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Introduction

This book examines arguments raised by brother Ian and sister Averil McHaffie in their book 'All One In Christ Jesus' (2010 edition). A number of issues and arguments related to the subject of their work, are also examined.

The purpose of this work is to test a particular case being made, and to assess its credibility. Evidence is placed before readers and they are invited to assess the case for themselves and reach their own conclusions. Readers will not find here:

- An argument that readers must hold a certain position in order to be consistent with Scriptural teaching: instead readers are left to weigh the evidence Scripturally in prayer, for themselves

- An attempt to intimidate readers by associating any particular view repeatedly with apostasy, church tradition, feminism, or misogyny: instead readers are encouraged to assess each view on its own merits

- A promotion of my personal views on the subject: instead readers are invited to assess the evidence, compare it with Ian and Averil’s claims, and decide for themselves

Readers should also understand that this work is not an unsolicited criticism. It is a response to Ian and Averil’s own appeal for others to read their work and respond:

'We continue to welcome constructive criticism of anything we write, and will be happy to correct anything which can be demonstrated to be in error.'

1 I choose not to make a promotion of my personal views, because my own personal views are irrelevant; it is the responsibility of each individual to determine their own understanding of the Scriptures, and I have no desire to impose my interpretation on others or claim that it is the only valid interpretation and that all those who disagree are apostate.

2 'All One', p. iv (2010).
Notes to readers

Readers are encouraged to note the following points, which I hope will be helpful when reading this work.

Terms of address

Brother Ian and sister Averil are referred to throughout this work as simply 'Ian and Averil'; the reference is not intended to be disrespectful (readers are requested to bear in mind that Ian and Averil are our brother and sister in Christ), it simply contributes to the stylistic brevity of the text.3

Added emphasis

All emphasis in bold has been added to the text, except where otherwise noted (text in italics is original to the source quoted).

Quotations and citations

Direct quotations from any source are identified by placing the text within single quotation marks ('thus'), as well as providing a footnote identifying the source; indentation is not used to identify quotes or attribute text to a source, it is used as a typographical device with the aim of structuring the text for ease of reading.

Any text within single quotation marks which is unaccompanied by a footnote identifying the source is to be understood as my own words rather than being attributed to any other source. No text outside single quotation marks, or unaccompanied by a footnote identifying the source, is to be considered attributed to any source other than myself.

Paragraphing and spacing in quoted texts has sometimes been altered from the original layout for the ease of reading (specifically to avoid presenting readers with very large blocks of unbroken text which are difficult to read), but the text itself has been left unaltered.

The location of articles in journals is cited listing volume, number, and page in parentheses (v.n.p.), volume and page in parentheses (v.p.), where there is no journal number, or simply number (n), where the source is an unpaginated electronic article.

3 Similarly, Ian and Averil refer to me simply as ‘Brother Burke’ in ‘Reply 2’ (April 2009), at which I take no offence.
Absent page numbers indicate places where I have used electronic works which did not include page numbers.

Some quotations are applicable to more than one section of the work, and so will appear several times throughout. This is partly in acknowledgement of the fact that I do not expect this work to be read from cover to cover, but rather used as a reference for information on various subjects. Readers will therefore find some material repeated in several different locations, as appropriate to the topic under discussion.

Many quotations have been provided from a wide range of works by egalitarian, complementarian, and neutral commentators. In order to minimize bias against the egalitarian view, I have ensured that the overwhelming majority of commentaries I have used are from egalitarians themselves.

Readers should not be intimidated by these quotations. In avoiding a presentation of my own personal exposition, I have necessarily provided the views of others, especially the views of scholarly commentary in the relevant fields. No appeal is being made to sheer numbers or authority, rather to the fact that an interpretation which is agreed on by commentators from a range of different backgrounds and with widely varying preconceptions is more likely to be accurate than an interpretation from a group of commentators with a narrow range of backgrounds and views, or sharing the same preconceptions.

Scripture quotations

Scripture quotations are from the New English Translation, unless otherwise noted.

Footnotes and enumeration

Significant footnotes from quoted works have been placed in a footnote of their own in this work. Typically these footnotes follow the enumeration of footnotes in this work, but sometimes the footnotes have been permitted to keep their original enumeration, resulting in a break in the ordinary sequence of footnote enumeration.
Glossary of terms

Please see the glossary at the end of this work, for definitions of terms used.

References to Ian and Averil's works

- 'All One – NT (2007)' and 'All One – OT (2007) refer respectively to Ian and Averil's 2007 booklets entitled 'All One – NT' and 'All One – OT'
- 'Reply 1' refers to Ian and Averil's first reply to me, in February 2008
- 'All One (March 2009)' refers to Ian and Averil's March 2009 edition of 'All One'
- 'Reply 2' refers to Ian and Averil's April 2009 reply to my work 'A Sister's Role – The Bible's Large Picture' (January 2009)
- 'All One (February 2010)', refers to Ian and Averil's February 2010 edition of 'All One', the most recently released edition to date

---

4 In ‘Reply 2’ (April 2009), Ian and Averil refer to this reply on page 68 as having been sent in February 2008, and then later on the same page refer to it as having been sent in February 2007; readers may be assured that the correct date is February 2008, the error is Ian and Averil's (they give the correct date elsewhere, on pages 1, 63, 95, 99, 100, 101, and 138).
Transliteration

The Greek transliteration scheme used in this work is the 'general-purpose style' used by the Society of Biblical literature.\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transliteration scheme</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>ê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ̃</td>
<td>rh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ϕ</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Transliteration scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χ</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>ῥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'</td>
<td>h (with vowel or diphthong)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is all this academic work necessary?

Confronted by the large number of quotations and citations from academic works presented in 'All One' (as well as in this work), readers may question the necessity for such detailed use of reference material in addition to the Scriptural text itself. Ian and Averil rightly comment that the use of such material is important to a correct understanding of the subject, as it helps illuminate the broader social, historical, and linguistic context of the text:

'Ancient authors have also been quoted extensively because it is not always easy to obtain access to these writers, whether in the original text or in translation. This book makes information available which is relevant to the context of the New Testament but is generally unknown. References are given so that the wider contexts of these quotations can be examined.'

'We all depend on others for translation of the Bible from Hebrew (Old Testament) or Greek (New Testament) into English. Translation is not straightforward; words have different meanings according to context, and translations are influenced by the background and understanding of the translators and commentators. It is important, therefore, never to rely on just one translation or on one commentator.'

---

6 'All One', p. 4 (March 2009); note that although references are given by Ian and Averil these references are frequently inaccurate or incomplete, making it difficult and time consuming (sometimes impossible), to locate, verify, and examine these quotations in their wider context.

7 Ibid., p. 4.
'It is necessary to evaluate each passage in its context, something which is not easy to do.'

'In assessing, therefore, the teaching given, the context is once more crucial but as in Corinthians there is the difficulty that while Paul, Timothy and Titus knew precisely the situation in the ecclesias there, we do not.'

'We who read at a distance of over 1,900 years are unlikely to pick up so accurately what is being said unless we acquaint ourselves with the whole background.'

As with the study of any other passage of Scripture, it is our responsibility to make the best efforts possible to obtain all relevant social, historical, and linguistic information relevant to the context, and this will require not only that we look to sources outside the Bible (such as the ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’), but also that we seek information from appropriate professionals in the relevant fields.

We are familiar with this practice as it is commonly applied to Old Testament study in particular, especially with regard to history and archaeology (scholarly works of both disciplines being frequently appealed to in our publications and presentations), and we are all familiar with the practice of investigating word meanings through the use of professional lexicons and Bible dictionaries.

Even a quick search through The Testimony and The Christadelphian will show a wealth of scholarly works used in the exposition of Scripture. The subject at hand is no different, and our responsibility is the same:

"If our love of God demands hard mental effort, let us not forget also to love God with all our strength. It is our responsibility to exercise the most serious scholarly endeavor of which we are capable" (p. 38).

---

8 Ibid., p. 5.
9 Ibid., p. 72.
10 Ibid., p. 72.
Furthermore, when specific social, historical, and linguistic claims are made concerning the context of Biblical passages, it is our responsibility to investigate such claims thoroughly, using all available relevant professional literature.
Claims Examined

Does adelphoi ever refer to brothers in Christ, not brothers & sisters in Christ?

The claim made

'Show where and why, when Paul uses the term “adelphoi” ("brothers"), he means “Brothers in Christ” not "Brothers and sisters in Christ".'\(^{12}\)

Examination

The primary meaning of *adelphos* is 'brothers' as a reference to males who are the sons of one mother. A secondary meaning is 'brothers' as males who share a non-literal 'brotherhood' on a legal, tribal, spiritual, or other figurative basis, or a male who is being referred to with affection (perhaps with a suggestion of filial intimacy), as used in the apocryphal work Tobit 10:12.\(^{13}\)

This usage is established by context. The broader use of the term as a referent to 'brothers and sisters' on a legal, tribal, spiritual, or other figurative basis is likewise established by context. When the word *adelphoi* appears in a text, the natural reading is 'brothers' as a reference to males unless the context indicates otherwise, and is therefore typically translated 'brothers', as in the following verses.\(^{14}\)

- 'Jeconiah and his brothers', Matthew 1:11; 'Judah and his brothers', Matthew 1:21
- 'Jesus' mother and his brothers' and 'his brothers', Mark 3:31-2
- 'five brothers', Luke 16:28
- 'his mother and his brothers', John 2:12; 'Jesus' brothers', John 7:3; 'his own brothers', John 7:5; 'his brothers', John 7:10

---

\(^{12}\) *Reply 1*, p. 70 (February 2008).

\(^{13}\) Though an uninspired work, it still shows how the word was used and understood in common speech.

• 'his brothers', Acts 1:14
• 'the Lord's brothers', 1 Corinthians 9:5

It should be understood that this usage of *adelphoi* as a specific reference to 'brothers in Christ' and not 'brothers and sisters in Christ' is not unusual in the New Testament. It is used many times in Acts with this meaning, including in direct address. In Acts 1:16; 2:29, 37; 7:37; 6:3; 9:30; 10:23; 11:1, 12, 29; 12:17; 13:15, 26; 14:2; 15:1, 3, 7, 22, 32, 36; 16:2, 40; 17:6, 10, 14; 18:18, 27; 21:7, 17; 22:1, 5; 22:5; 23:1, 5-6; 28:14-15, 17, 21, it is translated 'brothers', or 'the brothers'.

Many times in Paul's letters the reference is to brothers and sisters, as determined from the context (typically a greeting or farewell which is addressed explicitly to a congregation). But Paul also uses the word *adelphoi* (nominative masculine plural), and its declensions *adelphous* (accusative masculine plural), or *pseudadelphoi*, 'false brothers' (dative masculine plural), to refer specifically to 'brothers in Christ' as opposed to 'brothers and sisters in Christ' in the following places:

• 2 Corinthians 8:23: *adelphoi*, referring to the messengers of the ecclesia, the context indicating that this refers to three men; 'Titus' (verse 16), 'the brother who is praised by all the ecclesias' (verse 18), also referred to as 'this brother' (verse 19), and 'our brother' whom 'we are sending with them (verse 22)
• **2 Corinthians 9:3**: *adelphous*, referring to the same messengers of the ecclesia already identified in the previous chapter as three men (see above)

• **2 Corinthians 9:5**: *adelphous*, referring to the same messengers of the ecclesia as verse 3

• **2 Corinthians 11:9**: *adelpoi*, referring to the 'brothers' from Macedonia

• **2 Corinthians 11:26**: *pseudadelphois*, referring to 'false brothers' in Paul's list of dangers he has encountered

• **Galatians 1:2**: *adelpoi*, referring to the brothers who are with Paul at the time of his writing the epistle

• **Galatians 2:4**: *pseudadelphous*, referring to 'false brothers' who were brought in secretly to spy on Paul

• **Philippians 4:21**: *adelpoi*, referring to the brothers who are with Paul at the time of his writing the epistle

• **1 Timothy 5:1**: *adelphous*, referring to 'the younger men'

• **1 Timothy 6:2**: *adelpoi*, referring to Christian masters

• **Hebrews 2:12**: *adelphous*, quoting Psalm 22:22 which refers to males

The New English Translation (a standard modern translation which is inclusive of non-gendered terms), translates *adelpoi* as 'brothers' in each of the verses cited above, even though the NET also recognizes *adelpoi* can mean 'brothers and sisters' and translates it as such overwhelmingly in Paul's letters.

Ian and Averil point out that out of the 11 passages just examined, the TNIV translates 'brothers and sisters' in 2 Corinthians 11:9, 26, Galatians 1:2, Philippians 4:21, Hebrews 2:11-12, and translates...

---

19 2 Corinthians 8:23; 9:3, 5; 11:9, 26, Galatians 1:2; 2:4, Philippians 4:21, 1 Timothy 5:1; 6:2, Hebrews 2:12.
‘false believers in Galatians 2:4. 20 They acknowledge the TNIV is a gender neutral translation,21 though they point out that ‘it only does so where the translators judge that this correctly conveys the meaning of the original’. Nevertheless, they are still relying on a single (gender neutral), translation in order to argue that these passages should be rendered with ‘brothers and sisters’.

Out of these 11 passages the TNIV translates ‘brothers and sisters’ in only five of them, and leaves one ambiguous. A survey of 2 Corinthians 11:9, 26, Galatians 1:2, Philippians 4:21, Hebrews 2:11-12 in 15 Bible translations23 shows that in only one case is the majority of Bible translations against a reading with a male referent (Galatians 1:2, by one translation, 8 translations to 7); in a number of cases the male referent reading is supported even by ‘gender neutral’ translations and paraphrases.

Of all the translations used, only the CEV, NRSV, and TNIV consistently translate these passages without an explicit male referent. Ian and Averil would do well to heed their own advice to others.24

20 ‘Reply 2’ (April 2009).
22 Ibid., p. 71.
23 CEV, ESV, GNT, HCSB, ISV, NAB, NASB95, NCV, NET, NIV, NIRV, NLT, NRSV, TLB, TNIV.
24 ‘Translation is not straightforward; words have different meanings according to context, and translations are influenced by the background and understanding of the translators and commentators. It is important, therefore, never to rely on just one translation or on one commentator.’, ‘All One’, p. iv (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.
Does adelphoi mean 'those who are from the same womb'?

The claim made

'If we want the primary meaning we go back to the origin of the word. The word comes from the prefix a (= "connected together") and from the word delphus which means "womb". So it means those who are from the same womb.'  

Examination

If we want the primary meaning of a word we should look up the word in a standard lexicon. The method Ian and Averil are recommending is a lexical fallacy known as the 'root fallacy':

'The "root fallacy" involves insisting that a word's true meaning is tied to its root meanings, or the parts of the word. But this is not how language works. If you use the word "butterfly," does it help you understand the meaning by breaking it down into "butter" and "fly?" if you use the word "pineapple," does it help to say this word is a combination of the words pine and apple? No. Some Greek words may actually be made up of parts that are closely related to the word's true meaning, but this is somewhat beside the point. The "root word" fallacy is more likely to lead us down unproductive paths in our word studies.'

'As lexicographers have long noted, the root meaning of a word is not necessarily an accurate guide to the meaning of the word in later literature.'

'The Root Fallacy. This common error assumes that the root of a term and its cognates carries a basic meaning that is reflected in every subordinate use of the word(s).'


26 The Holman Student Bible, p. 4 (2007).


'Similarly, it is erroneous to take a compound word, break it into its component parts, and read the resultant meanings in that light. Louw states unequivocally, 'It is a basic principle of modern semantic theory that we cannot progress from the form of a word to its meaning' (1982:29).29

'Two well-known examples may help: ekklesia and parakletos. The first is often said to mean "the called out" believers, while in reality nowhere in extant Greek literature does ekklesia have this connotation. The other is the major title for the Holy Spirit in John 14-16 and contains the roots para ("beside") and kaleo ("call"). At one time the term did have a meaning similar to its root, "one called alongside to help," and was used in Hellenistic circles for a "helper" or "advocate". However, this is inadequate for John 14:16, 26; 15:26; and 16:7-8, 13 because that sense is never used in this context.'30

Ian and Averil cite Vine several times,31 but not in this case. In fact, Vine's entry for adelphos says the opposite of what they claim.32 Thayer's lexicon contains text which is sufficiently close to Ian and Averil's to warrant the thought that they may have adapted Thayer's words without attribution,33 yet they claim instead to have derived the word's meaning

29 Ibid., p. 85.
30 Ibid., p. 85.
32 ‘adelphos (δελφός, 80) denotes “a brother, or near kinsman”; in the plural, “a community based on identity of origin or life.” It is used of:— (1) male children of the same parents, Matt. 1:2; 14:3; (2) male descendants of the same parents, Acts 7:23, 26; Heb. 7:5; (3) male children of the same mother, Matt. 13:55; 1 Cor. 9:5; Gal. 1:19; (4) people of the same nationality, Acts 3:17, 22; Rom. 9:3. With “men” (aner, “male”), prefixed, it is used in addresses only, Acts 2:29, 37, etc.; (5) any man, a neighbor, Luke 10:29; Matt. 5:22; 7:3; (6) persons united by a common interest, Matt. 5:47; (7) persons united by a common calling, Rev. 22:9; (8) mankind, Matt. 25:40; Heb. 2:17; (9) the disciples, and so, by implication, all believers, Matt. 28:10; John 20:17; (10) believers, apart from sex, Matt. 23:8; Acts 1:15; Rom. 1:13; 1 Thess. 1:4; Rev. 19:10 (the word “sisters” is used of believers, only in 1 Tim. 5:2); (11) believers, with aner, “male,” prefixed, and with “or sister” added, 1 Cor. 7:14 (rv), 15; Jas. 2:15, male as distinct from female, Acts 1:16; 15:7, 13, but not6:3,’ Vine, Unger, & White, ‘Vine’s complete expository dictionary of Old and New Testament words’, volume 2, p. 82 (1996 ed.).
33 'δελφός, -ος, -ος (fr. a copulative and δελφύς, from the same womb; cf. γάστρων),
by themselves. Furthermore, the relevant text from Thayer is not in the definition of the word, but in the etymological description preceding the definition. When it comes to the definition, Thayer gives 'A brother' as the primary meaning of the word. Standard lexical entries do not support Ian and Averil's claim.35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44

[fr. Horn, down] ; 1. A brother (whether born of the same two parents, or only of the same father or the same mother) : Mt. i. 2 ; iv. 1 8, and often.’, Thayer, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Being Grimm’s Wilke’s Clavis Novi Testamenti Translated, Revised, and Enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, corrected edition’, p. 10 (1886); the rest of the definition has been omitted as it simply lists examples of the literal and figurative use of the word, without contributing any more to the point at hand.

34 Zodhiates The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament’, G80 (electronic ed., 2000), has ‘from the collative a (1), denoting unity, and delphús (n.f.), a womb’, but again this is in the description of the etymology of the word, not in the definition (the full definition from Zodhiates will be given shortly); furthermore the text from Thayer is closer to Ian and Averil’s definition, and the probability of Ian and Averil using Zodhiates is extremely low.


37 ‘The brother in the narrower, literal sense is the physical brother, which can also include half-brothers (→ 3).’, Balz & Schneider, ‘Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testamen’, volume 1, pp.28-30 (1990-c1993).


The only definitions given which refer the word to individuals from the same womb specify males ('male sibling' with at least one parent in common,45 'a male from the same womb',46 'a male having the same father and mother' as the reference person—'brother',47 'son of the same mother').

Even Vine (which Ian and Averil used elsewhere in their book49), defines the primary meaning as 'male children of the same parents, Matt, 1:2; 14:3; (2) male descendants of the same parents, Acts 7:23, 26; Heb. 7:5; (3) male children of the same mother'.50 This is the primary meaning of the word adelphos, and the lexicon entries quoted above (including Vine), show that this is also the primary meaning of the plural adelphoi. The plural adelphoi certainly has a secondary meaning with reference to brothers and sisters in Christ, and this is overwhelmingly the meaning in Paul’s writings. However, that meaning is still secondary.

---

49 Cited in ‘All One’, pp. 57, 95, 102 (March 2009).  
It seems therefore that Ian and Averil didn’t check the meaning of this word in any Bible dictionary or lexicon at all (not even the dictionary they used elsewhere in their book), and simply made up their own definition for it by combining the two root words (as they themselves say).

Given that they owned Vine’s, given that Thayer’s is freely available online, and given that the professional lexicon LSJ9 is also available freely online, it is unclear as to why they chose to make up their own definition of the word, ignoring even the definition in the dictionary they used elsewhere in their book.

Ian and Averil provided no evidence for their definition other than a personal application of the root fallacy, and readers will note that standard lexicons say otherwise.

51 http://www.tlg.uci.edu/lsj
Were New Testament texts corrupted by misogynists?

The claim made

'We rely on a large number of handwritten manuscripts in Greek to provide us with our text of the New Testament. Interestingly, it can be observed that alterations were made in the second century in such a way as to downplay the reported involvement and importance of women.'

Because these changes are not followed in the majority of manuscripts, the original text can easily be identified. But the changes suggest a climate in which some scribes were not happy to see women prominently involved. The changes are slight, but significant in the thinking they betray. They indicate an anti-women swing in at least some circles in the early churches.52

Readers will note that Ian and Averil describe the changes as slight, and explain that they are not followed in the majority of manuscripts. This is a considerable understatement. It would be far more accurate to say that in the vast majority of the thousands of New Testament manuscripts, less than a dozen such alterations have been found. Furthermore, these alterations are limited to a tiny number of texts.

Examination

Although Ian and Averil originally said 'it can be observed that alterations were made in the second century',53 they actually provided no evidence for this (whether they realise it or not). 54

52 ‘All One’, p. 246 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

53 ‘All One’, p. 181 (March 2009).

54 In the 2010 edition of ‘All One’, Ian and Averil revised their previously dogmatic statement to reduce its certainty; ‘Interestingly, it can be observed that alterations were made, probably in the second century, in such a way as to downplay the reported involvement and importance of women.’, ‘All One’, p. 246 (2010).
Neither of the two sources they cite actually says this. One source they cite (Ben Witherington), says *it appears that* there was a concerted effort by some part of the Church, perhaps as early as the late first century or beginning of the second.\(^55\)

However, when it comes to presenting the actual evidence which can be observed, Witherington does not cite any textual evidence earlier than the 4th century,\(^56\) some 200 years after the 2nd century,\(^57\) and most of his textual witnesses date to the 5th century.

It is significant that these errors are all found in the Western text type. This text type is most well known not for its ‘anti-feminist’ bias, but for its general tendency to paraphrase and edit the text in a particularly arbitrary manner.\(^58\)

It is also significant that almost all of these errors are found in only one manuscript tradition of the Western text (D), with only three errors appearing in any other Western manuscript tradition (G\(^{pm}\), ita),\(^59\) as this demonstrates that these are not even systematic changes to one particular manuscript tradition, let alone the entire Western text type.


56 In fact he only cites one text as early as the 4th century

57 Witherington’s most frequently referred to text is the 5th century text D (Codex Bezae), but the Greek text type (called ‘Western’), which D preserves cannot be dated any earlier than 250 CE, even if quotations from early Christian writers are used (there are no Western type Greek manuscripts or papyri earlier than the 4th century).

58 The chief characteristic of Western readings is fondness for paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences are freely changed, omitted, or inserted. Sometimes the motive appears to have been harmonization, while at other times it was the enrichment of the narrative by the inclusion of traditional or apocryphal material. Some readings involve quite trivial alterations for which no special reason can be assigned’, Metzger, ‘A Textual Commentary On the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition), p. xx (2nd edition 1994).

59 The text referred to as ‘G\(^{pm}\)’ (the ‘pm’ stands for the Latin ‘permulti’, meaning ‘very many’, and indicates that many manuscripts of this tradition have this reading), is a 9th century Greek/Latin interlinear diglot also known as Codex Boernerianus (Gregory-Aland number 012); Witherington (ibid., p. 84), says ‘D, G pm, et al. [and others]’, but does not say which other manuscripts he is referring to. The text referred to as ‘it’ is an African Old Latin copy of an earlier Greek text (the ‘it’ stands for ‘Itala’, meaning
This is one of the reasons why modern textual scholars generally view few (if any), of these alterations as genuinely motivated by a desire to minimize the role of women in the early church.

They are so few, so inconsistently found, and some of them are so much more readily attributable to accidental scribal error or the desire to render the text more grammatically, that they contradict the idea that the New Testament was revised studiously by groups of 'anti-feminist' scribes as a result of changing attitudes to women in early Christian history.

It should be pointed out that Witherington is an egalitarian scholar, whose interpretation of these textual alterations is influenced by his own sensitivity to the subject. Comparing Witherington's statements on the texts with the statements of the United Bible Societies' Committee edited by Bruce Metzger, shows that in a number of cases there is a more likely explanation for the text's alteration than any 'anti-feminist' attitude by a particular scribe.

- **Matthew 5:32**: Metzger makes the point that the scribal tendency to smooth the text (in this case to create a neat parallel), and to remove material perceived as redundant, is an adequate cause for the alteration, so there is no necessity to attribute to this alteration an 'anti-feminist' motivation.

- **Acts 1:14**: Metzger notes it is characteristic of the Western text type to alter the text to make it more stylistically 'interesting', and in this case Metzger also points out that the scribe altered the text to conform to the grammatical pattern already existing in Acts 21:5, an alteration which the scribe considered to be more likely to be in conformity with the original. This is characteristic of the Western text type, so there is no necessity to attribute this alteration to an 'anti-feminist' motivation.

- **Acts 17:4**: Both Witherington and Metzger agree that the text here is actually ambiguous in the first place, and could be read either way. This is therefore not clearly a matter of a deliberately 'anti-feminist'
reading being introduced, but a scribal decision as to which particular interpretation of the text made more sense to them.

- **Acts 17:12**: Metzger points out that the reason for Codex Bezae (D), altering the text was to smooth the grammar and render it into better Greek. This is a common feature of the Western text type, especially in Codex Bezae, so the alteration is simply what the scribes of this text type typically did in any case. There is therefore no need to attribute to this alteration an ‘anti-feminist’ motivation.

- **Acts 17:34**: There is a case to be made that the alteration is a deliberate attempt to diminish the importance of the women in the text, but Metzger says ‘It is, however, more likely, as A. C. Clark suggests, that a line in an ancestor of Codex Bezae had been accidentally omitted’, so there is no necessity to attribute to this alteration an ‘anti-feminist’ motivation.

- **Acts 18**: Although it is possible to read the tendency in some of the Western witnesses to place Aquila first or insert Aquila’s name without including Priscilla as a desire to reduce the prominence of Priscilla, there is also the fact (as Metzger observes), that the general tendency of the Western text type scribes was to ‘change the unusual to the usual’. They altered the text to conform to what they considered to be more likely to be original.

  The fact that they did this with many other passages having nothing to do with women indicates that there is no necessity to attribute to this alteration an ‘anti-feminist’ motivation, even though in this case it is entirely likely.

- **Colossians 4:15**: Metzger notes that the gender of the name was uncertain to start with, giving rise to variations in the text. The difference between the female name Nympha and the male name Nymphas was a matter of accenting the Greek letters one way or another, but the earliest manuscripts did not use any accents at all, meaning that later scribes had to make interpretative decisions at times. There is therefore no need to attribute to this alteration an ‘anti-feminist’ motivation, even though the ambiguity was settled in favour of the male name Nymphas.

---

The following table summarizes the conclusions of a number of recent studies on passages suspected of misogynist bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 5:32</td>
<td>Yes^64</td>
<td>NA^65</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 1:14</td>
<td>Yes^66</td>
<td>Yes^67</td>
<td>Unclear^68,69</td>
<td>Probable^70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

62 To meet Holmes’ criteria for a misogynist motivation ‘it must (a) be intentional (rather than accidental) in origin, (b) have some negative impact on the role or portrayal of women’, Holmes, ‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 201 (2003); he cites a number of alterations which have a negative impact on the portrayal of women but which he believes do not bear evidence of intentional alteration for the purpose.

63 Holmes also included Acts 2:17 in his analysis, deciding that there was no evidence for a misogynist alteration in this text; however, his judgment on this text has been omitted from this table since none of the other writers comment on it.

64 ‘Consider the Western text of Matt 5:32b. D, it^k, b, d, k, and other manuscripts omit κα ἐν τῇ μοιασμῷ in 5:32b. Bruce Metzger suggests that some scribes felt that if the divorced woman is made an adulteress by illegal divorce, then anyone marrying such a woman also commits adultery. Alternatively, this omission may reflect the tendency of the Western text to highlight and protect male privilege, while also relegating women to a place in the background. In this case, the omission here is of material that reflects badly on men.’, Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.84), March 1984.

65 The commentator made no direct comment on this passage.

66 ‘Of a similar nature is the addition of κα τέκνοις at 1:14 by Codex Bezae so that women are no longer an independent group but are simply the wives of the apostles.’, Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.82), March 1984.


68 ‘In spite of what most translations imply, it is by no means certain that in the former passage means “with (certain) women” (supposedly those who had followed Jesus during his earthly life), whereas in the latter, “with wives.”’, Kurek-Chomycz, ‘Is

69 ‘The addition of kai; tevkoi” in Codex Bezae does not necessarily indicate that the copyists wanted to marginalize the role of women as witnesses by identifying them as “wives” of the apostles. It could just as well suggest that they made more explicit what according to them was already implicit in the text.’, ibid., p. 122


72 There is no real evidence here of any "anti-feminist" tendency, and this passage may be set aside from further consideration.’, Holmes, ‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 190 (2003); Holmes does not comment directly on verse 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 16:14-15, 40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No71</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No (14–15)72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 17:4</td>
<td>Yes(^{73})</td>
<td>Yes(^{74})</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes(^{75})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 17:12</td>
<td>Yes(^{76})</td>
<td>Yes(^{77})</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unclear(^{78})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{73}\) "While there is some ambiguity in the text of 17:4 as we have it in p74, K, A, B, E, P (so that γυναῖκ ῳ τ ᾳ ρωτῶν might be translated "the wives of leading men" instead of rendering "women of the first magnitude"), D and others give us the unambiguous κα γυνα γες τ ρωτων.‘, Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.82), March 1984; Witherington says ‘D and others’, but does not specify which other texts he is referring to.

\(^{74}\) ‘While it is possible that the scribe of Codex D was simply clarifying an ambiguous reading in Codex B, it is also possible that the change plays down the prominence of women. The motive behind this textual change may become clearer when a similar phrase appears in Acts 17.12 below.’, Malick, ‘The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts’, Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.173), 2007.


\(^{76}\) ‘We find the same phenomenon at 17:12. D* alters the text so that both the men and women are prominent (κα τ ν λλήνων κα τ ν ε σχιμάτων ύδες κα γυνα κες) and thus the women’s prominence is lessened somewhat.’, Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.82), March 1984.

\(^{77}\) ‘Codex D reduces their importance by placing them after the men with the adjective explicitly modifying both of them.’, Malick, ‘The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts’, Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.175), 2007.

\(^{78}\) ‘It could be another instance of a textual variant that “consistently plays down any prominence given to women.”34 But it could also be, however, merely another example of Bezae smoothing out the grammar to produce better Greek (in which case any change in the portrayal of women would be a consequence rather than the motivating cause).’, Holmes, ‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 192 (2003).
Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 17:34</td>
<td>Yes(^{79})</td>
<td>Unclear(^{80})</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No(^{81})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{79}\) W. M. Ramsay has observed rightly that the omission in Codex Bezae of κα γυν νόματι Δάμαρις at 17:34 is in all likelihood more evidence of an anti-feminist tendency in this textual tradition.', Witherington, 'The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the 'Western' Text in Acts', Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.84), March 1984.

\(^{80}\) 'Therefore, the most one may be able to say on this problem is that it is indeterminate whether Codex D is showing a theological bias, since it is not clear whether the omission of Damaris was intentional.', Malick, 'The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts', Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.178), 2007.

\(^{81}\) 'In short, it seems that this variant is at least as (if not slightly more) likely to be accidental as it is to be intentional (let alone ideologically motivated).', Holmes, 'Women and the 'Western' Text of Acts', in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), 'The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations', p. 193 (2003).
### Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 18:2-3</td>
<td>Yes82</td>
<td>Yes83</td>
<td>Possible84</td>
<td>Unclear85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 18:7</td>
<td>Yes86</td>
<td>No87</td>
<td>No88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82 ‘In the Western text of chap. 18, there is a definite effort to reduce the prominence of Priscilla, probably because she appears to the editors to be assuming her husband’s first place and also because she was a well-known teacher of a male Christian leader, Apollos.’, Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.82), March 1984.


85 ‘To summarize, of these five variants in 18.2-3, only one - the addition of a reference to Aquila, 18.2c - is of any significance; what that significance is, however, is less than obvious.’, p. 197.

86 ‘In Acts 18.7, Codex D inserts a phrase that not only misunderstands Paul’s movement from one teaching location to another, but in the process makes the home only Aquila’s by not even mentioning Priscilla.,’ Malick, ‘The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabriensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts’, Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.182-183), 2007.

87 ‘In the “Western” text there was possibly an attempt to clarify the passage, which is slightly ambiguous in the Alexandrian version, hence the indication that Paul changed not just the location of teaching but also the living quarters.,’ Kurek-Chomycz, ‘Is there an ‘Anti-Priscan’ Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila’, Journal of Biblical Literature (125.1.124), 2007.

