had prevailed upon him to provide . . ." This translation of BGU 1208 by Paul D. Peterson conveys the nuance of contentious action. Similar is the actual translation sent by John Werner to Knight, "I called him to account." Knight tells me that Werner in a telephone conversation allowed the translation he attributes to Werner in the NTS article, "I exercised authority over him." In the letter accompanying the translation, however, Werner makes it clear that we do not even know if the speaker at this point was in a position of authority over the person he called into account. If he did not have authority, it would be inappropriate to translate it "exercised authority." Three further points in this document make the translation "exercised authority" doubtful. First, the text states that "in the hour he consented to provide for Calatytis the boatman on terms of the full fare, within the hour." How often do we make note that someone in a position under authority "*consented* to provide" or note the time frame within which he did so? Second, the person who was called into account, did not in fact pay the boatman. If the person speaking had authority over him, it would be utterly foolhardy for him so blatantly to lie to and disobey his master. Third, *αὐθεντηκότας* is followed by *πρός* with the accusative, a standard use for which is for "denoting a hostile or friendly relationship--a. hostile *against, with* after verbs of disputing, etc." (BAG, 717; cf. LSJ, 1497). This passage is about a hostile relationship; his action is called "insolence" in the text. None of the other uses of *πρός* in the over three columns devoted to it in BAG seem to fit this context, and "over" is not mentioned at all as a linguistic equivalent of *πρός*, nor do any of BAG's examples of usages of *πρός* imply a position of authority. Knight refers to this passage as his most important example of *αὐθεντέω* meaning "have authority over." Its date and verbal form make it important for understanding the range of meaning of the verb at the time Paul wrote, but its use here implies forcefulness or pushiness in a context of contention. The translation "in a contentious manner" fits the contentiousness of the false teachers and the contrast with "quietness" in 2:11 and 12 and the virtue in v 15.

3) "to teach in a *domineering* manner." Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* III.13, (2c A.D.), "Saturn dominates Mercury and the moon." (Loeb, 338f.). Chrysostom (died A.D. 407), *hom.in Col.* X.1 (II.396C) and XI.2. (406E) "do not tyrannize over your wife." Lampe, p. 262, translates these, "play the despot, act arbitrarily." Note that if *αὐθεντεῖν* must mean "to have authority," then Chrysostom wrote "do not have authority over your wife"! Joannes Philoponus (5-6c A.D.) wrote "ignorance dominates." Lampe, p. 263, gives five examples of the noun form *αὐθεντία* conveying the meaning "high-handedness; tyranny." Accordingly and in light of the contrast with "quietness"

and "submission" in 1 Timothy 2:11-12 the NEB, Berkeley, New Berkeley, Goodspeed, and Williams translate ἀθρευτεῖν "domineer over," Fenton "dominate," Way "lord it over," ASV "have dominion over," King James "usurp authority," Moffatt "dictate to", and Jerusalem Bible "tell a man what to do," cf. BAG, 120 "domineer over."

4) "teach in such a way that *virtues are destroyed*" Philo, *The Worse Attacks the Better* xxi (1c A.D.), "The person who has tried to destroy the virtues has become his own murderer." (Loeb, 78). Catherine Kroeger has given the interpretation "to teach licentious doctrines and practices." (*The Reformed Journal* (March 1979) 12-15.

5) "to teach in a way that *murders* [the truth]" ἀθρευτεῖν is used to mean "to murder" in the *Scholia Vetera* on Aeschylus' *Eum.* 42a (5-1 B.C.); cf. Phrynichus (late 2c A.D.) and Harpocration (1-2c A.D.). By far the most common meaning of ἀθρευτης is "murderer." Catherine Kroeger suggests the meaning, "to teach ritual or sham murder" as was done at Ephesus (the city to which 1 Timothy was sent) in the Artemis cult. Although there are extensive hints of sensual activity throughout 1 Timothy and in this context (2:9,15) and although ἀθρευτης occurs in many contexts focusing on illicit sex, I am not yet convinced that this was a distinct meaning of ἀθρευτεῖν.

