

1 TIMOTHY 2:9-15 CONCERNING WOMEN TEACHING

1 Tim 2:9-15, with its admonition for women not to teach but to be silent, has figured prominently in the discussion of women in the church.¹

1. *1 Tim 2:9-15 in Recent Discussion.*

In current evangelical literature, 1 Tim 2:9-15 remains a most important text, and understandings of that passage vary considerably. Books on 1 Tim 2:9-15 have been written by Catherine and Richard Kroeger² and by Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin.³ Although the former base their work upon egalitarianism and the latter upon hierarchalism, the two volumes share certain strengths and weaknesses. Both attempt to engage biblical texts and both make an effort to assess the literary and historical background of the texts. Certainly, that much is appreciable.

¹A. T. Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982): 42, typical of much critical scholarship, incorrectly views these epistles as "made up of a miscellaneous collection of material. They have no unifying theme; there is no development of thought." However, I am inclined to agree with Peter G. Bush, "A Note on the Structure of 1 Timothy," *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 152-156, that there is structure to 1 Timothy and that it is a letter to a particular situation in the early church, not a manual on church order to a general audience.

²Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992).

³Andreas Köstenberger, Thomas Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, ed., *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995): 334.

However, as was discussed on pp. 97-102, there is a tremendous difference between "presuppositions" and "prejudices." We noted earlier that presuppositions are necessary starting points which an interpreter takes when beginning an investigation.⁴ This means that both egalitarianism and hierarchalism have legitimate claim as starting points. Prejudices, however, are personal factors that affect the judgment of an interpreter and make objectivity difficult. It is unfortunate that the prejudices of the Kroegers and of Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin lead to manipulation and distortion of data to an extent that neither of these works on the text of 1 Tim 2:11-12 are commendable. We turn our attention first to the work of the Kroegers.

A. The Kroegers' Work on 1 Tim 2:9-15

Catherine Clark Kroeger, whose work was discussed earlier on pp 57-60 and repeated here for convenience, is exemplary of evangelical feminists who maintain the importance of the Bible in discussion of women in the church. However, the application of rigorous literary and historical controls in her use of the biblical text is unsatisfactory. For instance, in 1 Tim 2:12 the verb *authentēo* (which occurs only here in the NT) means "have authority, domineer"⁵ and "to control, to domineer,"⁶ yet is translated "usurp authority" (KJV), "have authority over" (NIV, NRSV), and "domineer" (NEB). Attempting to locate an alternative rendering, Kroeger suggested that *authentēo* in 1 Tim 2:12 is actually an erotic term referring to ancient female teachers in 5th century BC Athens who offered sex to

⁴Graham M. Stanton, "Presuppositions in New Testament Criticism," *New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Principles and Methods* (ed. H. Marshall; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977): 60.

⁵Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich; 2nd ed. rev. Gingrich and F. W. Danker; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1979): 121.

⁶Johannes P. Louw and E. A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988): 1.474.

their students after class.⁷ Kroeger says that it is that practice that is being forbidden by this text. Needless to say, this rather peculiar proposal was quickly countered by an avalanche of criticism from the scholarly world.⁸ The classical texts that Kroeger cites do not support her view of a sexual connotation to the verb *authentēo*!

It is not at all surprising, then, that in a recent study of this text a different view is presented.⁹ The Kroegers' new view is that the verse only prohibits women from teaching the gnostic heresies that women were created before men, that women were the source of all wisdom, and that bearing children was dishonorable. The Kroegers' treatment of this text purports to be an attempt to observe high standards of scholarship, including both philological and historical elements. They view the passage as refuting a specific heresy at a specific time and place, and thus should not be taken as a universal restriction on women in the church. However, in support of their current translation, that woman is not to "represent herself as originator of man" (103), the Kroegers fail both philologically and historically.

The Kroegers seem oblivious to proper word-study methodology.¹⁰ In arguing that *authentēo* should be trans-

⁷Catherine Clark Kroeger, "Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb," *The Reformed Journal* 29 (1979): 12-15, a view popularized uncritically by such writers as Kari Torjesen Malcolm, *Women at the Crossroads* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1982): 78-80, and though not accepted, is mentioned as "an interesting idea" by Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, 87, n. 15.

⁸See, for example, A. J. Panning, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΙΝ—A Word Study," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78 (1981): 185-191; and Carroll D. Osburn, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (1 Timothy 2:12)," *Restoration Quarterly* 25 (1982): 1-12.

⁹Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992).

¹⁰See James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961); and John F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research* (Studies in Biblical Theology, 24; Naperville, IL: Alec Allenson, 1972)

lated "represent oneself as originator of," they ignore the fact that this verb is rendered "domineer" in NT times. They appeal to outdated sixteenth-century Greek lexicons for a meaning that they then project back into Greek texts of the fourth and fifth centuries AD.¹¹ While they cite much secondary literature, they repeatedly misunderstand the sources they cite,¹² and selectively omit recent literature that opposes their view.¹³ They continue to repeat the misinformation that *authenteo* means "to murder" in ancient Greek. Now this meaning does occur for the noun form, but not for the verb form until the tenth century AD. While leaving the impression of engaging in scholarly investigation of the term (36-37, 84-102), in reality the Kroegers are merely scavenging the philological arena for an alternative to the traditional reading of the text. Wolters concludes,¹⁴

... the Kroegers have conspicuously failed to make their case. No doubt the book will have considerable influence in the evangelical world, but it is very doubtful whether any serious commentary on 1 Timothy will ever adopt its basic thesis. . . its argumentation is a travesty of sound scholarship.

¹¹See the extensive and scathing review of Albert Wolters in *Calvin Theological Journal* 28 (1993): 208-213. In addition, the Kroegers' interpretation takes the *oude* (negative) in v. 12 as a hendiadys (expression of an idea with two independent words connected by *and* [e.g., nice and warm] rather than a word and modifier [nicely warm]), making *authenteo* here function as an infinitive of indirect discourse. This vital grammatical point, however, is not supported with grammatical analysis, but simply with a reference to Philip Barton Payne (pp. 83-84), and this in spite of a negative response to Payne's view that they were aware of and quoted on p. 21.

¹²The Latin quote from Guillaume Budé on p. 102 (230, n. 27) is completely misunderstood, as is their mistranslation of a German citation on p. 101.

¹³L. E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further References to Αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 120-134.

¹⁴Wolters, *Calvin Theological Journal* (1993): 213

Historically, the Kroegers fail miserably.¹⁵ No Gnostic sect such as they postulate ever existed in first-century Ephesus, or anywhere else. Their supposed Gnostic sect, which is the historical key to their view of 1 Tim 2:12, is merely constructed of various features of pagan religion in Ephesus and Asia Minor, and from considerably later Gnostic texts. In simply "proof-texting" ancient sources, the Kroegers evidence uncritical methodology and their treatment of secondary sources is certainly careless. For instance, in their effort to locate sexual issues "under every stone" in Ephesus, they appeal to Vermaseren¹⁶ to set the problem in 1 Timothy in a context of supposed widespread influence of the cult of Cybele in Ephesus. The Kroegers mention over "seventy inscriptions" honoring Cybele, yet only twenty exist and most of those are from a much later period—those that do exist were found at one small shrine. This does not constitute proof of "widespread influence." Careless historical work abounds in the Kroegers' work. Further, failure to treat extensive ancient sources that do refer to the late-first century church in Ephesus (the Fourth Gospel, Polycarp, Ignatius, Papias—none of which evidences the kind of Gnostic sect at Ephesus the Kroegers suggest) damages their case beyond repair.¹⁷ Oster says,¹⁸

... irrespective of one's sympathy for the pain and frustration of women who have been oppressed by "the traditions of men," . . . this publication does not present a cogent and defensible way to circumvent or neutralize 1 Tim 2:11-15. A judicious use of historical and archaeological data may someday help the Christian community to see 1 Tim 2:11-15 in a better way, but if and when that is accomplished, it will have to be done using better evidence and superior research methods to those found in this work.

¹⁵This historical critique follows the insightful, negative review by Richard Oster in *Biblical Archaeologist* 56 (1993): 225-227.

¹⁶M. J. Vermaseren, *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attisdae* (Leiden: Brill, 1987): 1.184-203.

¹⁷See Thomas A. Robinson, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Western Asia Minor in the First Christian Century* (Ph.D. dissertation at McMaster Univ., 1985, esp. chapter 2 on Ephesus).

¹⁸Oster, *Biblical Archaeologist* (1993): 227.

The Kroegers' work evidences the strong influence of their feminist prejudices and, even though it cites much ancient data, its methodological failures and manipulation of data render it unusable.

B. Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin on 1 Tim 2:9-15

As was mentioned briefly on p. 83, a volume of essays was edited by Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin in 1995. In their work, preliminary essays addressing Ephesus in the first century and the literary genre of 1 Timothy are followed by major chapters on a word-study of the Greek term *authentēo* in 1 Tim 2:12 and on the sentence structure of that verse. Concluding the book are chapters on the interpretation of and hermeneutics involved in 1 Tim 2:9-15, and on the relationship of this text with Gal 3:28.

Certainly these are the principal matters involved in the study of this text, and at first reading one encounters in Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin what might appear to be *the* definitive volume on 1 Tim 2:9-15. The material is organized and presented in scholarly fashion, and is filled with references to ancient texts and involved argumentation. A responsible methodology is set out for word study that is now widely accepted among NT scholars.