88 ‘But can one infer anything about motivation on the basis of the effect of the change - especially if, as seems likely, the alteration is due to a misreading of the text?,’ ‘In short, it seems that this variant is at least as (if not slightly more) likely to be accidental as it is to be intentional (let alone ideologically motivated.).’, Holmes, ‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 197 (2003).
Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 18:18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 18:21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 *In the Western text of chap. 18, there is a definite effort to reduce the prominence of Priscilla, probably because she appears to the editors to be assuming her husband’s first place* and also because she was a well-known teacher of a male Christian leader, Apollos.’, Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.82), March 1984.

90 ‘It is remarkable that in v. 18 Prisca and Aquila are named together as accompanying Paul, the wife likewise preceding the husband. *Yet, in that verse, unlike verse 26, at least to my knowledge, no manuscript has changed the order.*’, Kurek-Chomycz, ‘Is there an ‘Anti-Priscan’ Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila’, Journal of Biblical Literature (125.1.125), 2007.

91 ‘There was no need for such a repetition, but it is remarkable that this time 614 ignores Aquila’s wife.’, ibid., p. 124.

92 ‘So Priscilla is once more (this time in comparison to verse 19) notable by her absence, and this alteration too has the effect of diminishing her presence in the narrative.’, ‘In short, it seems that this variant is at least as (if not slightly more) likely to be accidental as it is to be intentional (let alone ideologically motivated).’, Holmes, ‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 198 (2003).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 18:26</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;93&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;94&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;95&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Uncertain&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 18:27</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;97&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;98&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93 *In the Western text of chap. 18, there is a definite effort to reduce the prominence of Priscilla, probably because she appears to the editors to be assuming her husband’s first place and also because she was a well-known teacher of a male Christian leader, Apollos*., Witherington, *The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts*, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.82), March 1984.

94 ‘Finally, in Acts 18.26, Codex D inverts the order of names from Priscilla and Aquila so that the man has the appearance of taking the lead in teaching Apollos.', Malick, *‘The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts’, Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.183), 2007.*

95 ‘Moreover, even though Prisca’s name is not erased, in D the preceding participle is in the singular form: εφηκουσαντο, implying that it was only Aquila who heard Apollos speaking.49 The reversal of the order is probably the most (in)famous indication of the “Western” tendency to diminish the importance of Prisca, even though, as should be noted, it is not peculiar to “Western” texts, since the same has happened in the Byzantine textual tradition.5’, Kurek-Chomycz , *‘Is there an ‘Anti-Priscan’ Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila’, Journal of Biblical Literature (125.1.125), 2007.*

96 *The change of order, from “Priscilla and Aquila” to the reverse, certainly does entail diminution of a noteworthy emphasis on Priscilla, but it is uncertain whether it can be claimed as evidence of a specific ‘Western’ theological agenda.’, Holmes, *‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 199 (2003).*

97 *The “Western” editor supposedly could not accept that Prisca would have written a letter of recommendation and, as a result, completely reworked the account in order to avoid crediting her with too much merit. This line of argumentation, however, seems rather far-fetched.’, Kurek-Chomycz , *‘Is there an ‘Anti-Priscan’ Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila’, Journal of Biblical Literature (125.1.127), 2007.*

98 *‘If the change removes Priscilla from the picture, then it also does the same for Aquila.’, Holmes, *‘Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts’, in Nicklas & Tilly (eds.), ‘The Book of Acts as church history: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations’, p. 200 (2003).*
### Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Witherington</th>
<th>Malick</th>
<th>Kurek-Chomycz</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans 16:3-5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unclear⁹⁹</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Corinthians 16:19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians 4:15</td>
<td>Yes¹⁰⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readers will note the lack of complete agreement among all four studies, even though three of them were carried out by scholars with a liberal or egalitarian viewpoint.⁹¹ In fact all of them identify at least some of the alterations Witherington interpreted as misogynist, as more credibly attributable to factors other than a deliberate intention to reduce the role of women in the text.

Holmes’ analysis was praised by egalitarian Anne Brock for his correction of an over-exaggeration of the evidence for intentional alterations intended to diminish women.

> ‘In a recent contribution to text-critical assessment of Acts, however, Michael Holmes challenges this scholarly conjecture of what he calls an "alleged" antifeminist bias in the Western texts, stating that “the claim, though often repeated, has not, to my knowledge, been examined in a thorough or comprehensive fashion.”

---

⁹⁹ ‘In the end, of course, we cannot be sure about the intentions of the copyists responsible for inserting the diminutive form. Yet the consequence might be that Prisca’s image would be devalued to some extent for readers of the Pauline letters as a result of the use of the diminutive,’ Kurek-Chomycz, ‘Is there an ‘Anti-Priscan’ Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila’, Journal of Biblical Literature (125.1.117), 2007.

¹⁰⁰ This anti-feminist tendency appears also to be in evidence at Col 4:15. While B, 6, 424, 1739, 1881, et al. have α τ ζ indicating a church in the house of Nympha, D, G pm, et al. have α τ ο indicating a church in the house of Nymphas,’ Witherington, ‘The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the ‘Western’ Text in Acts’, Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1.84), March 1984.

¹⁰¹ Witherington, Malick, and Kurek-Chomycz.
In his detailed examination he rightly argues, in my view, that many scholars have taken variants or tendencies that appear in Codex Bezae and over-generalized them to describe Western texts as a whole, overlooking that Bezae is only one representative of this text type, and possesses idiosyncracies of its own.  

Brock challenged Holmes’ conclusions on three of the nine texts for which he considered there was little or no evidence of intentional alteration for the purpose of diminishing the role or portrayal of women; Acts 1:14, 2:17, and 17:12.

However, she did not challenge him on the other six texts he considered had not been altered in this way; Acts 16:14-15; 17:34; 18:2-3, 7, 26, 27.


103 ‘Their juxtaposition with children thus alters their presentation as peers and thrusts these women into the category of simply being the wives of the apostles.’, ibid., p. 258.

104 ‘Yet if one already perceives a tendency to downplay the role of women and/or to reconfigure it in terms of a domesticating function, then one has to question seriously the alleged accidental character of the missing article.’, ibid, p. 259.

105 ‘With this alternate order, Codex D’s text thus gives greater emphasis to Aquila as the instructor of Apollos, as opposed to Codex B, which gives the first rank to Priscilla.’, ibid, p. 261.
1 Corinthians 14:34-35: disorderly or chatting women?

The claim made

‘Thirdly he enjoins silence (sigan, the same verb) on “the women” – not on those who are speaking acceptably as outlined above (one at a time) but on the women whose speaking is adding to the confused uproar which Paul is trying to stop. There are three clues to the fact that it is disorderly speaking to which Paul refers: (1) “... they... should be subordinate, as even the law says” (verse 34); (2) “If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home”; (3) “... it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.”’

‘Perhaps they were taking part in weighing up what the prophets said (verse 29) but in a disruptive and arrogant manner.’

‘The suggestion here is that some women were disrupting the meeting by calling out to their husbands with questions or by talking to each other. Hence “If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home.”’

‘We suggest in this book that similarly we should all decide by context that 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 should only be taken as a ban on disorderly speaking.’

Examination

Ian and Averil do not inform readers that this suggestion is rejected strongly even by some egalitarian scholars. It is rejected by egalitarian commentator Gordon Fee.

106 ‘All One’, pp. 71-72 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

107 Ibid., p. 72.

108 Ibid., pp. 80-81.

109 Ibid., p. 85.
'The most commonly held view is that which sees the problem as some form of disruptive speech.\textsuperscript{9} Support is found in v. 35, that if the women wish to team anything, they should ask their own husbands at home.

Various scenarios are proposed: that the setting was something like the Jewish synagogue, with women on one side and men on the other and the women shouting out disruptive questions about what was being said in a prophecy or tongue; or that they were asking questions of men other than their own husbands; or that they were simply "chattering"\textsuperscript{10} so loudly that it had a disruptive effect.

The biggest difficulty with this view is that it assumes a "church service" of a more "orderly" sort than the rest of this argument presupposes. If the basic problem is with their "all speaking in tongues" in some way one may assume on the basis of 11:5 that this also included the women; furthermore, in such disarray how can mere "chatter" have a disruptive effect? The suggestion that the early house churches assumed a synagogue practice is pure speculation; it seems remote at best.\textsuperscript{110}

Egalitarian Richard Hays likewise rejects it.

\'First, some interpreters have proposed that Paul is not really prohibiting women from praying and prophesying in the assembly. Rather, he is addressing a specific local problem at Corinth and restricting certain kinds of disruptive speech, such as chattering and asking questions (v. 35a).

(A variant on this explanation is Ben Witherington’s suggestion that the women thought of Christian prophets on the analogy of the Delphic Oracle, which prophesied in response to particular questions about the personal life of the seeker [Witherington, 287].)

The difficulty with this explanation is that it fails to reckon with the categorical declaration that it is "shameful" for women to speak in church at all (v. 35b) and with the clear statement

\textsuperscript{110} Fee (egalitarian), 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians’, p. 703 (1987).
that this rule is for "the churches" at large, not just for a particular problem at Corinth."111

The typical argument (that the Greek word for ‘speak’ here is a word which actually means ‘chatter’), is rejected by lexical and textual commentators.112 113 Egalitarian Marion Soards likewise rejects it.

'Some suggest that he opposes only idle chatter or gossip. However, the verb to speak (Gk. lalein) is not, as some commentators suggest, equivalent with “to chatter.” The verb does not name an activity that is distinct from other sensible speech or prayer or prophecy. Through the rest of chapter 14 “to speak” clearly and consistently refers to inspired speech (see vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 18, 19, 21, 23, 27, 28, 29, 39).


112 It is worth noting that Ian and Averil do not appeal to the definition of this word in support of the argument; nevertheless, they still reach the same conclusion (though they do not explain exactly how, nor do they provide any lexical or historical evidence for their view).

113 The widespread notion that whereas 11:2–16 speaks of prophetic speech, the use of λαλεῖν refers to chatter in these verses ignores first-century lexicographical evidence and the context of discussion in 14:27–40. Deluz writes: “Paul, then, is not forbidding women to undertake ‘ministry of the word’; he is forbidding them to indulge in feminine chatter which was becoming a considerable nuisance.”384 Moffatt asserts, “Keep quiet means even more than a prohibition of chattering. Worship is not to be turned into discussion groups....”385 This view seems to have gained currency from Heinrici, who, together with Héring, cannot imagine Paul’s silencing “inspired” or “liturgical” speech, but can see him as calling to order “ordinary members of the congregation.”386 C. and R. Kroeger argue that Paul forbids either “chatter” or, at the other end of the spectrum, “frenzied shouting.”387 C. K. Barrett, however, soundly dismisses the faulty lexicography to which such interpretations of λαλεῖν often appeal. The meaning to chatter does occur in classical Greek of the earlier centuries, “but in the NT and in Paul the verb normally does not have this meaning, and it is used throughout chapter 14 (vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 18, 19, 21, 23, 27, 28, 29, 39) in the sense of inspired speech.”388 Fiorenza’s argument that 11:2–16 refers to women as such, but 14:33b–36 refers only to married women is also possible (especially since γυναῖκα κεῖς may mean married women, or wives, as well as women) but remains speculative and not perhaps the most obvious explanation if no contradiction between 11:2–16 and 14:33b–36 arises from a contextual exegesis.389’, Thielson, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 1157 (2000).
The vocabulary employed in these verses does not distinguish this reference from all other mentions of speaking in this and other chapters.\textsuperscript{114}

Egalitarian Gordon Fee also rejects the claim made that 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 is a prohibition only on one kind of speech, such as disorderly speaking.

"The first reason for the rule comes in the form of a prohibition: "They are not permitted to speak." What kind of speaking is intended depends on one's view, both of authorship and, if authentic, of its place in the present argument. The only internal suggestion is that of v. 35, that they should ask questions at home if they wish to learn.

If authentic, this unqualified use of the verb seems to tell against the probability that only a single form of speech is prohibited.

Elsewhere Paul has said "speak in tongues" when that is in view, and when he means "discern" he says "discern," not "speak". Again, as with the opening "rule," the plain sense of the sentence is an absolute prohibition of all speaking in the assembly.\textsuperscript{115}

The fanciful idea that men and women were separated in 1st century synagogues\textsuperscript{116} has long been refuted by archaeological evidence demonstrating that no such seating arrangements were made.\textsuperscript{117}


\textsuperscript{115} Fee (egalitarian), 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', pp. 706-707 (1987).

\textsuperscript{116} In ‘All One’, p. 66 (March 2009), Ian and Averil wrote ‘The comment “as even the law says” would fit well with the possibility that former members of the synagogue wish to return to the type of meeting where only the men speak, where women sit apart from the men, and where any learning by the women would be at home.’, ‘All One’, p. 66 (March 2009); in the current edition they have amended this to ‘where women perhaps sit apart from the men’, without identifying the scholarly commentary which contradicts this view, or informing readers of the change in what they wrote.

\textsuperscript{117} Nor did we find any evidence of a women’s gallery. By now it is widely accepted among scholars that synagogues from the early centuries of the Common Era did not
Egalitarian Craig Keener is one of a number of egalitarians who point this out.

‘Others have suggested that the church services were segregated by gender like the synagogues, thus rendering any communication between the sexes disruptive; **but this view is refuted both by the architecture of synagogues in this period (Brooten) and that of homes like that in which the Corinthian church met**’\(^\text{118}\).

---


Is 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 a quote which Paul rejects?

The claim made

‘Paul quotes his opponents and then refutes them’\textsuperscript{119}

Ian and Averil cite this as the claim of others, rather than making the claim themselves.

‘Gilbert Bilezikian in Beyond Sex Roles (Second edition, tenth printing 1999, pages 286-288) suggests that “e” can frequently be translated as “Nonsense!”, but this is only partly supported by the examples he gives.’\textsuperscript{120}

‘It is interesting that The Bible Translator (January 1995) suggests the following as an alternative which should be offered in translations.

Some of you say, “Women should be silent in the churches, because they are not permitted to speak. As the Jewish law says, they should be subordinate to men. If there is anything they want to know, they should wait until they get home and then ask their husbands. It is shameful for women to speak in church.” What kind of thinking is that? You are acting as if the word of God came from you! And you men, don’t ever think that you are the only ones who receive this word!’\textsuperscript{121}

Examination

What Ian and Averil do not tell readers are that both of these authors are egalitarian commentators. The following quotation is from a review of the work by Bilezikian which Ian and Averil cite.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} ‘All One’, p. 73 (2010, which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Ibid., p. 74.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p. 76.
\end{itemize}
'Bilezikian writes from an unabashedly egalitarian position, calling for “deliberate programs of depatriarchalization” (p. 211) in our religious institutions and “a systematic effort of deprogramming” in our thinking so that we do away with “regard[ing] the opposite sex as opposite” (p. 210; italics his).  

'He [David C. Arichea Jr] has also written numerous Bible studies for young people and on the subject of women in the Scriptures, one of which is entitled “Laying to Rest the Misconception of the Subordinate Role of Women in the Church.”'

In the article quoted by Ian and Averil, Arichea lists among the ‘advantages’ of this interpretation of the text the fact that it is supportive of the egalitarian case.

‘a) It changes the passage from that of an oppressive text that can be used as an anti-feminist tool to one which advocates the active participation of women within the church.’

‘f) The spirit of Gal. 3:28 is not violated by Paul in any way.’

Further, Ian and Averil do not tell readers that Arichea himself lists a number of objections against this interpretation of the text.

‘However, there are objections to this position as well, among which are the following:

a) There simply is no way to be certain, since the Greek text does not contain any interpretive markers of any kind. What then if Paul was actually advocating the silence of women in the church?


123 2008-09 Bulletin of the Duke University Divinity School; this is a publication by the university at which Arichea works.


125 Ibid., p. 110.

38
b) Such a position advocating the active participation of women in the church service seems too advanced for Paul and for the early church at that stage of its history.

c) Canonical history seems to indicate that vv 34-35 was understood primarily as an admonition to silence, as is clear in the repetition of these same arguments in 1 Tim. 2:11-15.

d) But the main objection has something to do with the difficulty of relating the passage to its immediate and wider context. Considering that the subject of the whole of chapter 14 is orderliness in the worship service, which came under threat due to the practice of speaking in tongues, it would be rather unlikely for the chapter to contain a section asserting the right of certain people, and specifically the women, to speak in the church service. It would be more likely for an admonition to silence to be included rather than a justification for speaking.¹²₆

Nor do Ian and Averil reveal that Arichea states clearly that the translation suggestion which he finally proposes has no support from the scholarly consensus whatever.¹²⁷

This suggestion has not found significant support among scholarly commentators, and remains a marginal position even among egalitarians. It is rejected by egalitarians such as Johnson and Witherington,¹²⁸¹²⁹¹³⁰ Fee,¹³¹ Hays,¹³² Horrell,¹³³ and Keener.¹³⁴ Thiselton notes other commentators rejecting the suggestion.¹³⁵

¹²⁶ Ibid., p. 110.

¹²⁷ 'Considering the whole argument, it does seem that this third option is worth considering and pursuing further. It should be noted, however, that no translation (to my knowledge) has followed this option, nor has it been mentioned in the notes accompanying various translations. Of all the commentaries I have examined, only one advocates this position.', ibid., p. 110.

¹²⁸ 'The best refutation of this view is given by Ben Witherington, who argues that the previous quotes of Corinthian views in the letter were actually stated and then refuted or circumstantially modified by Paul.', Johnson, '1 Corinthians', Inter-Varsity Press New Testament Commentary Series, volume 7, p. 272 (2004).

¹²⁹ 'More telling against this view is the large number of words in verses 34-35 that resonate with the immediate context (Witherington 1988:90-91).', ibid., p. 272.
Witherington offers stronger and more detailed arguments why the hypothesis of Odell-Scott and Flanagan and Snyder are open to doubt. In sum, because of such phrases as as in all the churches of God's holy people, and because 6:12; 10:23; 7:1 et al. represent not “rebuttals” but circumstantial qualifications “they raise more questions than they answer.”359 With a deft turn, he adds: “In all probability Paul is anticipating the response he expected to get (v. 36) when the Corinthians read his argument (vv. 34–35).”360, Thiselton, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 1151 (2000).

The very first word "e, "or," "either... or," or the interjection "what!") should not be seen as introducing a statement rejecting the previous two verses, as if they were an aberrant Corinthian viewpoint, but as Paul’s anticipation that his rules to control speech practices at Corinth would anger the Corinthians. As Gordon Fee correctly points out, "Has God given them [the Corinthians] a special word that allows them both to reject Paul’s instructions... and to be so out of touch with the churches?" (1987:7210)., Johnson, ‘1 Corinthians’, p. 277 (2004); instead, Fee suggests these verses do not belong in the text at all, that they are ‘most likely unauthentic’, Fee, ‘God’s Empowering Presence: the Holy Spirit in the letters of Paul’, p. 259 (1994).

"It appears that the Corinthians were trying to make up their own rules, and perhaps even thinking their own word is sufficient or authoritative or even the word of God themselves" (cf. v.36; Witherington 1988:98)., ibid., p. 277.

Hays considers it “far fetched in the extreme” to think that Paul was quoting the Corinthians in verses 34-35 before he rejects the statement in verse 36. (Hays p.249), Mayer, ‘The Women Should Keep Silence in the Churches’, Resources for Sustenance and Renewal (2002).

D.W. Odell-Scott’s attempt to offer an ‘egalitarian’ interpretation of 14.33b-36 based on the contrary force of the particle h (at the beginning of v. 36 is highly implausible in relation to vv. 34f (which must then be read as a statement of Corinth not Pauline opinion); the particle's 'contrary force' makes much better sense in connection with v. 33.' Horrell, ‘The social ethos of the Corinthians correspondence: interests and ideology’, p. 187 (1996).

Some have argued instead that Paul here quotes a Corinthian position (1 Cor 14:34–35), which he then refutes (1 Cor 14:36); but 1 Corinthians 14:36 does not read naturally as a refutation of 1 Corinthians 14:34–35., Keener, ‘Man and Woman’, in Hawthorne, Martin, & Reid, ‘Dictionary of Paul and his letters’, p. 590 (1993.)

Horrell finds the view of Odell-Smith and Allison “implausible” not least because, as Conzelmann also notes, v. 36, which attacks the self-important claims of some at Corinth to be “different,” then leaves v. 33b either as part of the Corinthian slogan, which would not cohere with our knowledge of Corinth, or as simply hanging without continuation until after an overly long quotation, or as belonging to vv. 26–33a, which,
Following the scholarly consensus, these verses are represented as Paul's words (not a quotation from the Corinthians), by the CEV, GNB/TEV, HCSB, ISV, Message, NAB, NASB95, NET, NCV, NIRV, NIV, NLT, TLB, and TNIV. In fact, no standard modern Bible translation renders these verses as a quotation.

apart from Barrett, KJV/AV, RV, Alford, and Phillips, is widely accepted as belonging with vv. 34–37 (as UBS 4th ed., NRSV, REB, NIV, NJB, Conzelmann, and most writers).357 "The point about the particle ... makes most sense when v. 36 is linked with v. 33."", Thiselton, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text', New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 1151 (2000).
What is the ‘law’ in 1 Corinthians 14:34?

The claim made

‘The reference to the law could either be to a Jewish understanding of the Old Testament, or to the Jewish oral law where women were forbidden to address the congregation in the synagogue:

Our Rabbis taught: All are qualified to be among the seven [who read], even a minor and a woman, only the Sages said that a woman should not read in the Torah out of respect for the congregation. (Babylonian Talmud, Megilla “The Scroll of Esther” 23a)

It is interesting that The Bible Translator (January 1995) suggests the following as an alternative which should be offered in translations.

Some of you say, “Women should be silent in the churches, because they are not permitted to speak. As the Jewish law says, they should be subordinate to men. If there is anything they want to know, they should wait until they get home and then ask their husbands. It is shameful for women to speak in church.” What kind of thinking is that? You are acting as if the word of God came from you! And you men, don’t ever think that you are the only ones who receive this word!’

Examination

Ian and Averil do not tell readers that the article in ‘The Bible Translator’ which they quote was written by egalitarian Daniel Arichea Junior. In the article quoted by Ian and Averil, Arichea lists among the

---

136 ‘All One’, pp. 75-76 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

137 [Daniel C. Arichea Jr] has also written numerous Bible studies for young people and on the subject of women in the Scriptures, one of which is entitled “Laying to Rest the Misconception of the Subordinate Role of Women in the Church.”, 2008-09 Bulletin of the Duke University Divinity School; this is a publication by the university at which Arichea works.
Ian and Averil do not tell readers that the scholarly consensus is that Paul’s reference to ‘the law’ is a reference to the Old Testament, not a reference to Jewish oral law or a Jewish understanding of the Old Testament.

The very phrase which Paul uses is found in a number of Jewish writings of a relevant time period, and its meaning is not in doubt.

It is a clear reference to a principle drawn from the Biblical text (not a direct quote), either to the Pentateuch or some other part of the Old Testament. Several commentators note that this appeal to ‘the Law’ is a standard form of argument in Paul’s writings.

138 a) It changes the passage from that of an oppressive text that can be used as an anti-feminist tool to one which advocates the active participation of women within the church.’, Arichea, ‘The Silence of Women in the Church: Theology and Translation in 1 Corinthians 14.33b-36’, The Bible Translator (46.1.110), January 1995.


140 ‘Against the argument that the use of ο ἄρης πιτρέπεται, there exists no permission, is not Pauline, 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 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’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 1151 (2000).

141 In particular, Paul felt quite comfortable in employing Scripture texts from the Old Testament to prescribe and interpret aspects of assembly activities. In 1 Cor 5:4 the church is assembled to censure a sinful fellow believer. The expulsion of wayward believers is authorized on the basis of a frequently found command (“Expel the wicked man from among you”) from Deuteronomy (e.g., 17:7; 19:19; 22:21, 24; 24:7). First Corinthians 11 provides a singular example of the use of Genesis material from the Creation and Fall Narratives to insure propriety regarding liturgical head
Of twelve standard modern Bible commentaries, almost all understand this as a reference to the Law of Moses or a general principle from Genesis or the Old Testament. The same understanding can be seen in standard English Bible translations.

**coverings** in the worship assembly of believers. More to the setting and context of 1 Cor 14, Paul refers to the Law (though the quotation is principally from the Prophets) to interpret the phenomenon of tongue speaking in a worship service in the Roman colony of Corinth.’, Oster, ‘1 Corinthians’, College Press NIV Commentary (1995).

142 The apostle’s reference to ‘the Law’ ( νόμος, ho nomos) is not as enigmatic as many scholars have suggested. This type of use of the Old Testament is generally in line with Paul’s technique at other places in 1 Corinthians.’, ibid.

143 The same apostle Paul who so naturally curbed unacceptable male and female head coverings practices during prophecy and prayer on the basis of principles from Genesis and challenged aberrant tongue speakers at Corinth with a theme from Isaiah, could with equal facility curb aberrant women’s speech with a theme from Genesis.’, ibid.

144 Fourth, “as the law says” does not refer to secular law restricting women’s actions in the public arena but to the OT law. Paul’s presumed impatience with the law is exaggerated. He appeals to it in the context in 14:21 and also in 7:19 and 9:8–10 (cf. Rom. 3:19; 7:7). The problem is that he does not cite a text from the law, and no OT passage instructs women to be silent. Perhaps he refers to a general assumption that the law calls for the wife’s submission to her husband.’, Garland (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, p. 672 (2003).


• **CEV:** The text has 'as the Law of Moses teaches', referring explicitly to the inspired Law of God given in the Old Testament

• **ESV:** The text has 'as the Law also says', the definite article and capitalization indicating that this is a reference to the law revealed in the Old Testament, not Jewish oral tradition or Roman law, and a footnote says '[ver. 21]', referring to 1 Corinthians 14:21, where Paul quotes Isaiah 28:11–12 and refers to it as 'the Law'

• **GNB/TEV:** The text has 'as the Jewish Law says', the definite article and capitalization, which may be a reference to the Jewish oral tradition rather than the Law of Moses

• **HSCB:** The text has 'as the law also says'

• **The Message:** The text has 'God’s Book of the law guides our manners and customs here', referring explicitly to the inspired Law of God given in the Old Testament

• **NAB:** The text has 'as even the law says'

• **NASB95:** The text has 'just as the Law also says', the definite article and capitalization indicating that this is a reference to the law revealed in the Old Testament, not Jewish oral tradition or Roman law, and a footnote says '1 Cor 14:21', where Paul quotes Isaiah 28:11–12 and refers to it as 'the Law'

• **NCV:** The text has 'as the law says'

• **NET:** The text has 'as in fact the law says'

• **NIV:** The text has 'as the Law says', the definite article and capitalization indicating that this is a reference to the law revealed in the Old Testament, not Jewish oral tradition or Roman law

• **NIRV:** The text has 'as the Law also says', the definite article and capitalization indicating that this is a reference to the law revealed in the Old Testament, not Jewish oral tradition or Roman law

• **NLT:** The text has 'just as the law says'

• **NRSV:** The text has 'as the law also says'

• **TLB:** The text has 'the Scriptures also declare', referring explicitly to the inspired Old Testament
**TNIV:** The text has ‘as the law says’, and a footnote says ‘ver 21; Ge 3:16’, referring to 1 Corinthians 14:21, where Paul quotes Isaiah 28:11–12 and refers to it as ‘the Law’, and citing the subordination of Eve in Genesis 3:16 as the specific principle Paul has in mind.
In 1 Timothy 1:9, does androphonos mean ‘manslayers’?

The claim made

In ‘All One’ (March 2009), Ian and Averil made the following claim.

‘Originally Artemis to the Greeks was a different goddess to Artemis in Ephesus, but the qualities attributed to each became assimilated. Paul’s criticism of prevailing attitudes at Ephesus echoes these myths. Is it simply a coincidence?

... the law is not laid down for the just but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers. (1 Timothy 1:9)

“Manslayers” is the exact word used of the Amazons who gloried in their defeat of the men. In mythology Artemis exercised power over men. Artemis was also the goddess to whom women appealed to save them through childbirth. It is not surprising that believers in Ephesus risked being influenced by this pagan atmosphere, nor that problems arose over women dominating men.\footnote{‘All One’, p. 77 (March 2009).}

Examination

Ian and Averil did not tell readers that their argument with regard to the Greek word here translated ‘manslayers’ is not supported by any standard modern Bible translation, and is contradicted by standard professional lexicons.

Readers will note that whereas Ian and Averil typically quote from a modern gender neutral translation to support their arguments (usually the TNIV), in this case they have deliberately quoted from the KJV.

The KJV’s rendering of the Greek word androphonos in 1 Timothy 1:9 is ‘manslayers’, because the KJV uses the masculine gendered language of its era. The Greek word does not mean ‘man slayers’ as opposed to ‘woman slayers’.\footnote{‘All One’, p. 77 (March 2009).}
The KJV is misleading, and creates precisely the false impression which Ian and Averil criticize in their work. They do not correct the error in 1 Timothy 1:9; they quote it as if it were accurate, and rely on it for their argument.

Ian and Averil did not tell readers that standard lexicons define *androphonos* as ‘murderer’, not ‘manslayer’ in the gender specific sense of a man or woman who kills men.

---

148 The preface to the NIV 1995 Inclusive Language edition (page vii) gives further reasons for using inclusive language: “A major challenge facing the Committee is how to respond to the significant changes that are taking place within the English language in regard to gender issues. The word ‘man’, for example, is now widely understood to refer only to males, even though that is not the intention of the corresponding Greek or Hebrew words.”, ibid., p. 42.

149 “In understanding *be men* (1 Corinthians 14:20) This verse should not be used to suggest that brothers think in a better or superior way to sisters. The contrast is between being children and being grown up. The King James Version reads: Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding *be men*. Most modern translations say “*mature or “adult*”: Brethren, do not be children in your thinking; be babes in evil, but in thinking be mature. (RSV) Brothers and sisters, do not be children in your thinking; rather, be infants in evil, but in thinking be adults. (1 Corinthians 14:20, NRSV), ibid., p. 233.


153 20.85 φονεύς, ἐκς μ; νδροφόνος, ου μ; νθροφοκτόνος, ου μ: a person who murders another person—‘murderer.’: πώλεσεν τα ρα φορετά κείνους ‘he destroyed those murderers’ Mt 22:7. νδροφόνος: πατριλ αις κα μητριλ αις, νδροφόνος ‘murderers of fathers, murderers of mothers, and murderers of people’ 1 Tim 1:9. νθροφοκτόνος: νθροφοκτόνος νη πρχ ζ ‘he was a murderer from the
The word is defined consistently as ‘murderer’. Three lexicons specifically identify the word as meaning ‘murderer’ in the context of 1 Timothy 1:9. One explains it means ‘a murderer of women and children as well as of men’, identifying this as the meaning in 1 Timothy 2:9, and another similarly says ‘a person who murders another person’, identifying this as the meaning in 1 Timothy 1:9.

Although the two words making up the word androphonos mean ‘man’ and ‘killer’ respectively, when they are combined to make the word androphonos the meaning is not ‘manslayer’ with the sense ‘someone who kills men as opposed to women’.

Ian and Averil committed the root fallacy by interpreting the word according to its root meaning rather than its cognate and contextual meaning. Standard modern Bible translations such as the CEV, ESV, GNB, HCSB, Message, NASB95, NCV, NET beginning’ Jn 8:44.’, Louw & Nida, ‘Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains’, volume 1, p. 237 (2nd ed. 1989)


155 Ian and Averil provide no lexical evidence supporting their understanding of this word.

156 BDAG, EDNT, Louw/Nida.


159 ‘those who would even kill their own parents’.

160 ‘those who strike their fathers and mothers, for murderers’.

161 ‘those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers’.
NIV,\textsuperscript{166} NIRV,\textsuperscript{167} NLT,\textsuperscript{168} TLB,\textsuperscript{169} and TNIV,\textsuperscript{170} all render this word with an ungendered translation in 1 Timothy 1:9.

In ’All One’ (February 2010), Ian and Averil removed their misleading claim “‘Manslayers’ is the exact word used of the Amazons who gloried in their defeat of the men’, \textsuperscript{171} having realized that the Greek word used by Herodotus is not the same Greek word used by Paul.\textsuperscript{172}

Unfortunately they retained their misleading statement that these words mean ‘mankilling’ or ‘manslaying’, giving the impression that these Greek words refer exclusively to the killing of males (as opposed to females).\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{162} ‘those who kill their fathers and mothers, for murderers’.
\textsuperscript{163} ‘those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers’.
\textsuperscript{164} ‘those who kill their fathers and mothers, who murder’.
\textsuperscript{165} ‘those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers’.
\textsuperscript{166} ‘those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers’.
\textsuperscript{167} ‘It is for those who kill their fathers or mothers. It is for murderers’.
\textsuperscript{168} ‘who kill their father or mother or commit other murders’.
\textsuperscript{169} ‘attack their fathers and mothers, and murder’.
\textsuperscript{170} ‘those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers’.
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid., p. 77; however, they did not tell readers they were correcting their previous error.
\textsuperscript{172} ‘The word is androktonoi, not the word androphonoi in 1 Timothy 1:9, but both mean “mankilling” or “manslaying”.’, ‘All One’, p. 91 (February 2010).
\textsuperscript{173} This error remains in the edition of ‘All One’ available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (\url{http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf}); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.
In fact, neither word refers specifically to the killing of males as opposed to females; *androktōnos*\(^{174}\) is identified in the latest edition of the 'A Greek-English Lexicon',\(^{175}\) as referring generally to murder whether of men or women,\(^{176}\) citing classical usage as evidence.