The translation of ἀθρευτεῖν as a positive concept, "to have authority over" may find support from Philodemus, *Volumina Rhetorica* (1c B.C.), but this depends on reconstruction of a damaged text. The crucial letters distinguishing between the verb and noun are missing from the text, and the word it modifies has only the first two letters extant, αυ, letters which begin hundreds of different words in Greek. Knight seems not to have recognized that the square brackets indicate conjectural reconstruction by the editor, S. Sudhaus (Leipzig, 1892). Thus, we have not even one undisputed case of ἀθρευτεῖν used to mean "to have authority" before or during the time of Paul. Lampe has established that the word was used in Patristic writings to convey various nuances of having and exercising authority. Paul does refer to authority in many passages, but nowhere else does he use this word, and it has been wondered if it is likely that he would have chosen such an unusual verb to convey the simple idea of authority. It is of course possible that Paul intended ἀθρευτεῖν in 1 Tim 2:12 to mean, "to have authority" in a positive sense, either as a separate prohibition along with "to teach" or as single prohibition of women teaching men authoritatively, but we do not have adequate comparative evidence to conclude this with even a modest level of confidence.

γάρ

Moo misinterprets my comments regarding γάρ as an "attempt to prove that the γάρ introducing vv 13-14 is 'explanatory' rather than 'illative' (75/202). . . It must be questioned whether Payne's interpretation *does*, in fact, utilize an explanatory γάρ. For he views vv 13-14 as illustrative of 'how serious the consequences can be when a woman deceived by false teaching conveys it to others.'" (p. 76/203) I was not trying to prove that the γάρ in 2:12 is explanatory rather than illative. Both are common, and the two categories commonly overlap.

My objection was (p. 75/202) and continues to be that Moo's position requires not simply that this γάρ is illative but also that Paul intended to give an *anthropological norm* describing the nature of women in general. Moo objects to my suggestion that γάρ in 2:13 may be explanatory on the basis that "the usage is rare, BAG cites only twelve examples of the explanatory force of γάρ in the NT, in agreement with Dana and Mantey; Thayer likewise gives a small number of such examples and Zerwick cites only 14 instances in Paul where the conjunction does *not* have its usual causal force."

Moo's statement is misleading for it implies that Dana and Mantey's examples are in agreement with the twelve cited by BAG and that Thayer and Zerwick do not add significantly to this number. In fact the figures are as follows:

BAG explanatory "for, you see" 12 examples

Mt 12:40,50; 23:3; 24:38; Mk 7:3; Lk 9:14; J 3:16; 4:8f; Ro 7:2; Hb 3:4; 2 Pt 2:8

Dana & Mantey: 13 examples "for instance" "Now" (*only 1 overlaps* BAG)

Mt 9:5; Lk 14:27-28; 1 Cor 11:6,7 (2x) 10:1; 11:19; Jn 4:8,44; Ac 13:36; 18:3; 19:37; 20:16; 2 Cor 1:12

Thayer "explain, make clear, illustrate, a preceding thought or word 12 (*none overlap*)

Mt 1:18; 4:18; 19:12; Mk 1:16; 2:15; 5:42; 16:4; Lk 11:30; 18:32; Ro 7:1; 8:18; 1 Co 16:5

Zerwick = sense of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, especially in Paul 14 (*only I overlaps*) and by writers other than Paul 10 (*only I overlaps*) Ro 1:18; 2:25; 4:3,9; 5:7; 12:3; 14:5; 1 Cor 10:1; 2 Cor 1:12; 10:12; 11:5; Gal 1:11; 5:13; 1 Tim 2:5
 Luke 1:15; 12:58; 14:28; Acts 2:34; 4:34a; 8:39; 13:27; 15:28; 16:37; 23:11

Thus, the works selected by Moo to show the infrequency of the explanatory use of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ list 58 verses, and only 3 citations overlap an instance in one of the other lists! The presence of slight overlapping shows that these lists were not written simply as supplements to the others. The ratio of elsewhere unlisted examples to overlapping ones (58:3) suggests that there are many more occurrences of explanatory $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ beyond these.

Many grammarians have not reflected as deeply as did A.T. Robertson on the close relationship between an example and a reason. Consequently many explanatory uses of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ have been categorized simply as illative and the extensiveness of the explanatory use of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ has been overlooked. Even slight reflection shows that explanations very often imply a reason or show the reasonableness of something, and reasons are often expressed through examples. Moo, who objects to the view that $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ here may be explanatory, himself wrote (p. 27/70 first article) "it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Paul cites Eve's failure as exemplary."

Moo on p. 76/203 writes "Thayer and BAG introduce the causal meaning first." Yet on p. 71/198 he criticized me for noting the first lexical listing, saying that this is "misleading when one is trying to establish the most common *usage* of a term." In fact, Thayer lists cause second, not first.

Moo on p. 76/203 writes, "Therefore the first thing which must be said is that Payne is attempting to establish a meaning for $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ which is relatively rare."