However, significant problems in the volume leave it unconvincing. Major problems exist with their presentation of word study, grammar, and interpretation of this troublesome text. In fact, there are major problems with each of the seven chapters in the book, but for our present purposes the chapters by the three editors are deserving of closer examination because those surface the main issues of interpretation. We will undertake a detailed analysis of the arguments presented by Baldwin, Köstenberger, and Schreiner, and will follow the critique of Giles concerning chaps 1,2,6,7, and Appendix I.¹⁹

¹⁹Kevin Giles, "A Critique of the 'Novel' Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 Given in the Book, *Women in the Church*," *Evangelical Quarterly* 72 (2000): 151-67, 195-215.

1. Baldwin's Attempt at Word-study²⁰

Scott Baldwin, lecturer in NT at Singapore Bible College, presents a word-study of *authentēo* ("have authority" RSV; "domineer" NEB). The term occurs only in 1 Tim 2:12 in the NT. In order to get a view of its use elsewhere, he presents usages of the term in Greek literature. He groups the usages into categories which, at first glance, give the appearance of convincing data from ancient usage that the term must have a hierarchal meaning in 1 Tim 2:12.

However, there are three fatal errors in Baldwin's presentation of the data: 1) he makes distinctions of word meanings in English that do not hold up in Greek, 2) his groupings of ancient citations are not actually representative of Greek usage, but are contrived to prove his hierarchical prejudices, and 3) in some instances his argument is made upon mistranslations of Greek.

a. *Distinctions in English.* Baldwin mentions various word studies of *authentēo* over the past two decades, but he favors the meaning "to have authority over"²¹ and rejects "to domineer." Baldwin dismisses "domineer" as even a possible meaning of *authentēo* in 1 Tim 2:12 by positing that the meaning "domineer" actually occurs only once in all Greek literature.²² Now the way Baldwin has translated the texts and formed his groups might give this impression, but this is simply not true.

First, Baldwin presents categories of meaning for *authentēo* that are divided into twelve groups (78-79). His various groups are formed for argumentative reasons and do not accurately describe word usage. Too, not all the texts illustrate the meaning which Baldwin suggests.

²⁰H. Scott Baldwin, "A Difficult Word. *authentēo* in 1 Timothy 2:12," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 65-80.

²¹With G. W. Knight III, "*Authentēo* in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 143-57.

²²Baldwin, "A Difficult Word," *Women in the Church*, 75

There are several problems with Baldwin's groups. For instance, he makes a distinction between the English terms "dominate" and "domineer." "Dominate" would forbid a woman "having authority over." "Domineer" would permit a woman to teach a man as long as she is not overbearing. He says (73, n.19),

The distinction between domineer and dominate becomes an important one in the exegesis of 1 Timothy 2. Therefore, the two terms should not be taken as interchangeable. *The Compact Oxford Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971), ad loc., gives the meaning of "to dominate," a transitive verb, as "to bear rule over, to have a commanding influence on, to master." By connotation this is a negative term in some instances when used as a description of human relationships, but not necessarily so. In contrast, "domineer" is defined as an intransitive verb meaning "to rule or govern arbitrarily or despotically. . . . to exercise authority in an overbearing manner." Therefore, dominate and domineer are not synonyms unless it is shown that the domination is considered improper.

What he is trying to establish regarding the transitive and intransitive uses of the verb,²³ is that *authenteo* does not have a negative connotation, (to domineer), but rather a neutral meaning (have authority over). One must keep in mind that Baldwin is arguing that if *authenteo* means "have authority over," then in 1 Tim 2:12 Paul limits women's authority categorically. If, however, the term means "to domineer," Paul only prohibits these specific women from teaching men in a domineering manner.

Baldwin's argument on the English distinction between "dominate" as transitive and "domineer" as intransitive simply does not hold true in English, much less in Greek. Actually the terms are synonyms in standard English, "dominate" is just used more frequently than "domineer."²⁴

²³A transitive verb is one which takes a direct object; an intransitive verb does not take a direct object.

²⁴*Webster's Dictionary of English Usage* (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 1989): 360.

"Domineer" is used now mostly as a participle, *domineering*. "Dominate," can refer either to a position of being dominant or to the fact of being dominant.²⁵ *The Illustrated Reverse Dictionary*²⁶ also states that "dominate" simply means "to domineer." Baldwin's English argument has no basis.

Greek grammarians are aware that there is no distinction between transitive and intransitive uses of a verb in Greek. Smyth²⁷ says that the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs is purely a grammatical convenience. Jannaris²⁸ notes, "In many cases, a Greek verb is used now in a transitive and now in an intransitive sense." Blass and Debrunner²⁹ confirm this understanding, stating that,

²⁵*Dictionary of Modern American Usage* (B. A. Gauer, ed.; Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998): 220.

²⁶*The Illustrated Reverse Dictionary* (Pleasantville, NY: Reader's Digest, 1990): 157. See also *Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd ed.; ed. J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989): 4.947-948.

²⁷Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959): 389. He also notes on p. 355, # 1561, that in Greek, "the same verb may be used transitively or intransitively, often with little difference of signification." See also H. P. V. Nunn, *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1945): 6, also notes, "Many transitive verbs may also be used intransitively."

²⁸Antonius N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect* (London: Macmillan, 1897): 328-29. H. E. Dana and J. R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: 154), state that it "is not to be construed . . . that the verb is fixed as transitive or intransitive by its root meaning." W. W. Goodwin and C. B. Gulick, *Greek Grammar* (Dallas: Gin, 1930): 223, note, "The object denoted by the accusative may be the external object of the action of a transitive verb, or the internal (cognate) object which is often implied in the meaning of even an intransitive verb."

²⁹F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. & rev. R. Funk; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961): 82, who note that the action of certain verbs, originally conceived absolutely, can be placed in relation to an object. See A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville:

"Transitive use of original intransitives was always possible in Greek." What this means is that *authenteo* did not originally take a direct object, but on some occasions it does. So Paul could very well have written *authenteo* in this verse with the meaning, "woman is not to domineer (over) a man."

Only context can determine whether "dominate" means "to hold supremacy or mastery over by reason of superior power or authority," or whether it means "to hold in subjection through force."³⁰ Baldwin's suggestion that "dominate" is transitive and means "to exercise control" (neutral meaning), while "domineer" is intransitive and means "overbearing, bossy" (negative meaning), does not reflect either standard English or Greek usage. In fact, this argument clouds the issue and should be abandoned.

b. *Categories of Usage.* In an appendix,³¹ Baldwin presents all known occurrences of the verb *authenteo* in Greek literature. He attempts to categorize these usages by dividing them into twelve groups (73). The result of Baldwin's numerous categories is his conclusion that:

to domineer / play the tyrant," is substantiated by only a single case. . . . This is the sole unambiguous instance I have found where *authenteo* is plainly intended to convey the negative meaning of "tyrannize. (75)

Baldwin concludes that "play the tyrant" (domineer) is not supported by the context.

Broadman, 1934): 472, who says with regard to the freedom of the Greek verb, "The same verb may be used now transitively, now intransitively." See also Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (2nd ed., Munich: C. H. Beck, 1959): 2.71-72.

³⁰See *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language* (ed. P. B. Gove; Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 1993): 671-72.

³¹H. Scott Baldwin, "Authenteo in Ancient Greek Literature," *Women in the Church*, Appendix 2, pp. 269-305, based upon 1) *Greek Documentary CD-ROM (#6)*, and *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae CD-ROM #D*.

This abandonment of "domineer" as even a possible meaning is striking. While Baldwin included "domineer" as one of his twelve groups (78), he extends the meaning of "domineer" to "tyranny, to play the tyrant" (79) and then concludes hastily that "tyranny" is not consistent with the context of 1 Tim 2. So he dismisses the meaning "to domineer" from any further consideration. Significantly it is excluded from his list of possible meanings of *authenteo*. This sort of manipulation of data is intolerable.

c. *Mistranslation of Greek Citations.* The single text in which Baldwin finds *authenteo* meaning "to domineer," or as he puts it, "to tyrannize," is found in the fourth-century church father John Chrysostom,³²

see how in nature also it hath been ordered, that the one should love, the other obey. For when the governing party loves the governed, then everything stands fast. Love from the governed is not so requisite, as from the governing to the governed; for from the other obedience is due. For that the woman hath beauty, and the man desire, shows nothing else than that for the sake of love it hath been made so. Do not therefore, because thy wife is subject to thee, *act the despot* [*authenteo*].

Baldwin notes, "In this unique usage Chrysostom has apparently transformed 'exercise sole authority' into 'play the tyrant'" (75). He extends Parker's translation "despot" to mean "tyranny." He then posits that "tyranny" is not supported by the context of 1 Tim 2:12. Thus Chrysostom's example is of no use. This permits Baldwin to dismiss the entire category of "domineer." While Baldwin makes much of the English translation here, the context is clear even to a casual reader that Chrysostom forbids husbands from being "domineering, overbearing, controlling, lording it over."³³

³²John Chrysostom, *In Epistulam ad Colossenses* (Homily 10.1) in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graece* 62.299-392. See the English translation in John Parker, *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom* (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1879): 309

³³G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961): 262, translates Chrysostom's text here as.

Baldwin's maneuvering simply avoids the possibility that Chrysostom actually says, "Do not therefore . . . act *domineeringly* toward her."

Another text also uses *authenteo* in the sense of "to lord it over." In the third-century, Hippolytus³⁴ describes the chaos at the end of the world, as Roberts³⁵ translates:

Wherefore all shall walk after their own will. And the children will lay hands on their parents. The wife will give up her husband to death, and the husband will bring his own wife to judgment like a criminal. Masters will *lord it over their servants* savagely, and servants will assume an unruly demeanour toward their masters.