\(^{174}\) Though it does not appear in Greek lexicons covering the text of the New Testament, since the word is not used there.

\(^{175}\) The standard classical Greek lexicon.

Is 1 Timothy 2:11-12 a prohibition on Gnostic-influenced women?

The claim made

‘Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, because the false teaching in Ephesus, as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve.’ \(^{177}\)

‘I Suffer Not a Woman – Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence, Richard & Catherine Kroeger (1992). This book has been much quoted and much criticised. The writers aim to give detailed background and analysis, to compare parallel grammatical usages in the New Testament, and explain how translation alternatives are reached. They suggest (page 103) that 1 Timothy 2:12 should be translated, “I do not permit woman to teach nor to represent herself as originator of man.... For Adam was created first, then Eve.” \(^{178}\)

Examination

Ian and Averil acknowledge that the Kroegers’ work has not been accepted by the scholarly consensus, \(^{179}\) and advise due caution.\(^{180}\)

---

\(^{177}\) ‘All One’, p. 111 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing [http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf]; this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

\(^{178}\) Ibid., pp. 118-119.

\(^{179}\) ‘This book has been much quoted and much criticised.’, ibid., p. 119.

\(^{180}\) ‘Their suggested translation of authentein as “claim to be the originator” has received some, but not general, acceptance. In their notes they also refer to a fourth possibility which relies on understanding didaskein (“to teach”) as governing a dative case rather than the usual accusative. This construction is used in Revelation 2:14: “Balaam, who taught Balak [dative] to...”. This would then produce something like: “I certainly do not permit people to teach a woman that she is superior to a man but she is to behave quietly. For Adam was created first, then Eve.” If such a translation is correct, Paul is objecting to what is taught to women, not by women, but we would like to see some definite support amongst other scholars before advocating a translation like this.’, ibid., p. 119; an earlier edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), had ‘amongst reputable scholars’ (p. 95), but no explanation is given for this change in the current edition.
Nevertheless, earlier in their work Ian and Averil spend some time attempting to build the case that ‘Gnostic teaching’ forms the context of Paul’s prohibition on sisters teaching. Careful readers will note that Ian and Averil stop just short of claiming that Gnostic teaching existed in the 1st century, contemporary with Paul. They cautiously avoid saying this because they are well aware that the scholarly consensus is that Gnosticism was not contemporary with Paul.

However, they still insinuate strongly that Gnostic teachings were present in the 1st century. In a footnote they include text from a scholarly commentary on the ‘Nag Hammadi Library’ which notes debates over whether some Gnostic texts might have originated in the first century, but none of these texts contain references to the alleged ‘Gnostic teaching’ suggested by Ian and Averil as the background for 1 Timothy.

Readers will note that Ian and Averil’s own source says that the Gnostic writings in the Nag Hammadi Library are typically dated by scholars to the 2nd and early 3rd centuries, and that there is no mention here of any Gnostic writings contemporary with Paul.

---

181 The closing comment by Paul gives a useful clue to the probable nature of some of the false teachings, for Christianity was challenged for several centuries by various brands of heresy which came to be known as Gnosticism. Certain believers claimed to have superior knowledge (gnosis) beyond ordinary believers. Gnosticism flourished as a heresy particularly from the second to fourth centuries. There is debate as to when it began, but ideas such as were developed in Gnosticism do not spring suddenly out of nowhere, and a first century AD (or even BC) origin is very possible. A vast amount of literature from the ancient world details the various teachings of Gnosticism. The discovery of many Gnostic writings at Nag Hammadi in Egypt in 1945 has thrown more light on the subject than was previously available.’, ibid., p. 92.

182 ‘There is debate as to when it began, but ideas such as were developed in Gnosticism do not spring suddenly out of nowhere, and a first century AD (or even BC) origin is very possible.’, ibid., p. 92; a previous edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), had ‘a first century AD (or even BC) origin makes good sense’ (p. 86), but no explanation is given for this change in the current edition, which reduces the strength of their original claim.

183 ‘The manuscripts were produced in the fourth century, but all of the texts are clearly translations from Greek originals. The original Greek compositions date most likely from the second century and the early third century, although there are debates over whether some texts might have originated in the first century, e.g. The Gospel of Thomas.” Dictionary of Later New Testament and its Developments, Gnosis, Gnosticism, 3.4.1. (IVP, 1997), ibid., p. 76.
The scholarly consensus is overwhelmingly against the idea that Paul’s letter to Timothy had Gnostic groups in mind.\textsuperscript{184} It is generally agreed that Gnosticism did not exist at the time of Paul, and that no Gnostic or proto-Gnostic texts have ever been found dating even close to the time of Paul.\textsuperscript{185, 186, 187, 188}

The Kroegers’ work has been overwhelmingly rejected by the scholarly consensus across several disciplines (including New Testament interpretation, Gnostic studies, and archaeology), and is taken seriously only by egalitarian commentators attempting to re-interpret Paul’s words in 1 Timothy 2:11-15.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{184} Scholarship must in all likelihood abandon the hypothesis that a cohesive Gnostic movement\textsuperscript{204} is reflected in Paul’s letters.’, Lüdeman, ‘Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals’, p. 150 (2003).

\textsuperscript{185} Egypt has yielded early written evidence of Jewish, Christian, and pagan religion. It has preserved works of Manichaean and other Gnostic sects, but these are all considerably later than the rise of Christianity.’, Unger, ‘The Role of Archaeology in the Study of the New Testament’, Bibliotheca Sacra (116.462.153), 1996.

\textsuperscript{186} Some modern researchers suggest that several NT and related texts evidence contact with “Gnosticism” in various stages of its development. Texts that especially stand out are Paul’s Corinthian correspondence, Colossians, Ephesians, the Pastoral Epistles, Jude, 2 Peter, and the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (d. ca. 115) and Polycarp of Smyrna (d. ca. 165) among others. But even here the issues discussed are diverse, demonstrating a complex assortment of competing new religious movements, but no evidence of “Gnosticism.”’, Freedman, ‘Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible’, p. 509 (2000).

\textsuperscript{187} Even if it could be proven that any of the previously discussed works or, for that matter, any of the NH tractates are non-Christian Gnostic documents, that would not in itself be evidence for pre-Christian Gnosticism.’, Combs, ‘Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and New Testament Interpretation’, Grace Theological Journal (8.2.207-208), 1987.

\textsuperscript{188} And even if we are on solid ground in some cases in arguing the original works represented in the library are much older than extant copies, we are still unable to postulate plausibly any pre-Christian dates’, McRae, ‘Nag Hammadi and the New Testament’, pp. 146-47, in Combs, ‘Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and New Testament Interpretation’, Grace Theological Journal (8.2.208).

\textsuperscript{189} Kroeger and Kroeger have offered a unique interpretation of this injunction, suggesting that authentein at one time denoted participation in religious fertility rites. According to such an interpretation, the author was admonishing the women of the Ephesian church not to teach or engage in fertility practices with men, evidently
Of all the egalitarian attempts to provide an interpretation of the passage, this is the one which has received the most criticism from egalitarians, and has been demonstrated repeatedly by a range of scholars (egalitarian, complementarian, and unaligned third parties), to be completely without historical basis. Egalitarians criticizing the Kroeger's claims include Liefeld, Marshall and Towner, Scholer, Grenz and Kjesbo, Holmes and Strelan.


190 'It is precarious, as Edwin Yamauchi and others have shown, to assume gnostic backgrounds for New Testament books. Although the phrase, "falsely called knowledge," in 1 Timothy 6:20 contains the Greek word gnosis, this was the common word for knowledge. It does seem anachronistic to transliterate and capitalize it "Gnosis" as Kroeger does.' Liefeld (egalitarian), '1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View', in Mickelsen, 'Women, Authority & The Bible', p. 246 (1986).

191 'Kroeger and Kroeger thus explain v. 13 as an answer to the false notion that the woman is the originator of man, with the Artemis cult in Ephesus, that had somehow crept into the church, possibly by way of the false teaching. However, this explanation cannot be substantiated (except from later Gnostic writings). Marshall & Towner (egalitarians), 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles', p. 463 (2004).

192 Scholer's particular comment is also generally the case, that there is "no clear or particular evidence that connects this heresy [of 1 Timothy] with any pagan worship in Ephesus and its sexual activities and connotations" (1984:199 n 19). Strelan, (egalitarian) 'Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus', p. 155 (1996); Scholer is also an egalitarian.

193 'Thirdly, some scholars have sought to relate the opponents' teaching to Ephesian devotion to Artemis. Thus, Richard and Catherine Kroeger have argued that the opponents taught the priority of Eve over Adam and that Eve enlightened Adam with her teaching.11 Similarly, Gritz argues that the restriction on women teaching was related to the influence of the cult of Artemis among the addressees in Ephesus.' However, both works go considerably beyond the evidence in their reconstructions of the opponents' teaching and its supposed connection with the context of Ephesian non-Christian religious life. Grenz & Kjesbo (egalitarians), 'Women In The Church', p. 119 (1995).

194 'As a classicist, however, her [Catherine Kroeger] own contributions are reconstruction of a background and choices from linguistic options viewed as
In 1 Timothy 2:12, is authenteō used in a negative sense?

The claim made

‘There is disagreement among scholars as to the meaning of the word authentein which occurs only here in the New Testament. Suggested translations are “have authority” in a good sense, or “dominate” in a bad sense.’196

‘Other writers continue to maintain the word has a negative meaning. I. H. Marshall, The Pastoral Epistles (1999), writes: “Ideas such as autocratic or domineering abuses of power and authority appear to be more naturally linked with the verb in view of the cognate nouns authentes and authenteia”.102 Bruce W. Winter (2003)103 concludes his discussion on authentein: “... it seems that here the term carries not only the connotation of authority but also an inappropriate misuse of it.”104’197

Examination

English Bible translations over the years have been generally in agreement when rendering the word authenteō in 1 Timothy 2:12:

- CEV: ‘tell men what to do'
- GNB: ‘have authority over men’
- KV: ‘usurp authority over the man'

appropriate to that background. Both have been discredited.’, Holmes (egalitarian), 'Text In A Whirlwind', p. 26 (2000).

195 ‘The heresies and associated practices opposed in Timothy can be better understood on a Jewish background. That is not to say that they did not have a [distinctive] Ephesian flavor or that they were totally isolated from the influence of the Artemis cult - Jews and Christians did not live in a social or “religious” vacuum. But nor does it mean the problems came from gentiles who brought with them practices and ideas from the cult of Artemis’. Strelan, (egalitarian) ‘Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus’, p. 155 (1996).

196 'All One’, p. 118 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

197 Ibid., p. 120.

56
The meaning of the word was not seriously disputed until 1979, when Catherine Kroeger (then a university classics student), asserted the meaning ‘to engage in fertility practices’. Although the claim made was rejected by the scholarly consensus, debate over the meaning of the word had been opened, and Christians affirming an egalitarian view of the role of women in the church continued to contest the meaning of the word authenteō.

Within the lexical community there is no controversy over the lexical range of this word, and none of the standard lexicons have accepted the novel definitions suggested by egalitarians such as Kroeger, though the well recognized sense ‘domineer’ has been proposed as appropriate to 1 Timothy 2:12.

---

198 α θεντέω strictly, of one who acts on his own authority; hence have control over, domineer, lord it over (1T 2.12.), Friberg, Friberg, & Miller ‘Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament’, volume 4, p. 81 (2000).


201 37.21 α θεντέω: to control in a domineering manner—‘to control, to domineer.’ γυναικ ο κ πιτρέπω ... α θεντε ν νδρός ‘I do not allow women ... to dominate men’ 1 Tm 2.12., Louw & Nida, ‘Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains’, volume 1, p. 473 (2nd ed. 1989).

202 ‘authent-e-ō , A. to have full power or authority over, tinos I Ep.Tl.2.12...’, Liddell, Scott, & Jones, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon’, p.275 (rev. and augm. throughout, electronic ed., 9th ed. with supplement, 1996); note reference to the meaning ‘murder’, which was obsolete by the 1st century CE.

Two early papyri using the word authenteō, Papyrus BGU 1208 (c.27 BCE), and Papyrus Tebtunis 15 (c.100AD), are significant because they former contains the closest use of the word authenteō to the time of Paul and the latter uses the noun authentēs, one of the cognates of authenteō, and a word which has also been included in a number of lexical studies seeking to establish the meaning of authenteō itself. Both are supportive evidence for the recent studies by Baldwin and Wolters.207

The lexical data was later supplemented by a large scale contextual syntax study of the passage by Andreas Köstenberger in 1995,208 who argued that the neither/nor construction used in οὐκ διδασκεῖν οὐδὲ αὐθηνεῖν (‘neither teach nor have/exercise authority’), requires that both didaskein and authentein have a positive or negative sense. Köstenberger concluded that like the verbs in Luke 12:24 (‘neither sow nor harvest’), and Acts 4:18 (‘neither speak nor teach’), teaching has a positive meaning in such passages as 1 Timothy 4:11; 6:2, and 2 Timothy 2:2.209

This would therefore mean that authenteō has a positive meaning in 1 Timothy 2:12, and does not refer to domineering but the positive exercise of authority. The majority of both complementarian and egalitarian scholars agreed with Köstenberger’s study. Many consider that the contextual meaning of authenteō in 1 Timothy 2:12 has been decided conclusively by Köstenberger.


209 Ibid., p. 315.

58
Among the egalitarians supporting Köstenberger’s study are Kevin Giles, Craig Blomberg, Esther Ng, Craig Keener, and Judith Hartenstein.

Ian and Averil make brief reference to Köstenberger’s work in a footnote, disputing Köstenberger’s conclusion on the grounds that the Greek verb didaskō (‘teach’) can have a negative connotation, and citing Titus 1:11, 1 Timothy 1:7; 6:34 as evidence.

What readers are not told is that didaskō, is not even used in two of the three passages cited by Ian and Averil. Furthermore, the only time it is used there are words used in contexts which qualify the meaning of the word, proving it is not the word itself which has a negative meaning. None of the verses contain what Ian and Averil claimed.

210 ‘finds himself in essential agreement with the present syntactical analysis of 1 Tim 2:12’, ibid., pp. 48-49; Giles suggests however that Paul may have broken this grammatical rule in 1 Timothy 2:12.

211 ‘Decisively supporting the more positive sense of assuming appropriate authority is Andreas Köstenberger’s study’, ibid., p. 49.

212 ‘However, since a negative connotation of didaskein is unlikely in this verse (see below), the neutral meaning for authentein (to have authority over) seems to fit the oude construction better’, ibid., p. 49; Ng has critiqued both egalitarian and complementarian commentaries, and does not appear to be firmly established on either side, but inclines towards egalitarianism.

213 ‘Another egalitarian, Craig Keener, in a review that appeared in the Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, says that while (in his view) the principle is not clear in all instances cited in the present study, “the pattern seems to hold in general, and this is what matters most.” Keener concurs that the contention of the present essay is “probably correct that ‘have authority’ should be read as coordinate with ‘teach’ rather than as subordinate (‘teach in a domineering way’).”’, ibid., p. 47.

214 Köstenberger shows through a syntactical study that 1 Tim 2:12 forbids women to teach and to have authority over men, not only to abuse authority’, ibid., p. 49.

215 ‘Also in this book, Andreas J. Köstenberger argues that for reasons of Greek syntax, if “teach” has a positive meaning (as often in the New Testament), so too should authentein. But in the Pastoral Epistles “teach” can have a negative connotation (Titus 1:11, 1 Timothy 1:7, 1 Timothy 6:3), so by Köstenberger’s argument, this could lead to authentein as also having a pejorative meaning in the context.’, ‘All One’, p. 120 (2010).

216 1 Timothy 1:7: “They want to be teachers of the law, but they do not understand
In none of them is the Greek verb for 'teach' (didaskō), used in a negative sense. In fact the verb doesn't even appear in two of them.

what they are saying or the things they insist on so confidently.‘: in this case the verb didaskō ('teach'), is not even used, instead Paul used the noun nomodidaskalos ('teachers of the law'), which does not have a negative meaning at all; Paul’s point is that these people want to be ‘teachers of the law’, but they are not able to.

217 1 Timothy 6:3: ‘If someone spreads false teachings and does not agree with sound words (that is, those of our Lord Jesus Christ) and with the teaching that accords with godliness,’ in this case the verb didaskō ('teach'), is not even used, the negative verb heterodidaskaleō ('teach falsely'), is used instead.

218 Titus 1:11: ‘who must be silenced because they mislead whole families by teaching for dishonest gain what ought not to be taught.’; in this case it is the phrase ‘ought not’ (Greek dei mē), which tells us that the teaching here is wrong, not the word for ‘teach’ (the very fact that the word didaskō has to be qualified shows us that it has no inherent negative meaning here).
In 1 Timothy 2:12, does authenteō mean ‘originator’?

The claim made

‘I Suffer Not a Woman – Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence, Richard & Catherine Kroeger (1992). This book has been much quoted and much criticised. The writers aim to give detailed background and analysis, to compare parallel grammatical usages in the New Testament, and explain how translation alternatives are reached. They suggest (page 103) that 1 Timothy 2:12 should be translated, “I do not permit woman to teach nor to represent herself as originator of man... For Adam was created first, then Eve.” We quoted this in our 1996 draft version of this book. Their suggested translation of authentein as “claim to be the originator” has received some, but not general, acceptance.’

Examination

Ian and Averil tell readers that the Kroegers’ suggestion that authentein (the infinitive form of the verb authenteō), means ‘claim to be originator’ has ‘received some, but not general, acceptance.’ This is a considerable understatement of the facts. In reality, it has received acceptance only among some egalitarian commentators, and has even been rejected by other egalitarian commentators.

‘I Suffer Not a Woman is filled with efforts to find “sex reversal,” “female dominance,” and “sex and death” motifs in Ephesian society, because the Kroegers believe that, in the end, all these things are implied in Paul’s prohibition that women should not αθενεν.

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

---

219 ‘All One’, p. 118 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

220 Ibid., p. 95
usages of the word authenteo and its variants.16 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 221 below]222

Furthermore, Ian and Averil do not inform readers that the Kroegers’ definition of authentein has been completely rejected by lexicographers, and is ignored in all standard lexical authorities. The following quotations are definitions of authenteō (the primary form of the verb authentein), from the standard scholarly lexicons.

‘αθεντέω strictly, of one who acts on his own authority; hence have control over, domineer, lord it over (1T 2.12).’223

‘αθεντέω (s. αθέντης; Philod., Rhet. II p. 133, 14 Sudh.; Jo. Lydus, Mag. 3, 42; Moeris p. 54; cp. Phryn. 120 Lob.; Hesychius; Thom. Mag. p. 18, 8; schol. in Aeschyl., Eum. 42; BGU 1208, 38 [27 b.c.]; s. Lampe s.v.) to assume a stance of independent authority, give orders to, dictate to w. gen. of pers. (Ptolem., Apotel. 3, 14, 10 Boll-B.; Cat. Cod. Astr. VIII/1 p. 177, 7; B-D-F §177) διδάσκειν. w. διδάσκειν, 1 Ti 2:12 (practically = ‘tell a man what to do’ [Jerusalem Bible]).’224

‘αθέντης,‐ου+ N1M 0-0-0-0-1=1 Wis 12,6 Murderer Cf.


222 Ibid., p. 157.


αθεντέω: to control in a domineering manner—‘to control, to domineer.’ γυναικῶν αθεντέω... αθεντεν νδρός ‘I do not allow women... to dominate men’ 1 Tm 2.12. ‘To control in a domineering manner’ is often expressed idiomatically, for example, ‘to shout orders at,’ ‘to act like a chief toward,’ or ‘to bark at.’

To have full power or authority over, tinos 1 Ep.Ti.2.12; pros tina BGU1208.37 (i B.C.): c. inf., Lyd.Mag.3.42. 2. commit a murder, Sch.A.Eu.42.

‘αθεντεν domineer, have authority over.’

‘883 αθεντέω (authenteō): vb.; Str 831—LN 37.21 control, have authority over (1Ti 2:12).’

‘831. αθεντέω authentéō; contracted authentó; fut. authentésō, from authéntēs (n.f.), murderer, absolute master, which is from autós (846), himself, and éntea (n.f.) arms, armor. A self-appointed killer with one’s own hand, one acting by his own authority or power. Governing a gen., to use or exercise authority or power over as an autocrat, to domineer (1 Tim. 2:12).’

---

226 Lust, Eynikel, & Hauspie, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint’ (electronic rev. ed. 2003); readers will note that the definition here is very short, and contains only one sense, as this word is only used once in the LXX and only with this meaning; this usage was obsolete by the 1st century CE.


228 Liddell, Scott, & Jones, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon’, p.275 (rev. and augm. throughout, electronic ed., 9th ed. with supplement, 1996); note again reference to the meaning ‘murder’, which was obsolete by the 1st century CE.


In acknowledgment of the lexical agreement on this word, and in recognition of the Kroegers' flawed scholarship concerning the meaning of this word, their proposed definitions of *authentein* have been rejected by scholars across the entire spectrum of views.

'Unfortunately she mars her study by a questionable linguistic analysis of α θεντεω, seeking to tie an etymological idea to the hapax legomenon, ultimately taking the word to mean "originator or source of something."'[^232]

'While they have provided significant background data, their suggestion that the phrase "to have authority" (*authentein, authentein*) should be rendered "to represent herself as originator of man" *is, to say the least, far-fetched and has gained little support.*[^233]

'The second part of the thesis is that the other verb, authenteo, "represents either a ritual act or a doctrinal tenet propounded by the heretical teachers." This does not seem to fit any of the meanings proposed for authenteo in her first paragraph: "begin." "be... responsible for," "rule," "dominate," "usurp power or rights." "claim ownership, sovereignty or authorship." Further, it is a bit of a twist to claim that authenteo, which is a verb, could "represent a doctrinal tenet," when "tenet" is a noun.'[^234]

'Kroeger uses older dictionaries, projects backwards from developed Gnosticism, and neglects the broader context.'[^235]

[^232]: House, review of ‘1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist’s View’, in Mickelsen, ‘Women, Authority & The Bible’ (1986), Bibliotheca Sacra (145.458), April 1988; House is a complementarian, but he is well supported by Liefeld (see below), and the standard lexicon definitions.

[^233]: Moss, ‘NIV Commentary: 1, 2 Timothy & Titus’, p. 60 (1995); Moss is a complementarian, but he is well supported by Liefeld (see below), and the standard lexicon definitions.


'On the basis of outdated lexicography, uncited and no longer extant classical texts, a discredited background (see my Introduction n. 25), and the introduction of an ellipsis into a clause which is itself complete, the Kroegers rewrite v. 12.'\textsuperscript{236}  

\textsuperscript{236}Ibid., p. 89.
In 1 Timothy 2:15, what does *teknogōnia* mean?

The claim made

In their paraphrase of this verse, Ian and Averil make the following suggestion.

’Yet, though Eve was deceived, a wife will be saved, and there will be no deception and no sin, if she lives a proper married life, bearing children and continuing in faith and love and holiness, with modesty.’\(^{237}\)

They therefore understand *teknogōnia* to mean ‘bearing children’, though they also see it as representing part of ‘a proper married life’.\(^{238}\)

The understanding of this word in verse 15 as given by brother Brian Luke in ‘The Sister’s role – The Bible’s large picture’,\(^{239}\) was challenged by Ian and Averil in ‘Reply 2’.\(^{240}\)

Examination

The word itself means ‘child bearing’, but its use in the context of verse 15 suggests more than this.

---

\(^{237}\) ‘All One’, p. 113 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

\(^{238}\) Ibid., p. 113.

\(^{239}\) ‘Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing (i.e. all that is motherhood, Gk TEKNOGONIA), if THEY continue in faith and love and holiness with sobriety’ 1 Timothy 2:15,’ ‘The Sister’s role – The Bible’s large picture’, p. 8 (January 2009).

\(^{240}\) On what grounds does Brother Luke redefine “teknogonia” as “all that is motherhood”. The word means “childbearing” not “childrearing”. Compare 1 Timothy 5 where the two Greek words are distinguished: I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children (“teknonoede”), guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. (1 Timothy 5:14, KJV) and 1 Timothy 5:10 Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man. Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children (“teknotropheo”), if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work. (1 Timothy 5:9-10), ‘Reply 2’, pp. 8-9 (April 2009).

The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the New Testament identifies the meaning as 'by implication including all the duties of the maternal relation (1 Tim. 2:15), through the faithful performance of her duties as a mother in bringing up her household for God'.\textsuperscript{243}

Ian and Averil have been too hasty here. There is no evidence that brother Luke has attempted to redefine the word tekno\gbox{401}{\v}{\v}nia; on the contrary, he has used a meaning found in two professional lexicons and a standard Bible dictionary, as the sense of the word in this verse.

Given this fact, and that Ian and Averil themselves see tekno\gbox{401}{\v}{\v}nia as meaning 'bearing children' but representing in this verse part of 'a proper married life'\textsuperscript{244} (a phrase they insert in their paraphrase of verse 15), there are no good grounds for their objection.

Standard scholarly commentaries understand tekno\gbox{401}{\v}{\v}nia as having a non-literal sense in verse 15, representing the God given role of the woman by a figure of speech.\textsuperscript{245}

\hspace{1em}---


\textsuperscript{243} τεκνογονία tekno\gbox{401}{\v}{\v}nia; gen. tekno\gbox{401}{\v}{\v}nias, fem. noun from tekno\gbox{401}{\v}{\v}nē (5041), to bear children. The bearing of children, and thus by implication including all the duties of the maternal relation (1 Tim. 2:15, through the faithful performance of her duties as a mother in bringing up her household for God [cf. 1 Tim. 5:10]);', Zodhiates, 'The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament' (electronic ed., 2000).

\textsuperscript{244} Ibid., p. 93.

\textsuperscript{245} 'In a somewhat awkward manner, Paul is saying that a woman's salvation and the practical outworking of that salvation (cf. Phil 2:12) do not consist in altering her role in the church. Rather, she is to accept her God-given role, one of the specific
This view (which is the same given by brother Luke), is described as the majority view in one standard commentary.

"The final interpretation may be termed “the majority view.” 44 This view would hold that Christian women are not saved through teaching and asserting authority, but by attention to their traditional role. “Childbearing” serves as a figure of speech to illustrate Paul’s argument that women need not behave as men but rather fulfill their divinely appointed role to find salvation.

The figure may be termed either a metonymy 45 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 246 below] or a synecdoche. [original footnote reproduced in footnote 247 below]’ 248

In fact one commentary notes that the word is being used to describe the salvation demonstrated by women becoming ‘model wives’, 249 a phrase similar to Ian and Averil’s own ‘a proper married life’. 250

Leaving aside the marginal difference between brother Luke’s ‘all that is motherhood”251 and Ian and Averil’s ‘a proper married life’, 252 it is


246 'A figure in which the name of one thing is used for another because the two are closely associated. For example we may say “the White House reported today that ...” which really means the president and his staff have reported.’

247 'A synecdoche is a figure in which a part is used for the whole or the whole for a part or a species is used for the genus. Cf. Lea and Griffin, p. 102.’

248 Moss (complementarian), ‘1, 2 Timothy & Titus’, The College Press NIV Commentary (1994).

249 Paul is not suggesting that women must have children to be saved. Childbearing represents Paul’s teaching “that women prove the reality of their salvation when they become model wives and mothers whose good deeds include marriage and raising children (1 Tim 5:11, 14).”’, Moss (complementarian), ‘1, 2 Timothy & Titus’, The College Press NIV Commentary (1994).

250 ‘All One’, p. 93 (March 2009).

251 ‘The Sister’s role – The Bible’s large picture’, p. 8 (January 2009).

252 Ibid., p. 93.
clear that brother Luke’s understanding is recognized in professional lexical sources and standard commentaries, and that Ian and Averil’s understanding is not far from such support either.

The New English Translation footnote on 1 Timothy 2:15 discusses various proposed interpretations of the meaning of the Greek word τεκνογονία in verse 15, of which the following is given as one of the most plausible.

‘(5) “It is not through active teaching and ruling activities that Christian women will be saved, but through faithfulness to their proper role, exemplified in motherhood” (Moo, 71). In this view τεκνογονία is seen as a synecdoche in which child-rearing and other activities of motherhood are involved.”

253 tn Or “But she will be preserved through childbirth,” or “But she will be saved in spite of childbirth.” This verse is notoriously difficult to interpret, though there is general agreement about one point: Verse 15 is intended to lessen the impact of vv. 13–14. There are several interpretive possibilities here, though the first three can be readily dismissed (cf. D. Moo, “1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance,” TJ 1 [1980]: 70–73). (1) Christian women will be saved, but only if they bear children. This view is entirely unlikely for it lays a condition on Christian women that goes beyond grace, is unsupported elsewhere in scripture, and is explicitly against Paul’s and Jesus’ teaching on both marriage and salvation (cf. Matt 19:12; 1 Cor 7:8–9, 26–27, 34–35; 1 Tim 5:3–10). (2) Despite the curse, Christian women will be kept safe when bearing children. This view also is unlikely, both because it has little to do with the context and because it is not true to life (especially life in the ancient world with its high infant mortality rate). (3) Despite the sin of Eve and the results to her progeny, she would be saved through the childbirth - that is, through the birth of the Messiah, as promised in the protevangelium (Gen 3:15). This view sees the singular “she” as referring first to Eve and then to all women (note the change from singular to plural in this verse). Further, it works well in the context. However, there are several problems with it: [a] The future tense (σωθήσεται) is unnatural if referring to the protevangelium or even to the historical fact of the Messiah’s birth; [b] that only women are singled out as recipients of salvation seems odd since the birth of the Messiah was necessary for the salvation of both women and men; [c] as ingenious as this view is, its very ingenuity is its downfall, for it is overly subtle; and [d] the term τεκνογονία (teknoagonia) refers to the process of childbirth rather than the product. And since it is the person of the Messiah (the product of the birth) that saves us, the term is unlikely to be used in the sense given it by those who hold this view. There are three other views that have greater plausibility: (4) This may be a somewhat veiled reference to the curse of Gen 3:16 in order to clarify that though the woman led the man into transgression (v. 14b), she will be saved spiritually despite this physical reminder of her sin. The phrase is literally “through childbirth,” but this does not necessarily denote means or instrument here. Instead it may show attendant circumstance (probably with a concessive force): “with, though accompanied by” (cf. BDAG 224 s.v. δία A.3.c; Rom 2:27; 2 Cor 2:4; 1 Tim 4:14). (5) “It is not through active
Did Christianity make a new form of religious participation available to women?

The claim made

'But exemption from time-required laws easily turned to exclusion, so that women became excluded from active personal participation in study of the Law or active involvement in religious activities in the synagogue even when time-relatedness was irrelevant.'

'It appears that women at the time of Jesus were restricted by the legal framework and were discouraged from religious involvement outside the home.'

'Jesus is totally and refreshingly free from this kind of approach to women. Discipleship on a wider scale was now open to women. They could study and learn Christian teaching; they could promote and teach the Good News, though the conventions of society would still restrict them.'

Teaching and ruling activities that Christian women will be saved, but through faithfulness to their proper role, exemplified in motherhood" (Moo, 71). In this view τεκνογονία is seen as a synecdoche in which child-rearing and other activities of motherhood are involved. Thus, one evidence (though clearly not an essential evidence) of a woman's salvation may be seen in her decision to function in this role. (6) The verse may point to some sort of proverbial expression now lost, in which “saved” means “delivered” and in which this deliverance was from some of the devastating effects of the role reversal that took place in Eden. The idea of childbearing, then, is a metonymy of part for the whole that encompasses the woman’s submission again to the leadership of the man, though it has no specific soteriological import (but it certainly would have to do with the outworking of redemption).', The NET Bible First Edition, footnote on 1 Timothy 2:15 (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

254 'All One', p. 14 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

255 Ibid., p. 16.

256 Ibid., pp. 26, 27.
Examination

Ian and Averil attempt to substantiate their claims largely by using quotes from the Mishnah and Talmud. Although recognizing that the Talmud was compiled well after the 1st century, they still quote from it repeatedly as if its contents were directly relevant to the position of 1st century Jewish women, despite the fact that such a practice has long been criticized by Jewish scholars.

Such quotes are widely recognized as unrepresentative of general 1st century Jewish attitudes. Ian and Averil do tell readers that the rabbinical literature is not consistently negative towards women, but the two positive quotes they provide are far outweighed by the long list of negative quotes they have selected.

---

257 Note that the quote they provide from the scholarly work, ‘Chattel or Person? The Status of Women in the Mishnah’ (Judith Wegner), also describes only the status of women as depicted in the post-1st century Mishnah, rather than the 1st century Jewish environment.

258 The Talmud (“Study”) comprises the Mishnah with various commentaries upon it by later rabbis’, p. 10, ‘All One’ (2010).

259 More than twenty times in ‘All One’ (2010), five times on page 15 alone.

260 Similarly, references to rabbinic customs or sayings as contemporary with Jesus also reflect a misunderstanding of the development of Judaism. The Rabbinate emerged as an institution only after the fall of the Temple in 70 C.E., and it took considerable time before rabbinic authority was consolidated and came to represent more than a minority opinion within the Jewish community’. Jaskow, ‘Blaming Jews for inventing patriarchy’, Lillith (11.7), 1980.