But 1) This meaning is not rare.

2) I am not "attempting to establish such a meaning," merely showing that such a meaning is already established, and that it can make good sense of this passage.

Moo on p. 76/203 paragraph two does make a significant point about $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ usually implying a reason when used after a command in the Pastoral epistles. I agree that it is appropriate to look for a reason for the command just given. He overstates his case, however. Of the 21 instances he adduces three are clearly not causal, 1 Tim 3:13; 2 Tim 3:6, and Titus 3:3. 1 Tim 5:15 is also translated as not causal in the NIV. What precisely, however, is the command for which Paul gives the reason? There has been one imperative: "Let women learn." It is modified by "in quietness and all submission." Then Paul added, "However, I am not permitting a woman to teach οὐδὲ ἀυθεντεῖν a man, but rather to be in quietness." Is what Paul introduces with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ the reason for letting them learn? for their being quiet? for their being submissive? for their not teaching? for their not domineering/having authority/teaching autonomously? or for a combination of these?

How much of what follows the $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is the reason or reasons? The sequence in which Adam then Eve were formed by God? That Adam was not deceived? Eve's deception? Transgression, the result of Eve's deception? These are the sort of questions which grammar alone cannot answer definitively. Zerwick notes "that sometimes the real reason is expressed in the second place only, preceded by something not alleged as a reason but merely conceded parenthetically as well known" (p. 159 §474). Only by comparing the various parts of Paul's command and its explication in verses 11 and 12 with the content of what he says regarding Adam and Eve can we identify the possible options and try to determine Paul's probable intention.

The sequence in which God formed Adam first, then Eve, does not in itself give a reason for any of the foregoing statements. Only as one makes a judgement about the significance of this sequence can one make a judgement about how this may give a reason for the preceding statements or part of them.

One's interpretation of 1 Cor 11:8 and 12 about "the woman coming from the man" will have significant bearing on one's interpretation of 1 Tim 2:13. 1 Corinthians 11:2-15, however, is one of the most difficult passages for any view. I have not yet read a published exegesis of this passage which did not depart significantly from the normal range of meaning of its words and the normal function of its syntax. One's interpretation of 1 Cor 11:8 is closely related to how one understands the word $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ and how one interprets the whole issue regarding head coverings. The majority view

in recent scholarship appears to be that in 1 Corinthians 11 "head" carries its recognized Greek meaning *source*. For example, κέφαλη by Berkeley and Alvira Mickelsen and my response in *Woman, Authority & the Bible* (Naperville, Ill: IVP, 1986) and my review of W. Grudem's analysis forthcoming in *Themelios*.

1 Cor 11:7-12 reads literally as follows: 7 A man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; and the woman is the glory of man. 8 For man did not come from woman, but woman from man; 9 neither was man created for the sake of woman, but the woman for the sake of man. 10 For this reason a woman ought to have authority over her head, because of the angels. 11 In the Lord, however, woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. 12 For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman. But everything comes from God."

Paul's statement that man did not come from woman but woman came from man is given as an explanation (all three γὰρs in vv 7-9 are explanatory) for his affirmation that woman is the glory of man. This parallels his immediately prior statement that man is the image and glory of God, through whose creative act man came into being. In order to determine what consequences Paul associated with woman having her source in man we have only to read Paul's explicit statements in 1 Corinthians 11. He states that man must not "*dishonor*" (καταισχύνει) 11:4 his head-source, Christ, by covering his head while praying or prophesying. This would dishonor Christ because to cover his head is tantamount to denying the open direct access we have to God through the sacrificial work of Christ. Paul argues this at length in 2 Cor 3:12-18. Similarly woman owes honor to man, the source from which she was taken. Thus, Paul states that she should not "*dishonor*" (καταισχύνει) 11:5 her head-source (man).

Paul reiterates this idea that one should show proper honor to one's source in verse 8. This verse gives the reason for Paul's statement in verse 7 that woman is the *glory* of man: "For man is not from woman but woman from man." She must not dishonor him because she is his glory. Similarly man, the image and glory of God should honor his maker. The glory of anything should honor it, not dishonor it. Whatever the precise nature of the headcovering problem which Paul here addresses, Paul was concerned because it was dishonoring. His references to woman having her source in man are designed to show that she has a proper obligation to show man honor as her source. Paul immediately points out in v 12 that the obligation of honor is not a one way street: "For just as woman is from man, so also man is through woman, but all are from God." Not only does woman have her source in man. All men have their source in a woman. Not only should women honor men; men should honor women; and all owe supreme honor to their ultimate source, God.