Baldwin disagrees with Robert's translation of *authenteo* as "*lord it over* their servants," so he provides his own translation, "*have legal authority over* their servants." He cites two examples from the seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale*³⁶ of the meaning "have legal authority over." The first text, *Chronicon Paschale* 619.9, reads, "In this year the Justinianic Codex was completed and it was ordered that it *be authoritative (authentesthai)* from the 16th day before Kalends of April [17 March] of the current tax period 7." Similarly *Chronicon Paschale* 634.1 reads, "It was ordered that, the previous edition being made void, it should *be valid (authentesthai)* from the 4th day before Kalends of January [29 Dec.], in indication 13." Regarding Hippolytus' citation, Baldwin admits, "The case cannot be decided with certainty," but he still bases "have legal authority over" on the two instances from *Chronicon Paschale*.

"play the despot, act arbitrarily," as a meaning under "assume authority, act on one's own authority."

³⁴Hippolytus, *On the End of the World* 7 in *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften* (GCS 1.2; ed. H. Achelis; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich's, 1897): 289-309.

³⁵Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, ed., *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957 reprint of 1885-96 ed.): 5.243.

³⁶*Chronicon Paschale* (ed. Dindorf; Bonn: Weber, 1832).

There is a significant problem with this maneuver. Baldwin avoids context in determining the meaning of words. *Chronicon Paschale* is concerned with the enforcement of decrees. Hippolytus is concerned with the very different topic of conduct at the end of the world.

Take a closer look at Hippolytus' citation. Is he not concerned about people treating one another in overbearing, insolent, high-handed ways? Note the beginning of the text: "all shall walk *after their own will*." The context is one in which children are insolent to parents, wives determine the fate of their husbands, husbands dominate their wives in court, inhuman masters *domineer over* their slaves, and slaves assume an unruly attitude toward their masters. The context is precisely one of domineering control over others—and the relationship of masters to slaves is described perfectly here by *authenteo*, "domineer, lord it over."

To conclude, Baldwin's dismissal of "domineer" for *authenteo* is wrong. Both Hippolytus and Chrysostom should be credited with the use of *authenteo* meaning "to domineer." This should be placed under the general meaning of "to dominate." By distorting and manipulating data, Baldwin wrongly dismisses "domineer" as even a possible meaning in 2:12.

2. Köstenberger's Attempt at Sentence Structure³⁷

The sentence structure of 1 Tim 2:12 has been variously understood. Two major ways to read the text are:

1. I do not permit a woman to teach nor to have authority over a man
2. I do not permit a woman to teach a man in a domineering manner

³⁷Andreas J. Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 81-103.

In the first, the Greek *oude* (nor) prohibits two closely related, yet distinct, items (not to teach nor to exercise authority over).³⁸ In the second, *oude* (not) connects two infinitives as a single idea (not to teach domineeringly).³⁹ Andreas Köstenberger, professor of NT at Southeastern Seminary in Wake Forest, NC, prefers the former.

As basis for his view, he presents instances of *oude* (not) joining verbs, both in the NT and in extra-biblical Greek. He mentions Acts 16:21 as the only text in the NT in which the exact grammatical construction as 1 Tim 2:12 occurs. However, he notes fifty-two similar passages.

a. *Patterns of Usage.* Köstenberger contends that there are only two patterns of usage in these fifty-two examples:⁴⁰

- Pattern # 1: two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence denied due to circumstances or conditions made clear in the context (see Matt 7:6).

- Pattern # 2: two activities or concepts are viewed negatively and consequently they are prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided (see Lk 3:14).

Köstenberger's view of Greek usage is controlled by his notion that when two activities or concepts are prohibited, all that matters is whether they are viewed positively or negatively. While these two patterns of usage do occur in texts cited by Köstenberger (85-88), he has omitted another very significant pattern.

³⁸See Douglas J. Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?" *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 179-193.

³⁹Preferred by Philip Barton Payne, "oude in 1 Timothy 2:12," in a paper read at the 1986 annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, p. 10.

⁴⁰Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 85.

b. *Hendiadys.* In fact, the usage he omits is precisely the one that militates against his thesis. This third pattern is called "hendiadys"—"the coordination of two ideas, one of which is dependent upon the other."⁴¹ Hendiadys means that one term is general, while another term comments in some specific way upon it. For example,

Acts 4:18 — Jewish leaders tell Peter and John "not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus." "Speak" is generic. "Or to teach at all in the name of Jesus" gives the specific prohibition, specifying what speaking is prohibited. Not *all* speaking is prohibited; only speaking in the name of Jesus. Here one phrase comments on the other.

Gal 1:16-17 — Paul says that after his conversion, "I did not consult any man, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to see those who were apostles before me." "I did not consult any man," is followed by the note that specifically he did not consult "those who were apostles before" him. The hendiadys here underscores Paul's point that his theology was not dependent upon human sources in Jerusalem, but upon God.

1 Tim 1:3-4 — Paul urges Timothy to stay in Ephesus in order to command certain people "not to teach error any longer, nor to devote themselves to myths and endless genealogies." The general statement, "not to teach error any longer," is followed by a second statement that qualifies and makes specific what he said generally in the first statement.

Acts 16:21 — The one text Köstenberger cites as exactly parallel to 1 Tim 2:12 has exactly this same usage. In Acts 16:21, certain Philippians complain of Paul and his group that, "They teach customs which it is not lawful for us to accept nor to practice being Romans." "Accept" is a general term made specific by the following statement that Romans cannot practice such things.

⁴¹Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the NT*, 228 [§ 442.16]

It is the view of several commentators that 1 Tim 2:12 involves hendiadys, and Payne presents the translation, "I do not permit a woman to teach in a domineering manner."⁴² Köstenberger briefly critiques Payne (82-84), criticizing him for beginning with the assumption that *authenteo* means "domineer" and for making a circular argument. However, this is an instance of "the pot calling the kettle black," for Köstenberger himself begins by assuming that *authenteo* cannot mean "domineer" and then proceeds to make a classic circular argument in that regard. This omission of hendiadys from consideration in 1 Tim 2:12 is unconscionable.

Köstenberger makes the same mistake in his examples from ancient Greek writers in that he does not consider the important category of hendiadys (91-102). For example, Polybius, a second-century BC writer, says in his *History* 2.56.10 that,

a historical author should not try to thrill his readers by exaggerated pictures, nor should he, like a tragic poet, try to imagine the probable utterances of his characters or reckon up all the consequences probably incidental to the occurrences with which he deals, but simply record what really happened.

Köstenberger sees this only as an example of two items viewed negatively and therefore inherently prohibited. However, here the first prohibition, that a historical writer "should not elaborate," is followed by two specific examples of not putting words in the mouths of his characters or making up hypothetical incidents regarding the story. This usage occurs in several of Köstenberger's examples.

Thus he concludes that *didaskain* (to teach) is always used positively in the NT and if a negative connotation had been intended in 1 Tim 2:12, the term *heterodidaskalein* (false teacher) would have been used, as in 1 Tim 1:3.⁴³

⁴²Philip Barton Payne, "oude in 1 Timothy 2:12," paper read at the 1986 annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, p. 10.

⁴³*Didaskain* is the principal word in the NT for "to teach," while *heterodidaskalein*, "to teach otherwise," occurs only in 1 Tim 1:3 and

However, Köstenberger's view that only two categories of usage are important for 1 Tim 2:12 is simply wrong. By omitting the important category of "hendiadys," restricting categories and manipulating data, Köstenberger presents a mass of material that gives only apparent support to his thesis. By distorting and manipulating data, Köstenberger wrongly dismisses "teaching domineeringly" as even a possible meaning in 2:12.

3. Schreiner's Interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-15⁴⁴

Thomas Schreiner, professor at Bethel Theological Seminary, writes on "Dialogue with Scholarship." His analysis of 1 Tim 2:9-15 concludes that women,

should learn submissively and silently, and not engage in teaching or the exercise of authority. Women are prohibited from teaching or exercising authority because of the creation order.

Schreiner claims to have changed from a less to a more restrictive view of women due to intensive study. However, a careful reading reveals that he has merely changed presuppositions, which in turn have become his prejudices.

6:3. Actually, Köstenberger's argument does not hold in Matt 15:9, where Jesus chides those who "teach (*didaskain*) for doctrines the commandments of men," nor in Tit 1:11, where the malicious intruders "teach (*didaskain*) things they ought not," nor at Rev 2:20, where John rails against Jezebel the prophetess who "by her teaching (*didaskain*) misleads my servants into sexual immorality and the eating of idol food." According to Köstenberger, all such texts should have been written *heterodidaskalein*. *Didaskalein* can have either a positive or negative connotation, depending upon the context.

⁴⁴Thomas R. Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 105-154. Along this line, see M. D. Roberts, "Woman Shall Be Saved: A Closer Look at 1 Timothy 2:15," *TSF BULLETIN* 5 (1981): 5; and R. W. Pierce, "Evangelicals and Gender Roles in the 1990's—1 Tim 2:8-15: A Test Case," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 347-48, 353.

a. *Critique of Views.* To his credit, Schreiner notes that 1 Tim is addressed to a specific situation and that it should be understood in terms of the circumstances that occasioned it (counter false teaching; 1:3-11, 18-20; 4:1-10; 5:11-15; 6:3-10, 20-21). He correctly views "Therefore" (KJV; "then" NIV, RSV) in 2:1 as relating the following section to the false teaching introduced in 1:3-11. A question exists, though, as to whether Paul's admonitions in 2:9-15 are aimed at that particular audience or whether they are timeless. On this point Schreiner concludes, "Paul may have responded to these specific problems with a general principle that is universally applicable" (109).