261 Ross Shepard Kraemer suggests that ‘rabbinic sources may at best refract the social realities of a handful of Jewish communities, and at worst may reflect upon the utopian visions of a relative handful of Jewish men’, Jackson, ‘Jesus as First-Century Feminist: Christian Anti-Judaism?’, Feminist Theology (7.91), 1998.

262 ‘On occasions, favourable attitudes are expressed. Rabbi Hisda is reported to have said, “Daughters are dearer to me than sons” (Baba Bathra 141a). The anonymous Palestinian Jew described as Pseudo-Philo (first century CE) presents a positive view of women; this is thought so unusual that the suggestion has been made that this anonymous writer is in fact a woman.’, pp. 15-16, ‘All One’ (2010).

263 In summary, though far from being comprehensive and admittedly insufficient to make my case decisively, the purpose of this note is simply to question the commonly accepted paradigm that women were second-class, unjustly oppressed people in the
Their overall treatment of historic Jewish attitudes to women is thus little different to that first opposed by Jewish scholars 30 years ago.264

Ian and Averil fail to tell readers of evidence for the active religious participation of 1st century Jewish women.265 More seriously, readers are not told of the evidence for 1st century Jewish women in leadership positions,266 contradicting the claim made, that such positions were only made available to women in the Christian era.267

---

Rabbinic writings (and some argue, by implication, the OT) and that now, in the new era of the NT, women are finally accorded justice, that is, the same roles as men. Such a position can be argued, citing various chauvinistic Rabbinic sources, but it does not appear that all the Rabbinic data fit this paradigm, and it is even more questionable if the OT, as a whole, can be portrayed as anti-women. More work needs to be done on this.', Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 105 (1999).

264 Judith Plaskow (‘Blaming Jews for Inventing Patriarchy’, Lilith 7 [1980], p. 11) was one of the first to challenge Swidler and other Christian feminists to deepen their understanding of Judaism before evaluating ‘the uniqueness or nonuniqueness of Jesus’ attitudes towards women’. Jackson, ‘Jesus as First-Century Feminist: Christian Anti-Judaism?’, Feminist Theology (7.86), 1998.

265 She argues for epigraphical, archaeological and nonrabbinic writings to be placed in the total picture regarding Jewish women in the first century: there is evidence ‘that at least some Jewish women played active religious, social, economic, and even political roles in the public lives of Jewish communities.’ Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 91 (1999).

266 The most compelling evidence comes from Jewish inscriptions from the Hellenistic and Roman diaspora communities. These inscriptions, collected by Brooten and Kraemer,23 appear both in Greek and Latin and date from the first century b.c.e. to the sixth century c.e. Their provenances reach from Italy to Asia Minor, Palestine and Egypt.24 These inscriptions give the titles “Mother of the Synagogue” (μητηρσυναγωγης, mater synagogae) and “elder” (πρεσβύτερα) to women.’ Crawford, ‘Mothers, Sisters, and Elders: Titles for Women in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Communities’, The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001, p.184 (2003).

267 Bernadette J. Brooten argues that ‘the inscriptive evidence for Jewish women leaders means that one cannot declare it to be a departure from Judaism that early Christian women held leadership positions.’, Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 92 (1999).
Inscriptions ascribing synagogue leadership titles to women (once disputed, now accepted), prove 1st century Jewish women were active religious participants in private and public, contradicting Ian and Averil’s claim that public religious roles for Christian women were restricted local attitudes. Some 1st century Jewish women were even religious leaders, proving this was not a role unavailable to 1st century Christian women.

268 ‘Other women more clearly singled out for their roles as leaders in the synagogues, include Sara Oura, called presbutis, or elder; Beturia Paulla, called mother of the synagogues of Camus and Volumnius, Marcella, mother of the synagogue of the Augustesians; and Simplicia, mother of an unidentified synagogue, whose husband was also called father of the synagogue. Gaudentia is called hieris, the feminine equivalent of the Greek word for priest’, Kraemer, ‘Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt’, in Juschka, ‘Feminism in the study of religion: a reader’, p. 227 (2001).

269 ‘Until very recently, scholars routinely assumed that women could not have held functional leadership roles in Roman synagogues, and viewed these inscriptions as purely honorific, or, in the case of Gaudentia, evidence for priestly family ties’, ibid, p. 227.

270 ‘Recently, however, Bernadette J. Brooten has convincingly demonstrated that these titles and inscriptions almost certainly testify to women leaders in ancient Roman synagogues. Even stronger evidence exists for women leaders in synagogues in other Jewish communities in the Greco-Roman world.’ ibid., p. 227.

271 ‘From these inscriptions, and the adjectives praising their piety and devotion to the law, we see that Jewish women in Rome were active participants in the religious life of their communities, both at home and in the public religious life of the synagogue.’ ibid., p. 227.

272 ‘the conventions of society would still restrict them’, ‘All One’, p. 25 (March 2009).

273 ‘As Brooten has argued, there is no reason to assume that these titles do not reflect a leadership role for the women so designated. Brooten lists seven Greek inscriptions that contain the epithet πρεσβύτερα, and Kraemer adds one more. The women called πρεσβύτερα appear to have been members of a synagogue council of elders, Crawford, ‘Mothers, Sisters, and Elders: Titles for Women in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Communities’, The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001, p.184 (2003).

274 However, there is no evidence that 1st century Christian women actually held such positions, despite their availability; Crawford says ‘early Christian communities produce evidence for the use of the epithets πρεσβύτερα, αδεφή[sic] and possibly
Similarly, 1st century Greco-Roman society contained a wide range of attitudes towards women, from the misogynist to the egalitarian. Paul would thus have been aware of how his commandments sounded to some women.

μήτηρ as titles for women in positions of leadership and authority in the early Christian community’, ibid., p. 187 (emphasis added), but provides no definite evidence for adelphē (‘These wives may have participated in various leadership roles in the communities they visited, but Paul does not say this’, p.187, emphasis added), describes the case for μήτηρ as merely ‘possible’ (p.189), and the earliest evidence she provides for presbutera is from the mid-2nd century (p.190).

275 But studies of Roman society have found a variety of indicators about the status of women, and what was true about women in the eastern part of the empire was not necessarily true about women in the western empire. On the one hand, there was the household headed by the husband/father/master, a hierarchical order-obedience structure that included those who were economically dependent. On the other hand, there were emancipatory ideas about women that allowed them greater freedom and economic independence (some were even the heads of households).’, Tanzer (egalitarian), ‘Eph 5:22-33 Wives (and Husbands) Exhorted’, in Meyers, Craven, & Kraemer, ‘Women in scripture: a dictionary of named and unnamed women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament’, p. 481 (2001).

276 In other contexts, among some gentiles, Paul’s moral conservatism and reaffirmation of traditional roles for women would have appeared too confining (this appears to have been the case in Corinth).’, Witherington (egalitarian), ‘Women (New Testament)’, in Freedman (ed.), ‘Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary’, volume 6, p. 959 (1996).
Was Jesus more egalitarian than his contemporaries?

The claim made

‘In his attitudes and relationships with women, Jesus was distinctly different from his contemporaries, and he accorded them the respect and value which God intended “at the beginning”.’

‘That women were actively involved, and to a considerable extent, is shown repeatedly in the New Testament. To us in the twenty-first century this does not seem surprising, but within the context of the ancient world it was a new and important development which followed on from the example of Jesus himself.’

Examination

Ian and Averil compare Jesus’ attitudes towards women with selected negative comments from Greek and Roman sources, as well as from late Jewish sources, but do not mention the most egalitarian views held by Jesus’ contemporaries.

---

277 ‘All One’, p. 32 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

278 Ibid., p. 33.

279 Ibid., pp. 231-233.

280 Ian and Averil also very fairly note ‘Some very positive descriptions of marriage have been handed down from antiquity, and these usefully provide a counter to the negative comments’, ibid., p. 232.

281 Ibid., pp. 9-17.

282 Though they also note ‘On occasions, favourable attitudes are expressed. Rabbi Hisda is reported to have said, “Daughters are dearer to me than sons” (Baba Bathra 141a). The anonymous Palestinian Jew described as Pseudo-Philo (first century AD) presents a positive view of women; this is thought so unusual that the suggestion has been made that this anonymous writer is in fact a woman.’, p. 17.
The March 2009 edition of ‘All One’ made no reference at all to such attitudes among the Stoics; a very brief reference was added to the February 2010 edition of ‘All One’.²⁸³ Stoic views were traditionally egalitarian,²⁸⁴ they condemned gender discrimination,²⁸⁵ and they have even been identified as having at least inclinations towards feminist views.²⁸⁶

Though not consistently egalitarian²⁸⁷ and definitely not feminist,²⁸⁸ and though misogyny can still be found in some of their writings,²⁸⁹ ²⁹⁰ they still remain a useful point of comparison when

²⁸³ ‘The Stoics took a more moral position.’, ‘All One’, p. 211 (February 2010); also found on page 233 of the current edition (2010).

²⁸⁴ ‘That Stoicism is fundamentally egalitarian and universalistic is well established.’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, History of Political Thought, (22.1.15), 2001.

²⁸⁵ ‘The Stoics condemned discrimination against people based on class, gender, ethnicity or any other contingent facts about them.’, ibid., p. 17.

²⁸⁶ ‘A cursory review of Stoic literature certainly points to a Stoic feminism’, ibid., p. 19.

²⁸⁷ ‘We have seen that the Stoics fall short in achieving a systematic feminism’, ibid., p. 34.


²⁸⁹ ‘despite the feminist potential of so much Stoic writing, subordinating and misogynistic tendencies are clearly present.’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’ , History of Political Thought, (22.1.40), 2001.

²⁹⁰ ‘the late Stoics are not as wholly sympathetic to women as some scholars have asserted, and it will become clear that they never advocated the political empowerment of women. Indeed, when given the opportunity to do so, they explicitly rejected the suggestion.’, Engel, ‘Women’s Role in the Home and the State: Stoic Theory Reconsidered’, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, (101.273), 2003.
assessing other literature as egalitarian, since they were the most egalitarian of the 1st century Roman philosophical groups.291 292 293

Stoicism was widespread,294 and even had an egalitarian influence on Roman law.295 Seneca the Younger’s earlier reputation as a ‘feminist’ has not withstood academic scrutiny,296 but he is still recognized as having expressed significant egalitarian views.297 298 Musonius Rufus is still regarded highly for his egalitarian attitude.299 300


292 ‘when compared with the attitudes toward women that prevailed in the days in which these arguments were put forward, the arguments are, occasionally, downright astounding.’, Engel, ‘Women’s Role in the Home and the State: Stoic Theory Reconsidered’, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, (101.273), 2003.

293 ‘Stoicism is the only ancient philosophy that provides a sufficiently egalitarian concept of human beings to suit a liberal ideology.’, Long, ‘Stoic Communitarianism And Normative Citizenship’, Social Philosophy & Policy Foundation, (24.2.242), 2007.

294 ‘Not merely restricted to the elite classes.

295 ‘The overall development of Roman equity law was influenced by the Stoic natural law principle of the equality of the sexes’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, History of Political Thought, (22.1.20), 2001.

296 ‘Seneca’s feminist tendencies, in particular, seem to me to be vastly overrated’, ibid., p.23.

297 ‘Seneca, well in advance of his time, is willing to grant women equal opportunity at the banquet table, equal place at the feast of human endeavor. She is, he would argue, everyone’s equal in capacity, and, if she exercise virtue, everyone’s superior.’, Motto, ‘Seneca on Women’s Liberation’, The Classical World (65.5.157), 1972.

298 ‘You know that a man does wrong in requiring chastity of his wife while he himself is intriguing with the wives of other men.’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, History of Political Thought, (22.1.29), 2001; note that this statement is actually cited by Ian and Averil, ‘All One’, p. 171 (March 2009).

299 ‘Musonius is probably the most enlightened Stoic in his attitude to women, sex and marriage.’, ibid., p. 27.
Unlike Paul, Musonius Rufus did not make any call for women to be subject,\textsuperscript{301} and opposed explicitly a range of misogynist prejudices,\textsuperscript{302} challenging the view of any form of gendered division of tasks,\textsuperscript{303} with a statement which has no Biblical parallel.\textsuperscript{304}

Ian and Averil added a very brief reference to Rufus’ views on marriage in the February 2010 edition of ‘All One’,\textsuperscript{305} but did not address the full significance of his egalitarian position, which extended well beyond their quotation.

Women in 1st century Jewish society enjoyed active religious participation,\textsuperscript{306} \textsuperscript{307} and some even held leadership positions.\textsuperscript{308} \textsuperscript{309} \textsuperscript{310}

\textsuperscript{300} Musonius tells us that husbands who commit adultery are just as culpable as wives, and it is extremely objectionable for them to have sexual relations with their slave-girls.', ibid., p. 28.

\textsuperscript{301} ‘There is no demand on his part for subordination of the woman’, ibid., p. 28.

\textsuperscript{302} ‘It was a common belief that an educated woman would become ‘unpalatable’, arrogant and neglectful of her household duties.\textsuperscript{126} But the Stoics were bound to question social convention and, recognizing this duty, C. Musonius Rufus challenged Roman prejudices about women head on.’, ibid., p. 32.

\textsuperscript{303} ‘Musonius now questions the reasonableness of a gender-based division of labour in the first place, noting that, apart from the relatively insignificant differences in physical strength and personal bent, no other rationale stands up to close scrutiny as a relevant basis for discrimination’, ibid., p. 33.

\textsuperscript{304} ‘All human tasks’, he says, ‘are a common obligation and are common for men and women, and none is necessarily appointed for either one exclusively.’, ibid., p. 33.

\textsuperscript{305} ‘All One’, p. 211 (February 2010); also found on page 234 of the current edition (2010).


\textsuperscript{308} ‘Other women more clearly singled out for their roles as leaders in the synagogues, include Sara Oura, called presbutis, or elder... Gaudentia is called hierisa,
Both of them 1st century Jewish communities, the Essenes are believed by many scholars to have been egalitarian,311 312 and the Therapeutae are known for their egalitarian attitudes towards the division of labor.313 314

These non-Christian texts have no ‘difficult passages’. Unlike Musonius Rufus and the Therapeutae, neither Paul nor Jesus opposed a gendered division of tasks. Unlike Jewish inscriptions, we find no sisters as elders or titled ecclesial leaders in the New Testament.

the feminine equivalent of the Greek word for priest.’, ibid., p. 227.

309 ‘As Brooten has argued, there is no reason to assume that these titles do not reflect a leadership role for the women so designated. The women called πρεσβύτερα appear to have been members of a synagogue council of elders.27’, Crawford, ‘Mothers, Sisters, and Elders: Titles for Women in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Communities’, in Davila, ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001’, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, number 46, p.184 (2003).

310 ‘Bernadette J. Brooten argues that ‘the inscriptional evidence for Jewish women leaders means that one cannot declare it to be a departure from Judaism that early Christian women held leadership positions.’’, Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 92 (1999).


314 ‘It is striking that the division of labor between elders and juniors is emphatically not along gender lines’. ‘The membership of this community was gender-inclusive, since women participated as both seniors and (implicitly) juniors’, Taylor & Davis, ‘The So-Called Therapeutae of “De Vita Contemplativa”: Identity and Character’, The Harvard Theological Review (91.1.23, 24), 1998.
Were the 1st century ecclesias egalitarian?

The claim made

‘Life and service within the ecclesia, according to Paul, are not divided up by reference to whether male or female, nor whether slave or free, nor whether Jew or Gentile.’

‘But a new start had been made and the new equality in Christ within the ecclesia had set a pattern for the future even if it could only partially be realised in the first century.’

Examination

The scholarly consensus is that the early ecclesias (though affirming of women), were not egalitarian in the modern sense:

‘The evidence surveyed above concerning the Corinthian community in its early years also presents a sharp challenge to socio-historical studies which describe the earliest Christian communities as radical or egalitarian communities in sharp contrast to their societal context, or which characterize the movement as a ‘discipleship of equals’, into which patriarchalisation and social ordering gradually crept.’

Historian David Horrell acknowledges that women did hold certain positions of responsibility. However, Horrell points out that the 1st century ecclesial ‘Haustafeln’ (‘household code’), placed males at the head.

---

315 ‘All One’, p. 58 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

316 Ibid., p. 149.


318 ‘Phoebe, for example, a diakonos of the church at Cenchreae, is described as a patron of many (Rom 16: 1-2)’, Horrell, ‘Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity’, Sociology of Religion, (58.4.326), 1997.
'The Colossian and Ephesian Haustafeln address the same social groups in the same order: wives, husbands, children, fathers, slaves, masters (Col 3: 18-4: 1; Eph 5: 22-6:9). Women, children, and slaves are instructed to be submissive, the husbands, fathers, and masters are urged to be loving and just in their actions towards those under their care.'319


'As Campbell has argued, here (and in 1 Peter) the "elders" seem to comprise a group of men who are senior in faith and prominent in social position (1 Peter 5: 5; Campbell 1994: 210-16; cf., Maier 1991: 93, 100). The prominent (male) heads of households have their responsibility qua leaders of the community.

This is most clear in the Pastoral Epistles, especially 1 Timothy, where the main duties mentioned for the bishop and the deacon are their responsibilities for respectable citizenship and good household management (1 Tim 3: 1-13; Titus 1: 5-9). This is where the instruction to the socially prominent men of the community is found.

The corollary of these requirements is the instructions in the Pastorals that women and slaves must be submissive and appropriately obedient. Women are forbidden to teach or be in authority over men; they must learn in silent submission (1 Tim 2: 11-15).

The church community is shaped according to the household model; indeed, it is described as the "household of God" (1 Tim 3: 15), and so the ecclesiastical hierarchy mirrors the domestic and social hierarchy. "The role of leaders as relatively well-to-do householders who act as masters of their wives, children, and slaves is inseparably linked with their authority in the church" (MacDonald 1988: 214).321

319 Ibid., p. 334.
320 Ibid., p. 334.
321 Ibid., p. 335.
'However, it seems clear that the "false" forms of the faith allow women to take leading roles, or at least, that women regard themselves as legitimate teachers and propagators of this faith. Why else would the author of 1 Timothy need to make the stern declaration: "I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent" (1 Tim 2: 12), a declaration which is then undergirded with legitimation drawn from the Genesis creation narratives (2: 13-14)?'³²²

Historian Alastair Campbell acknowledges the possibility of women as leaders of ecclesial meetings held in their households, but believes it is futile to argue the egalitarian case on this basis.

'Rather than striving to show that women played a more prominent part than our evidence suggests, or that the prohibitions of the Pastoral do not mean what they appear to say, it would be more honest to admit the facts and then, if so minded, set them aside.'³²³

Egalitarian historian Elliott recognizes that women had some leadership positions, but rejects the typical egalitarian claims.

'The claim made that the Jesus movement was egalitarian involves flawed reasoning and an anachronistic, ethnocentric, and ideologically-driven reading of the New Testament. Feminist scholars including Mary Rose D'Angelo (1992), Amy-Jill Levine (1994), and Kathleen E. Corley (1998), are likewise rejecting the egalitarian theory, objecting, inter alia, to its lack of historical support and its isolation of Jesus from his Israelite matrix.'³²⁴

'That women were prophets is no indication of an egalitarian revolution (against Schüssler Fiorenza 1983:235), since women prophets existed in the patriarchal world prior to the Jesus movement (Luke 2:36-38). That women assumed leadership roles in the Jesus movement likewise can be attributed to their prior social status rather than to the egalitarian revolution

³²² Ibid., p. 331.


'With every fibre of my egalitarian being I wish it were demonstrable that the Jesus movement had been egalitarian, at least at some point in its early history. This surely would make it easier for today’s advocates of equality, among whom I count myself, to appeal to our past as a source of inspiration and moral guidance for the present.

But, as the historical and ideological critic in all of us insists, wishing and politically correct ideology cannot not make it so. Ultimately, this well-intentioned theory is an unhappy example of anachronism and idealist thinking that must be challenged not just because it is indemonstrable or an example of flawed interpretation but also because it is so seductive.'326

'By imputing to the biblical authors a modern concept of equality that is not found in the Bible and the ancient world and by allowing this imputed concept to determine their interpretation of the New Testament, they have produced an interpretation that distorts and obscures the actual content and thrust of these texts.'327

Dale Martin is another egalitarian rejecting the claim that the early Christians were egalitarian:

‘Contesting that Paul was an egalitarian with regard to gender, Dale Martin (1995:199) aptly notes that “in fact his writings confirm the Greco-Roman gender hierarchy.”

Despite assigning women larger roles and more respect in his churches, “he never makes The claim made that the female is equal to, much less superior to, the male” (1995:199).

“Neither Paul’s androgynous statement in Gal. 3:28 nor his admission of women to important positions within his churches


326 Ibid., pp. 205-206.

demonstrates that he was a gender egalitarian" (1995: 232)."328

Was the role of sisters in 1st century ecclesias revolutionary?

The claim made

‘That women were actively involved, and to a considerable extent, is shown repeatedly in the New Testament. To us in the twenty-first century this does not seem surprising, but within the context of the ancient world it was a new and important development which followed on from the example of Jesus himself.’ 329

‘In view of the general male leadership which existed in society in the first century, and in view of the problems in Crete which Paul was aiming to tackle, it is not surprising if the elders there were all male, for believers had to conduct themselves in a manner which was, as far as possible, beyond reproach in the opinion of pagan society.’ 330

Examination

Stoicism was widespread,331 and even had an egalitarian influence on Roman law.332 The Stoics were the most egalitarian of the 1st century Roman philosophical groups.333 334 335 336 337

329 ‘All One’, p. 33 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

330 Ibid., pp. 128-129.

331 Not merely restricted to the elite classes.

332 ‘The overall development of Roman equity law was influenced by the Stoic natural law principle of the equality of the sexes’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?', History of Political Thought, (22.1.20), 2001.

333 Perhaps they are better understood as failed proto-liberal feminists’, ibid, p. 40.

334 ‘when compared with the attitudes toward women that prevailed in the days in which these arguments were put forward, the arguments are, occasionally, downright astounding’, Engel, ‘Women’s Role in the Home and the State: Stoic Theory Reconsidered’, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, (101.273), 2003.
Musonius Rufus is one 1st century example. Unlike Paul, Musonius Rufus did not make any call for women to be subject, opposed explicitly a range of misogynist prejudices, and challenged the view of any form of gendered division of tasks, with a statement which has no Biblical parallel. Egalitarian views were also present in 1st century Jewish society; women enjoyed active religious participation, and some even held leadership positions.

335 ‘Stoicism is the only ancient philosophy that provides a sufficiently egalitarian concept of human beings to suit a liberal ideology.’, Long, ‘Stoic Communitarianism And Normative Citizenship’, Social Philosophy & Policy Foundation, p. 242 (2007).

336 ‘That Stoicism is fundamentally egalitarian and universalistic is well established.’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, History of Political Thought, (22.1.15), 2001.

337 ‘The Stoics condemned discrimination against people based on class, gender, ethnicity or any other contingent facts about them.’, ibid., p. 17.

338 ‘Musonius is probably the most enlightened Stoic in his attitude to women, sex and marriage.’, ibid., p. 27.

339 ‘Musonius tells us that husbands who commit adultery are just as culpable as wives, and it is extremely objectionable for them to have sexual relations with their slave-girls.’, ibid., p. 28.

340 ‘There is no demand on his part for subordination of the woman’, ibid., p. 28.

341 ‘C. Musonius Rufus challenged Roman prejudices about women head on.’, ibid., p. 32.

342 ‘Musonius now questions the reasonableness of a gender-based division of labour in the first place, noting that, apart from the relatively insignificant differences in physical strength and personal bent, no other rationale stands up to close scrutiny as a relevant basis for discrimination’, ibid., p. 33.

343 ‘[A]ll human tasks’, he says, ‘are a common obligation and are common for men and women, and none is necessarily appointed for either one exclusively.’, ibid., p. 33.


345 ‘Jewish women in Rome were active participants in the religious life of their communities, both at home and in the public religious life of the synagogue.’,
Among 1st century Jewish religious communities, the Essenes, and the Therapeutae are considered groups with egalitarian values and practices. Contrary to the claim made by Ian and Averil, 1st century ecclesial organization and roles were neither revolutionary nor restricted by social attitudes. Ecclesias developed and operated in the


Other women more clearly singled out for their roles as leaders in the synagogues, include Sara Oura, called presbutis, or elder... Gaudentia is called hierisa, the feminine equivalent of the Greek word for priest.', ibid., p. 227.

The women called πρεσβύτερα appear to have been members of a synagogue council of elders. Crawford, 'Mothers, Sisters, and Elders: Titles for Women in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Communities', The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001, p.184 (2003).

Bernadette J. Brooten argues that 'the inscriptive evidence for Jewish women leaders means that one cannot declare it to be a departure from Judaism that early Christian women held leadership positions.', Hove, 'Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute', p. 92 (1999).

The Essenes and the Therapeutai show evidence of influence by Hellenistic utopian thinking (including the egalitarian aspects of such thought), Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion (23.2.46), 2007.


No barriers can be placed around the women Therapeutae that would exclude them from any functions in the community.', Taylor, 'The Women “Priests” of Philo’s De Vita Contemplativa; Reconstructing the Therapeutae', in 'On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza', p.118 (2003).

The division of labor between elders and juniors is emphatically not along gender lines, ‘membership of this community was gender-inclusive, since women participated as both seniors and (implicitly) juniors’, Taylor & Davis, 'The So-Called Therapeutae of "De Vita Contemplativa": Identity and Character', The Harvard Theological Review (91.1.23, 24), 1998.
same way as the contemporary Roman 'voluntary associations'.

Even the very language of ecclesial fellowship is borrowed from these groups, within which social norms could be transgressed without penalty (though acknowledging the norms).

353 Sometimes called ‘private associations’, known in Latin as sodalitates, or collegia.

354 ‘It is in this larger cultural context that the early Christian associations emerge. The cultural readiness and modeling of individuals gathering voluntarily to explore new identities and a sense of belonging within a religious frame allowed the early Christian groups to form. The larger context of voluntary associations provided a cultural pattern in which nascent early Christian community could come into being.’, Nerrny, & Taussig, ‘Re-Imagining Life Together in America: A New Gospel of Community’, p. 13 (2002).

355 ‘In other words the notion of a diverse group coming together for the sake of a special sense and spirit of belonging was already going on in many different ways. That early Christians did this fits the larger social momentum of the day.’, p. 13.

356 ‘Early Christian communities need to be seen then as a kind of voluntary association. Their quick and strong development rides on the momentum of the larger Hellenistic momentum of the associations. Their interest in social experimentation is in keeping with the way the associations developed.’, p. 13.

357 ‘When the Greek literature of this time refers to a wide variety of voluntary associations, the terms often used are, in fact, koinoinia, or koine, meaning “community,” “that which is held in common,” “friendship,” or “fellowship”’, ibid., p. 12.

358 Transgressive commensality, according to Donahue, is characterized by temporal, porous group boundaries in which there is “a relationship of exchange between parties of a different social or economic status” (2005:106). Ascough, Forms of Commensality in Greco-Roman Associations: draft paper for the SBL Greco-Roman Meals Consultation, p. 7 (2008).

359 ‘According to Grignon (2001:30) transgressive commensality “plays upon oppositions between social groups and the borders which separate them.” Such borders, while recognized, are “temporarily and symbolically transgressed” and thus establish, in the context of a meal, a relation of exchange. Nevertheless, “it is by transgressing them that it contributes to recognizing and maintaining” social distinctions (2001:31).’, ibid., p. 19.
Slave and free mingled together, and slaves could even be leaders. Men and women fraternized without the restraints of social convention, and ethnic and family loyalties were set aside.

The ecclesias therefore could have appointed women as leaders and elders or provided them with authoritative speaking roles without fear of social reprisal. The culture of the day empowered them, rather than restricting them.

Where is the evidence that the ecclesial roles of 1st century sisters were restricted or opposed by Jewish, Greek, or Roman attitudes? Why is no such controversy mentioned in the entire New Testament?

---

360 ‘The mix of slaves and free in this protected environment was frequent’, Nerrny, & Taussig, ‘Re-Imagining Life Together in America: A New Gospel of Community’, p. 12 (2002).

361 ‘Slaves could be leaders in such groups.’, ibid., p. 12.

362 ‘Similarly men and women associated in these settings far more than in public.’, ibid., p. 12.

363 ‘Both the joy and stress around this new mix of people and traditions evident in the Hellenistic literature indicates that the voluntary associations were places of social experimentation.’, ibid., p. 12.

364 ‘The general family and ethnic loyalties of former times were breached in the associations’ acceptance of many different individuals.’, ibid., p. 12.

365 ‘Whereas in the larger outside world, both Roman control and residual customs mitigated against mixing men and women, slave and free, foreign and religious practice; in the voluntary associations there was a lively atmosphere in which these mixes could be tried out and experienced without threat of larger social catastrophe or consequences’, ibid., p. 12.
What is the historical background of 1st century Ephesus?

The claim made

‘Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, because the false teaching in Ephesus, as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve. Gnostic writers conflated Eve with the Mother Goddess – Isis/Cybele/Artemis. We gave one example on page 93.’

Examination

Timothy was in Ephesus, not Paul, so when Paul says ‘I suffer not a woman to teach’ he is speaking from his understanding of the position of sisters, he is not saying ‘When I am in Ephesus I don’t permit the sisters to teach’, or ‘I don’t permit the sisters in Ephesus to teach’. Paul’s words therefore are based on the Scriptural passages and principles to which he makes explicit reference, not to any specific environment in Ephesus.

Ian and Averil’s claim depends heavily on the work of egalitarian scholars Catherine and Richard Kroeger, which has been rejected by the scholarly consensus. The following are claims by the Kroegers which have been rejected by scholars in the relevant fields.

- A ‘proto-Gnostic’ background and Ephesian fertility cult forms the context of 1 Timothy

‘It is precarious, as Edwin Yamauchi and others have shown, to assume gnostic backgrounds for New Testament books. Although the phrase, “falsely called knowledge,” in 1 Timothy 6:20 contains the Greek word gnosis, this was the common word for knowledge. It does seem anachronistic to transliterate and capitalize it “Gnosis” as Kroeger does.’

---

366 ‘All One’, p. 111 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

'Kroeger and Kroeger thus explain v. 13 as an answer to the false notion that the woman is the originator of man, with the Artemis cult in Ephesus, that had somehow crept into the church, possibly by way of the false teaching. **However, this explanation cannot be substantiated (except from later Gnostic writings).**'368

'Scholer’s particular comment is also generally the case, that there is "no clear or particular evidence that connects this heresy [of 1 Timothy] with any pagan worship in Ephesus and its sexual activities and connotations" (1984:199 n 19).369

"Thus, Richard and Catherine Kroeger have argued that the opponents taught the priority of Eve over Adam and that Eve enlightened Adam with her teaching.11 Similarly, Gritz argues that the restriction on women teaching was related to the influence of the cult of Artemis among the addressees in Ephesus." **However, both works go considerably beyond the evidence** in their reconstructions of the opponents’ teaching and its **supposed connection** with the context of Ephesian non-Christian religious life.'370

'As a classicist, however, her [Catherine Kroeger] own contributions are **reconstruction of a background and choices from linguistic options** viewed as appropriate to that background. **Both have been discredited.**'371

- Ephesus contains evidence of serpent worship related to the worship of the goddess Artemis (Diana), in a pagan theology similar to the Genesis narrative concerning Eve and the serpent, only with the serpent and Eve depicted favourably

---


'Kroeger presents a wide range of material relating to the pervasive presence of the serpent in ancient religion. Here again, caution is needed. The serpent motif was so common that we must not read too much into its appearance. Its presence in the Timothy passage is only an inference. Kroeger develops a network of phenomena without carefully explaining how closely these items truly are to each other and to the text in 1 Timothy.'

'The artifacts mentioned by the Kroegers bear witness to widespread beliefs which had nothing to do uniquely with Ephesus, nothing to do with Judeo-Christian imagery about Satan/Devil and the serpent, and were certainly not a possible "allusion to the Garden of Eden story in one form or other" (p. 168).'373

'One must recognize, though, that their portrayal of Ephesus is inspired by an eccentric reading of 1 Tim 2:12.'374

- Paul's use of didaskō ('teach'), is intended to command that women not teach men error in the congregation, rather than they not teach men in the congregation.

'But in contrast, neither of the Greek words used for the content of teaching (didaskalia, didache) is used in the verse under consideration. The two nouns occur a total of seventeen times in the Pastorals and could easily have been used here. Kroeger's task is to explain how one can maintain that the verb didasko "prohibits the erroneous teaching" when Paul, who could have said clearly, "I do not permit women to teach error," omitted any such reference to the content. Then, too, the verb itself is usually used in connection with good, rather than with erroneous, teaching in the Pastorals. To propose that the verb refers in a special way to the content, and specifically to


erroneous content, goes beyond the natural meaning of the text.

Also, while the verb *teach* is used absolutely, without an object expressing content, *it does have a subject, woman*, which is not mentioned in Kroger's initial thesis statement at all. In summary, the Greek reader of this text would naturally understand the emphasis of the first words to be "I do not permit a woman to teach," whereas Kroger proposes to demonstrate that its emphasis is "I do not permit a woman to teach error."375

- Paul's letter to Timothy is attempting to deal with local Ephesian religious practices involving sex, castration, and the worship of fertility goddesses.