Paul's own explanation of the meaning of the parallels in 1 Cor 11:8,12 provides the best basis for understanding 1 Tim 2:13. Accordingly, Paul's reference to "Adam was formed first, then Eve" should indicate that women ought to show honor to men because of woman's original source in Adam. Does this give a valid reason for any of the immediately prior statements? Yes! Immediately prior to v. 13 Paul wrote, "But she is to be ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, "in quietness." This was of major concern to Paul, for this repeats the similar expression in v. 11, "Let women learn in quietness and all submission". Her quiet teachable spirit shows proper honor to her Christian teachers such as Timothy. Furthermore, if ἀυθεντεῖν connotes domineering or acting independently of men, woman's obligation to honor man, her source, provides an ideal reason for this prohibition. Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 11:11-12 implies that this obligation to honor the other sex is a mutual obligation, for every man is born of woman. Similarly, 1 Tim 2:15 points to another reason for mutual honor: the Savior came through a woman. We are called to "honor all persons" (1 Peter 2:17).

Paul then adds: "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being thoroughly deceived became a transgressor." This gives Paul's key reason why he did not permit women to teach at that time in Ephesus. They, like Eve before them, were deceived. Deception receives the greatest stress of all of Paul's explanation for his statement "I am not permitting a woman to teach." It is stressed both in the repeated use of the word "deceived" and in the heightened form of this word regarding Eve, "thoroughly deceived." The example of the terrible consequences of Eve's deception stand as a powerful argument for the need of this (present) restriction on their teaching. Their deception was serious. It was causing some to wander from the faith (1:6). "Some have in fact already turned away to follow Satan" (1 Tim 5:15). And the testimony of the church was at stake since this was giving the enemy opportunity for slander (1 Tim 5:14).

Of course, if the text taught that all women are by nature easily deceived and therefore not reliable teachers and that men are not so deceived, then this would be a basis for prohibiting women to teach at all, whether that teaching be to men or women, with or without a position of authority. But the text does not draw any such anthropological generalizations, and we are not wise to do so either. To the contrary, Paul teaches that all persons tend toward deception. 2 Timothy 3:13 states that "evil persons (ἄνθρωποι, generic for men and women) and impostors will go from bad to worse, deceiving and being deceived." Titus 3:3 states "For we also once were foolish ourselves, disobedient, deceived..." (cf. Rom 1:29; 3:13; 7:11; 16:18; 1 Cor 3:18; 6:9; 15:33; 2 Cor 11:13; 12:16; Gal 6:3,7; Eph 4:14,22; 5:6; Col 2:8; 1 Thess 2:3; 2 Thess 2:3,10; 1 Tim 4:1; Titus 1:10). So throughout Paul's letters including the pastorals he clearly regarded the tendency to deceive and be deceived as characterizing men as well as women. Paul at about this time explicitly calls women to be "teachers of what is excellent" in Titus 2:3. Thus, he clearly rejected the view that since women are easily deceived they are unreliable teachers.

Moo's statement on p. 77/204 exposes the extent of his assumptions about the created nature of man and woman: "[In] the pre-fall situation ... the man bears responsibility for religious teaching." How Moo reads this into Genesis 1-2 eludes me, but OT scholars such as C. Westermann and J. B. Payne have not found it there at all, nor any other teaching of separate roles or of a hierarchy of men over women.

σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας

On p. 78/205 Moo asks, "Why is it objectionable to view faithfulness to a God-ordained role as a... necessary accompaniment... to salvation?" First, because if "bearing children" is a "necessary accompaniment" to salvation then unmarried and sterile women are excluded from salvation. Moo can avoid this only by the rejecting the natural meaning of "child-bearing." Second, this would place a special requirement for salvation on a special category of persons. This objection applies even with Moo's interpretation of "childbearing" as "childrearing." On his view all women would have to "bear children" in order to be saved, but men would not have this requirement for salvation. I know of no other instance in the NT where a particular category of persons are required to meet standards for salvation which are not universal. Furthermore, this smacks of a work and seems out of harmony with Paul's understanding of salvation by faith apart from works.

overseer vocabulary used of women in 1 Timothy

I welcome Moo's questions regarding the significance of the very extensive correlation between the vocabulary describing overseers and statements referring to women in 1 Timothy (63-67/191-195) and have modified them accordingly. His first criticism is that καλοῦ ἔργου, the good work of overseer, is "not comparable" (84/211) to the good works ἔργοις καλοῖς (5:10) which a woman may do. The latter, of course, is in the plural and so encompasses many specific tasks and positions (eg. "the good work of deacon"). Both refer to the same sort of reality of service and they are expressed in the same words, and so it seems inappropriate to exclude them. The case of "one woman man" and "one man woman" is regarded by almost all interpreters as excluding the same infidelity in the case of the woman as of the man. Since these phrases are nearly identical in both meaning and form, it would not be proper to exclude them from our statistics. They show that this moral requirement demanded of an overseer can be fulfilled by a woman.