Schreiner finds the Kroegers'⁴⁵ argument (that the prohibition of women teaching men is due to the heresy in 1 Tim being an amalgamation of Jewish-gnosticism and the local Artemis cult) to be filled with methodological errors.⁴⁶ He finds Gritz'⁴⁷ argument (that the restriction on women teaching is due to the infiltration into the church of some from the Artemis cult) unconvincing due to failure to establish convincingly from solid data that the Artemis cult did in fact influence 1 Timothy. He finds Towner's⁴⁸ argument (that the Ephesian Christians believed that the resurrection had already occurred and that a spiritual resurrection with Christ was behind their food prohibitions, view of marriage, and emancipation of women to be a "promising" view [112]).

⁴⁵Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992).

⁴⁶See critiques in Albert Wolters, "Review: *I Suffer Not a Woman*," *Calvin Theological Journal* 28 (1993): 208-13; and Richard Oster, *Biblical Archaeologist* 56 (1993): 225-27.

⁴⁷Sharon H. Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century* (New York: University Press of America, 1991).

⁴⁸Philip Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction* (JSNTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989):21-45.

b. *Schreiner's Examination of the Text.* Schreiner views 2:1-7 as stating God's desire for all to be saved, and sees "Therefore" in v. 8 (absent in NIV) beginning a new section closely connected with 2:1-7. He takes the call for men to pray "in every place" (everywhere, NIV) to refer to house churches. Consequently, 2:9-15 deals with public assemblies. Thus he understands vv. 11-12 to prohibit women from teaching or exercising authority over men in those assemblies. (112-114). In this connection, Schreiner views the relation between v. 8 and vv. 9-15 as follows,

In verse 8 Paul considers the problem men have when gathered for public worship (anger and disputing in prayer), while in verses 9-15 two issues that have cropped up with the women in public gatherings (adornment and teaching men) are addressed. One should not conclude from the call to men to pray and women to adorn themselves properly that only men should pray in worship or that they should take the spiritual leadership in worship. First Corinthians 11:5 clarifies that women are allowed to participate by praying in public meetings (114).

While some⁴⁹ have argued that this reference is to husbands and wives, Schreiner concludes with most commentators that such a reference is improbable here. The instructions, he says, "are given instead regarding proper behavior for men and women in public meetings of the church" (117).

Most understand that the reference in 1 Tim 2:9 for women to "dress modestly, with decency and propriety" (NIV) refers to respectable behavior. Most hold that women's adornment in vv. 9-10 must be applied in the same way as prohibitions against women teaching in vv. 11-12.⁵⁰

⁴⁹Schreiner illustrates with Gordon Hugenberger, "Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis? A Survey of Approaches to 1 Tim 2:8-15," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (1992): 341, 60; and Gritz, *Mother Goddess*, 125, 131, 133, 135-36, 140.

⁵⁰See, among others, Gordon Fee, "Reflections on Church Order in the Pastoral Epistles," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1985): 150.

Similarly, most view wearing proper clothing as being closely linked to submission to husbands in Paul's day.⁵¹ Scholer⁵² says that hierarchalists have been inconsistent in enforcing the prohibition against teaching (vv. 11-12) while ignoring prohibitions against adornment (vv. 9-10).

Responding to this charge, Schreiner holds that the warning is against extravagant preoccupation with one's appearance, and suggests that the prohibition includes "seductive and enticing clothing" (119). However, he side-steps Scholer's argument that suitable clothing is linked with submission to one's husband with the passing comment that the ancient texts Scholer used to make this argument do not deal with submission but with unchastity (120). Aware that he is on thin ice here, Schreiner says that even if Scholer is correct that adornment is related to submission, the wearing of a golden wedding band, for instance, is different in our culture and would now be accepted. His way of avoiding the dilemma presented by Scholer and others is to say that neither v. 11 or v. 12 should be interpreted literally, but that the principles should be applied today. The question becomes, then, what are those principles?

The prejudice that drives his interpretation of vv. 11-12 is stated by Schreiner in his first paragraph, "we believe that it is a mistake for women to take on a pastoral role" (105). He disagrees with Keener,⁵³ who says that a woman can teach if she has good information. Schreiner says, "Two

⁵¹David Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 & the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," in *Women, Authority & the Bible* (ed. Alvera Mickelsen; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986): 200-202. See also his "Women's Adornment: Some Historical and Hermeneutical Observations on the New Testament Passages," *Daughters of Sarah* 6 (1980): 3-6, as well as Gordon Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991): 57-58, and Craig Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992): 103-07.

⁵²Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 193-219.

⁵³Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 107-08.

things are forbidden for a woman: teaching and exercising authority" (127). It is not unimportant that his argument is based upon the seriously flawed arguments of Baldwin and Köstenberger.

Interestingly, he allows, "We should not rule out the possibility that the context will incline us toward the meaning 'domineer' or 'play the tyrant' rather than 'exercise authority,'" but "we shall see shortly that the definition 'exercise authority' is constrained by the context" (133). There is a major problem at this point, however, for nowhere in his following explanation is 'domineer' shown to be "constrained by the context." At this critical point where strong evidence is demanded, Schreiner has only his prejudice to show.

Fee,⁵⁴ among others, has argued that the reference to Adam and Eve in v. 13 does not refer to an "order of creation." Schreiner counters that an "order of creation" is very much in view (134-40). At issue is whether the connective "for" [Greek, *gar*] relates vv. 13-14 to vv. 11-12 as giving the reason or examples.

A succinct discussion of vv. 13 and 14 from a non-hierarchal point of view is that of Ben Witherington, professor at Ashland Theological Seminary.⁵⁵ Witherington makes three arguments. 1) The Greek term *gar* is not used here in an illative sense [for, because], giving the reason for the prohibition, but simply introducing an example [for example].⁵⁶ 2) Vv. 13-14 are a short exposition on Gen 2:7ff and 3:1ff, texts commonly used by Jewish expositors to teach women a lesson. 3) V. 15 concludes the admonition, stating that women in Ephesus are not to be like Eve in

⁵⁴Fee, *Gospel and Spirit*, 61-62.

⁵⁵Ben Witherington, *Women in the Earliest Churches* (SNTSMS, 59; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988): 122-24.

⁵⁶A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934): 1190, says that in Greek, *gar* "does not always give a reason. It may be merely explanatory."

being deceived, but are to go about life, not attempting to domineer over men or disseminate incorrect teaching, but by being married, having children, and raising them in responsible ways.⁵⁷ There is, Scholer argues,⁵⁸ no evidence that these allusions to Genesis give vv. 11-12 universal significance.

Schreiner counters that *gar* most often states the reason for a command.⁵⁹ He reads v. 13 in a "Can't you read plain English?" mode, claiming that he has "a higher view of biblical authority than these scholars" (137). However, he avoids the importance of context in deciding the significance to attach to a Greek connection.

Certainly *gar* can introduce an example and can be translated, "for example," as Witherington suggests. V. 13 can be taken to comment on "not domineering" in v. 12, simply stating that woman was created second for the purpose of being a meaningful complement. These Ephesian women, given their attitudes and actions, would not be fitting into their intended role, and should attempt to be "daughters of Eve" rather than arrogant and disruptive.

Similarly, the reference in v. 14 to Eve's deception and sin is drawn from Jewish adaptation of Gen 3. As Scholer puts it, "Women who were falling prey to the false teachers in Ephesus were being deceived and were transgressing as Eve did."⁶⁰ In Gen 3:1-7, the man and woman sin together, the serpent addresses the woman with the plural, "you," and v. 6 says the man was present with the woman.⁶¹ Even so,

⁵⁷See traditional Jewish exegesis of Gen 2-3 in 2 Enoch 31:6; 4 Maccabees 18:6-8; Babylonian Targum Yebamoth 103b, and Philo, *Questions on Genesis* 1.33.46.

⁵⁸Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 208.

⁵⁹Following Douglas Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder," *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981): 198-222, esp. 202-03.

⁶⁰Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 211.

⁶¹RSV is not alone in omitting without justification the statement in v. 6 that, "he was with her at the time." NRSV corrects this unfortunate omission.

3:13 says that she ate the fruit first and took the blame.⁶² From this, Jewish tradition emphasized Eve's culpability. For instance, Sirach 25:24, states, "From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die" (RSV Apocrypha). In Rom 5:12-14 and 1 Cor 15:21-22, Paul attributes sin to Adam, not Eve. So v. 14 should be understood as an example from traditional Jewish interpretation that selectively uses data from Gen 3 to suit the argument that women with erroneous information should not teach.

Schreiner admits that v. 14 is difficult for hierarchalists because to take it literally would mean that women are by nature intellectually inferior and susceptible to deception (141).⁶³ He attempts to avoid this difficulty by stressing that the text does not say that these women are teaching a wrong message (141). They are, he argues weakly, simply teaching men. Although Schreiner makes an attempt to deny misogyny (145-46), he concludes, "Women are prohibited from teaching not only because of the order of creation but also because they are less likely to preserve the apostolic tradition."

However, this overlooks the obvious statement in 1 Tim 4:1-4 that the teaching involved deceiving spirits, teachings of demons, abstinence from marriage and certain foods—things certainly typical of various cults and religions of the day (Cybele) and in philosophical discussions (Pythagoreans and Stoics). Fee⁶⁴ and Witherington⁶⁵ are on more solid ground in viewing the women in 2:11-15 as being involved in the teaching of aberrant material.

⁶²Philo, *Allegory on the Law* 3.61, expresses this point.

⁶³With Douglas Moo, "Interpretation," *Trinity Journal*, 204. Even James Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981): is forced to admit that it is, "very unlikely that Paul meant to say . . . that all women are too gullible to teach." See on this point, Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction*, 217.