'My evaluation of their work will be organized into three sections: 1) Erroneous information; 2) Problematic evidence; and 3) Methodological fallacies.'376

'The most serious issue of methodology in I Suffer Not a Woman is the authors' frequent neglect of primary sources of Ephesian archaeology and history. It is perplexing that the Kroegers' views about Ephesus, about Artemis, and about the role of women in the city's life are so uninformed by the appropriate corpora of inscriptions, coins, and scholarly literature about the city's excavations.'377

'The Kroegers often string sources together even when these are separated by centuries and perhaps hundreds of miles. On occasion ancient literature is cited with little regard for the propensities of the author or the context in which the statements were made.'378


377 Ibid., p. 226.

378 Ibid., p. 226.
'In conclusion, irrespective of one's sympathy for the pain and frustration of women who have been oppressed by the "traditions of men," irrespective of one's sympathy for some of the goals of I Suffer Not a Woman, this publication does not present a cogent and defensible way to circumvent or neutralize 1 Tim 2:11-15.'

379 Ibid., p. 227.
Is Galatians 3:28 an ‘equality text’?

The claim made

‘If we understand what he says in accordance with the context, Paul approves of equal service by sisters and by brothers. Life and service within the ecclesia, according to Paul, are not divided up by reference to whether male or female, nor whether slave or free, nor whether Jew or Gentile. Society might still impose restrictions, and it did. But as far as life and service in the ecclesia was concerned, in Christ you are all one.’

Examination

Many scholars agree that this passage is not about the role of women in the ecclesia. Hove notes there are two key reasons why the ‘all one’ phrase does not mean ‘all equal’. One is the fact that the Greek word for ‘one’ here simply does not mean ‘equal’.381 The other is the fact that in other Greek literature of this same ‘all one’ phrase,382 indicate that it was not used to refer to equality, but unity.383

380 ‘All One’, p. 58 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

381 As noted in the previous chapter, there are two critical reasons why “you are all one” does not mean “you are all equal.” I will review these two reasons briefly. The first reason is the lexical range of the word one.43 Lexically this word cannot mean “equal.” Our overview of BAGD confirmed this, as we found that there is no known example of one being used this way.’, Hove (complementarian), ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 108 (1999).

382 Searching Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (a collection of thousands of Greek texts), I found only one use of the phrase ‘all one’ as used in Galatians 3:28 (Greek εςς, eis este), between 200 BCE and 100 CE (Hove lists 16 analogous phrases in Greek literature during the same time frame, pp. 73-74), used to speak of two nearby cities as ‘one community’; ‘you are almost one community, one city only slightly divided’ (‘κα ας εςς εςς εςς δι μος κα μία πόλις ν ο μαλ διαστήματι.’), ’Orations’ 41.10.7, Dio Chrysostom (Greek orator 40-120 CE), Cohoon (trans.), ‘Dio Chrysostom IV’, Loeb Classical Library, p. 159 (1946).

383 The second reason “you are all one” does not mean “you are all equal” is that the
Watson argues Paul is not addressing hierarchy and equality in this passage, but unity in Christ. 384 He objects to an egalitarian reading of Galatians 3:28 on the basis that the relationships referred to by Paul are not hierarchical. 385 Wright objects to misuse of this passage by egalitarians, 386387 identifies a common egalitarian straw man, 388 and notes a mistranslation of the verse used commonly by egalitarians. 389

phrase was not used in that way in the era of the New Testament. As we have seen, a study of every parallel use of the phrase “we/you/they are one” in the 300 years surrounding the New Testament reveals that this expression fails to express the concept of unqualified equality. In fact, “you are all one” is used of diverse objects to denote one element they share in common; it is not used of similar objects to denote that they are the same. , Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 108 (1999).

384 ‘In baptism, Jew, Greek, slave, free, male, female receive a new identity as they ‘put on Christ’ (3.27): the emphasis lies not on their ‘equality’ but on their belonging together as they participate in the new identity and the new practices and modes of interaction that this will entail. Paul could have assumed that the three distinctions he mentions were hierarchical ones, and that in Christ these are replaced by an egalitarian oneness, but there is nothing in the wording of his statement (or in the hypothetical baptismal formula supposed to underlie it) to suggest that he actually did so.’, Watson (egalitarian), ‘The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11.2–16’, New Testament Studies (46.521), 2000.

386 ‘In Gal 3.28, for example, the three distinctions (Jew/Greek, slave/free, male/female) do not straightforwardly represent a series of hierarchical relationships. The distinction between Jew and Greek does not constitute a hierarchical relationship, since each party regards itself as superior to the other.’, Watson, ‘The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11.2–16’, New Testament Studies (46.521), 2000.

387 ‘The point Paul is making overall in this passage is that God has one family, not two, and that this family consists of all those who believe in Jesus; that this is the family God promised to Abraham, and that nothing in the Torah can stand in the way of this unity which is now revealed through the faithfulness of the Messiah. This is not at all about how we relate to one another within this single family; it is about the fact, as we often say, that the ground is even at the foot of the cross.’, Wright (egalitarian), ‘Women’s Service in the Church: The Biblical Basis. A conference paper for the Symposium, ‘Men, Women and the Church’’, (4 September, 2004).

388 The first thing to say is fairly obvious but needs saying anyway. Galatians 3 is not about ministry. Nor is it the only word Paul says about being male and female, and instead of taking texts in a vacuum and then arranging them in a hierarchy, for instance by quoting this verse and then saying that it trumps every other verse in a kind of fight to be the senior bull in the herd (what a very masculine way of
Witherington likewise does not agree with the egalitarian interpretation of this verse. 389 In a book review, Andrew Pitts points out that egalitarian Blomberg makes the same argument.391 Miller affirms that the passage teaches a union with Christ available to all without distinction,392 but points out the distinctions Paul refers to are not

approaching exegesis, by the way!), we need to do justice to what Paul is actually saying at this point.', ibid.

388 I am surprised to see, in some of your literature, the insistence that women and men are equally saved and justified; that is, I'm surprised because I've never heard anyone denying it. Of course, there may well be some who do, but I just haven't met them.', ibid.

389 First, a note about translation and exegesis. I notice that on one of your leaflets you adopt what is actually a mistranslation of this verse: neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female. That is precisely what Paul does not say; and as it's what we expect he's going to say, we should note quite carefully what he has said instead, since he presumably means to make a point by doing so, a point which is missed when the translation is flattened out as in that version. What he says is that there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, no 'male and female'.', ibid.

390 Many recent interpreters have seen in Gal 3:28 the Magna Carta of human equality (Stendahl 1966). However, closer attention to both the baptismal context of this saying (which suggests that it is about entrance requirements for being “in Christ”), and the specific wording of the text (which reads “no male and female” not “no male or female”), suggests a different interpretation (Witherington 1981: 593–604.). Paul says that neither one's racial nor social nor marital status should determine whether or not one can be in Christ. In Christ such distinctions as Jew and gentile, or married and unmarried, still exist (Romans 9–11; 1 Corinthians 7), but they have no inherent salvific value, nor do they determine whether or not one can be in Christ.', Witherington (egalitarian), 'Women (New Testament)', in Freedman (ed.), 'Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary', volume 6, p. 959 (1996).

391 I must agree with Blomberg’s assertion that Gal. 3:28 should have no significant place in the discussion since gender roles are not under consideration in the context.', Pitts, 'Review: PORTER Paul and his Theology', Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (5.133), 2008.

392 The good news is that this passage does indeed teach that at some level and in some sense such distinctions as Jew/Greek, bond/free, male/female, fall away and prove irrelevant from the standpoint of Christian faith. At this level, the soteriological level, all believers enjoy a salvific union with Christ.', Miller (egalitarian), 'Is Galatians 3:28 the Great Egalitarian Text?', The Expository Times, (114.1.9), 2002.

98
eliminated but reinforced. He insists that this reading of the passage is in agreement with its context, and Paul’s overall teaching.  

While observing arguments should not be based on what was not written, Hove notes Paul could have written such a passage which spoke of brothers and sisters as ‘equal’ if that was his point, providing a relevant 1st century parallel but noting even such a term would not necessarily mean those referred to had identical roles.  

---

393 The bad news is that there is another level presupposed by the passage, and it turns out that at this other level such distinctions, far from being abrogated, are actually reinforced.1, ibid., p. 9.

394 This may be a disappointing interpretation of this celebrated ‘egalitarian’ passage, for it turns out at one level to be only another proof-text for those very elements in Paul that many are struggling to get rid of - sexism and patriarchalism, for example.1, ibid., p.11.

395 ‘It must be admitted, though, for better or for worse, that this view of Galatians 3:28 coheres both with its immediate context and with the rest of what we know of Paul. This includes his notion of the priority of the true Israel over Gentile Christians who are merely grafted on to it, his implicit condoning of slavery, and his hierarchical view of husband-wife relations.’ ibid., p.11.

396 ‘That is not to say that we today, as others before us, cannot work that out and draw the implication on Paul’s behalf. But it seems not to have been done in the Pauline texts themselves, and certainly not the one before us. We have to try to be honest about that.’ ibid., p.11.


398 ‘Philo, writing at about the same time as Paul, uses the phrase παντες εισ εστε ισοτιμοι (“you are all entitled to equal honor”), which is almost directly parallel to Galatians 3:28 παντες εισ εστε (“you are all one”).’ ibid., p. 110.

399 ‘Moses’ argument here is much like Galatians 3:28. The parts (Jew/Greek, slave/free, male/female) have inheritance only because of the whole (being in Christ).’ ibid., p. 110.

400 ‘But notice, while each tribe has equal honor, and each is treated the same way when it comes to fighting battles or settling land, not all the tribes have the same roles (e.g., Gen. 49:10, “the scepter will not depart from Judah,” and Numbers 3, which details the unique role of the tribe of Levi). Thus, even if Paul had used an ισος (“equal”) word in Galatians 3:28, it would not follow that Jew/Greek, slave/free, male/female have the same roles. In addition, the fact that Paul did not use an ισος root word, when it was available, is evidence, though admittedly not
Reading Paul’s use of this ‘all one’ language in the three passages in which it appears, readers may decide for themselves if Paul is saying no distinctions in ecclesial roles are to be made between men and women.\textsuperscript{401}

weighty, that his intent was not to emphasize the equality of Jew/Greek, slave/free, male/female.”, ibid., p. 110.

\textsuperscript{401} Romans 10:11-13, ‘For the scripture says, “Everyone who believes in him will not be put to shame.” For there is no distinction between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord is Lord of all, who richly blesses all who call on him. For everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.’, 1 Corinthians 12:12-13, ‘For just as the body is one and yet has many members, and all the members of the body – though many – are one body, so too is Christ. For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body. Whether Jews or Greeks or slaves or free, we were all made to drink of the one Spirit.’, Galatians 3:27-29, ‘For all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female – for all of you are one in Christ Jesus. And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s descendants, heirs according to the promise.’; ‘male and female’ occurs only once in these passages, showing Paul’s point was not about gendered role distinctions.
Is Gnosticism the background to 1 Timothy?

The claim made

‘Gnosticism flourished as a heresy particularly from the second to fourth centuries. There is debate as to when it began, but ideas such as were developed in Gnosticism do not spring suddenly out of nowhere, and a first century AD (or even BC) origin is very possible.’ 402 403

‘A vast amount of literature from the ancient world details the various teachings of Gnosticism. The discovery of many Gnostic writings at Nag Hammadi in Egypt in 1945 has thrown more light on the subject than was previously available.’ 404

‘Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, because the false teaching in Ephesus, as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve.’ 405

Examination

The following sections compare Ian and Averil’s statements on Gnosticism with the scholarly consensus.

- Claim: ‘A vast amount of literature from the ancient world details the various teachings of Gnosticism. The discovery of many Gnostic writings at Nag Hammadi in Egypt in 1945 has thrown more light on the subject than was previously available.’ 406

402 ‘All One’, p. 92 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

403 A previous edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), had ‘a first century AD (or even BC) origin makes good sense’ (p. 86); Ian and Averil make no mention of their change of wording in the latest edition, which reduces the strength of their original claim.

404 Ibid, p. 92.

405 Ibid., p. 111.

406 Ibid., p. 92.
This is true, but the wealth of Gnostic writings which have been
discovered has simply confirmed the scholarly consensus that Gnosticism
arose in the 2nd century, well after the death of Paul.

No undisputed 1st century Gnostic writings were found at Nag
Hammadi, and even those few for which a 1st century date is suggested do
not contain the specific Gnostic ideas to which Ian and Averil refer. The
Nag Hammadi Library is not simply a collection of Gnostic texts, and is not
even considered to belong to a single group or movement.407 Most of the
texts have nothing to do with Gnosticism or religion.408

• Claim: ‘There is debate as to when it began.’409

There is debate as to precisely when Gnosticism began, but the
scholarly consensus places its beginning in the 2nd century, long after Paul
had died. 410 411 412 413

407 'The Nag Hammadi library is a collection of religious texts that vary widely from
each other as to when, where, and by whom they were written. Even the points of
view diverge to such an extent that the texts are not to be thought of as coming from
one group or movement.', Robinson, Smith, & Coptic Gnostic Library Project, 'The Nag

408 'But a majority of the papyri are categorized as nonliterary: letters, tax papers,
diaries, judicial proceedings, magical texts, marriage contracts, wills, and a variety of
other items from public and private life.', Vos, 'Archaeology and the Text of the New
Testament', Bible and Spade (9.2.57), 1980.

409 'All One’, p. 92 (2010).

410 'Some modern researchers suggest that several NT and related texts evidence
contact with “Gnosticism” in various stages of its development. Texts that especially
stand out are Paul’s Corinthian correspondence, Colossians, Ephesians, the Pastoral
Epistles, Jude, 2 Peter, and the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (d. ca. 115) and Polycarp
of Smyrna (d. ca. 165) among others. But even here the issues discussed are diverse,
demonstrating a complex assortment of competing new religious movements, but no
evidence of “Gnosticism.”', Freedman, 'Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible', p. 509
(2000)

411 'Even if it could be proven that any of the previously discussed works or, for that
matter, any of the NH tractates are non-Christian Gnostic documents, that would not
in itself be evidence for pre-Christian Gnosticism.', Combs, 'Nag Hammadi,
Gnosticism and New Testament Interpretation', Grace Theological Journal (8.2. 207-
208), 1987.
• **Claim:** ‘...but ideas such as were developed in Gnosticism do not spring suddenly out of nowhere, and a first century AD (or even BC) origin is very possible.’

The specific Gnostic ideas to which Ian and Averil refer do not appear in the 1st century at all. The scholarly consensus is that ‘a first century AD (or even BC) origin’ is not credible.

• **Claim:** ‘The God of the Hebrew Scriptures was considered evil because He created a material world. He was regarded as an inferior demi-god, which could explain why Paul uses the word “blaspheme” of the activities of Hymenaeus and Alexander.’

This describes the well developed Gnosticism from the 2nd century onwards, but nothing in the 1st century.

---

412 ‘And even if we are on solid ground in some cases in arguing the original works represented in the library are much older than extant copies, we are still unable to postulate plausibly any pre-Christian dates.’ McRae, ‘Nag Hammadi and the New Testament’, pp. 146–47, in Combs, ‘Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and New Testament Interpretation’, Grace Theological Journal, (8.2.208), 1987.

413 ‘Egypt has yielded early written evidence of Jewish, Christian, and pagan religion. It has preserved works of Manichaean and other Gnostic sects, but these are all considerably later than the rise of Christianity.’, Unger, ‘The Role of Archaeology in the Study of the New Testament’, Bibliotheca Sacra, (116.462.153), 1996.


415 ‘Scholarship must in all likelihood abandon the hypothesis that a cohesive Gnostic movement204 is reflected in Paul’s letters.’, Lüdeman, ‘Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals’, p. 150 (2003).

416 ‘The full-fledged Gnosticism of later church history did not exist in the first century A.D.21 An incipient form of Gnosticism was present, but Schmithals makes the error of reading later Gnosticism into the first century documents. Richard and Catherine Kroeger follow in Schmithals’s footsteps in positing the background to 1 Timothy.22 They call the heresy “proto- Gnostic,” but in fact they often appeal to later sources to define the false teaching.23 External evidence can only be admitted if it can be shown that the religious or philosophical movement was contemporary with the New Testament.’, Schreiner (complementarian), ‘Interpreting the Pauline Epistles’, Southern Baptist Journal of Theology (3.3.10), 1999.

There is no evidence that Paul uses the word blaspheme in relation to Hymenaeus and Alexander on the basis of their belief in ‘an inferior demi-god’. Paul specifically identifies their heresy as teaching that the resurrection had already passed.

- **Claim:** ‘Eve (“the mother of all living”, Genesis 3:20) was identified with Artemis (whose great Temple was in Ephesus) and with Isis (salvation goddess from Egypt) and with Cybele (“the great mother” of pagan fertility religion). Eve was considered, therefore, as having a primacy over Adam.’\(^{418}\)

  No such Gnostic teachings are found in the 1st century. The specific text from which Ian and Averil quote is dated no earlier than the 3rd century, and the scholarly consensus is against a date anywhere near the 1st century.\(^{419}\)

  There is no evidence that Eve ‘was identified with Artemis’, or that Eve was considered, therefore, as having a primacy over Adam’ at any time in the 1st century.\(^{420}\)

- **Claim:** ‘Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, because the false teaching in Ephesus, as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve. Gnostic writers conflated Eve with the Mother

---

\(^{418}\) Ibid., pp. 92-93.

\(^{419}\) ‘The document is tentatively dated in the third century C.E. It is obviously no later than the fourth century, to which the Nag Hammadi collection is dated. But the well-developed gnostic treatment of the material in this document as well as the midrashic handling of scriptural material argue against an early date. Further, the philosophical orientation of 96, 11–14 has been identified as typical of third-century Neoplatonism.’, Robinson, Smith, & Coptic Gnostic Library Project, ‘The Nag Hammadi Library in English’, p. 161 (4th rev. ed.,1996).

\(^{420}\) ‘Thirdly, some scholars have sought to relate the opponents’ teaching to Ephesian devotion to Artemis. Thus, Richard and Catherine Kroeger have argued that the opponents taught the priority of Eve over Adam and that Eve enlightened Adam with her teaching.11 Similarly, Gritz argues that the restriction on women teaching was related to the influence of the cult of Artemis among the addressees in Ephesus.” However, both works go considerably beyond the evidence in their reconstructions of the opponents’ teaching and its supposed connection with the context of Ephesian non-Christian religious life.”, Grenz & Kjesbo (egalitarians), ‘Women In The Church’, p. 119 (1995).
Goddess – Isis/Cybele/Artemis. We gave one example on page 93. Here is another:421

Due to the complexity of this work, its wide range of later sources, and its general literary cohesion, it is dated no earlier than the 4th century.422 There is no evidence that any of the content quoted by Ian and Averil existed at any time in the 1st century.

They say ‘Some of the Gnostics had a strong aversion to childbirth, rejecting anything to do with the material body which they regarded as evil, while the ‘new’ women preferred promiscuous relationships and measures to prevent pregnancy or childbirth’, 423 without informing readers that there is no evidence that any Gnostic group contemporary with Paul taught such ideas.


423 ‘All One’, pp. 112-113 (2010).
Were 1st century Greek and Roman attitudes a hindrance to sisters?

The claim made

'It is difficult to give an adequate analysis of societies which lasted for centuries and covered the area from Syria to Britain. Different customs existed, according to place and date.'

Examination

Despite the caution they express, Ian and Averil still provide a long list of quotes (overwhelmingly negative), which they consider relevant to identifying 1st century Greek and Roman attitudes affecting sisters.

However, a number of them are anachronistic, others say the same as Scripture, some are positive, and some are unrepresentative.

---

424 ‘All One’, p. 231 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

425 Ibid., pp. 231-233.

426 Ian and Averil very fairly note ‘Some very positive descriptions of marriage have been handed down from antiquity, and these usefully provide a counter to the negative comments. There are few more attractive pictures of happily married life than that painted in the fictional account in the Odyssey, composed about 800 BC.’, ibid., p. 232.

427 *the conventions of society* would still restrict them’, ibid., p. 27.

428 Relevant to earlier eras, but not demonstrably relevant to the 1st century.

429 Demonstrating they are not in themselves negative statements about women, contrary to Ian and Averil.

430 Therefore not supportive of the case Ian and Averil are attempting to make.

431 That is, they cannot be viewed as necessarily representative of general Greek and Roman attitudes towards women during the 1st century.
Although Greek and Roman attitudes to women were typically far short of Christlike, there is no evidence such attitudes ever affected the role of 1st century sisters, contrary to Ian and Averil’s claim.

Hesiod (800 BCE), 432 Semonides (7th century BCE), 433 Meno (attributed by Plato, 384 BCE), 434 Pericles (about 440 BCE), 435 and Demosthenes (4th century BCE), 436 are all quoted. They have little relevance to the general attitudes of 1st century Jews in Roman occupied Judea. 437

Ian and Averil provide statements from Aristotle 438 and Cato, 439 which are mirrored by statements by Paul with respect to the authority of the husband, 440 441 442 and women asking questions in the ecclesia. 443 Was Paul being demeaning to women when he made these statements?

432 ‘All One’, p. 231 (2010).

433 Ibid., p. 232.

434 Ibid., p. 233.

435 Ibid., p. 232.

436 Ibid., p. 233.

437 The latest dates to at least 350 years before Christ, and all of them are from the Greek elite, in Greece.

438 ‘Aristotle (384-322 BC) considered it part of the natural order that masters should rule over slaves, husbands over wives, fathers over children; and his reasoning has been followed for much of the last 2,000 years:’, ibid., p. 234.

439 ‘Cato, for example, in denying women at Rome any right to have a say in public discussion or law making, said in 195 BC, “Could not each have made the same request to her husband at home?”’, ‘All One’, p. 78 (2010).

440 Ephesians 6:5 ‘Slaves, obey your human masters with fear and trembling’, Colossians 3:22 ‘Slaves, obey your earthly masters in every respect’, Titus 2:9 ‘Slaves are to be subject to their own masters in everything’, 1 Peter 2:18 ‘Slaves, be subject to your masters with all reverence’.

441 Ephesians 6:1 ‘Children, obey your parents in the Lord for this is right.’, Colossians 3:21 ‘Children, obey your parents in everything’.

442 1 Timothy 34, 12 ‘keep his children in control without losing his dignity’, ‘good managers of their children’.
Ian and Averil provide two 1st century quotes\textsuperscript{444} which are very positive in their attitudes towards women,\textsuperscript{445} The March 2009 edition of ‘All One’ made no reference to the Stoics; a very brief reference was added to the February 2010 edition of ‘All One’.\textsuperscript{446} Egalitarian Stoic views\textsuperscript{447} were widespread in Roman society, influential on Roman law,\textsuperscript{448} and not merely restricted to the elite classes.

In an earlier edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), Ian and Averil acknowledge that views of the upper classes did not necessarily reflect those of the majority,\textsuperscript{449} but still quote Pliny the Younger\textsuperscript{450} (elite Roman historian\textsuperscript{451}), Philo\textsuperscript{452} (an elite Jewish philosopher living in Greek-}

\textsuperscript{443} Though in a different context; 1 Corinthians 14:35 ‘If they want to find out about something, they should ask their husbands at home, because it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church.’.

\textsuperscript{444} Though not necessarily representative, as they are from the Roman elite.

\textsuperscript{445} Seneca, Stoic philosopher, tutor of Nero and brother of Gallio (Acts 18:12), advocated chastity in marriage for both husband and wife’, ‘All One’, p. 171 (March 2009).

\textsuperscript{446} ‘The Stoics took a more moral position’, ‘All One’, p. 211 (February 2010); also found on page 233 of the current edition (2010).

\textsuperscript{447} ‘That Stoicism is fundamentally egalitarian and universalistic is well established’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, History of Political Thought (22.1.15), 2001; though Hill cautions ‘despite the feminist potential of so much Stoic writing, subordinating and misogynistic tendencies are clearly present’, and ‘Perhaps they are better understood as failed proto-liberal feminists’, ibid., p. 40.

\textsuperscript{448} ‘The overall development of Roman equity law was influenced by the Stoic natural law principle of the equality of the sexes’, ibid., p. 20.

\textsuperscript{449} ‘Public praise and activity was considered the role of men, activity in the home that of women, who were expected to be out of sight and out of mind. This would apply, primarily, to the upper classes; the lower classes could not remain at home: both men and women had to struggle to keep themselves fed and clothed, while slaves, male and female, had to do as their master or mistresses bade.’, ‘All One’, p. 172 (March 2009); the second sentence here is not in the current edition (2010).

\textsuperscript{450} ‘If I am giving a reading [of my poetry] she sits behind a curtain nearby and greedily drinks in every word of appreciation. (Pliny, Letters, IV, 19)’, ‘All One’, p. 234 (2010).

\textsuperscript{451} As Ian and Averil acknowledge, ‘Pliny [1st century AD], a prominent Roman lawyer, landowner and government official’, ibid., p. 234.
influenced Alexandria in Egypt), and Plutarch453 (elite Greek historian). Historical evidence454 proves these views are unrepresentative of the experience of 1st century Jewish women,455 as does Scripture.456

To support one claim,457 Ian and Averil provide a quotation from the 2nd century CE Roman grammarian Gellius (so they claim458), and from the 1st century BCE Roman orator Cicero.459

452 ‘It is suitable for women to stay indoors and to live in retirement, limited by the middle door (to the men’s apartments) for young girls, and the outer door for married women. (Philo, De Spec. Leg. III, 169)’ ibid., p. 172.

453 ‘Not only the arm, but the voice of a modest woman ought to be kept from the public, and she should feel shame at being heard, as at being stripped... ... she should speak to, or through, her husband. (Plutarch, Advice to Bride and Groom 31-32)’ ibid., p. 106.


455 Bernadette J. Brooten argues that ‘the inscriptive evidence for Jewish women leaders means that one cannot declare it to be a departure from Judaism that early Christian women held leadership positions.’, Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 92 (1999).

456 Lydia and the other Jewish women praying publicly and involved in public discussions with Paul (Acts 16:13-14), were clearly unaffected by such attitudes; the Samaritan woman who preached to her town was also unaffected (John 4:7-39); ‘many Samaritans from that town believed in him because of the report of the woman who testified’ (verse 39).

457 ‘Husbands felt entitled to have sex in these three areas: mistresses, concubines and wives’, ‘All One’, p. 233 (2010).

458 If you were to take your wife in the act of adultery, you could freely kill her without a trial; whereas if you were to commit adultery... she would not dare to lift a finger against you, nor would it be right. (Gellius 10.23)’, ibid., p. 233; in fact this is not a quotation from Gellius, it is a quotation attributed to Marcus Porcius Cato Salonianus (a misogynist and xenophobe), by Gellius.

459 ‘Anyone who thought young men ought to be forbidden to visit prostitutes would certainly be the virtuous of the virtuous, that I cannot deny. But he would be out of step not only with this easy-going age but also our ancestors, who customarily made youth that concession.’, ibid., p. 233.
These attitudes are contradicted by the marriage contracts of ordinary people (requiring fidelity and good treatment from the husband\footnote{\textit{It shall not be lawful for Philiscus to bring in another wife besides Apollonia, nor keep a concubine or boy, nor to have children by another woman while Apollonia lives, nor to inhabit another house over which Apollonia is not mistress, nor to eject or insult or ill-treat her, nor to alienate any of their property to the detriment of Apollonia’}, marriage contract, 92 BC, Hunt & Edgar, ‘Select Papyri I: Non-Literary Papyri, Private Affairs’, p.7 (1956).}, and the views of other elite 1st century Romans such as Musonius Rufus\footnote{Apollonius son of Ptolemaeus shall furnish to Thermion as his wedded wife all necessaries and clothing in proportion to his means and \textbf{shall not ill-treat her nor cast her out nor insult her nor bring in another wife}, or he shall straightway forfeit the dowry increased by half’, marriage contract, 13 BC, ibid, p.11.} and Seneca the Younger.\footnote{Musonius tells us that \textbf{husbands who commit adultery are just as culpable as wives}, and it is extremely objectionable for them to have sexual relations with their slave-girls.’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, History of Political Thought, (22.1.28), 2001.}

\footnote{\textit{You know that a man does wrong in requiring chastity of his wife while he himself is intriguing with the wives of other men’}, ibid., p. 29; this statement is actually cited by Ian and Averil, ‘All One’, p. 233 (2010).}
Was an originally egalitarian Christianity replaced by patriarchy?

The claim made

'Several changes can be noticed which confirm the kind of trend we are describing here and which count further against an involved role for women.

Leadership was narrowed down to a male priesthood, the Breaking of Bread became ritualised, texts were altered to downplay the position of women, women were blamed for all the world’s troubles, and Old Testament purity laws were reintroduced.

Pagan teachings and attitudes began to be imported, especially when Christianity became state-supported under Constantine. All of these downgraded women, and all are contrary to New Testament teaching.' 466

'With changes such as these, which indicate a move away from the original gospel and from New Testament ecclesial belief and practice, it is easy to see how the New Testament’s initial involvement of women and the freedoms granted them there were eliminated.' 467

Examination

The scholarly consensus is that the role of women in the early Christian community was non-egalitarian from the start, and that there is no evidence for a gradual decline from an original egalitarianism to a later patriarchal hierarchy.

The practice of the 2nd and 3rd century Christians with regard to women teaching in the congregation (and having authority over men), was the same as that of the 1st century community, not different.468

466 ‘All One’, p. 244 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

467 Ibid., p. 249.

468 ‘One can see that from the time of the New Testament little progress was made in women assuming teaching or leadership roles over men in the church. None of the
Historian David Horrell points out that the historical evidence available contradicts the claim.

'The evidence surveyed above concerning the Corinthian community in its early years also presents a sharp challenge to socio-historical studies which describe the earliest Christian communities as radical or egalitarian communities in sharp contrast to their societal context, or which characterize the movement as a 'discipleship of equals', into which patriarchalisation and social ordering gradually crept.'469

'This is not to deny that Paul may have had a vision of the community as in some way 'egalitarian', but it certainly cannot simply be assumed that this ever or anywhere approximated to the reality encountered.'470

Historian John Elliott notes that a change from an egalitarianism to a patriarchal community would have left distinctive traces in the historical record, yet no such traces exist.

'If such an egalitarian community had been established by Jesus and such monumental changes had been achieved, where is the evidence thereof? And of course that which qualifies as evidence is not alleged ideas of equality, but concrete proof of a radical alteration of social relationships having taken place within the Jesus movement and indicative of an “equality of its members.”


470 Ibid., p. 125.
On this the New Testament is silent as are extra-biblical sources. No historical evidence is to be found in the writings of Josephus, Pliny, Tacitus, Suetonius or any other author outside the New Testament indicating or alluding to a movement in first century Palestine that accomplished a social transformation along the lines required by the egalitarian hypothesis.\footnote{Elliott (egalitarian), ‘Jesus Was Not An Egalitarian. A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory’, Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology, (32.85.90), 2002.}

He observes that the emphasis Paul placed on the leading role of the man in family and household structures, was not a departure from Jesus’ original teaching, but a continuation of it.

‘Attention to household and family following Jesus’ death and instruction on household conduct did not entail an “abandonment” of equality and a “reversion” to patriarchalism (as argued especially by Schüssler Fiorenza), but continuation of a concentration on household and family initiated by Jesus.’\footnote{Elliott, ‘The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian But Family-Oriented’, Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches (11.2.173), 2003.}

‘Families and households, patriarchy structred, remained the focus of mission and the locus of assembly as the messianic movement continued its spread across the Mediterranean world. Few hints of equality are traced to this period by egalitarian theorists. One explanation offered for this absence of evidence involves the claim that egalitarianism, once flourishing, was now deliberately suppressed within the Jesus movement and patriarchal structures were reintroduced in order to facilitate an assimilation to Greco-Roman society.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 195.}

Elliott raises repeatedly the complete lack of historical evidence for the claim made.

‘The alleged egalitarian revolution left not a single trace in the historical record. There is no incontestable evidence of a supposed egalitarian phase of the Jesus movement prior to Paul
and hence no evidence that Paul and his successors undermined and reversed this egalitarianism. To the contrary, after Jesus’ death the movement was marked by the same social, economic and legal inequalities that prevailed earlier.

Complex economic, social, and cultural changes would have had to precede and accompany the dramatic shifts in the movement's internal structure from patriarchy to egalitarianism back to patriarchy. Of such changes there is not the slightest evidence in the historical record.

That this all occurred within some seventy years, as postulated by Schüssl er Fiorenza, defies imagination. Her theory is sociologically implausible and historically indemonstrable.474

‘If some form of egalitarianism actually had been established, we also would expect to find some lament of its loss by those who had previously benefited from the “old” arrangement. But of such a lament there is also no trace. Nor is there evidence of any attempt to justify a latter return to patriarchal patterns, as would be required in order to gain compliance from persons prospering from previous egalitarian arrangements.’ 475

Judith Liu rejects explicitly the idea that either Jesus or Paul understood their teachings in the modern egalitarian sense.