I grant that different words are used of overseers "managing their own house" (οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον) and women "managing the house" (οἰκοδεσποτεῖν), and so have deleted them from the statistical table as well as "having children in subjection" and "not younger ones." Note that Paul commands women when married to "rule their households," literally "be house despots." Paul called men to the same task of ruling their house well. Paul was not assigning roles based on sex or limiting the sphere appropriate to Christian women. Moo's allegation on p. 79/206 is simply not true that "Paul in 1 Tim 2:8-14 [is] concerned preeminently with the appropriate sphere of the Christian woman's activities, this is a major theme in the letter as a whole-cf. especially 5:2-16." These verses encourage activities appropriate for both men and women: prayer (2:8 of men, 5:5 of women), caring for physical needs (5:4,8), good works, bringing up children, entertaining strangers, washing the feet of saints, relieving the afflicted (5:10); and they counter mistaken elements of the false teaching, hence, "marry and bear children" (5:14; cf. 4:3 "forbidding to marry").

Second, Moo states that my statistics are incomplete in not showing differences. My tables, however, show every word describing the office of overseer and identify parallel descriptions of women in 1 Timothy for each of them. If I knew of an objective way of including all of this data into the probability analysis my statistics would be even more striking.

Third, Moo writes that the statistical picture "would be meaningful only if calculated on the basis of the unique vocabulary of the Pastorals." The third table below shows that even if we restrict the statistical comparison to the Pastorals the odds of the coincidence of these terms in both the overseer requirements and of passages specifically about women is less than 3 in 100,000. Is it correct, however, to regard the situation of the Pastorals as so unique? We have seen close parallels between the false teaching in Ephesus and Corinth. All of Paul's letters have a similar aim of building up Christians in the faith. Moo's insistence that statistical probabilities must be limited to the Pastoral epistles seems to imply that the vocabulary of the Pastorals is so foreign to Paul's vocabulary elsewhere that it cannot be statistically compared to his other letters. If Moo held, as do many critics, that the Pastorals were not authored by Paul, I would understand his objection. Ironically, on p. 71/198 Moo expressed his frustration with those who restrict what constitutes evidence to only a part of Scripture!

Each of the words or phrases in the 11 lines of text describing overseers are paralleled by descriptions of women in the 36 lines of 1 Timothy dealing exclusively with women. Of these, 8 words or phrases recur about women in nearly identical terminology. The first table below shows the probability of this happening based on random distribution of these words in the Pauline epistles is approximately two in a hundred billion (10^{11} or 100,000,000,000) without even taking into account any of the other parallels using different terminology. 2 Tim 4:11, "Only Luke is with me," seems to require the commonly argued thesis that Luke was the secretary who helped Paul write the pastoral epistles. Accordingly, if we include Luke-Acts then the probability of such extensive terminological overlap is less than four in one hundred trillion (10^{14} or 100,000,000,000,000).

Identical Terminology Used of Women and of Overseers in 1 Timothy

<u>1 Tim 3:1-7 terminology</u>	<u>nearly identical terminology</u>	<u>Pauline occurrences^a</u>	<u>odds^b</u>
καλοῦ ἔργου	5:10 ἔργοις καλοῖς	8 ^c	8/113
ἀνεπίγημπτον	5:7 ἀνεπίλημπτοι	3	3/113
μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνδρα	5:9 ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή	4	4/113
νηφάλιον	3:11 νηφαλίους	3	3/113
ὡφρονα	2:9,15 σωφροσύνης	12 ^d	12/113
κόσμιον	2:9 κοσμίῳ	2	2/113
σεμνότητος	3:11 σεμνάς	7	7/113
κρίμα	5:12 κρίμα	12	12/113