⁶⁴Fee, *Gospel and Spirit*, 55.

⁶⁵Witherington, *Women in the Earliest Churches*, 118.

Finally, Scholer⁶⁶ observes that v. 15 serves as the climax of the entire unit of text that begins at v. 9. This verse provides the positive conclusion to the negative statements in vv. 11-14. Although various suggestions have been made as to the interpretation of "being saved through childbirth," it is clear that in this context the writer is stressing that women find their place among the "saved" through traditional maternal and domestic roles clearly understood as proper for women in Paul's day.⁶⁷ This is especially important in view of the fact that the opponents were forbidding even to marry (4:3). In fact, throughout 1 Tim there is a strong emphasis upon proper domestic life.

Schreiner counters that the reference to childbearing is "appropriate because it represents the fulfillment of the woman's domestic role as a mother in distinction from the man" (151). "This rounds out the passage," he says, "because a woman should not violate her role by teaching or exercising authority over a man; instead she should take her proper role as a mother of children" (151). Schreiner has ended where he started, with his prejudice.

4. Giles' Critique of Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin

Kevin Giles, an Anglican rector in Australia, has written a penetrating critique of the book edited by Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin.⁶⁸ He begins by observing that the task of the book is to demonstrate that sound exegesis yields

⁶⁶Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 196. See also Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 118. Some hierarchalists do not even address v. 15, e.g., George Knight, *The New Testament Teaching*, and Susan Foh, *Women and the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980): 128.

⁶⁷See Sarah Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Schocken, 1975), for the cultural context.

⁶⁸Kevin Giles, "A Critique of the 'Novel' Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 Given in the Book, *Women in the Church Evangelical Quarterly* 72 (2000):151-67, 195-215.

the same meaning of 1 Tim 2:9-15 that all commentators have given until recent times, a view they call the "historic" position. Giles responds that what they claim to be the "historic" position is in fact quite novel. Instead, Giles claims, the writers, "are themselves practitioners of a 'progressive hermeneutic', 'Cartesians', who read the Bible in the light of their present situation—the very things they accuse their evangelical opponents of doing" (152). Giles observes,

They are presenting evidence for what is already believed to be true. . . . (They are) full of generalisations, special pleading and highly emotive language. The editors in fact depict themselves as a faithful minority who are suffering and misunderstood for their obedience to the inspired Scriptures (152).

Giles' critique of the chapters by Yarbrough and Brown, as well as the appendix by Doriani, are important to note just here. In chap 6, Robert Yarbrough, a New Testament professor at Covenant Theological Seminary, discusses the hermeneutics of 1 Tim 2:9-15.⁶⁹ Yarbrough states that, "moving from the original message of the text in its historical setting to today, from 'signification' to 'significance', is complicated."⁷⁰ Giles agrees, on matters such as foot washing, hair styles, slavery and women in the church, but rejects Yarbrough's fundamentalist approach of holding that what the text says must always apply "one for one in every place for all time" (156). Yarbrough expresses three major problems with scholarship on 1 Tim 2:9-15: 1) too many Christians have been seduced by modern Western culture regarding women and are guilty of the 'Cartesian error' of giving new meanings to texts to make them fit their own cultural perspective, and 2) they have greatly overstated Gal 3:28, and 3) they have over-played the relationship between slavery and women in the church.

⁶⁹Robert W. Yarbrough, "The Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9-15," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 155-96.

⁷⁰Yarbrough, "Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9-15," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 157.

However, Giles notes, it is Yarbrough and his fellow essayists who are the real Cartesians with novel ideas. The important text of Gal 3:28 is not discussed by Yarbrough at all, causing Giles to conclude that Yarbrough's "emotive rhetoric implies that honestly dealing with the text is too difficult" for him. And Yarbrough simply denies, against current scholarship, that the NT endorses slavery.⁷¹

According to Giles, Brown's chapter on Gal 3:28 "is the most emotive and unscholarly in the book" (158).⁷² Brown dismisses all who read 1 Tim 2:12, 1 Cor 14:34 and related texts other than he does as "an entire civilisation which has increasingly strayed from God's order of creation"⁷³ (158). Any attempt to deal with Gal 3:28 exegetically is lacking in Brown's chapter.

The most fascinating chapter, Giles notes, is the one by Daniel Doriani, who sets out to prove that the understanding of 1 Tim 2:9-15 as understood by Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin is the view that has been held throughout the history of the church until the recent feminist controversy, when the text was given a novel interpretation.⁷⁴ "This chapter," Giles observes, "is absolutely foundational to the whole case put in this book," i.e., that their view is the "historic" interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-15. It is here that Giles makes his strongest observation that these writers are the ones who are putting forth "a quite novel and ahistorical interpretation" (159). They have, he says, creatively reinterpreted the text,

⁷¹See among others, Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War & Women: Case Issues in Biblical Interpretation* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1983), and J. A. Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1995).

⁷²Harold Brown, "The New Testament Against Itself: 1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the 'Breakthrough' of Galatians 3:28," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 197-208.

⁷³Op cit., 198.

⁷⁴See Daniel Doriani, "A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 213-67.

to make it 'fit' the changed context. They then claim mischievously, or because they are blinded by dogma, that what they are teaching is the 'historic' interpretation of the passage in dispute (159).

Giles argues that the *actual* "historic view" is quite other than that argued by Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin (160-64). For instance, over the centuries most writers have argued that in 1 Tim 2:11 Paul demands total silence by women in church. Giles notes Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Jerome and Aquinas. Luther and Calvin argued from this text that women are to keep silent in worship, but can sing hymns. Calvin allowed them to lead prayer; Luther did not. And the general view of this verse has been that women are to be subordinate to men in all things in all situations.

Until recent times, Giles states, commentators agree that "Paul forbids women in general from doing two things, teaching in church and having authority over men" (160). Chrysostom, he notes, is adamant that women are not even to speak in church, let alone teach, and that all women in every area of life are to be subject to men. This view holds the field down through John Knox and the Puritans and on into the modern era.

As far as v. 13 is concerned, Giles says the principal interpretation is that "because woman was created second she is to take second place to man; she is an inferior being" (161). From the time of Chrysostom, it is held that "God made man first to show male 'superiority'." Giles notes the question of Aquinas, "does the fact that man was created first, woman second, imply that she is a deficient or defective male?" Aquinas answers, "Yes!" Giles cites Douglas' conclusion that both Luther and Calvin were "deeply influenced by the tradition which sees men as more fully made in the image of God than women."⁷⁵

⁷⁵Jane Dempsey Douglas, "The Image of God in Women as Seen in Luther and Calvin," in *The Image of God: Gender Models in Judeo-Christian Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991): 260.

V. 14 has historically been taken to mean that "Eve is to be blamed for all evil and death and that she and all her sex are more prone to sin and error than men" (162). Irenaeus says, "Having become disobedient, she (Eve) was made the cause of death, both to herself and the whole human race" (162). Tertullian wrote of women, "Do you not know that each of you is Eve? . . . You are the devil's gateway, you are the first deserter of divine law" (162). This view is held by most writers, including Chrysostom, Luther and Calvin.

Then the dominant view of v. 15 throughout Christian history has been that "here Paul is teaching that womens' special domain is to bear children" (163). Giles illustrates with Chrysostom's statement, "Be not cast down because your sex has incurred blame, . . . the whole sex shall be saved, notwithstanding, by childbearing" (163).

So this extreme view is actually the dominant view of 1 Tim 2:9-15 in Christian literature.

On the other hand, Giles notes that these so-called complementarians are the ones who have given a novel interpretation of this text. For instance, where the dominant historic view takes v. 11 to refer to the submission of all women to all men, Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin insist that Paul is not demanding the submission of all women to all men, but only in the domain of the home and the church.

Also, Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin hold that two things are forbidden in v. 12, women teaching in church or exercising authority in the church or the home. Giles notes, however, that,

Schreiner admits that Paul's use of the verb *epitrepo* in the present, active indicative form, could mean that Paul is saying, 'I am not permitting women to teach or exercise authority at this time.' On its own the verse does not indicate this is a 'universal principle' What proves that the double 'command is universal and for all time', he says, is verse 13 (125-27).

Now vv. 13 and 14 are viewed by Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin as reasons for curtailing activity by women in the church. The Greek *gar* introducing the verses is understood to be causal in force. This means that they are forced to view v. 13 as reflecting an order of creation. Doriani puts it this way, "For complementarians, the phrase, 'Adam was formed or created first,' refers beyond chronology to God's sovereign decree that made males the spiritual heads of God's kingdom, churches and homes."⁷⁶ Schreiner tries to argue that v. 13 does "not imply women are inferior to men" (135). However, this shift toward creation order and away from the historical view is in fact a *reinterpretation* of 1 Timothy 2:13 by complementarians, according to Giles (165). This is admitted by Doriani regarding v. 14.⁷⁷ It is more than interesting that Schreiner simply admits, "women are less prone to see the importance of doctrinal formulations, especially when it comes to the issue of identifying heresy and making a stand for the truth."⁷⁸ So, like it or not, Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin begin to fall in line with the actual historic view in v. 14.

Then Schreiner views v. 15 as saying that Christian women "will be saved by adhering to their ordained role."⁷⁹ In comparing Schreiner's view to the actual historical view, however, Giles notes three things that stand out: 1) Blatant misogynist language is missing in Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin, and women are not blamed for sin and death, resulting in a more positive view of women than that of the actual historical view. 2) Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin actually contradict the historic interpretation of 1 Tim 2 by denying that God made women inferior to men and by insisting that the restrictions on women apply only in the church and the home. 3) Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin ignore the historic view that places women in a

⁷⁶Doriani, "A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 262.