‘This essay has already rejected any model which starts with ‘the good’ that Christianity or Judaism could offer women, for such models tend to personify Christianity, usually in the person of Jesus or Paul, when recent study suggests that both Jesus and Paul were ambiguous regarding this issue, and that any place women had in their movements was ancillary to their definition of those movements.’476

Historian Alastair Campbell urges egalitarians to be honest in their interpretation of the Biblical text, and to accept that it does not support the egalitarian case.

474 Ibid., p. 198.
475 Ibid., p. 204.
'Rather than striving to show that women played a more prominent part than our evidence suggests, or that the prohibitions of the Pastorals do not mean what they appear to say, it would be more honest to admit the facts and then, if so minded, set them aside.

Again, rather than using the New Testament to establish a primitive, egalitarian innocence for the church, while discarding much of the New Testament in the process, those for whom the New Testament documents speak with authority would do better to take them as a whole and ask what we learn from the disciples of the apostles and the fact that they in their generation closed the door to women in leadership after Jesus and Paul had seemed to open it.'

How can we identify husbands and wives in Greek?

The claim made

‘In whatever manner the term “head” and the comments about headcovering are to be understood,46 the mutual dependency of husband and wife (or man and woman)47 in the new Christian relationship (“in the Lord”) is strongly asserted.’478

‘From the point of view of the part played in ecclesial life, 1 Corinthians 11 does not show any distinction in role. There is no suggestion that because the husband is head of the wife, therefore the wife should not pray or prophesy in the meetings.’479

Examination

The scholarly consensus is against the reading ‘husband and wife’ in 1 Corinthians 11:

‘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.’480

The majority of lexicons, commentaries, and translations understand the relation referred to as man/woman, rather than husband/wife:

‘a. γυνή (LN 9.34, 10.54) (BAGD 1. p. 168): ‘woman’ [AB, BAGD, Herm, HNTC, ICC, LN (9.34), Lns, NIGTC, NTC; all versions except NRSV, TEV], ‘his wife’ [NRSV, TEV], ‘wife’ [LN (10.54)]. b. ἄνδρος (LN 9.24, 10.53) (BAGD 1. p. 66): ‘man’ [AB, BAGD, Herm, HNTC, NTC; all versions except NRSV, TEV], ‘his wife’ [NRSV, TEV], ‘woman’ [LN (9.34)].’

478 ‘All One’, p. 61 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

479 Ibid., p. 61.

QUESTION—What is meant by γυνή ‘woman/wife’ and ἄνηρ ‘man/husband’?

1. The relationship between woman and man in general is in focus here [AB, Herm, Lns, MNTC, NIC, NIC2, TG, TNTC, Vn]: the head of woman is man. **Marriage is not in focus**, but the makeup of a community and the nature of man and woman as such [Herm]. **The relation of man and woman in the Christian assembly is being referred to here, not marriage** [Vn]. **Unmarried women should cover their heads also** [TNTC].

2. The relationship between wife and husband is in focus [Gdt, ICC, NTC, TH; NAB, NLT, NRSV, TEV]: the head of a wife is her husband.481

‘In order to keep the implications of Paul’s argument clear, it is crucial to translate the pairing man/woman ( νήρ/γυνή, ἄνηρ/γυνὴ) consistently in this particular rhetorical section.

Accordingly, not only is it poor translation technique, but it also confuses the historical issues at Corinth to **vacillate between man-woman and husband-wife in this section**, or to interpret this section through the **situation addressed in Eph 5:21ff where marriage is clearly meant**.482

‘This use of head does not likely refer metaphorically to the woman’s husband as Kistemaker25 and Gill26 believe since in this section ἄνηρ refers to man and not to a husband.483

For this reason, ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are in the majority of standard translations; CEV, HCSB, ISV, NASB95, NCV, NET, NIRV, NIV, NLT, TLB, and TNIV. The ESV, GNT/TEV, Message, and NAB have ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ in verse 3, but translate ‘man’ and ‘woman’ throughout the rest of the passage (the ESV and Message also have ‘wife’ in verses 5 and 6).

---

483 Ibid., p. 255.
Brother Steven Cox explains how Greek makes such distinctions.484

1. **Genitive case constructions, "of"**. 
Greek words decline. gyne - woman, gynaikos, woman-of

This is the most simple, since a genitive case, by definition, indicates possession.

- Spanish: "Sara, la mujer de Abraham"
- "Woman of [genitive] one man" (in the widow's welfare list qualifications)
- "Man of [genitive] one woman" (μις γυναικές ἡ γυναῖκα, in the elders' and deacons' qualifications)

2. **Marking with possessive pronouns, "her" "his" "thy" "your" "their".**

Matt 1:20 Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy woman. – Matt 1:20 Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy woman:

- Greek: Mariam ten gunaika sou - Μαριαμ τὴν γυναῖκα σου –
- Spanish: María tu mujer - Mary thy woman
- this example has been chosen to show that the same works with what we would call 'fiancée' or 'wife to be'
- Greek 5:24 αὐτῆς γυναικείας τοῖς δ ὅις ὑνδρέσιν

3. **Marking with the reflexive possesive, 'eautos, of self, of him/herself.**

This can be attached to either "women" or to "men" (only one idios, own is enough for both). Eph 5:24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the women [=wives] be to their own men [=husbands] in every thing.

4. **Contextual marking.**

Contextual marking is the most difficult. And the default position should be that if there is no clear and demonstrable

484 In correspondence, all words and emphasis his; although Steven is not a professional Greek scholar the grammatical explanations here may be checked against standard Greek grammars and with professionals on the B-Greek email list.
contextual marking then "woman" "man" as gender categories is meant.

For example in 1Tim 3:11 "Even so must the women be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things." there is no marker so the default position here should be that "women" means "women" (Spanish las mujeres) not "wives" (Spanish sus mujeres)

* However in this particular example most English versions still translate "wives" because of a series of contextual markers:
(i.) 1Ti 3:8 the deacons be grave.. 11 the women be grave = duplication of the adjective "grave".
(ii.) 1Ti 3:11 the women in the same way [wsautws ἡσαφικῶς] = use of "in the same way" indicating a comparative connection to deacons.
(iii) 3:12a Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, = a genitive construction.
(iv.) 3:12b ruling children [no "their own"] children and their own [idios] houses well = a possessive adjective applied to house (oikos i.e. family)
(v.) common sense = beyond these rules a certain amount of common sense also comes into play. For example even if "children" did not have "own house" following, it would still be clear that a deacon does not rule all children.

But then also 'common sense' can be wrong - in another context it might be talking about the Sunday School Superintendent where it's clear he does not only rule his own, idios, children.

So, basically, if the ESV committee (or another responsible mainstream Bible) puts "wife" or "woman", "man" or "husband", it's not by any means a random decision, it also probably isn't a matter of opinion.

In the vast majority of cases it's clear cut according to the 5 syntax rules above, and all versions agree. There may be one or two places in the NT where it is debatable.'
What were Jewish attitudes to women in the 1st century?

The claim made

‘Thus, in the thinking of many who produced the Mishnah, women were generally denied the opportunities open to men to develop spiritual understanding and stimulus, to appreciate for themselves the meaning of God’s will and revelation, and to teach and encourage others apart from their own children.’

Examination

Ian and Averil rightly note the importance of treating fairly the contrast between Jewish and Christian attitudes to women:

‘Katharina von Kellenbach, for example, in Anti-Judaism in Feminist Religious Writings, (Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1994) objects to the way she considers Judaism has been blackened in order to show Christianity by contrast to be better in its treatment of women. We have tried to avoid this pitfall.’

However, Ian and Averil have quoted almost exclusively from Jewish sources written after the 1st century. Although citing the Apocrypha as another possible source, they do not quote any 1st century apocryphal works. Nor do they refer to the 1st century records of

---


486 ‘All One’, p. 9 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

487 The historian Josephus, the philosopher Philo of Alexandria, and the unidentified writer ‘pseudo-Philo’ (a source comprising writings falsely attributed to Philo), are the only 1st century Jewish sources they quote.

488 Ibid., p. 9.
two significantly egalitarian Jewish religious communities, the Essenes \(^{489}\) and Therapeutae\(^{490}\).

Ian and Averil acknowledge that the Mishnah\(^{491}\) is a 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century source, but despite claiming it contains some 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century material\(^{492}\) they do not provide any evidence that they have quoted only this material.

Unless they do, these quotes are not reliable evidence for the position of women in the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century any more than quotes from the Talmud. \(^{493}\)

‘Rabbi Juda ben Elai \((150 \text{ AD, but echoing statements made earlier})\) said:

There are three Benedictions which one must say every day:


\(^{490}\) ‘No barriers can be placed around the women Therapeutae that would exclude them from any functions in the community.’, Taylor, ‘The Women “Priests” of Philo’s De Vita Contemplativa; Reconstructing the Therapeutae’, in ‘On the Cutting Edge: The Study of Women in Biblical Worlds: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza’, p.118 \((2003)\).

\(^{491}\) Quoted repeatedly in ‘All One’ \((2010)\), p. 10 \((three times)\), p. 11 \((once)\), p. 12 \((once)\), p. 13 \((twice)\), p. 14 \((three times)\), p. 21 \((twice)\), p. 24 \((once)\).

\(^{492}\) ‘The Mishnah (“Oral Teaching”) is a book of rules \textbf{compiled in Palestine in the second century AD but using material going back at least to the time of Jesus}, ibid., p.9.

\(^{493}\) ‘first of all, a number of discussions of Jewish attitudes towards women \underline{use the Talmud or passages from it to establish the role of Jewish women in Jesus’ time}. The Talmud however, is a compilation of Jewish law and argument which was not given final form \textbf{until the sixth century}. Passages in it may be much older or at least reflect reworkings of earlier material. \textbf{But this can be determined only on the basis of painstaking scholarly sifting of individual texts.}, Jaskow, ‘Blaming Jews for Inventing patriarchy’, Lillith, \((11, 7)\), 1980.
"Blessed be He who did not make me a Gentile"; "Blessed be He who did not make me a woman"; "Blessed be He who did not make me an uneducated man." (Tosephta “Additions”: Tractate Berakoth “Benedictions” vii, 18) 494

This is a quote from 2nd century rabbi without any evidence that this is relevant to the 1st century. 495 Ian and Averil do not identify which ‘statements made earlier’ 496 are being echoed by this quote or how much earlier they were made, so these unidentified statements are irrelevant to the task of determining the position of women in 1st century Judaism.

The claim that this quote is ‘echoing statements made earlier’, 497 may mislead readers into thinking that this quote is representative of how women were viewed in 1st century Judaism.

'Paul, when a traditional Jew, would have prayed thanking God for not making him a Gentile, a slave or a woman.' 498

There is no evidence whatever that Paul or any other 1st century Jew ever prayed this. 499

494 'All One’, p. 15 (2010).

495 ‘Similarly, references to rabbinic customs or sayings as contemporary with Jesus also reflect a misunderstanding of the development of Judaism. The Rabbinate emerged as an institution only after the fall of the Temple in 70 C.E., and it took considerable time before rabbinic authority was consolidated and came to represent more than a minority opinion within the Jewish community.’, Jaskow, ‘Blaming Jews for inventing patriarchy’, Lillith, (11. 7), 1980.

496 ‘All One’, p. 15 (2010).

497 Ibid., p. 15.

498 Ibid., p. 56; an earlier edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), had ‘Paul, when a traditional Jew, once prayed’, p. 49 (the change is not explained in the latest edition).

499 ‘First, the earliest dating on a source for this prayer is the mid-second century (attributed to Rabbi Judah Ben Elai)—about one hundred years after Paul writes this letter.’ 49 Thus, as Cottrell says, “it is pure speculation” to think that this was a Jewish prayer that Paul would have grown up praying, 50, Schemm, ‘Galatians 3:28 — Prooftext or Context?’, Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (8.1.27), 2003; the author is a complementarian, but the facts to which he refers are a matter of historical record.
Ian and Averil do tell readers that the rabbinical literature is not consistently negative towards women, but the two positive quotes they provide are far outweighed by the long list of negative quotes they have selected.

If Ian and Averil feel that the rabbinical commentary of the centuries after Christ is relevant, they should quote it fairly and at length, in accordance with scholarly concerns over the use of such sources, and according to approved academic standards of practice.

There are many more comments in the later Jewish literature which are positive towards women, and even egalitarian in tone.

---

500 ‘On occasions, favourable attitudes are expressed. Rabbi Hisda is reported to have said, “Daughters are dearer to me than sons” (Baba Bathra 141a). The anonymous Palestinian Jew described as Pseudo-Philo (first century AD) presents a positive view of women; this is thought so unusual that the suggestion has been made that this anonymous writer is in fact a woman.’, ‘All One’, p. 17 (2010).

501 ‘In summary, though far from being comprehensive and admittedly insufficient to make my case decisively, the purpose of this note is simply to question the commonly accepted paradigm that women were second-class, unjustly oppressed people in the Rabbinic writings (and some argue, by implication, the OT) and that now, in the new era of the NT, women are finally accorded justice, that is, the same roles as men. Such a position can be argued, citing various chauvinistic Rabbinic sources, but it does not now appear that all the Rabbinic data fit this paradigm, and it is even more questionable if the OT, as a whole, can be portrayed as anti-women. More work needs to be done on this.’, Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 105 (1999).

502 ‘Yet writers dealing with Jewish attitudes towards women often select only the most negative rabbinic passages on the topic. Their treatment of Judaism is analogous to conservative Christian arguments for the subordination of women which quote only certain verses from Paul.’, Plaskow, ‘Blaming Jews for inventing patriarchy’, Lilith, (11. 7), 1980.

503 ‘When the daughters of Zelophehad (Num. xxvii, 1-12) heard that the land was being divide among men to the exclusion of women, they assembled together to take counsel. They said: ‘The compassion of God is not as the compassion of men. The compassion of men extends to men more than women, but not thus is the compassion of God; His compassion extends equally to men and women and to all, even as it is said, “The Lord is good to all, and His mercies are over all his works”’ (italics mine). Sifre Numbers, Pinehas, §133, f. 49a, quoted in Montefiore and Loewe, Rabbinic Anthology, 510.’, Hove, ‘Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute’, p. 104 (1999).
These passages all postdate the 1st century and should not be considered necessarily representative of 1st century attitudes, but they do help provide a more balanced view of the relevant Jewish literature.

504 "If a poor man comes, and pleads before another, that other does not listen to him; if a rich man comes, he listens to, and receives, him at once: God does not act thus: all are equal before Him, women, slaves, rich and poor" (italics mine). R. Judah b. Shalom [fourth century A.D.] quoted in Exodus Rabbah 21.4, quoted in Montefiore and Loewe, Rabbinic Anthology, 346.', ibid., p. 104.

505 4. This passage is remarkably similar to Galatians 3:28: "God says to Moses, 'Is there respect of persons with me? Whether it be Israelite or Gentile, man or woman, slave or handmaid, whoever does a good deed, shall find the reward at its side, as it says, 'Thy righteousness is like the everlasting hills: man and beast alike thou savest, O Lord'" (italics mine). Yalkut, Lek leka, §76, quoted in Montefiore and Loewe, Rabbinic Anthology, 380.', ibid., p. 104.
Does *kephalē* mean ‘source’?

The claim made

‘A considerable debate on the meaning and translation of “head” (kephale) in Greek has been taking place for several decades in the evangelical world, one group maintaining the word means “chief” or “ruler”, the other that it means “source” or “origin”.’

Examination

Although the meaning of the word *kephalē* has been debated extensively among evangelical commentators for years, among professional lexicographers there is no debate.

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’.

Despite years of egalitarian arguments and claims of new evidence, none of the standard lexicons has accepted the egalitarian definition of the word *kephalē*.

Standard professional lexicons specifically identify *kephalē* as having meanings such as ‘first, superior rank, pre-eminent status, leader, master, head’ in 1 Corinthians 11:3.

---

506 ‘All One’, p. 228 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

507 An entry in the 1968 edition of LSJ9 has been cited by egalitarians as evidence for their understanding of *kephalē*, but the editor of the lexicon has explained that this was not the intended meaning of the entry (which has been misinterpreted), that the entry was badly worded, and that the meaning ‘source’ for *kephalē* as asserted by egalitarians does not exist.

508 Though a number of the standard professional lexicons have been updated recently with additional lexicographical information derived from additional lexical studies or the discovery of new sources; BDAG, Louw/Nida, LSJ9, and Swanson, for example.
Standard professional lexicons define *kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3 as a reference to pre-eminent status or authority.

---


511. The meaning of κεφαλή as leader, chief, master, which is attested for the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents (see also KQT 197f.) and mediated through Hellenistic Judaism (LXX, Philo, T. 12 Patr.), allows Paul in 1 Cor 11:3 to combine the sociological fact of ancient patriarchy (Theissen 107f.) with the theological idea of origin and rule.’, Balz & Schneider, ‘Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament’, volume 1, p. 285 (1990-c1993).

512. 87.51 κεφαλή, κ: (a figurative extension of meaning of κεφαλή 'head,' 8.10) one who is of supreme or pre-eminent status, in view of authority to order or command—one who is the head of, one who is superior to, one who is supreme over.’ κ στιν κεφαλή, Χριστός 'who is the head, (even) Christ' Eph 4.15; παντι θ νήρ κ κεφαλ Χριστός στιν, κεφαλ δ γυναικ θ νήρ, κεφαλ δ το Χριστο θεός 'Christ is supreme over every man, the husband is supreme over his wife, and God is supreme over Christ' 1 Cor 11.3.’, Louw & Nida, ‘Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains’, volume 1, p. 738 (2nd ed. 1989).

513. ... 2. LN 87.51 superior, one of pre-eminent status, figurative extension of first entry (1Co 11:3):’, Swanson, ‘Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)’, DBLG 81, #5 (2nd ed. 2001).

514. 2. In 1 C. 11:3, in relation to the question of the veiling of women in divine service, Paul says: θέλω δ μ ε δέναι, τι παντι θ νήρ κ κεφαλ Χριστός στιν, κεφαλ δ γυναικ θ νήρ, κεφαλ δ το Χριστο θεός. From 11:7: ν ρ μ ν γ ρ ο κ φίλει κατακαλύπτεται τ ν κεφαλήν, ε κ η κα δόξα θεον πάρχων γιν δ δόξα νυφος στιν, we learn that to the direct subjection of the man to Christ corresponds the fact that the man is ε κ η κα δόξα θεον, and to the position of man as κεφαλή of the γυνή corresponds the fact that she is the δόξα νυφος,’ Kittel, Bromley, & Friedrich, ‘Theological dictionary of the New Testament’, volume 3, p. 679 (1964-c1976).

515. (II) Metaphorically of persons, i.e., the head, chief, one to whom others are subordinate, e.g., the husband in relation to his wife (1 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 5:23) insofar as they are one body (Matt. 19:6; Mark 10:8), and one body can have only one head

126
From the evidence provided, readers will see for themselves that there is no genuine lexical controversy over the definition of this word. All the standard lexicons agree. The following quotation from a conservative complementarian scholar describes the current verifiable lexical consensus.

‘Is there any dispute in the lexicons about the meaning of κεφαλή? Where does this leave us with regard to the dispute over kephalē in the ancient world? Up to this time, Liddell-Scott was the only Greek-English lexicon that even mentioned the possibility of the meaning “source” for kephalē. 87 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 516 below] All the other standard Greek-English lexicons for the NT gave meanings such as “leader, ruler, person in authority” and made no mention of the meaning “source.” 88 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 517 below]


516 '87. Professor Al Wolters has pointed out to me in private correspondence (Dec. 7, 1997), however, that the recognition that Herodotus 4:91 speaks of the “sources” of the Tearus River with the plural of κεφαλή is rather standard in Greek lexicons in other languages than English. I agree that κεφαλή is applied to the sources of the river in the Herodotus passage, but I would also agree with the analyses of Glare and Chadwick that this is simply an application of the word to the geographical end-points of a river, and fits the common sense “extremity, end-point” for κεφαλή, and should not be counted as an example of a new meaning, “source.” (Wolters himself thinks the Herodotus reference is a result of semantic borrowing from Persian, and so has a rather un-Greek character. This is certainly possible, and would not be inconsistent with my understanding of κεφαλή.)’, Grudem, ‘The Meaning Of κεφαλή (“Head”): An Evaluation Of New Evidence, Real And Alleged’, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society (44.1.61), 2001.

517 '88. See BAGD 430; Louw-Nida, 1:739 ; also the older lexicons by Thayer, 345, and Craemer, 354; also TDNT 3:363–372; as well as the sixth German edition of Walter Bauer, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1988) 874-875; and most recently A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (ed. J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996) 254; similarly, for the patristic period see Lampe, Patristic Greek Lexicon 749, as cited above’, ibid., p. 61.
But now the editor of the only lexicon that mentioned the meaning "source" in any connection says that κεφαλή "does seem frequently to denote leader or chief ... and here it seems perverse to deny authority" and, "The supposed sense 'source' of course does not exist."

These recent developments therefore seem to indicate that there is no "battle of the lexicons" over the meaning of κεφαλή but that the authors and editors of all the English lexicons for ancient Greek now agree (1) that the meaning "leader, chief, person in authority" clearly exists for κεφαλή, and (2) that the meaning "source" simply does not exist.518

Perriman notes the lack of evidence for the definition 'source',519 Liefeld dismisses the definition 'source', supporting Grudem's analysis.520 Tucker disputes claims for the definition 'source'.522

518 Ibid., p. 61.

519 Perriman (1994: 612–14) notes that this connotation does not occur in the LXX, and the evidence adduced from extrabiblical sources is ambiguous and unpersuasive. Perriman (1994: 621) points out that nowhere "do we find anything like the idea of material origin that 'source' must imply in this context (woman created out of the body of man).", Garland (egalitarian), '1 Corinthians', Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, p. 515 (2003).

520 The meaning "source," adduced by Bedale as a clue to some of Paul’s passages, lacks clear evidence., Liefeld (egalitarian), 'Women, Submission, and Ministry in 1 Corinthians', in Mickelsen, 'Women, authority & the Bible', p. 139 (1986).

521 In my judgment, however, it is no longer possible, given Grudem's research, to dismiss the idea of "rulership" from the discussion., ibid., p. 139.

522 In conclusion, it is my impression that whatever the word kephale meant to the apostle Paul as he wrote 1 Corinthians 11 and Ephesians 5, it was generally interpreted by the church fathers and by Calvin to mean authority, superior rank, or pre-eminence. These findings bring into question some of the Mickelsens’ assumptions — particularly that the "superior rank" meaning of kephale is not "one of the ordinary Greek meanings" but rather a "meaning associated with the English word head."., Tucker (egalitarian), 'What does kephale mean in the New Testament: A Response', in Mickelsen, 'Women, authority & the Bible', p. 117 (1986).
Osiek explains that the 'headship' metaphor to express leadership was well established in Hebrew and Greek before Paul,523 considering critics of the revisionist interpretation of kephalē have made a convincing case.524

523 ‘Does the Bible teach male headship? I would certainly say it presumes male headship. References to individuals as "head" (rōsh, Hebrew, or kephale, Greek) are quite common in biblical and other ancient sources, and of the numerous examples, they are nearly always male: a military commander, a chief of a clan, a ruler, or the leader of a group of people. This metaphorical use of the word for "head" tells us that the people of ancient biblical times considered the anatomical head as the guiding agent of the body.’, Osiek, ‘Did Early Christians Teach, or Merely Assume, Male Headship?’, in Blakenhorn, Browning, & Van Leeuwen (eds.), ‘Does Christianity Teach Male Headship?: the equal-regard marriage and its critics’, p. 23 (2004).

524 ‘More recently, the argument has been put forth that kephale (head) can mean "source" rather than "leader," particularly in the case of 1 Corinthians 11:3, where Paul says that the head of the man is Christ, the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God. There is some good evidence for interpreting kephale as "source" here, but I think that the critics are correct that most of the evidence does not support that interpretation as a general meaning.’, ibid., p. 24.
The truth about the Malleus Maleficarum

The claim made

'Misogyny reached its highest extent in the persecution of witches. There is a strong theological background. Pope Innocent VIII in 1484 enthusiastically approved a book Malleus Maleficarum (“The Hammer of the Witches”). Thousands of innocent women were burned at the stake as a consequence of the type of thinking shown here.'\textsuperscript{525}

Examination

Contrary to these claims, Malleus Maleficarum was not enthusiastically approved by Pope Innocent VIII, and was nowhere near as influential as it is described by Ian and Averil. Moreover, although the misogynist ravings of Malleus Maleficarum were particularly vile and completely unbiblical,\textsuperscript{526} they were not reflective of the general attitudes towards women during this time.

The book claims to be the work of two Dominican priests (James Sprenger and Heinrich Kramer), but Sprenger showed no personal interest in witchcraft, was unconnected with any witch trials, and was actively hostile to Kramer.

There is evidence that the book was entirely the work of Kramer, who attached Sprenger’s name to the book in order to take advantage of Sprenger’s influential position in the church, and so give the work greater credibility.\textsuperscript{527} 528

\textsuperscript{525} 'All One', p. 251 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

\textsuperscript{526} 'True enough, the two Dominicans injected so much misogynist venom into their pages as to construe witchcraft almost exclusively as a crime of female lust.‘, Monter, ‘The Sociology of Jura Witchcraft’, in Oldridge (ed.), ‘The Witchcraft Reader’, p. 115 (2002).

\textsuperscript{527} This is disputed in part by Mackay, ‘Malleus Maleficarum: the hammer of witches’ (2006), but is the generally held view.
The front of the book includes a letter from Pope Innocent III, commending both Kramer and Sprenger for their work, and urging them to prosecute witches. However, the letter has been misrepresented.529 There is no evidence that the Pope actually commissioned the book, or even read it.531

The book also contains a letter of approval from the University of Cologne, but there is evidence that this was forged, or at least contrived dishonestly,532 as the university in fact condemned the book for unethical legal practices and contradicting Catholic teaching on demons.533

Scholars differ on whether the letter was a complete forgery,534 but there is agreement that even if genuine it was misrepresented.535


530 ‘But both the papal letter and the Cologne endorsement are problematic. The letter of Innocent VIII is not an approval of the book to which it was appended, but rather a charge to inquisitors to investigate diabolical sorcery and a warning to those who might impede them in their duty, that is, a papal letter in the by then conventional tradition established by John XXII and other popes through Eugenius IV and Nicholas V (1447-55).’, Jolly et al., ‘Witchcraft and Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages’, p. 239 (2002).

531 ‘there is not a shred of evidence that Innocent VIII ever saw the Malleus maleficarum or had the faintest notion of the ideas it contained’, Peters, ‘The Magician, the Witch, and the Law’, p. 173 (1978).

532 ‘So successful was this stroke of advertising strategy that the authors hardly even needed the approval of the Cologne University theologians, but just for good measure Institoris forged a document granting their apparently unanimous approbation.’, Ibid., p. 115.


534 ‘The approval of the theological faculty of Cologne was arranged through a complicated series of academic negotiations - it, too, does not address the remarkable qualities of the work itself.’, Ibid.
It must also be recognized that Malleus Maleficarum was not as influential as earlier modern historians originally thought.\textsuperscript{536} 537 538

It is indisputable that misogynist attitudes in the Middle Ages (both cultural and theological), undoubtedly contributed to the fact that the majority of victims in the European witch hunt were women.\textsuperscript{539} However, the significance of this is balanced by the fact that in many places men were accused far more frequently than women.\textsuperscript{540} 541

\textsuperscript{535} It is doubtful whether either Innocent VIII or the theological faculty of Cologne ever read the work., Joyy, Raudvere \& Peters, ‘Witchcraft and Magic In Europe’, p. 239 (2002).

\textsuperscript{536} It did not open the door to almost indiscriminate prosecutions’ 50 or even bring about an immediate increase in the number of trials. In fact its publication in Italy was followed by a noticeable reduction in witchcraft cases., Levack, ‘The Witch-Hunt In Early Modern Europe’, p. 55 (2\textsuperscript{nd} edition 1995).

\textsuperscript{537} In its own day it was never accorded the unquestioned authority that modern scholars have sometimes given it. Theologians and jurists respected it as one among many informative books; its particular savage misogyny and its obsession with impotence were never fully accepted., Monter, ‘The Sociology of Jura Witchcraft’, in Oldridge (ed.), ‘The Witchcraft Reader’, p. 116 (2002).

\textsuperscript{538} Its appearance triggered no prosecutions in areas where there had been none earlier, and in some cases its claims encountered substantial scepticism (for Italy, Paton 1992:264-306). In 1538 the Spanish Inquisition cautioned its members not to believe everything the Malleus said, even when it presented apparently firm evidence., Jolly et al. (eds.), ‘Witchcraft and Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages’, p. 241 (2002).

\textsuperscript{539} Women, in other words, were more readily suspected of and prosecuted for witchcraft by virtue of their sex, but they had no natural monopoly of the crime., Levack, ‘The Witch-Hunt In Early Modern Europe’, pp. 133, 135, text on p. 134 is a separate table, (2\textsuperscript{nd} edition 1995).

\textsuperscript{540} In two countries, Russia and Estonia, men constituted a solid majority of all accused witches, while in most Scandinavian countries the sex distribution was close to even., ibid., p. 135.

\textsuperscript{541} In the kingdom of Aragon, where almost all the witches prosecuted in the secular courts were female, 72 per cent of the witches tried by the Inquisition during the first half of the seventeenth century were male., ibid., p. 136.
Modern scholars agree that the witch hunts cannot be explained simplistically as an expression of male misogyny, as women were frequently accused of witchcraft by other women, and female midwives and 'white witches' were particularly responsible.  

Moreover, it has been pointed out that the Malleus was not written specifically against women, but actually against skeptics in the face of increasing opposition to beliefs in supernatural evil. This was recognized immediately when the work was first published, even by its supporters. In fact it is now recognized that the anti-women agenda of works on witchcraft has been greatly exaggerated.

---

542 'In Lorraine the majority were men, particularly when other men were on trial, yet women did testify in large numbers against other women, making up 43 per cent of witnesses in these cases on average, and predominating in 30 per cent of them.', Briggs, 'Witches & Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft', p. 264 (1998).

543 'The number of witchcraft quarrels that began between women may actually have been higher; in some cases, it appears that the husband as "head of household" came forward to make statements on behalf of his wife, although the central quarrel had taken place between her and another woman.', Willis, 'Malevolent Nurture: Witch-Hunting and Maternal Power in Early Modern England', p. 36 (1995).

544 'the theory that witch-hunting equals misogyny is embarrassed by the predominance of women witness against the accused', Purkiss, 'The Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth-Century Representations', p. 92 (1996); Purkiss provides detailed examples, and also demonstrates how some documents have been misread in a manner which attributes accusations or legal prosecution to men, when in fact the action was brought by a woman.

545 'Men were not responsible for all accusations: many, perhaps even most, witches were accused by women, and most cases depend at least partly on the evidence given by women witnesses.', ibid., p. 8.

546 'The work was essentially a defence of prosecutions for witchcraft written in the face of considerable scepticism - its arguments, especially in part III, are clearly aimed at reluctant lay magistrates.', Jolly et al. (eds.), 'Witchcraft and Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages', p. 239 (2002).


548 'On the whole, however, the literature of witchcraft conspicuously lacks any sustained concern for the gender issue; and the only reason for the view that it was extreme and outspoken in its anti-feminism is the tendency for those interested in this
Kramer himself was condemned by the Inquisition six years after the book was published (that Sprenger was not condemned supports the case that he was not a co-author), but despite this it gained great popularity among secular witch hunters and courts.

Rejected by the Catholic Church and Inquisition, it was never an accurate reflection of methods used by the Inquisition to deal with accusations of witchcraft. 549 550

subject to read the relevant sections of the Malleus maleficarum and little or nothing else.', Clark, 'Thinking with Demons: the idea of witchcraft in early modern Europe', p. 116 (1999).


550 'Actually the Inquisition immediately rejected the legal procedures Kramer recommended and censured the inquisitor himself just a few years after the Malleus was published. Secular courts, not inquisitorial ones, resorted to the Malleus.', ibid.
Secular commentary on egalitarianism

The claim made

'Society in the first century was inclined to oppose the new position given to women. In the 21st century, society is inclined to approve it, and to be considerably offended by organisations which discriminate. The practical implication of this is that we damage the spread and credibility of the Gospel if we follow our restrictive traditions.' 551

Examination

Although the complementarian case certainly receives criticism from general society, secular scholarship overwhelmingly supports the complementarian case and typically rejects egalitarian revisionism as ideologically motivated fiction.

Ironically, it is often the egalitarian case which brings the Bible into disrepute with the non-believer; secular scholars typically do not believe egalitarian arguments are being honest with the text. 552

Secular commentaries on early Christian history do not hold these views simply because they are driven by the desire to depict the Bible as negatively as possible, or because they assume the Bible is misogynist, patriarchal, and sexist. Many affirm that the Bible contains positive affirmation of women. But they are skeptical at best of egalitarian revisionist treatments of the Biblical texts, and of well established historical facts.

