

Misleading arguments

FALSE NEUTRALITY

Correctly observing that a particular argument is inconclusive due to inadequate or ambiguous evidence, and then appealing to the argument later as if it had been decisively proved.

1. 'It is not clear whether diakonos [in Romans 16:1] refers to a particular ecclesial office as in 1 Timothy 3:8-13 and Philippians 1:1, or whether the word should be translated as "servant" (KJV and NIV).'¹

2. 'Phoebe is called a diakonos, "deacon".'²

First Ian and Averil say it is not clear if *diakonos* in Romans 16:1 refers to a particular ecclesial office or if it should be translated 'servant', yet they later assert definitely that *diakonos* here means 'deacon' as a particular ecclesial office.

1. 'In whatever manner the term "head" and the comments about headcovering are to be understood,²⁸ the mutual dependency of **husband and wife (or man and woman)**²⁹ in the new Christian relationship ("in the Lord") is strongly asserted.'³

2. 'There is no suggestion that because **the husband is head of the wife, therefore the wife** should not pray or prophesy in the meetings.'⁴

First Ian and Averil say that 1 Corinthians 11 could be referring to husband and wife or man and woman, yet they later assert specifically that the passage is speaking of husband and wife.

1. 'The **suggestion** here is that **some women were disrupting the meeting**...'⁵

2. 'It is clear that Paul is condemning disorderly speaking earlier in the chapter...'⁶

First Ian and Averil offer the idea of women interrupting as a suggestion ('The **suggestion** here is'⁷), yet they later assert this specifically as fact; now it is 'clear that Paul is condemning disorderly speaking'.⁸

1. 'Alternatively it could mean that she is to refrain from speaking and teaching **false proto-Gnostic ideas**...'⁹

2. 'Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, **because the false teaching in Ephesus,**

as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve.'¹⁰

First Ian and Averil propose the idea of Gnostic teaching is a suggestion ('it **could** mean'¹¹), yet they later assert this specifically as fact ('Paul says... because'¹²).

AVOIDING CONSENSUS

Failing to represent accurately the established scholarly consensus, or concealing this information from readers.

'There is no suggestion that because **the husband is head of the wife**, therefore the wife should not pray or prophesy in the meetings.'¹³

Ian and Averil assume the man and woman in 1 Corinthians 11 are husband and wife, whereas the scholarly consensus is that these are generic terms for man and woman.¹⁴

'Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, **because the false teaching in Ephesus,**

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 90.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

¹² Ibid., p. 90.

¹³ 'All One', p. 53 (March 2009).

¹⁴ 'A few commentators defend husband, but the overwhelming majority of writers convincingly argue that the issue concerns gender relations as a whole, not simply those within the more restricted family circle', Thiselton, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text', p. 822 (2000).

¹ 'All One', p. 36 (March 2009).

² Ibid., p. 101.

³ Ibid., p. 53.

⁴ Ibid., p. 53.

⁵ Ibid., p. 68.

⁶ Ibid., p. 71.

⁷ Ibid., p. 68.

⁸ Ibid., p. 71.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve.¹⁵

Despite the appearance their carefully worded statement may give, Ian and Averil are well aware that the scholarly consensus rejects this view completely.¹⁶

‘The reference to the law could either be to a **Jewish understanding of the Old Testament, or to the Jewish oral law...**’¹⁷

Readers are not told that the scholarly consensus is that Paul’s reference to ‘the law’ is a clear reference to the Biblical text, either to the Pentateuch or some other part of the Old Testament (such as the Psalms or prophets).¹⁸

¹⁵ ‘All One’, p. 90 (March 2009).

¹⁶ Readers are not told that the scholarly consensus is overwhelmingly against the idea that Paul’s letter to Timothy had Gnostic groups in mind, especially it is agreed that Gnosticism did not exist at the time of Paul and no Gnostic or proto-Gnostic texts have ever been found dating even close to the time of Paul.

¹⁷ ‘All One’, p. 66 (March 2009).

¹⁸ ‘several writers refer with approval to S. Aalen’s argument that the key word is drawn here by Paul from a rabbinic formula used in the context of biblical texts, especially in the Pentateuch, which express a principle often introduced with ὁ νόμος λέγει, the law indicates.363 BAGD, Moulton-Milligan et al. and Grimm-Thayer provide instances of the verb in the sense of it is permitted (sometimes with the perfect stative sense, there exists permission) in the papyri, Josephus, and other first-century sources.’, Thiselton, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text’, p. 1151 (2000).

‘Paul quotes his opponents and then refutes them’¹⁹

Readers are not told this argument has been overwhelmingly rejected by scholars, including even a number of egalitarians.²⁰

ARTIFICIAL CONTROVERSY

Claiming scholars are significantly in dispute, when they are overwhelmingly in agreement.

‘A considerable debate on the meaning and translation of “head” (kephalē) in Greek has been taking place for several decades in the evangelical world...’²¹

Although the meaning of the word *kephalē* has been debated extensively among evangelical commentators for years, what Ian and Averil do not tell readers are that among professional lexicographers there is no debate whatever.²² No standard lexicon has accepted the egalitarian definition of the word *kephalē*,²³ although a number of them

¹⁹ ‘All One’, p. 64 (March 2009).

²⁰ Thiselton, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek text’, p. 1151 (2000).

²¹ Ibid., p. 169.

²² Standard professional lexicons do not include the meaning ‘source, origin’ for *kephalē* as understood by egalitarians, nor do recognized authoritative lexicographers debate whether the word means ‘source, origin’ or ‘chief, ruler’.

²³ An entry in the 1968 edition of LSJ9 has been cited by egalitarians as evidence for their understanding of KEFLAH, but the editor has explained that this was not the intended meaning of the entry (which has been misinterpreted), that the entry was badly worded, and

have been updated recently with additional information derived from new studies or the discovery of new sources.²⁴

‘I Suffer Not a Woman – Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence, Richard & Catherine Kroeger (1992).’²⁵

‘Their suggested translation of *authentēin* as “claim to be the originator” has received some, but not general, acceptance.’²⁶

Readers are told that the Kroeger’s suggestion that *authentēin* means ‘claim to be originator’ has ‘received some, but not general, acceptance.’²⁷ In reality, the Kroeger’s work has received acceptance only among some egalitarian commentators,²⁸ and the Kroeger’s definition of *authentēin* has been rejected by professional lexicographers.

(Jonathan Burke, 2010)

that the meaning ‘source’ for *kephalē* as asserted by egalitarians does not exist.

²⁴ BDAG, Louw/Nida, LSJ9, and Swanson, for example.

²⁵ ‘All One’, p. 95 (March 2009).

²⁶ Ibid., p. 95.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 95.

²⁸ it has even been rejected by other egalitarian commentators, such as Wilshire, ‘It is no wonder that L. E. Wilshire, even though he shares the egalitarian outlook, says: “This is a breathtaking extension into (pre-) Gnostic content yet an interpretation I do not find supported either by the totality of their own extensive philological study, by the NT context, or by the immediate usages of the word *authentēo* and its variants.”’¹⁶, Baugh, ‘The Apostle among the Amazons’, *Westminster Theological Journal* (56.157), (Spring 1994).