⁷⁷Op cit., 258.

⁷⁸Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 144-45.

⁷⁹Op cit., 151.

secondary place because woman was created second. Instead, Giles argues, they ground the differing 'roles' of men and women on a transcultural, permanently binding, constitutive order of creation.

In view of these observations, Giles concludes that the work of Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin is not at all the actual "historic" view of 1 Tim 2:9-15, but a distinctively new interpretation (166-67). They actually, he says,

embrace a 'Cartesian' and 'progressive hermeneutic'—the very thing they accuse their evangelical brothers and sisters of doing. And worse still, they claim that what they are teaching is what Christians have always believed, which is simply not true.

Finally, Giles discusses three elements vital to the work of Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin. First, he analyzes their novel argument from "the order of creation." The phrase, "order of creation," can be understood to refer either 1) to the sequential order in which man and woman were brought into existence, without any necessary implication or inferiority or subordination, or 2) to a constitutive ordering of human relationships in the creation story. Brown⁸⁰ gives an insightful statement of the view of Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin, saying that in creation God has established, "explicit *mandata Dei* (Divine mandates) that hold good for all time and in every place." This use of the phrase, "order of creation," dominates fundamentalist evangelical literature. However, Giles holds that, "this argument is completely novel. It is not found in any commentary or book prior to the Second World War" (196). The historic basis for defining womens' role in the church has been that God created woman second, and thus inferior to men.

Giles concludes that the "order of creation" argument does not stand exegetically or historically, and there is no basis for limiting it to the church and home.

⁸⁰Brown, "The New Testament Against Itself" *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 204.

Giles' second concluding observation deals with the usage of the word "role." He cannot find any evidence of Christian usage of this term prior to 1960, meaning that the hierarchal use of this term to argue the permanent subordination of women is something quite novel (200-01). Since Knight's book entitled, *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women*,⁸¹ "women's subordinate status has been redefined by hierarchalists in terms of role differentiation" (201). In fact, Neuer is the only hierarchalist Giles can find who has seen "the inappropriateness of role theory" to interpret the Bible's teaching on the differences between men and women." Neuer⁸² says, "In the cause of truth we should give up talking about the roles of the sexes."

Third, Giles observes that Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin use language much differently than that found in the actual historic interpretation. Whereas "stark and unambiguous language" is characteristic of the historic view (women are inferior, born to obey, weak and fickle), that found in Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin is characterized by ambiguous and evasive language (203). For instance, Giles notes that instead of saying that women are not to teach because they are prone to sin, we now hear in this new approach that, "they are less likely to draw the line on doctrinal non-negotiables."⁸³ Giles continues, "In politics making bad news sound good is called putting a 'spin' on things. The writers of *Women in the Church* are 'spin doctors' in this sense" (203).

This leads Giles to conclude that behind the thrust of the work of Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin is the self-serving theology of male hegemony—the right of males to run the show. With this prejudice underlying their work, "it

⁸¹George Knight, *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977).

⁸²Werner Neuer, *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1990): 30.

⁸³Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15," *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 145.

is not surprising that language is distorted, evidence is ignored, and logic goes out the door" (204). Even Brown⁸⁴ says in his chapter, "'presuppositions', not 'exegetical assertions', determine the conclusions reached on this matter."

When this debate began in the early '70s the two sides were content to call themselves "egalitarians" and "hierarchicalists." However, more recently hierarchalists began to reject this term, preferring to be called "complementarians," or "holders of the historic position." Giles concludes rightly that these so-called complementarians neither hold the historic position nor are they functionally complementarians. He notes, "The truth of the matter is that both sides in this debate are complementarians" (204). The real debate is,

between those who want men and women to complement each other by standing side by side in the home, the church and the state and those who want men and women to complement one another with the men standing above the women. The contrast is thus between hierarchal complementarians and egalitarian complementarians. Honesty demands that this be acknowledged (204).

5. Summary of Critiques of Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin

It is a shame that so much effort has resulted in a work that has no discernible value. Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin have simply provided a hierarchal counterpart to the equally useless evangelical feminist writings on 1 Tim 2:9-15 by the Kroegers. Both of these attempts are examples of prejudicial exegesis in addressing the important topic of women in the church. Both are examples of what not to do in biblical scholarship. Neither has any significant contribution to make to the current discussion of women in the church.

⁸⁴Brown, "The New Testament Against Itself" *Women in the Church. A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, 197.

2. 1 Tim 2:8-15: Exegetical Considerations

It is evident in 1 Tim 2:9-15 that some women were teaching in the public assembly of the church in Ephesus or Paul would not have forbidden it.⁸⁵ Two basic questions emerge from this text.⁸⁶ What precisely is Paul forbidding? In what way should the injunction apply to churches today?

A. The Context of 1 Tim 2:8-15

The introduction to 1 Tim begins in 1:3-11 with a statement of the problem created by individuals wanting to teach who do not have adequate or appropriate information, and it concludes in vv. 18-20 with Paul's excommunication of two of these, Hymenaeus and Alexander. Chapter three presents detailed characteristics essential for church leaders, which contrast markedly with what is said in the epistle about the false teachers. 1 Tim 2 occurs between these concerns about church life in Ephesus, all in the context of the disruptive influence of false teaching.

"Therefore" in 2:1 is to be understood as beginning the body of the letter in which the introductory appeal to Timothy to remain in Ephesus and counter the sinister influence of these false teachers (1:3-7) is given fuller discussion. The opening section of the body of the epistle (2:1-8) demands cessation of an exclusivist mentality on the part of the males and the incorporation of a vigorous prayer life for rulers and all in authority, in fact for *all* people. This continues a standard custom common in Jewish synagogues. Jewish people had been exempted from having to pray *to* the

⁸⁵Douglas Moo, "1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance," *Trinity Journal* 1 (1980): 62-83, esp. 82, however, curiously denies even the possibility that women were teaching at Ephesus.

⁸⁶It is unacceptable either to dismiss this text from consideration, as does E. M. Tetlow, *Women and Ministry in the New Testament* (New York: Paulist, 1980), or to disregard it because it does not cohere with one's preconceived notion of what Paul must have thought, as does Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972): 283-303.

Roman emperor, but were expected to pray *for* him.⁸⁷ Such prayer was expected to result in peaceful lives for the Christians in Ephesus.⁸⁸ It is not unimportant in this connection that the conclusion in v. 8 stipulates that men ought to pray without wrath and dissension.

This paragraph on prayer in Ephesian worship also establishes the context for the following paragraph on the dress and conduct of women while in the worship. Both sections in 1 Tim 2 address specific situations in the Ephesian church.

B. 1 Tim 2:(8)9-10

The Greek text does not have a main verb in v. 9, so one must be supplied from v. 8. If "I wish to pray" is brought over, as most understand to be the case, v. 9 would be understood as a specific instruction to women at prayer.⁸⁹ This would cohere with Paul's admonition in 1 Cor 11:3 that women pray in the public worship. "Likewise," in 2:9, suggests that, having instructed the men how to pray in Ephesus, Paul now instructs the women in the same way. If Schreiner is correct, that only "I wish" is to be brought over, v. 9 would give general instruction on women's clothing and adornment.⁹⁰ The matter may be incapable of resolution, but what is clear is that the context is the worshipping church in Ephesus, and it is probable that prayer is in focus in v. 9.

1 Tim 2:9-10 presents injunctions that are every bit as serious as those in 2:11-12. Instructions in vv. 9-10 are given without qualification and affirm acceptable standards of decency, as opposed to those found in the false teaching.

⁸⁷See A. M. Rabello, "The Legal Condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.13: 703-04.

⁸⁸Hans Conzelmann, *History of Primitive Christianity* (trans. J. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973): 133.

⁸⁹This view is advocated by Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 102-03; Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 70-71.

⁹⁰Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 114.

Certainly, from 1:3-8 it is clear that Paul directs Timothy to counter the sinister effect of certain teachers in the congregation. Their influence surfaces in Paul's directives in 2:1-8 (men not to argue), 2:9-15 (women) and 5:11-15 (widows). The situation in Ephesus is that some Christian women have overstepped traditional roles held by society. Their fundamental attitudinal shift has two facets. 1) They dress in culturally unacceptable ways. 2) They forsake domestic roles, seeking visible, teaching roles in congregational life. In each instance, their attitude is assertive, insensitive, and out of line.

That these women in the Ephesian church are brazenly over-dressed is stated and not at all unrelated to the following context.⁹¹ The prohibition against excessive adornment should be understood against its cultural background. Diodorus, *Hist.* 12.21, says that golden jewelry or a garment with a purple border was a sign of a prostitute. Ps.-Lucian, *Affairs of the Heart* 38-43, laments a husband's horrible experiences in living with a wife who spends her day before the mirror attempting to beautify herself with creams, powders, expensive jewels, earrings, bracelets, and necklaces. She then visits the various gods, and later returns home after being unfaithful to her husband. Philo, *On the Virtues* 39-40, says that such adornment was associated with visiting pagan temples and with sexual promiscuity, as well as with disrespect for the husband's authority. In the *Sentences of Sextus* 513 is a typical observation of the period that, "A wife who likes adornment is not faithful." In view of these, and many similar statements, the dress and adornment of a wife is certainly very closely related to her submission to her husband.