---

551 ‘All One’, p. 283 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

552 ‘Rather than striving to show that women played a more prominent part than our evidence suggests, or that the prohibitions of the Pastorals do not mean what they appear to say, it would be more honest to admit the facts and then, if so minded, set them aside.’, Campbell, ‘The elders: Seniority within earliest Christianity’, p. 275 (2004).
Despite acknowledging the possibility of women as leaders of ecclesial meetings held in their households, historian Alastair Campbell's overall response to egalitarian historical revisionism is negative.553 Instead, Campbell argues, modern Christians should simply accept that their position is different to that of the 1st century ecclesias, and acknowledge that they will necessarily abandon the apostolic teaching and example as a result of living in a different culture.554

Judith Lieu is a respected academic commentator on early Christianity holding views sympathetic to egalitarian revisionism. Lieu is skeptical of such attempts firstly because of their origin.555 She is also skeptical of them on the basis of their methodology.556

553 Rather than striving to show that women played a more prominent part than our evidence suggests, or that the prohibitions of the Pastoralas do not mean what they appear to say, it would be more honest to admit the facts and then, if so minded, set them aside. Again, rather than using the New Testament to establish a primitive, egalitarian innocence for the church, while discarding much of the New Testament in the process, those for whom the New Testament documents speak with authority would do better to take them as a whole and ask what we learn from the disciples of the apostles and the fact that they in their generation closed the door to women in leadership after Jesus and Paul had seemed to open it,’ Campbell, ‘The elders: Seniority within earliest Christianity’, p. 275 (2004).

554 ‘They would say to us, I think: We did what we thought was right in our situation for the sake of the spread of the gospel (1 Cor 9:20–23). The spread of the gospel is still paramount, but your day is not ours. We refused to bring discredit on the gospel by an untimely and intertemperate rush for freedom. See that you do not bring discredit on the same gospel by denying a freedom whose time has long come!’, ibid., p. 275.

555 ‘The politics of such a view are self-evident, for much study of the subject has developed within a context where women were struggling to establish a proper role for themselves within the contemporary church; to this end they have sought an egalitarian past to act as a model for present polity.’, Lieu, ‘Neither Jew nor Greek? constructing early Christianity’, p. 83 (2002).

556 ‘While other enthusiastic assertions about the distinctiveness of early Christianity and/or of the teaching of Jesus have been somewhat tempered in recent years, this one, [better treatment of women by early Christianity than in early Judaism] for those same reasons, has continued to be repeated. It is the purpose of this discussion neither to prove nor to disprove that claim, something which with our evidence may not be possible, but rather to explore the rhetoric which surrounds it and to expose the hazards of the naive use of sources which often accompanies it.’, ibid., p. 83.
Lieu identifies the fact that such criticism of egalitarian revisionism is well established, and notes the methodological flaws typical to such revisionist efforts. She is unpersuaded by attempts to present Christ or Paul in an egalitarian light, and un convinced by the dramatic claims made by egalitarians for Galatians 3:28.

Secular New Testament scholar Gerd Lüdemann is unconvinced by egalitarian claims, and criticizes the revisionist work of the respected Biblical scholar Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza.

557 To do so is not totally new: a range of recent studies has shown that such wishful thinking about Jesus’ or Paul’s ‘liberalism’ is deeply flawed, resting on a naive use of the early Christian sources, particularly regarding Jesus, and on a, perhaps less naive, misuse of the Jewish sources, taking as descriptive of the first century, the prescriptive construction of a world by the second-century male scholarly elite we know as the rabbis. [original footnote reproduced in footnote below], ibid., p. 83.

558 This essay has already rejected any model which starts with ‘the good’ that Christianity or Judaism could offer women, for such models tend to personify Christianity, usually in the person of Jesus or Paul, when recent study suggests that both Jesus and Paul were ambiguous regarding this issue, and that any place women had in their movements was ancillary to their definition of those movements., ibid., p. 97.

559 The arguably pre-Pauline formula in Gal. 3:28, ‘In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, and not male and female’, has been celebrated with enthusiasm as the cornerstone of early Christian egalitarianism, particularly within feminist exegesis. Yet the rhetoric of Galatians remains unaffected by the last clause of that confession., ibid., p. 112.

560 For all those seeking historical information and plausible historical reconstruction in Schüssler Fiorenza’s feminist-theological reconstruction of Christian origins, reading is a torment. With arbitrary exegesis she attempts to show that the early Christian movement opened up positions of leadership for women and therefore could be called egalitarian., Lüdemann, ‘Primitive Christianity : A survey of recent studies and some new proposals’, p. 87 (2003).

561 Many textual analyses are very farfetched; those mentioned in the report could easily be supplemented. [original footnote reproduced in footnote below] ...The theological zeal behind this book is at least as absolutist as the patriarchalist exegesis of primitive Christianity and modernity which Schüssler Fiorenza attacks. It is hardly much use in moving forward constructive research into primitive Christianity., ibid., p. 87.
Also receiving sharp rebuke from Lüdemann are the egalitarian attempts to read into the text more than is there.\textsuperscript{562} Like other secular scholars, Lüdemann is unconvinced by egalitarian claims for Galatians 3:28.\textsuperscript{563}

Lena Ksjarjian is sympathetic to egalitarian and feminist efforts to re-interpret the Bible, but does not find these efforts convincing.\textsuperscript{564} Ksjarjian is particularly critical of the claims made by Schüssler Fiorenza.\textsuperscript{565} \textsuperscript{566}

Craig Martin describes the flawed interpretive methods he used to use when he was an egalitarian Christian.\textsuperscript{567}

\textsuperscript{562} Scattered through the chapter there are again theses that serve to re-evaluate the role of the woman in early Christianity: Phoebe (Rom. 16:1–2) was not a deaconess commissioned for women’s work but a minister of the whole church of Cenchreae (170). \textit{That does not emerge from the wording}. Three women, namely Lydia and her companions (cf. Acts 16:15), \textit{are said to have been founders and leaders of the church of Philippi}, with whom ‘Paul had entered into a “communal partnership” (societas)’ (178). \textit{This thesis is derived solely from Acts}. Finally Prisca—by means of an uncertain historical judgement—becomes the teacher of Apollos (179).’ ibid., p. 87.

\textsuperscript{563} Ch. 6 is headed ‘Neither Male and Female. Galatians 3:28—Alternative Vision and Pauline Modification’ (205–41). Schüssler Fiorenza rightly regards the text as a pre-Pauline baptismal declaration. The text is ‘best understood as a communal Christian self-definition \textit{rather than a statement about the baptized individual}’ (213).’ ibid., p. 87.

\textsuperscript{564} In conclusion, I am sympathetic with the feminist project. I do not believe that feminist scholars are engaging in some intellectual sleight of hand or are pulling a nonexistent rabbit out of a nonexistent hat. I do believe these scholars are well-intended. However, some of these intentions \textit{serve to promote patriarchy rather than help eliminate it.}, Ksjarjian, ‘Trying to Prove that the Bible Is Pro-Woman How some feminists perpetuate patriarchy’, Free Inquiry Magazine, (19.1), 1999.

\textsuperscript{565} In Schüssler Fiorenza’s view, Galatians 3:28 is the “magna carta of Christian Feminism.”\textsuperscript{9} From the historical point of view, \textit{Schüssler Fiorenza’s interpretation is vulnerable.}, ibid.

\textsuperscript{566} In light of these complexities I do not see how Schüssler Fiorenza’s interpretations \textit{can withstand historical scrutiny.}, ibid.

\textsuperscript{567} Another example of selective privileging can be seen with the way in which Christian communities \textit{interpret the comments about the status of women in the}
He explains how, on the prior assumption that the New Testament taught egalitarianism, he used these methods was to interpret the text in a manner which was acceptable to his theology.\textsuperscript{568 569}

\textbf{Pauline and deuterological letters.} Some passages in these letters recommend measures that we would now consider to be sexist; other passages suggest Paul apparently supported women in leadership positions.' Martin, ‘How to Read an Interpretation: Interpretive Strategies and the Maintenance of Authority’, The Bible and Critical Theory (5.1.05.14), 2009.

\textsuperscript{568} ‘This was exactly the position I took in my early undergraduate studies: reconciling my assumption of the inerrancy and authority of the Bible \textit{with my view of God as necessarily egalitarian required exhaustive mental gymnastics.},’ ibid., p. 06.14.

\textsuperscript{569} ‘I tended to privilege selectively the passages that appeared to support women in leadership positions, and then I read the passages that disparaged the role of women in light of those, often attempting to interpret the sexist passages as if they were not sexist. How could the apparently sexist passages be interpreted as not sexist? Sometimes with the simultaneous deployment of ventriloquism – ‘Paul really means something completely different than what he seems to say’ – and sometimes with the simultaneous use of disabling contextualization – ‘this comment was only applicable to the specific context in which Paul was writing, and doesn’t apply to other contexts.’ ibid., p. 06.14.
Are these arguments from the Bible?

The claim made

'How much are we following Bible teaching, ecclesiastical tradition, or secular attitudes of previous centuries?'\(^{570}\)

'It is not the “the philosophies of the modern world” which have made us ask for change. It is looking at the Bible and observing where Christadelphian practice has developed from church traditions.'\(^{571}\)

'We ask, therefore, since our stated Christadelphian belief is that we should go "Back to the Bible", why do we follow Roman Catholic and Protestant traditions instead of following the Bible?'\(^{572}\)

Examination

Ian and Averil provide information concerning the extra-Biblical sources from which they have derived their understanding of these texts, which reveals that they did not arrive at their conclusions simply by 'looking at the Bible'.\(^{573}\) What follows is a list of conclusions proposed by Ian and Averil, together with the sources which they identify as contributing to their conclusion.

- Argument: 'When in 1 Corinthians 14 we read a description of a first century ecclesial meeting, the same applies. Although in the masculine, it is addressed to all brothers and sisters and describes the varied activity.'\(^{574}\)

\(^{570}\) 'All One', p. 256 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

\(^{571}\) ‘Reply 1’, p. 7 (February 2008).

\(^{572}\) Ibid., pp. 39-40.

\(^{573}\) Ibid., p. 40.

\(^{574}\) ‘All One’, p. 50 (2010).
• Source: NIV 1998 Inclusive Language edition (egalitarian, gender inclusive)

• Argument: 'Although all manuscripts contain verses 34-35, some place them after verse 40. Various reasons can be suggested for this. Did a scribe accidentally miss the words out, and then put the omitted verses below? Or did one of Paul’s critics write these remarks in the margin, and a subsequent copyist put them into the text?"575

• Source: Gordon Fee, Philip Payne (egalitarians)

• Argument: 'The letters themselves give good reason, however, to question this interpretation, and indicate an emergency response to particular problems which had arisen in Ephesus and Crete.576

• Source: Gordon Fee (egalitarian)

• Argument: 'There are two ways the verse could be translated:

   “I likewise desire the women to dress modestly...” or “I likewise desire the women to pray [without quarrelling], to dress modestly...” Translators usually choose (a) but (b) is possible, and several commentators consider it preferable."577

• Source: Dibelius & Conzelmann (third party578), Jewish New Testament (fringe paraphrase),579 Emphatic Diaglott (third party,

575 Ibid., p. 79.

576 Ibid., p. 87.

577 Ibid., p. 99.

578 The term ‘third party’ here refers to a source which is neither egalitarian nor complementarian; these may usually be regarded as valuable ‘neutral’ sources; unfortunately in this case Ian and Averil chose a biased source which believed Scripture is riddled with fabrication and fiction (Dibelius and Conzelmann were skeptics with regard to the Bible).

579 David Stern’s ‘Jewish New Testament’ is the work of one man with a personal bias, and without formal training in Greek; it is not taken seriously by professional Bible translators.
non-authoritative\textsuperscript{580}), Latin Vulgate (third party, non-authoritative\textsuperscript{581}), Modern Greek Bible (paraphrase, in disagreement with other standard modern translations)

- Argument: 'One suggestion is that Paul approved of sisters teaching in a private context, such as when Priscilla taught Apollos at home, but did not permit a woman to teach in public. In both the Greek and Jewish worlds the idea that women could be teachers was not generally acceptable. Pagan writers in the ancient world objected to women taking public roles in a number of areas, including teaching.'\textsuperscript{582}

- Source: James G Sigountos & Myron Shank (egalitarians)

- Argument: 'There is disagreement among scholars as to the meaning of the word \textit{authentein} which occurs only here in the New Testament. Suggested translations are “have authority” in a good sense, or “dominate” in a bad sense.'\textsuperscript{583}

- Argument: 'Other writers continue to maintain the word has a negative meaning.'\textsuperscript{584}

- Source: Richard & Catherine Kroeger, Ian Marshall (egalitarians)

- Argument: 'TNIV (2004), the latest update of the NIV, gives: “I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man”. In the footnotes it points out that "woman" and "man" may mean "wife" and "husband" respectively, and it also offers: “I do not permit a woman to

\textsuperscript{580} With due respect to Benjamin Wilson, his translation was his own work and suffers from his own bias; no modern scholar would consider it authoritative or worth quoting to settle an academic dispute.

\textsuperscript{581} Late Latin translations of the earlier Greek texts are treated cautiously by modern textual scholars as such translations do not conform to modern techniques, and sometimes demonstrate a lack of understanding of the Greek; they are sometimes used to inform textual investigations, but they are not treated as reliable translations, especially in comparison to modern English translations.

\textsuperscript{582} 'All One', p. 106 (2010).

\textsuperscript{583} Ibid., p. 118.

\textsuperscript{584} Ibid., p. 120.
teach a man in a domineering way” or “I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise (or have) authority over a man.”

- Source: Gender inclusive translation
- Argument: ’It can be translated as “their wives” (i.e. the wives of deacons). There is good reason, however, to translate it as “the women deacons”.
- Argument: ’The REB translates “Women in this office”.
- Argument: ’TNIV (2004) puts the footnote: “Probably women who are deacons, or possibly deacons’ wives”.
- Source: Revised English Bible (gender inclusive), TNIV (gender inclusive)
- Argument: “We conclude, therefore, that there are no adequate grounds for thinking that calling her “woman” indicates in itself any intention that she was to be subordinate to him or that he was intended to rule over her”.
- Source: Gilbert Bilezikian (egalitarian)
- Argument: ’We rely on a large number of handwritten manuscripts in Greek to provide us with our text of the New Testament. Interestingly, it can be observed that alterations were made, probably in the second

---

585 Ibid., p. 120; the publication date given for the TNIV is wrong, the correct date is 2005.

586 Ibid., p. 124; a previous edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), read ‘or (more probably5) it should be translated “the women deacons”.’ (pp. 100-101), but no explanation is given for this change in the current edition.

587 Ibid., p. 125.

588 Ibid., p. 125; the publication date given for the TNIV is wrong, the correct date is 2005.

589 Ibid., p. 169.
century, in such a way as to downplay the reported involvement and importance of women.\footnote{Ibid., p. 246; a previous edition of ‘All One’ (March 2009), had ‘alterations were made in the second century’ (p. 181), but no explanation is given for this change in the current edition, which reduces the strength of their original claim.}

- Source: Ben Witherington III (egalitarian)

Despite their claim,\footnote{‘It is not the “the philosophies of the modern world” which have made us ask for change. \textit{It is looking at the Bible} and observing where Christadelphian practice has developed from church traditions.’, ‘Reply 1’, p. 7.} it is clear that Ian and Averil’s request for change is not simply the result of looking at the Bible, but the result of consulting sources outside the Bible.\footnote{There is nothing wrong with this in principle, it is invariably necessary to seek insight from extra-biblical sources when interpreting the Bible in detail; however, when such a step is taken it should not be represented as simply looking at the Bible, or merely getting back to the Bible.}

What Ian and Averil have actually done is to go back to what other people have said about the Bible, and specifically what people who already support the egalitarian position have said about the Bible. This is not simply looking at the Bible, and it is also a careful collection of sources biased towards one particular view.
What did Paul say about slavery?

The claim made

‘The same applies to slavery: “there are no direct prophetic admonitions or arguments in the Gospels or Paul's letters calling for new social relations”. This enabled people, wrongly, to claim that the Bible favours slavery.’593

Examination

Bible teaching on slavery is consistent and explicit throughout the Old and New Testaments.

• No one is to be treated as a ‘chattel slave’: Exodus 21, Leviticus 25, Deuteronomy 15,594 595 596 597 Colossians 4:1598


594 Legislation maintained kinship rights (Exodus 21:3, 9, Leviticus 25:41, 47-49, 54, Hebrew indentured servants), marriage rights (Exodus 21:4, 10-11, a Hebrew daughter contracted into a marriage), personal legal rights relating to physical protection and protection from breach of conduct (Exodus 21:8, a Hebrew daughter contracted into a marriage, Exodus 21:20-21, 26-27, Hebrew or foreign servants of any kind, and Leviticus 25:39-41, Hebrew indentured servants), freedom of movement, and access to liberty (Exodus 21:8, 11, a Hebrew daughter contracted into a marriage, Leviticus 25:40-45, 48, 54, Hebrew indentured servants, and Deuteronomy 15:1, 12; 23:15, Hebrew or foreign servants of any kind).

595 ‘The nations subjected by the Israelites were considered slaves. They were, however, not slaves in the proper meaning of the term, although they were obliged to pay royal taxes and perform public works.’, Dandamayev, ‘Slavery’, in Freedman (ed.), Anchor Bible Dictionary, volume 6, p. 62 (1996).

596 ‘people who were enslaved in ancient Israel had a social and legal status different from that of the chattel slaves who made up the system practiced later in Hellenistic-Roman times.’, Wright III, ‘Ebed/Doulos: Terms and Social Status in the Meeting of Hebrew Biblical and Hellenistic Roman Culture’, Semeia (83/84.86), 1998.

597 ‘The Hebrew Bible, however, is sharply critical of various forms of human servitude. Its critique is rooted in Israel’s formative memory of having been “redeemed from slavery” in Egypt, on the basis of which Israelites are expected not to enslave fellow Israelites and to care for the destitute.’, Callender, ‘Servants of God (S) and Servants of Kings in Israel and the Ancient Near East’, Semeia (83/84.74), 1998.

598 Just as the masters want the slaves to do right by them, so should the masters deal in the same way with their slaves. Slaves have to serve their masters, and in the same way there are certain duties which the masters have towards their slaves. They are to give their slaves all to which they are entitled. There are to live by the same moral principles that the slaves are to live by. It is equality in the sense of being equals with them. The masters are to treat their slaves in a way which reflects the fact that they are equals with them, the slaves being their Christian brothers because both the masters and the slaves have been redeemed. This means that they are to treat them kindly.

599 We have in the Bible the first appeals in world literature to treat slaves as human beings for their own sake and not just in the interests of their masters. Dandamayev, Slavery, in Freedman (ed.), Anchor Bible Dictionary, volume 6, p. 65 (1996).

600 In contrast to many ancient doctrines, the Hebrew law was relatively mild toward the slaves and recognized them as human beings subject to defense from intolerable acts, although not to the same extent as free persons. ibid., p. 65.

601 Slaves were afforded a degree of legal protection in Israel. The Covenant Code stipulated three basic measures: beating a slave to death would necessitate an unspecified punishment (Ex. 21:20); if a master permanently injured a slave, release of the slave was required (21:26f); and masters were required to provide the sabbath rest for their slaves (23:12). Hanson, Slavery: OT, International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, volume 4, p. 541 (rev. ed. 2002).


603 Slaves both born in the household and those bought with money, just like the free Israelites, were to be circumcised in order to share cultic life and eat the Passover (Gen 17:13, 23, 27; Exod 12:44; Deut 12:12, 18; Lev 22:11). ibid. p. 65.

604 Household slaves, however, were accorded a certain degree of status in the Israelite family in connection with religious integration. The males were circumcised (Gen. 17:12f). They were included at religious meals, while foreigners and hired servants were excluded (Ex. 12:44; Dt. 12:12ff, 16:11ff). And priests’ slaves could eat
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Servants are to obtain their liberty if possible: Deuteronomy 23:16-17, 610 611 612 1 Corinthians 7:21, 613 614 615 Philemon 1:16 616 617 618


607 'If slaves like Onesimus have their duties, so do masters like Philemon; they must treat their slaves fairly and justly. They are masters on earth, but they themselves have a Master in heaven: let them treat their servants with the same consideration as they themselves hope to receive at the hands of their heavenly Master.’, ibid., p. 171.

608 'The sanction is what we might expect given the emphasis of the preceding verses: as slaves should serve their masters as doing it for the Master, so masters should remember that they themselves have a Master in heaven.’, Dunn, ‘The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 260 (1996).

609 'Nevertheless, Christian masters are different people because of their relationship with the Lord. They, too, have a new center of reference and so are called upon to demonstrate fairness and justice toward those who serve them; they too have a Master in heaven.’, Patzia, ‘Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 94 (1990).

610 'In contrast to all the ANE laws, Deuteronomy (23:15–16) forbade the handing over of a fugitive slave who had sought asylum from his master. The law instructed the owner to let the slave stay where he chose to live.’, Dandamayev, ‘Slavery’, in Freedman (ed.), Anchor Bible Dictionary, volume 6, p. 65 (1996).

611 'A slave could also be freed by running away. According to Deuteronomy, a runaway slave is not to be returned to its master. He should be sheltered if he wishes or allowed to go free, and he must not be taken advantage of (Deut 23:16-17). This provision is strikingly different from the laws of slavery in the surrounding nations and is explained as due to Israel’s own history of slaves. It would have the effect of turning slavery into a voluntary institution.’, Westbrook (ed.), ‘History of Ancient Near Eastern Law’, volume 2, p. 1006 (2003).

612 'Ancient Near Eastern law forbade harboring runaway slaves, and international treaties regularly required allied states to extradite them. The present law, in

contrast, permits escaped slaves to settle wherever they wish in the land of Israel and forbids returning them to their masters or enslaving them in Israel.’, Tigay, ‘Deuteronomy’, JPS Torah Commentary, p. 215 (1996).

Rather than encouraging slaves to remain in their slavery, Paul offers an exception that encourages them to make use of any opportunity to obtain their freedom: “Though if you can gain your freedom, do so” (RSV, NIV, REB).’, Garland (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, p. 309 (2003).

The apostle goes on to qualify his remarks, as he has done on more than one occasion in this chapter, by encouraging believers to welcome manumission when granted to them. There were recognized legal means (there were few slave revolts in Paul’s Roman world) by which a slave could be freed from the legal status of slavery in the Roman setting. It is in light of these legal options well known to Paul and his readership, that Paul acknowledges the preference to manumission.’, Oster (complementarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, College Press NIV commentary (1995).

On the topic of slavery, Paul teaches that believers should be content with their lot, but if the chance to go free arises, he advises the slave to take it.’, Beale & Carson, ‘Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament’, p. 715 (2007).

He writes as one who assumes that Philemon will do the decent thing—that he will take legal steps to change the master-slave relationship.’, Bruce (egalitarian), ‘The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians’, New International Commentary on the New Testament, p. 218 (1984).

The question regarding manumitting Onesimus was most likely when, not if, Philemon planned to set Onesimus free. Paul’s climactic appeal in v 16 (receive him “no longer as a slave but ... as a beloved brother”) seems best understood as Paul’s request that Onesimus’ manumission not be delayed because of any wrongdoing (see v 18) and that Philemon forgive his slave and manumit him very soon.’, Barty, ‘Philemon, Epistle to’, in Freedman, Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary, volume 5, p. 308 (1996).


Slave traders’ (or “kidnappers”: only here in biblical Greek) denotes those engaged in the business of kidnapping or stealing people and selling them into

148
Every time specific teaching on slavery is referred to in the Bible, the same principles and commandments are described explicitly. If these commandments had been followed consistently in the West, then the evil slavery systems of the North American plantations and the British colonies, could never have existed. The Law of Moses permitted only voluntary service (of the type called ‘indentured service’), for the purpose of paying off debts.

Both enforced servitude and ‘chattel slavery’ (under which slaves are treated as inanimate objects), are condemned consistently from one end of the Bible to another. Servants of whatever kind are to be treated humanely, and with compassion.

In the Old Testament era slaves suffered under the inhumane system of the Ancient Near East, which the Law of Moses condemned, and in the New Testament era slaves suffered under the inhumane system of the Romans, against which Paul protested; his own commandments concerning the subject of slavery and urging the humane treatment of slaves were strikingly opposed to the common treatment of slaves in his day.623

---

621 ‘Kidnappers refers generally to those in Biblical times who sold people as slaves (so NRSV “slave traders”), and specifically to those who used kidnapping as a way of capturing people for the purpose of selling them into slavery.’, Ariceha (egalitarian), & Hatton, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s letters to Timothy and to Titus’, UBS handbook series, p. 25 (1995).


623 Surprisingly, despite Paul’s repeated calls for social relations between slaves and their masters under the Roman slave system to be replaced by Christlike social relations (Ephesians 6:9, Colossians 4:1), despite his instruction to Philemon to free Onesimus (Philemon 1:16), despite his condemnation of enforced servitude (1 Timothy 1:10), and despite his encouragement for slaves to take any available opportunity for freedom (1 Corinthians 7:21), Ian and Averil claim ‘The same applies to slavery: “there are no direct prophetic admonitions or arguments in the Gospels or Paul’s letters calling for new social relations”’. This enabled people, wrongly, to claim that the Bible favours slavery.’, ‘Reply 2’, p. 124 (April 2009); readers may judge for themselves to what extent this is actually true.
What do most translations say?

The claim made

- **Claim:** The word for ‘deacon’ (*diakonos*), in Romans 16:1, should be translated as a title meaning ‘deacon’.

- **Translations cited:** JB, NEB, REB, RSV.

- **Translations agreeing:** NRSV, NLT, TNIV, CEV, NAB.

- **Translations disagreeing:** ESV, GNB/TEV, HCSB, Message, NASB95, NCV, NET, ISV, NIV, NIRV, TLB.

---

624 In ‘All One – NT’, p. 30 (2007), Ian and Averil identify the word for ‘deacon’ (DIAKONOS), as occurring in Romans 16:2 (“‘Deacon’ in Romans 16:2 is presented as a title or an office’), and in ‘All One’, p. 36 (March 2009), the same mistake is made (‘Accordingly, in Romans 16:2 diakonos is frequently translated as a title or an office’), but the correct reference is Romans 16:1; the error was finally corrected in the 2010 edition.

625 ‘Accordingly, in Romans 16:1 diakonos is frequently translated as a title or an office.’, ‘All One’, p. 40 (2010).

626 ‘a deaconess’.

627 ‘who holds office in the congregation’.

628 ‘a minister in the church’.

629 ‘a deaconess’.

630 ‘a deacon’.

631 ‘a deacon’.

632 ‘a deacon’.

633 ‘a leader’.

634 ‘a minister’.

635 ‘a servant’.

636 ‘who serves the church’.

637 ‘a servant’.
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• **Claim:** The words anēr and gunē in 1 Corinthians 11:3 should be translated 'husband' and 'wife' rather than 'man' and 'woman'.

• **Translations cited:** None.

• **Other translations agreeing:** ESV, GNB/TEV, Message, NAB.

• **Other translations disagreeing:** CEV, HCSB, ISV, NASB95, NCV, NET, NIV, NIRV, NLT, TLB, TNIV.

• **Claim:** The word adelphoi in 1 Corinthians 14:26 should be translated as a reference to both brothers and sisters.

• **Translations cited:** NIV inclusive edition (1996).

• **Other translations agreeing:** CEV, GNT, Message, NCV, NET, NIRV, NLT, NRSV.

---

638 'she’s a key representative of the church at Cenchrea'.
639 'a servant'.
640 'a helper'.
641 'a servant'.
642 'a servant'.
643 'a servant'.
644 'she serves the church'.
645 'a dear Christian woman'.
646 'From the point of view of the part played in ecclesial life, 1 Corinthians 11 does not show any distinction in role. There is no suggestion that because the husband is head of the wife, therefore the wife should not pray or prophesy in the meetings.', 'All One', p. 61 (2010).
647 'There is no distinction made as to whether it is a sister or a brother who brings a hymn, a lesson (didache, "teaching"), a revelation, a tongue, or interpretation. By saying "each one" when addressing the brothers and sisters, Paul indicates clearly that he is referring to both.', ibid, p. 50.
648 On p. 46 of 'All One' (2010), Ian and Averil incorrectly cite the publication date as 1995, and on page 50 they incorrectly cite the date as 1998; the correct date of publication is 1996, by Hodder and Stoughton.
649 'my friends'.
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• **Other translations disagreeing:** ESV, HCSB, ISV, NAB, NLT.

• **Claim:** The command to pray with holy and uplifted hands in 1 Timothy 2:9-10 refers to both men and women praying.657

• **Translations cited:** Emphatic Diaglott, modern Greek New Testament, JNT, Vulgate.

• **Other translations agreeing:** CEV.658

• **Other translations disagreeing:** HCSB, ISV, Message, NASB95, NCV, NET, NIV, NIRV, NLT, TLB, TNIV.

• **Claim:** The injunction concerning women and authority in 1 Timothy 2:12 should be translated ‘I permit no wife to teach or to have authority over her husband’.659

• **Translations cited:** NRSV (footnote).

• **Other translations agreeing:** None.

• **Other translations disagreeing:** CEV, ESV, GNB/TEV, HCSB, ISV, Message, NAB, NASB95, NCV, NET, NIV, NIRV, NLT, NRSV (text), TLB, TNIV.

• **Claim:** The women in 1 Timothy 3:11 should be identified as women deacons,660 rather than the wives of male deacons (note 661 below)

---

650 ‘my brothers and sisters’.

651 ‘So here’s what I want you to do’.

652 ‘brothers and sisters’.

653 ‘brothers and sisters’.

654 ‘Brothers and sisters’.

655 ‘my brothers and sisters’.

656 ‘my friends’.

657 ‘But some translations and commentators consider that Paul’s instructions also refer to women praying.’, ‘All One’, p. 99 (2010).

658 ‘I want everyone everywhere to lift innocent hands toward heaven and pray’.

659 ‘The switch from “women” in the plural (verse 9) to “woman” (gyne) and “man” (aner) in the singular in verses 11 & 12, and the reference to childbearing in verse 15, likewise suggest a marriage context’, ‘All One’, p. 107 (2010).
Translations cited: REB.

Other translations agreeing: Message, NAB662, NASB95663, NCV664, NRSV665, TNIV666. Other translations disagreeing: CEV, ESV667, GNB668, HCSB, ISV669, NET670, NIV671, NIRV, NLT672, TLB.

The REB translates “Women in this office”, and many modern translations add a footnote which says “or, deaconesses”. TNIV (2004) puts the footnote: “Probably women who are deacons, or possibly deacons’ wives”. Since Phoebe in Romans 16 was described as a deacon, there is precedent for this. ibid., p. 125.

Translations have been identified as ‘Translations agreeing’, if they include the ambiguous word ‘women’ in the text, but suggest ‘women deacons’ as an alternative rendering in a footnote, whereas translations have been identified as ‘Translations disagreeing’ if they rendered the text as a reference to the wives of deacons, though they may say in a footnote that ‘deaconsesses’ is a possible rendering.

‘Women’, a footnote says ‘Women: this seems to refer to women deacons but may possibly mean wives of deacons. The former is preferred because the word is used absolutely’.

‘women’, a footnote says ‘i.e. either deacons’ wives or deaconesses’.

‘women’, a footnote says ‘This might mean the wives of the deacons, or it might mean women who serve in the same way as deacons’.

‘women’, a footnote says ‘Or Their wives, or Women deacons’.

‘women’, a footnote says ‘Probably women who are deacons, or possibly deacons’ wives’.

‘Their wives’, a footnote says ‘Or Wives, likewise, must, or Women, likewise, must’.

The text has ‘Their wives’, a footnote says ‘Their wives; or Women helpers’.

their wives’, a footnote says ‘Or Women’.

‘Their wives’, a lengthy footnote includes ‘It is possible that this refers to women who serve as deacons, “deaconsesses.”’, but also says ‘The translation “wives” - referring to the wives of the deacons - is probably to be preferred’.

‘In the same way, their wives’, a footnote says ‘Or way, deaconesses’.

‘Their wives’, a footnote says ‘Or the women deacons. The Greek word can be translated women or wives’.
Examination

Ian and Averil recognize the importance of using a range of different translations. However, when reviewing Ian and Averil's use of translations readers will note that in three cases only one translation is appealed to, and in one case no particular translation is appealed to at all.

In one case a translation used is particularly old (Diaglott), in another case it is in a completely irrelevant language (Vulgate), and in yet another a fringe translation of no scholarly reputation is appealed to (JNT).

In most cases a translation with an egalitarian bias or using gender neutral language is used, and in the majority of cases the number of translations agreeing with them is significantly smaller than the number of translations which do not.

Ian and Averil repeatedly make claims which are supported only by a minority of standard modern Bible translations. In some cases they appeal to translations which are out of date, or have no scholarly recognition.

In all but one of the cases examined here, the majority of standard Bible translations disagree with the reading preferred by Ian and Averil.

---

673 Translation is not straightforward; words have different meanings according to context, and translations are influenced by the background and understanding of the translators and commentators. It is important, therefore, never to rely on just one translation or on one commentator.', 'All One', p. iv (2010), which is the edition available on the 'sistersspeak' website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document's metadata.
Misleading arguments

False neutrality

False neutrality is the practice of 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.

- '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).’674

- 'Phoebe is called a diakonos, “deacon”.’675

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.

- 'In whatever manner the term "head" and the comments about headcovering are to be understood,46 the mutual dependency of husband and wife (or man and woman)47 in the new Christian relationship ("in the Lord") is strongly asserted.'676

- 'There is no suggestion that because the husband is head of the wife, therefore the wife should not pray or prophesy in the meetings.'677

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.