<u>1 Tim 3:1-7 terminology</u>	<u>nearly identical terminology</u>	<u>Pauline + Lucan occurrences</u>	<u>odds^e</u>
καλοῦ ἔργου	5:10 ἔργοις καλοῖς	8	8/258
ἀνεπίγημπτον	5:7 ἀνεπίλημπτοι	3	3/258
μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνδρα	5:9 ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή	4	4/258
νηφάλιον	3:11 νηφαλίους	3	3/258
ὡφρονα	2:9,15 σωφροσύνης	14 ^f	14/258
κόσμιον	2:9 κοσμίῳ	2	2/258
σεμνότητος	3:11 σεμνάς	7	7/258
κρίμα	5:12 κρίμα	16	16/258

<u>1 Tim 3:1-7 terminology</u>	<u>nearly identical terminology</u>	<u>Pastorals occurrences</u>	<u>odds^g</u>
καλοῦ ἔργου	5:10 ἔργοις καλοῖς	8 ^c	8/14
ἀνεπίγημπτον	5:7 ἀνεπίλημπτοι	3	3/14
μῆς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα	5:9 ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή	4	4/14
νηφάλιον	3:11 νηφαλίους	3	3/14
σώφρονα	2:9,15 σωφροσύνης	6 ^d	6/14
κόσμιον	2:9 κοσμίῳ	2	2/14
σεμνότητος	3:11 σεμνάς	6	6/14
κρίμα	5:12 κρίμα	2	2/14

- Cf. Moulton and Geden's Concordance of the Greek Testament.
- These odds are calculated as follows: There are 36 lines of Greek text in the Nestle-Aland 26th edition specifically regarding women in 1 Timothy (2:9-15; 3:11; 5:2-7, 9-16) out of a total of approximately 4070 lines of Greek in the Pauline epistles. Therefore, these verses about women in 1 Timothy comprise almost exactly 1/113 of the Pauline epistles. Thus, the total number of comparable occurrences of any of these expressions divided by 113 gives the odds that in a random distribution throughout the Pauline epistles this expression would occur in the 36 lines of 1 Timothy exclusively about women.
- 1 Tim 3:1; 5:10,25; 6:18; Titus 2:7,14; 3:8,14.
- All occurrences of the σώφρων group including: σωφρονέω, σωφρονίζω, σωφρονισμός, σωφρόνως, σωφροσύνη, and σώφρω.
- See note b plus approximately 5210 lines of Greek in Luke-Acts, for a total of approximately 9280 lines in Luke-Acts plus the Pauline epistles. Therefore, these verses about women in 1 Timothy comprise almost exactly 1/258 of Luke-Acts plus the Pauline epistles.
- see note d plus Lk 8:35; Acts 26:25.
- See note b. There are 516 lines of Greek text in the Pastoral epistles. Therefore, these verses about women in 1 Timothy comprise almost exactly 1/14 of the Pastoral epistles.

Conclusion

I conclude, then, that this overlap is not random coincidence, but that the Holy Spirit so inspired 1 Timothy as to make it undeniable that in Paul's thinking the qualifications of overseers not only could but in fact do apply to women. I conclude as well that careful exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 does not require a universal of prohibition of women teaching or of having authority over men. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the latter is even addressed. The text nowhere states that women in general are unsuited to teach or exercise authority. We find textual evidence lacking for Moo's conclusion that "in every age and place: Women are not to teach men nor to have authority over men because such activity would violate the structure of created sexual relationships and would involve the woman in something for which she is not suited." (39/82)

Needed now is a comprehensive view of the wider theological issues which impinge on our exegesis of this text. This should begin with solid exegesis of the early chapters of Genesis exploring the implications that follow from man and woman together being in the image of God and together being given the creation mandate and blessing. What are the practical implications that God is no respecter of persons? The second and even more important pivot is an examination of the new reality Jesus Christ has brought into existence and its relationship to God's intent in the creation and to the effects of the fall. Should we foster the effects of the fall? What are the implications of our present participation in Christ's eschatological kingdom? Do we really believe that in Christ there is no male and female, that we are one? What are the implications of the oneness of the body of Christ? of our liberty in Christ? of our equal standing as adopted children and joint-heirs of Christ? of the priesthood of all believers? Do we really believe that God calls us to mutual submission in the church and in marriage (Eph 5:21ff.; 1 Corinthians 7)? What are the implications that the character of Christian leadership is not like the authoritarian leadership of the world, but is servanthood? or that the Spirit pours out His gifts on women and men freely as He chooses? No exegesis of 1 Timothy 1:12 is complete which does not ponder deeply its relationship to such overarching themes of Biblical theology as these and find a harmonious solution.