Such women, disdaining the accepted code of dress, are told in vv. 11-12 that they must *learn*. This certainly denotes inadequate information on their part. That they should learn in a *peaceable* and *deferential* manner suggests some sort of unruly, disquieting, tumultuous, autocratic, domineering, or

⁹¹Note the similar prohibition against excessive adornment in 1 Pet 3:1-6, also in a context addressing deferential attitude.

arrogant behavior on their part. Now some, such as Philo,⁹² argued that women should take care of domestic matters and appear in public only to go to the market and to the temple. He also stressed that women did not need education.⁹³ However, not all women were so restricted. The education of women was common among Stoics and Pythagoreans, among others (note the false teaching typical of both these groups in 4:1-4; see p. 229 above).⁹⁴ Yet, this education had certain drawbacks. Musonius Rufus,⁹⁵ a first-century AD philosopher who favored the education of women, argued that,

some say that it is inevitable that women who associate with philosophers will be self-willed for the most part and arrogant when they abandon their duties at home and spend their time with men practicing discourses, speaking subtly, and analyzing syllogisms. They ought to be home spinning! I would not expect that the women who practice philosophy—any more than the men— would abandon their appropriate tasks to deal only with discourses; rather, I maintain that whatever discourses they pursue ought to be about the deeds they pursue.

What Musonius Rufus said probably would not occur, did in fact occur among some of the Christian women in Ephesus. Interest in teaching resulted in arrogant attitudes and abandonment of various domestic tasks. Paul finds this unacceptable.

⁹²Philo, *Special Laws* 3.169-71, "A woman, then, should not be a busybody, meddling with matters outside her household concerns, but should seek a life of seclusion."

⁹³Philo, *Apology for the Jews* 7.14, "The husband seems competent to transmit knowledge of the laws to his wife, the father to his children, the master to his slaves." In certain rabbinic circles, women were seen as temptation and distraction from study. See Pirke Aboth 1.5.

⁹⁴Sterling, "Women in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds," *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, 1.76-84.

⁹⁵Musonius Rufus, F 3. See O. Hense, ed., *Musonii Rufi Reliquae* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1905).

In lieu of this situation, Paul stresses in v. 10 that these Christian women would do well to concentrate on healthy teaching conducive to genuinely Christian life-style. "Good works" here does not refer to works that might be done with the motive of acquiring merit, but to the sort of "good works which God designed long ago that we should walk in them" (Eph 2:10)—that is to say, works (life-style characteristics) such as goodness, kindness, patience, gentleness, modesty and the like. These things are just more "fitting" for these Ephesian women who "profess" the Christian faith than expressing a lack of respect for their husbands by wearing inappropriate clothing that sends distinctly wrong signals.

C. 1 Tim 2:11-12

English translations of 1 Tim 2:12 vary somewhat.

I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. NIV

I do not permit a woman to be a teacher, nor must woman domineer over man; she should be quiet. NEB

I am not giving permission for a woman to teach or to tell a man what to do. A woman ought not to speak. JerB

It must be kept in mind that the entire letter of 1 Timothy deals with the false teachers mentioned in 1:3ff and Timothy's role in quelling their influence. In 2:1-8, the men are admonished to pray for all people, without "getting involved in the quarrels and disputes engendered by the false teaching."⁹⁶ In 2:9-15, the women are admonished to present and conduct themselves in a manner appropriate for godly women, without abandoning submission to their husbands and distorting their place among men in general.⁹⁷ In 2:11-12, Paul continues to address the problem of insubordination, moving from dress and demeanor to the realm of information.

⁹⁶Fee, *Gospel and Spirit*, 57.

⁹⁷Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 201.

Two principal views have emerged concerning the interpretation of 1 Tim 2:11-12. 1) One view holds that this text forbids women from teaching or exercising authority over men because of the order of creation. Proponents of this view maintain that the Genesis material in vv. 13-14 provides the reason for the prohibitions in vv. 11-12, and the conclusion is drawn that these sanctions are to be applied universally in all times and places. 2) The other view holds that this is a temporary restraint to curb the inordinate conduct of certain Ephesian women who were teaching the heresy mentioned in 1:3-7 as the reason for the epistle. In this view, the Genesis material in vv. 13-14 provides an example or explanation of how the deception of Eve having drastic consequences parallels that of the women at Ephesus.

To begin with, just as vv. 9-10 are to be understood in terms of ancient cultural values and are addressed to the threat of certain false teachers in Ephesus, so also are the admonitions to silence and submission in vv. 11-12. The stipulations in vv. 11-12 are well in line with first-century AD expectations for women, both in the Jewish and Greco-Roman worlds. Consequently, vv. 11-12 stipulates responsible action for women in response to the sinister teaching that forms the basis of the epistle from 1:3.

In this view, vv. 11-12 is a temporary stipulation intended for the particular situation at Ephesus. These injunctions were not intended as universal norms for all women in all times and places.⁹⁸ Instead, vv. 11-12 were intended to curtail the influence and involvement of certain women involved in the false teachings at Ephesus.

V. 11 states that "a woman must learn in a quiet spirit with all submissiveness." The term "learn" (*manthanéto*) is a present imperative in Greek, which means that the term is concerned with the ongoingness of their leaning, i.e., "a woman must go about this business of learning with a . . ." Women were participating in worship and learning; but such learning was a relatively new thing for women at that time.

⁹⁸With Fee, *Gospel and Spirit*, 61, and others.

Whereas some in Ephesus might oppose women learning, Paul underscores the right of women to learn. These women, though, have presented a problem in that regard and need to adopt an appropriate manner of learning, e.g., in a spirit of quietude which implies receptivity. They should learn adequate and correct information before challenging their teachers or even trying to teach it themselves. They should remember that they are novices, not "teachers." Silence was expected of students, both in Judaism and in the Greco-Roman world.⁹⁹

The phrase, "with all submissiveness," describes the manner in which these women are to learn. The meaning of "submissiveness" must be determined by the context in which it occurs. Towner cautions that the term has a wide range of meanings, and that care must "be taken to avoid assigning the basic meaning of 'order *under*' indiscriminately."¹⁰⁰ The term is used at times when hierarchy is under discussion (Rom 8:20; 1 Cor 15:27-28; Phil 3:21), but in numerous other instances the term denotes a willing deference rather than hierarchy (Eph 5:21-22; Col 3:18; 1 Pet 3:1). Such "submissiveness" was intended to provide order and peace, but the text does not specify to whom they are to be submissive. Actually, the term simply signifies a basic attitude. As Ward puts it, "Paul's aim is to avoid 'disturbance'."¹⁰¹ "Submissiveness" refers to a willingness to be taught and to be accountable to what is taught.

So certain Ephesian women have serious attitudinal problems relating to their dress and adornment and to the learning process going on in the assembly. Paul's counter in vv. 9-11 is that they should 1) dress in ways that show respect for their husbands and for males in general, 2) be more concerned with basic life-style characteristics that are appropriate for godly women, and 3) undertake the learning of accurate information in a receptive spirit.

⁹⁹See Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 107-08

¹⁰⁰Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction*, 213.

¹⁰¹Ronald A. Ward, *Commentary on 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, 51.

It is easy to understand how 2:12 could be read in English with the conclusion that a woman is never to teach a man or be in a position of authority over a man. However, in the Greek text, the verb "domineer" [NEB; "have authority" RSV NIV] qualifies "teach" and specifies what kind of teaching is prohibited.¹⁰² It is not that these women are "teaching" per se, but specifically that they are "teaching domineeringly" that annoys Paul.¹⁰³

The term *authentain* is taken by some to mean "exercise authority" [RSV NIV], but stronger reasons exist for taking it to mean "domineer."¹⁰⁴ Instead of "domineering over a man," they are encouraged to be "deferential" (2:11). Instead, they should evidence an attitude of "peaceableness/quietude."¹⁰⁵ This prohibition of "domineering" does not introduce a second prohibition, but qualifies the first—that is, they are "not to teach *in a domineering way*, but are to be in peaceableness/quietness." In this context, the term refers to the role the women were playing in teaching the erroneous information of the false teachers.¹⁰⁶

The admonition at the end of v. 12 that these women are to "keep silent" [RSV] is not a mandate that women maintain absolute silence in worship. It rather specifies that an attitude of "peaceableness/quietness" be maintained instead of their current attitude of "domineering." Since in 1:7 Paul specified that "they want to be teachers of law, but they do not understand what things they so confidently affirm," it is

¹⁰²When two Greek verbs are joined in this way, the nearer qualifies the farther, i.e., "domineer" qualifies "teach." See Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. G. Messing; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1956): 364-365.

¹⁰³With J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London: A. & C. Black, 1963): 68, among others.

¹⁰⁴See, among others, Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 205; Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 73; Keener, *Pau, Women & Wives*, 108-09.

¹⁰⁵See Carroll Osburn, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (1 Timothy 2:12)," *Restoration Quarterly* 25 (1982): 1-11.

¹⁰⁶Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 111-12.

clear that they need instruction. It follows that if they learn in a peaceable and gentle spirit (v. 11) and teach in a peaceable and gentle spirit (v. 12), Paul would have no problem with them.¹⁰⁷ This is not at all unlike the situation in 1 Cor 11, where Paul had no problem with the women praying and prophesying, only their bad attitude in disdain social customs regarding appearance in public.

D. 1 Tim 2:13-15

The Greek *gar* [for] in 2:13 indicates that the two following illustrations are intended to support the prohibition against domineering teaching by these women. Paul grounds his prohibition in the creation stories in Genesis. Now v. 13 is often taken to refer to an "order of creation" in which man has authority over woman because Adam came first,¹⁰⁸ and v. 14 is likewise taken to mean that Eve's gullibility illustrates why women should not teach.¹⁰⁹ Thus, heirarchalists view these as reasons from Genesis for the prohibitions. Alternatively, the Greek term *gar* is not used here in an illative sense [for, because], giving the reason for the prohibition, but simply introducing an example [for example].¹¹⁰ In this view, vv. 13-14 are a short exposition on Gen 2:7ff and 3:1ff, texts commonly used by Jewish expositors to teach women a lesson.¹¹¹ At issue is whether the connective "for" [Greek, *gar*] relates vv. 13-14 to vv. 11-12 as giving the reason or examples. Taking *gar* to provide examples rather than reasons, Scholer argues that

¹⁰⁷With Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 112.

¹⁰⁸Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 207.

¹⁰⁹Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?" *Rexocering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 188-190.

¹¹⁰A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934): 1190, says that in Greek, *gar* "does not always give a reason. It may be merely explanatory."

¹¹¹Witherington, *Women in the Earliest Churches*, 122-24.

there is no evidence that these allusions to Genesis give vv. 11-12 universal significance.¹¹²

Now 2:12-14 is a sentence in Greek. Within that sentence there are four thought-units: 1) not to teach, 2) not to domineer, 3) Adam first, 4) Eve deceived. V. 15, although a separate sentence, is closely linked to vv. 11-14. There exists here a literary structure in which the two items in v. 12 are followed by an analogy and an appeal. The analogy in vv. 13-14 comments on "not to teach" in v. 12a, and the appeal in v. 15 comments on "domineeringly" in v. 12b.

- 12 a I am not permitting a woman to teach
 b domineeringly a man,
- 13 a' for Adam was formed first, then Eve,
 14 Adam was not deceived, but the woman,
 when she was deceived, became a
 transgressor.
- 15 b' She will be saved through
childbearing, if they continue in faith,
 love, and holiness with propriety

From a linguistic point of view, the relationship of an example or illustration to a specific situation must be understood in terms of topic, image, and point of similarity. In this passage, the topic is the *domineering* teaching of certain women in Ephesus. The image is that Eve was created after Adam. What, then, is the point of similarity?

Well, Paul is certainly not engaging in exegesis of Gen 1-3.¹¹³ Rather, he is using a common Jewish analogy in which Eve was caricatured as a deceived and bumbling fool who constantly led Adam into trouble. For example, we

¹¹²Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 208.

¹¹³See Rick R. Marrs, "In the Beginning: Male and Female (Gen 1-3)," *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity* (ed. Carroll D. Osburn; Joplin, MO: College Press, 1995): 2.1-36.

have already quoted Sirach 25:24, "from a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all will die." In the *Life of Adam and Eve*, a first century expansion of Gen 1-4, Eve is assigned in 44:2 responsibility for sin in the world, and in *Apocalypse of Moses* 32:1-2, Eve acknowledges full responsibility for the human dilemma. As Chesnutt¹¹⁴ says,

the portrait of Eve as one constantly weeping, ignorant, perplexed, vulnerable to sin, and dependent upon the males around her for insight bears some relation to the way women were actually perceived and treated in the authors' and redactors' own times and places.

So, Paul does not draw from Gen 1-3 a universal principle from the historical Eve, but an ad hoc analogy from the later caricature of Eve in Jewish tradition. The point of similarity between v. 12 and v. 13 is that just as it is commonly remarked that Eve was deceived and led Adam astray, so certain women in the Ephesian church lack information and teach false information that leads people astray.

The reference in v. 14 to Eve's sin in Gen 3 comments on the analogy in v. 13. The image that Eve, rather than Adam, was deceived is drawn from traditional Jewish interpretation of Gen 3. It is important to remember that in Gen 3:1-7 the man and woman sin together, the serpent addresses the woman with the plural "you," and vv. 3 and 6 indicate that the man was with the woman at the time.¹¹⁵ However, in Jewish tradition, Eve was deceived with unfortunately catastrophic results for all mankind.¹¹⁶ The analogy is carried further in v. 14, specifying that these Ephesian women are not to teach because they have been deceived and transmit false information just as in Jewish tradition Eve was deceived and led Adam to sin.

¹¹⁴See Randall Chesnutt, "Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman Era," *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity* (ed. Carroll D. Osburn; Joplin, MO: College Press, 1993): 1.93-130, esp. 102.

¹¹⁵See Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 210.

¹¹⁶See Philo, *Questions on Genesis* 33.

Paul's use of this illustration from Genesis underscores the fact that his prohibition against these women teaching was not done with reference to hierarchalism. Instead, where the original complementary relationship between men and women is destroyed, as in Ephesus, Paul mandates what is necessary in that particular setting to restore the original pattern. It is not necessary or advisable to take this as a general directive to all women everywhere.

In 2:15, Paul concludes the admonition to these Ephesian women with an observation that women are not saved through teaching (i.e., domineering), but by attention to their traditional roles, represented here by bearing children.¹¹⁷ Porter notes that the passage should be understood contextually:

The author of 1 Timothy seems to be fighting against a group distinguished by several characteristics. They were promoting doctrine (1 Tim. 1.3) that resulted in the telling of all sorts of silly myths and the emphasizing of genealogies (1.4), holding to stories about deceitful spirits and demons (4.1), and forbidding marriage and other practices (4.3). . . . It is easy to conclude that the encouraging of ascetic practices, combined with shunning of the women's domestic roles, resulted in sexual abstinence or similar practices which were considered by the author to have missed the mark (cf. 1.3-7; 6.20-21). In the light of this ascetic tendency, the author endorses the resumption of normal practices between men and women, including sexual relations that result in giving birth to children.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷See J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963): 69; and Krijn A. Van der Jagt, "Women are Saved Through Bearing Children (1 Timothy 2.11-15)," *The Bible Translator* 39 (1988): 201-08. Thomas Geer, "Admonitions to Women in 1 Tim 2:8-15," *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, 1.297, mentions three other views: 1) despite Eve's transgression, Christian women will be saved through the childbirth, i.e., Christ, 2) despite the curse (Gen 3:16), Christian women are brought safely through the birth experience, and 3) in their proper submissive role, Christian women disdain teaching and domineering over men.

¹¹⁸Stanley E. Porter, "What Does It Mean to be 'Saved By Childbirth' (1 Timothy 2.15)?" in *New Testament Text and Language*

V. 15 is the climax of the entire unit of text that began in v. 9 with, "*likewise women.*" This verse was written as a positive alternative for these women to the negative critiques in vv. 11-14.

One grammatical problem with v. 15 is that the first verb is singular (she will be saved) and the second is plural (they continue). This is due to the fact that womankind is in focus with "she" (as with Eve), whereas the latter reference shifts to the plural with the Ephesian women in mind (they).

The statement that "the woman will be saved through childbirth," is translated incorrectly in NIV as, "women will be kept safe through childbirth." Not only does experience show that this statement is incorrect, but "safe (saved)" is shown to refer to Christian salvation by the following phrase, "if they continue in faith, love, and holiness with propriety" (NIV). The point is that just as ancient (post fall) Eve was to find her place in society as a mother with domestic roles, so these women should find their place in society by fitting into "the maternal and domestic roles that were clearly understood to constitute propriety in the Greco-Roman culture of Paul's day."¹¹⁹

3. Conclusion.

It may be concluded, then, that 1 Tim 2:9-15 was directed to a specific group of troublesome women in a particular place in the early church. Their particular problem was specifically that of being misinformed and domineering teachers. In overstepping traditional roles, some Ephesian Christian women demonstrate a fundamental attitudinal shift which evidences itself in their dress and in forsaking traditionally domestic roles in a quest for visible roles in congregational life. Such domineering and assertive

(ed. by Porter and C. A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996): 160-175 [originally published in *JSNT* 49 (1993): 87-102].

¹¹⁹Scholer, "1 Tim 2:9-15," *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 197.

behavior, coupled with such scandalous behavior as overdressing in public, certainly sent the wrong signals to Ephesus about the real nature of Christianity. Hence, Timothy is admonished forthrightly to counter this sinister development in the Ephesian congregation.

So, wherever there are misinformed, unreliable, and domineering women attempting to teach Christian truth, the ancient admonition of Paul to Timothy has direct application. However, nothing is said in this text about informed, reliable, and gentle women teaching—either in church or out, either on religion or not, either to men or women, either to young or old. No biblical text has been so misused to legislate so many prohibitions that stifle so much service by so many people. Put simply, any female who has sufficient and accurate information may teach that information in a gentle spirit to whomever in whatever situation they may be.

While the particular situation Paul addresses in 1 Tim arose due to particular *women* who were misinformed and domineering, the point of the text would be equally applicable to any *men* who might be acting similarly.

CONCLUSION

The question of the role of women in the church must be refocused in terms of the view of women we are to have in the church. Christians certainly have no right to bind as biblically imperative that which is merely cultural. So, it becomes necessary for Christians to sort out what is distinctly biblical in their religion from what is cultural.¹

1. *Assessment of Current Options*

A. *Radical Extremes*

Radical feminism and patriarchalism are both rejected as viable options. While both have some commendable questions and answers, each proceeds in reactionary ways from basically cultural agendas. It is unlikely that human relations will profit significantly from either perspective.

Both of these extreme views are steeped in prejudice, both are essentially isolationist, and both are influenced tremendously by cultural bias. Both views tend to ignore

¹Unfortunately some books on maleness are based upon negative experience and hurt. See Robert Bly, *Iron John* (New York: Random House, 1992), and Sam Keen, *Fire in the Belly: On Being a Man* (New York: Bantam, 1991). See also Victor Seidler, *Recovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality* (London: Routledge, 1989). For a growing literature on biblical manhood that promotes positive views of both men and women, see, among others, Don Welch, *Macho Isn't Enough!—Family Man in a Liberated World* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, *Gender and Grace: Love, Work & Parenting in a Changing World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990).