674 ‘All One’, p. 40 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

675 Ibid., p. 125.

676 Ibid., p. 61.

677 Ibid., p. 61.
• "The suggestion here is that some women were disrupting the meeting." 678

• "It is clear that Paul is condemning disorderly speaking earlier in the chapter." 679

First Ian and Averil offer the idea of women interrupting as a suggestion ("The suggestion here is") 680, yet they later assert this specifically as fact; now it is 'clear that Paul is condemning disorderly speaking'. 681

• 'Alternatively it could mean that she is to refrain from speaking and teaching false proto-Gnostic ideas.' 682

• 'Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, because the false teaching in Ephesus, as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve.' 683

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

Avoiding consensus

Avoiding consensus is the practice of failing to represent accurately the established scholarly consensus, or concealing this information from readers.

678 Ibid., p. 80.
679 Ibid., p. 85.
680 Ibid., p. 80.
681 Ibid., p. 85.
682 Ibid., pp. 109.
683 Ibid., p. 111.
684 Ibid., pp. 109.
685 Ibid., p. 111.
• "There is no suggestion that because the husband is head of the wife, therefore the wife should not pray or prophesy in the meetings."\textsuperscript{686}

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.\textsuperscript{687}

• 'Paul says that Adam was formed first, then Eve, because the false teaching in Ephesus, as seen later in Gnosticism, gave priority to Eve.'\textsuperscript{688}

Despite the appearance their carefully worded statement may give, Ian and Averil are well aware that the scholarly consensus rejects this view completely.\textsuperscript{689}

• 'The reference to the law could either be to a Jewish understanding of the Old Testament, or to the Jewish oral law.'\textsuperscript{690}

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).\textsuperscript{691}

\textsuperscript{686} Ibid., p. 61.

\textsuperscript{687} ‘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’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 822 (2000).

\textsuperscript{688} ‘All One’, p. 111 (2010).

\textsuperscript{689} 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.

\textsuperscript{690} Ibid., p. 75.

\textsuperscript{691} ‘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 νόμος λέγει, the law indicates. 363 BAGD, Moulton-Milligan et al. and Grimm-Thayer provide
• ‘Paul quotes his opponents and then refutes them’\textsuperscript{692}

Readers are not told this argument has been overwhelmingly rejected by scholars, including even a number of egalitarians.\textsuperscript{693}

Artificial controversy

Artificial controversy (or ‘manufactured controversy’), is the practice of claiming scholars are significantly in dispute, when they are overwhelmingly in agreement.

• ‘A considerable debate on the meaning and translation of “head” (kephale) in Greek has been taking place for several decades in the evangelical world.’\textsuperscript{694}

Although the meaning of the word \textit{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.\textsuperscript{695}

No standard lexicon has accepted the egalitarian definition of the word \textit{kephalē},\textsuperscript{696} although a number of them have been updated recently.

\begin{quote}
\textit{instances of the verb in the sense of it is permitted} (sometimes with the perfect stative sense, there exists permission) in the papyri, \textit{Josephus, and other first-century sources’}, Thielson, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 1151 (2000). \hfill \textsuperscript{692}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{All One’}, p. 73 (2010). \hfill \textsuperscript{693}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Ibid., p. 169. \hfill \textsuperscript{695}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Standard professional lexicons do not include the meaning ‘source, origin’ for \textit{kephalē} as understood by egalitarians, nor do recognized authoritative lexicographers debate whether the word means ‘source, origin’ or ‘chief, ruler’. \hfill \textsuperscript{695}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
An entry in the 1968 edition of \textit{LSJ9} has been cited by egalitarians as evidence for their understanding of \textit{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 that the meaning ‘source’ for \textit{kephalē} as asserted by egalitarians does not exist. \hfill \textsuperscript{696}
\end{quote}
with additional information derived from new studies or the discovery of new sources.697


- 'Their suggested translation of authentein as “claim to be the originator” has received some, but not general, acceptance.'699

Readers are told that the Kroger’s suggestion that authentein means ‘claim to be originator’ has ‘received some, but not general, acceptance.’700

In reality, the Kroeger’s work has received acceptance only among some egalitarian commentators,701 and the Kroeger’s definition of authentein has been rejected by professional lexicographers.

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


699 Ibid., p. 119.

700 Ibid., p. 119.

701 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 authenteo and its variants.”16′, Baugh, ‘The Apostle among the Amazons’, Westminster Theological Journal (56.157), Spring 1994.
Other Issues Examined

Which are the explicit texts?

Key texts guiding our understanding of a topic are those which provide instruction, teaching, commandments, or guidance with regard to a particular topic. They are identified by means of the kind of criteria described in the rules for interpretation written by brother James Foreman\textsuperscript{702} and brother Colin Byrnes,\textsuperscript{703} \textsuperscript{704} rules with which Ian and Averil agree.\textsuperscript{705} The following are texts speaking explicitly on the subject of the role of women in the family and the ecclesia.

- 1 Corinthians 11:3, ‘But I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.’\textsuperscript{706} \textsuperscript{707} \textsuperscript{708}

\textsuperscript{702} ‘Fifth. The truth in relation to any doctrine must be established by those passages which speak of it in positive and unequivocal language, and those texts belonging to the same subject but which only admit of inferential testimony, no inference should be drawn from them at variance with the truths already established by positive texts.’, from brother Foreman’s principles of interpretation, printed by brother Thomas in ‘Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come’, pp.179-180 (1859).

\textsuperscript{703} ‘We must avoid basing doctrine on passages that only infer e.g. Thomas’ statement ‘My Lord and my God’ to a believer in the Trinity, teaches that Jesus is part of a triune Godhead but this view of the statement is based on inference. It is not a statement on the nature of the Godhead but an outburst from a now undoubting Thomas.’, Byrnes, ‘God Christ Man Woman’, p. 11 (2010).

\textsuperscript{704} ‘Passages on which doctrine is based should not be incidental i.e. passages that are non-essential to the main teaching of a book or that do not constitute a teaching statement.’, ibid., p.12.

\textsuperscript{705} ‘We consider the methods printed by Dr Thomas and from your own website (see below) to be sound, and we reckon we have followed them.’, ‘Reply 1’, p. 64 (February 7, 2008).

\textsuperscript{706} ‘What does κεφαλή ‘head’ imply? 1. It implies a hierarchical meaning of authority of one over another [AB, Alf, BAGD, Ed, EGT, Gdt, Herm, Ho, ICC, Lns, MNTC, My, NIC, NTC, TG, TNTC, Vn]’, Trail, An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 10-16’, p. 58 (2nd ed. 2008); the seventeen references cited shows agreement from a range of standard Bible commentaries and lexicons.

\textsuperscript{707} ‘Even if by “head” Paul means “more prominent/preeminent partner” or “one through whom the other exists,” his language and the flow of the argument seem to reflect an assumed hierarchy’ through which glory and shame flow upward from those
• 1 Corinthians 14:33-35, ‘As in all the churches of the saints, the women should be silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak. Rather, let them be in submission, as in fact the law says. If they want to find out about something, they should ask their husbands at home, because it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church.’

• Colossians 3:18, ‘Wives, submit to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.’


708 °Some interpreters have tried to explain away the hierarchical implications of v.3 by arguing that kephalē means "source" rather than "ruler." This is a possible meaning of the word, and it fits nicely with v. 8, in which Paul alludes to the Genesis story that describes the creation of woman out of man; however, in view of the whole shape of the argument, the patriarchal implications of v. 3 are undeniable. Even if Paul is thinking here primarily of man as the source of women rather than authority over woman, this still serves as the warrant for a claim about his ontological preeminence over her, as vv. 7-9 show.’, Hays (egalitarian), ‘First Corinthians’, Interpretation: a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching’, p. 184 (1997).


710 °One may or may not agree with Paul’s teaching about the submission of women and his views about Genesis, but it seems to be blatant special pleading to attempt to discredit or to diminish the point of 14:34 by claiming it is unpauline, either in its view toward women or in its method of appropriation of Scriptural themes from the Old Testament.’, Oster (complementarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, College Press NIV Commentary (1995).

711 °The call for wives to be subject ( ποτάσσωμαι, “subject oneself, be subordinate to”) is unequivocal, not even lightened by the prefixed call “Be subject to one another,” or the addition “as the church is subject to Christ” (as in Eph. 5:21, 24).16 The exhortation should not be weakened in translation in deference to modern sensibilities (cf. again 1 Cor. 14:34; so rightly Martin, Colossians and Philemon 119). But neither should its significance be exaggerated; “subjection” means “subordination,” not “subjugation” (Schrage, Ethics 253; so also Aletti, Épître aux Colossiens 251–52).’, Dunn, ‘The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A commentary on the Greek text’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 247 (1996).
• Ephesians 5:22-24, ‘Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as also Christ is the head of the church – he himself being the savior of the body. But as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything.’ 713 714 715

• 1 Timothy 2:11-12, ‘A woman must learn quietly with all submissiveness. But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man. She must remain quiet.’ 716 717 718 719 720

712 Paul believed that there was a hierarchical order in creation, and that in this order the man was the “head” of the woman (1 Cor. 11:3). 179, Bruce (egalitarian), ‘The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians’, New International Commentary on the Greek New Testament, p. 164 (1984).

713 In translation the verb must be supplied from the participle of “to submit” in the preceding verse. This verb is used in military contexts of a subordinate’s relationship to his superior in the army hierarchy. It is used of a wife’s relation to her husband in Colossians 3:18; Titus 2:5; 1 Peter 3:1; of servants to masters in Titus 2:9; 1 Peter 2:12; of people to state authorities in Romans 13:1. It means “to be subject to, obey, be ruled by.” It carries the implication of subordination, reflecting the standards of the time, which no amount of special pleading can disguise. Phaps “learn to adapt yourselves” is an unfortunate attempt to make the command more palatable in a different age.’, Bratcher & Nida, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s Letter to the Ephesians’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 139 (1993).

714 It should also be noted that the parallel in Col 3:18ff. does not mention mutual submission; it begins with a straightforward imperative command.’, Boles, ‘Galatians & Ephesians’, College Press NIV Commentary (1993).

715 The exhortation to wives to be subject to their husbands is often understood as a request for voluntary subordination. However, the strength of the analogy with Christ and the church undercuts the “voluntary” quality of the exhortation.’, Tanzer (egalitarian), ‘Eph 5:22-33 Wives (and Husbands) Exhorted’, in Meyers, Craven, & Kraemer, ‘Women in Scripture: a dictionary of named and unnamed women in the Hebrew Bible, the apocryphal/deuterocanonical books, and the New Testament’, p. 482 (2001).

716 This perhaps means that the women should submit to the authority of the men as teachers and should accept with humility and obedience what is taught to them. The logical offshoot of this is that women should not teach men or have authority over them.’, Arichea (egalitarian), & Hatton, ‘A handbook on Paul’s letters to Timothy and to Titus’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 58 (1995).
Titus 2:4-5, 'In this way they will train the younger women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be self-controlled, pure, fulfilling their duties at home, kind, being subject to their own husbands, so that the message of God may not be discredited.'


722 'Women are asked to subordinate themselves to men and not presume to exercise leadership roles over them.', Evans, 'From prophecy to testament: the function of the Old Testament in the New', p. 233 (2004).

720 The author of 1 Timothy excluded women from this role in any case. He says: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man" (2:12). On the other hand, the Letter to Titus, probably written by the same author, does give a teaching role to older women.', Sullivan, 'From apostles to bishops: the development of the episcopacy in the early church', p. 74 (2001).

721 'Finally, the instructions invoke the most fundamental element of the household ethic concerning wives: younger wives must “be subject to their husbands.”', Towner (egalitarian), 'The Letters to Timothy and Titus', New International Commentary on the New Testament, p.728 (2006).

722 'Submissive derives from a verb that includes the elements of recognition of authority (“accept the authority of someone”), subordination, and obedience. This means that these younger women should willingly subject themselves to their husbands, whether they are believers or not. This idea of wives submitting to husbands is found in other parts of the New Testament (see, for example, 1 Peter 3:1; Col 3:18; and Eph 5:22).', Aricea (egalitarian), & Hatton, 'A handbook on Paul's letters to Timothy and to Titus.', UBS Handbook Series, p. 284 (1992).

723 'Finally, he urges that they also be subject to their husbands cf. 1 Tim. 2:11; Col. 3:18; Eph. 5:21–23; 1 Pet. 3:1).', Fee (egalitarian), 'New International Biblical commentary: 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus', p. 188 (1988).
• 1 Peter 3:1, *In the same way, wives, be subject to your own husbands.* Then, even if some are disobedient to the word, they will be won over without a word by the way you live.\(^{724} \text{725} \text{726}\)

\(^{724}\) ‘Wives are to express their submission “to every human creature” *by their submission to their own husbands.*’, Davids (egalitarian), ‘The First Epistle of Peter’, New International Commentary on the New Testament, p. 115 (1990).

\(^{725}\) ‘since Christians are expected to “be submissive,” *it is likewise expected that wives should submit to their husbands.*’, Arichea (egalitarian), & Nida, ‘A Handbook on the first letter from Peter’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 88 (1994).

\(^{726}\) ‘As all Christians should submit to the governing authorities (2:13) and slaves should submit to their masters (2:18), *in the same way* *wives should submit to their husbands.*’, Black & Black, ‘1 & 2 Peter’, The College Press NIV Commentary (1998).
Which are the implicit texts?

Implicit texts are those which speak indirectly about a particular topic. Such texts may present teaching or an example to follow, which indicates what we should think and do with regard to a topic. However, it is wrong to draw inferred arguments from passages which do not speak directly to the subject, and then use these to interpret passages which do speak directly and explicitly.727 728 729

The following are implicit New Testament texts speaking of women and their teaching role indirectly. Commentary on each passage is provided from complementarians, egalitarians, and unaligned sources.

- Acts 2: 4-15: 'But Peter stood up with the eleven, raised his voice, and addressed them: “You men of Judea and all you who live in Jerusalem, know this and listen carefully to what I say. In spite of

---

727 Ian and Averil acknowledge they actually do this; commenting on a number of texts they use to argue their case, they acknowledge 'We don't claim that these "passages ... contain explicit teaching on the role of women in the ecclesia, as far as leadership and teaching is concerned"'. They do, however, present explicit information about Jesus and his attitudes to women and form the background to the explicit teaching in the rest of the New Testament.', 'Reply 2', pp. 112-113 (April 2009).

728 'iv. Passages on which a teaching is based should not be incidental - i.e. passages that are non-essential to the main teaching of a book or that do not constitute a teaching statement. For example, Romans, the one book of the N.T. that systematically explains how sin and death entered the world, what sin is and how the life, sacrifice and resurrection of Christ overcome sin and death, contains only one reference to Satan at the end of 16 chapters of detailed exposition. This one incidental reference cannot be used to alter the Apostle’s argument in the rest of the book by suggesting that a fallen-angel Satan had a role to play in how sin entered the world, what causes sin etc.‘, Byrnes, ‘God Christ Man Woman’, p. 12 (2010).

729 ‘We must avoid basing doctrine on passages that only infer e.g. Thomas' statement 'My Lord and my God' to a believer in the Trinity, teaches that Jesus is part of a triune Godhead but this view of the statement is based on inference. It is not a statement on the nature of the Godhead but an outburst from a now undoubting Thomas. The expression ‘my Lord’ is used in the same chapter by Mary Magdalene in a context that proves she did not believe that Jesus was God while ‘God’ is a term used in the O.T. to describe the coming Messiah without any notion that Messiah would be God. In the risen Jesus, Thomas now saw the final proof of Jesus’ Messianic claims.’, ibid., pp. 11-12.
what you think, **these men** are not drunk, for it is only nine o’clock in the morning.\textsuperscript{730}

- Acts 18:26: ‘He began to speak out fearlessly in the synagogue, but when Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they **took him aside and explained the way of God to him more accurately.**\textsuperscript{731}

\textsuperscript{730} Peter’s phrase ‘these men’ (Greek outoi, nominative masculine plural, referring to males), indicates that he is referring only to ‘the eleven’, the other apostles who are with him; this is acknowledged by Bruce (egalitarian) ‘The Book of the Acts’, New International Commentary on the New Testament, pp. 59-60 (1988), Kistemaker writes ‘Then Peter stood up with the eleven... For **these men** are not drunk’, ‘Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles’, Baker New Testament Commentary, p. 88 (1990), Newman & Nida write **These men** may be either the eleven (Peter does not seem to include himself among those who are thought to be drunk) or the larger group of the one hundred and twenty,’ ‘A Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 42 (1993), Gaertner, ‘Acts’, College Press NIV Commentary (1993), Williams, ‘Acts’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 55 (1990), Mare writes ‘These men are not drunk. The **masculine form is used for the word “these”**’, ‘New Testament Background Commentary: A New Dictionary of Words, Phrases and Situations in Bible Order’, p. 149 (2004).

\textsuperscript{731} This verse describes Priscilla participating with her husband Aquila in the instruction of Apollos; Bruce (egalitarian), writes ‘how much better it is to give **such private help** to a teacher whose understanding of his subject is deficient than to correct or denounce him publicly!’ ‘The Book of the Acts’, New International Commentary on the New Testament, p. 360 (1988), Kistemaker writes ‘Next, Apollos demonstrated remarkable restraint when he consented to **come to the home** of a tentmaker and his wife and to receive instruction not only from a humble craftsman but also from a woman.’ ‘Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles’, Baker New Testament Commentary, pp. 668-669 (1990), Newman & Nida write **Took him home** (so many translations: NAB, Twentieth Century, Goodspeed, Moffatt) is a meaning well supported by the use of this verb elsewhere in the New Testament (see 28:2; Romans 14:1; 15:7a). However it may mean simply “**take aside**” (Phps).’, ‘A Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 358 (1993), Gaertner writes ‘At any rate, Priscilla and Aquila came into contact with Apollos and **invited him to their home**’ (προσλαμβάνωμα, proslambanomai). The Greek term means “to take someone to oneself,” and thus is interpreted by the NIV to mean a private meeting in the home (and justly so). **Evidently the fact that Priscilla was a woman did not prohibit her from being involved in this instruction of Apollos.**’, ‘Acts’, College Press NIV Commentary (1993), Williams writes ‘Afterwards they **took him home** and made good what was lacking in his instruction.’, ‘Acts’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 325 (1990), Mare writes ‘Priscilla and Aquila **invited Apollos to their home** for further training’, ‘New Testament Background Commentary: A New Dictionary of Words, Phrases and Situations in Bible Order’, p. 202 (2004).
2 Timothy 2:2: ‘And entrust what you heard me say in the presence of many others as witnesses to faithful people who will be competent to teach others as well.’

732 The NET footnote says ‘Grk “faithful men”; but here νθρώπους (anthrōpoi) is generic, referring to both men and women., which is the translation with the most support, even though standard commentaries are divided on the issue of whether or not the word is generic here (the passage is only implicit for the purpose of the subject under discussion because although it indicates both brothers and sisters are to teach, which is not in dispute, it does not describe who they are to teach or in what circumstances); Towner (egalitarian), writes ‘The command itself, “entrust [parathō] [these things] to reliable people,”’ which comes in the next phrase, picks up and echoes the language of “deposit” and “guarantor” (parathēkē) introduced in 1:12–14 and earlier in 1 Tim 1:18; 6:20 to describe the succession of Paul’s ministry to his follower’, ‘The Letters to Timothy and Titus’, New International Commentary on the New Testament, p. 490 (2006), Kistemaker writes ‘The deposit which was entrusted to Timothy (I Tim. 6:20; II Tim. 1:14) must be deposited with trustworthy men. They must be men, moreover, who will be qualified to teach others (cf. I Tim. 3:2), so that these others as well as their teachers will have been instructed in God’s redemptive truth, ‘Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles’, Baker New Testament Commentary, p. 246 (1990), Arichea (egalitarian), & Hatton, write ‘An alternative translation model for this verse is: You have heard me proclaim the teachings (or, Christian doctrine) in front of many other people. You must take these same teachings and give (or, tell) them to other competent people (teachers) who will then tell others about them.’, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s letters to Timothy and to Titus’, UBS handbook series, p. 192 (1995), Mounce (complementarian), writes ‘In order to continue the work that Timothy began, it is essential that men of character continue to teach the true gospel, the same gospel Timothy learned from Paul. Timothy is to identify these men and entrust the gospel to them before he leaves, helping to ensure the integrity of the gospel message (Spicq, 2:738). Because teaching is the responsibility of elders (cf. 1 Tim 3:2), the faithful men are probably elders’, ‘Pastoral Epistles’, Word Biblical Commentary, volume 46, p. 504 (2002), Knight (complementarian), writes ‘Paul combines with the need for personal spiritual strength (v. 1) the need to handle rightly and communicate faithfully the apostolic message (cf. 1:6–8, 13–14; 1 Tim. 4:6–16, especially v. 16, where this combination is succinctly stated). Timothy is to “entrust” to “faithful men” what he has “heard” from Paul, κουσας παρ μοι (cf. 1:13).’, ‘The Pastoral Epistles’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 389 (1992), Moss (complementarian), writes ‘It should be noted that the word “men” ( νθρωπους, anthrōpoi) primarily indicates not “male persons” but “human beings” or “people.” Knight argues that the word is here to be understood as adult males in contrast to women, primarily on the basis of Paul’s prohibition in 1 Tim 2:12 (cf. 1 Cor 14:34). He suggests that Timothy would have understood Paul’s admonition as directed toward the instruction of elders/overseers.3 While Knight’s argument needs to be considered, he has pressed his conclusions further than the data allows. Paul’s real concern here is that Timothy seek out “faithful” people who are able to share the gospel with others.4 The setting here is not the public assembly. Paul would himself argue that older women need to be able teachers of the gospel and its implications
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• 2 Timothy 3:15: ‘and how from infancy you have known the holy writings, which are able to give you wisdom for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.’

We can also draw inferences from indirect evidence, though this can never be allowed to take precedence over explicit evidence. I agree with Ian and Averil that ‘we should note practices approved by the inspired writers as well as direct teaching’.

Ian and Averil acknowledge that sisters were not explicitly included in aspects of leadership, were not appointed to all the same positions of leadership and teaching as men, were not appointed as elders, and that teaching and praying were performed by younger women (Titus 2:4–5). Priscilla had a part in the teaching of Apollos (Acts 18:24–26).’

for younger women (Titus 2:4–5). Priscilla had a part in the teaching of Apollos (Acts 18:24–26).’

733 This verse shows that Timothy had received instruction in the Scriptures from a young age, and since his father was a Greek and his mother was a Jew (Acts 16:1), it is likely that he was instructed by his mother; Anchea (egalitarian), & Hatton write ‘What the statement wants to emphasize is that at a very early age Timothy was introduced to the Scriptures, although we cannot be sure as to how old Timothy was when this started. However, there is information to the effect that at the age of five a Jewish boy received instruction in the Torah and memorized from it. This practice may be reflected in this verse, and if so, then Timothy was taught the Scriptures by his mother, since his father was not a Jew.’, ‘1, 2 Timothy & Titus’, College Press NIV Commentary (1994), Fee (egalitarian), writes ‘Those to whom he entrusts those teachings are to be reliable or trustworthy people (cf. 1 Tim. 1:12).’


734 ‘All One’, p. 4 (2010).

735 ‘Reply 1’, p. 20 (February 2008).

736 Ibid., p. 27.


738 Ibid., pp. 128-129.
brothers to a larger extent than by sisters. These are the practices approved by the inspired writers.

719 Ibid., p. 150.
Reading in context: lexical-syntactical analysis

Lexical-syntactical analysis is the means by which a text is analysed according to the meaning of individual words and the way in which they are used in their context.\(^{740}\)\(^{741}\) These are phrases used consistently by Paul to provide a specific context for his words.

Universal application throughout all ecclesias:\(^{742}\)

- 1 Corinthians 4:17, ‘He will remind you of my ways in Christ, as I teach them everywhere in every church.’
- 1 Corinthians 7:17, ‘I give this sort of direction in all the churches.’
- 1 Corinthians 11:16, ‘we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God’
- 1 Corinthians 14:33, ‘As in all the churches of the saints’
- 1 Timothy 2:8-9, ‘So I want the men to pray in every place, lifting up holy hands without anger or dispute. Likewise the women are to dress in suitable apparel, with modesty and self-control’
- 1 Timothy 3:14-15, ‘I am writing these instructions to you in case I am delayed, to let you know how people ought to conduct themselves in the household of God’

Offence to non-Christians is to be avoided:

- 1 Corinthians 11:32, ‘Do not give offense to Jews or Greeks or to the church of God’

\(^{740}\) Lexical-syntactical analysis is the study of the meaning of individual words (lexicology) and the way those words are combined (syntax) in order to determine more accurately the author’s intended meaning., Virkler & Ayayo, ‘Hermeneutics: Principles and processes of Biblical interpretation’, p. 98 (2nd ed. 2007).

\(^{741}\) Lexical-syntactical analysis does not encourage blind literalism: it recognizes when an author intends his words to be understood literally, when figuratively, and when symbolically, and then interprets them accordingly., ibid., p. 98.

\(^{742}\) See also Acts 14:23, ‘When they had appointed elders for them in the various churches’.
• 1 Corinthians 14:23, 'So if the whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and unbelievers or uninformed people enter, will they not say that you have lost your minds?'

• 2 Corinthians 6:3, 'do not give anyone an occasion for taking an offense in anything, so that no fault may be found with our ministry.'

• 1 Timothy 3:7, 'And he must be well thought of by those outside the faith'

• 1 Timothy 5:14, 'So I want younger women to marry, raise children, and manage a household, in order to give the adversary no opportunity to vilify us'

• 1 Timothy 6:1, 'prevent the name of God and Christian teaching from being discredited.'

• Titus 2:5, 'so that the message of God may not be discredited'

  Responding to local ecclesial issues:

• 1 Corinthians 5:1, 'It is actually reported that sexual immorality exists among you, the kind of immorality that is not permitted even among the Gentiles, so that someone is cohabiting with his father's wife.'

• 1 Corinthians 5:9, 'I wrote you in my letter not to associate with sexually immoral people'

• 1 Corinthians 7:1, 'Now with regard to the issues you wrote about'

• Galatians 1:6, 'I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you by the grace of Christ an are following a different gospel.'

• 1 Timothy 1:3, 'As I urged you when I was leaving for Macedonia, stay on in Ephesus to instruct certain people not to spread false teachings'

• Titus 1:3, 'The reason I left you in Crete was to set in order the remaining matters and to appoint elders in every town, as I directed you.'
Standard modern English translations show a phrase of universal application is used by Paul in the context of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16,743 1 Corinthians 14:34-35,744 Ephesians 5:22-25,745 Colossians 3:18-19,746 1 Timothy 2:8-15,747 Titus 2:4-5,748 and 1 Peter 3:1-7.749

Parallelomania750 is an error in assembling background sources for a particular text, whereby the interpreter reads ‘parallels’ into the text from historical sources, simply on the basis of isolated similarities of words, phrases, or concepts.751

---

743 1 Corinthians 11:4, ‘any man’, 11:5, ‘any woman’, 11:16, ‘we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God’, referring to all men, all women, and all the ecclesias.

744 1 Corinthians 14:33, ‘As in all the churches of the saints’, 14:34, ‘the women’ (or ‘the wives’), referring to all the women (or wives), in all ecclesias.


747 1 Timothy 3:14-15, ‘I am writing these instructions to you in case I am delayed, to let you know how people ought to conduct themselves in the household of God’, explicitly referring to how all people should conduct themselves in the ecclesias.


749 1 Peter 3:1, ‘wives’, ‘your own husbands’, referring to all wives and all husbands.

750 Nearly forty years ago, Samuel Sandmel published his SBL presidential address for 1961 under the title "Parallelomania," which he defined as "that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction" (p. 1). His article remains very useful but I think the discussion can be carried further today.', Davila, ‘The Perils of Parallels’, lecture at the University of St Andrews (April 2001).

751 This does not mean that all parallels are necessarily invalid; ‘I am not denying that literary parallels and literary influence, in the form of source and derivation, exist.’, Sandmel, ‘Parallelomania’, Journal of Biblical Literature (81.1), 1962.
A well known example is the misreading of the Greek word *gnōsis* in 1 Timothy 6:20 as a reference to Gnostic teaching. Having decided that the word referred to Gnosticism, expositors attempted to find evidence throughout the letter that the Gnostics were the specific false teachers mentioned. The conclusion that Paul was warning against Gnostics was then transferred wrongly to Paul’s other letters.  

The result was a false interpretation disregarding historical evidence that Gnosticism did not exist in the 1st century. New findings often result such errors. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Qumran and the Nag Hammadi library in Egypt, prompted Bible commentators to look through the New Testament for similar words to those used in these texts, assuming identical thoughts, concepts, and backgrounds on the basis of mere similarity of vocabulary.

Though corrected repeatedly in the relevant scholarly literature, this error continues in populist, and even some academic works. The ‘selective fallacy’ occurs when ‘parallels’ are drawn only from those sources which the interpreter has previously determined are relevant.

752  1 Timothy 6:20, ‘O Timothy, protect what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the profane chatter and absurdities of so-called “knowledge.”’.

753 ‘We must beware of imposing an outside situation upon the letters. For instance, in previous generations some scholars read Gnosticism from the second and third centuries A.D. into the New Testament letters, so that the opponents in almost every Pauline letter were identified as Gnostics. Virtually no one advocates the Gnostic hypothesis today, for it is illegitimate to read later church history into first century documents. The Gnostic detour could have been avoided if scholars had read the Pauline letters themselves more carefully, for evidence for full-fledged Gnosticism cannot be read out of his letters.’, Schreiner (complementarian), ‘Interpreting the Pauline Epistles’, Southern Baptist Journal of Theology (3.9), 1999.

754 ‘Scholars are prone to engage in “parallelomania” where information from the Dead Sea Scrolls or Nag Hammadi or the Church Fathers is imposed upon the New Testament documents.’, ibid., p. 9.

755 When searching for true parallels, all possible sources should be evaluated, and criteria established for assessing which of the sources contains genuine parallels to the text under study; interpreters committing the ‘selective fallacy’ choose their source on the basis that they already believe it is the source of the parallels they expect to find.
Does the New Testament make gendered distinctions in authority or role?

Egalitarian and complementarian scholars agree that a number of texts affirm gendered distinctions in authority or role.757

Gendered distinctions in role:

- 1 Corinthians 11:4-5: ‘Any man who prays or prophesies with his head covered disgraces his head. But any woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered disgraces her head’758 759 760 761

756 An excellent article by Robert Kysar (1970:250–55) shows that Rudolf Bultmann and C. H. Dodd in their commentaries on John (specifically the prologue) used entirely different sources of evidence to "prove" their respective theories. Rarely did either consider the parallels adduced by the other. In other words, they chose only those parallels that would support their preconceived notions. This happens all too often in scholarly circles. Instead of a comprehensive study of all possible parallels in order to discover which best fits the context, scholars will select only those most favorable to the thesis and ignore the others. Further, they will often accumulate numerous examples in order to overwhelm the reader with volume. Carson calls this "verbal paralleloamania, ... the listing of verbal parallels in some body of literature as if those bare phenomena demonstrate conceptual links or even dependency" (1984c:43–44).', Osborne, 'The Hermeneutical Spiral: A comprehensive introduction to biblical interpretation', p. 91 (2nd rev. ed. 2006).

757 Texts only recognized as such by complementarians on the one hand or egalitarians on the other are not listed, such as Galatians 3:28, since some egalitarians believe it denies gendered distinctions in role but many egalitarians who agree with complementarians that it does not; likewise 1 Timothy 3:11 is omitted since some complementarians believe it affirms gendered distinctions in role, but many complementarians agree with egalitarians that it does not.

758 In the absence of any indicators to the contrary, it is preferable to understand Paul’s directives here as applying to everyone in the community, married or unmarried: women should have covered heads in worship; men should not.', Hays (egalitarian), 'First Corinthians', Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, p. 185 (1997).

759 He did not forbid the Corinthian women to prophesy, but he demanded that they cover their heads when they prayed in public, and in 1 Corinthians 11:8-9 he added a statement — "For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man" — that uses Genesis, a sacred text, to define women as subordinate to men.', Murphy (egalitarian), 'The Word According to Eve: Women and the Bible in Ancient Times and Our Own', p. 225 (1999).
• 1 Corinthians 14:33, 34: ‘the women should be silent in the churches... it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church’

• 1 Timothy 2:11: ‘A woman must learn quietly with all submissiveness.’

• 1 Timothy 2:12: ‘But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man. She must remain quiet.’

• 1 Timothy 3:2, 4: ‘The overseer then must be above reproach, the husband of one wife... He must manage his own household well’

---


764 ‘sexual distinctions are not erased (as implied in Paul’s statements about marriage, sex, and gender-specific headdress).’, ibid., p. 281.

765 ‘While affirming the delicate interdependence of man and woman under God (vv. 11–12), Paul also upholds the distinctiveness of the two sexes by reasoning from the relational dynamics within the Godhead (v. 3) and from human origins (vv. 7b–9; cf. Gen. 2:18–25). For a woman, therefore, to venture into male behaviour violates the transcendent ordering of relationships.’, Ortlund, ‘Man and Woman’, in Alexander & Rosner, ‘New Dictionary of Biblical Theology’ (electronic ed. 2001).

766 ‘Later, in 1 Corinthians 14, he employed a reprise of the same argument to single out women and insist that they should keep silent in church.’, Murphy (egalitarian), ‘The Word According to Eve: Women and the Bible in Ancient Times and Our Own’, p. 225 (1999).

767 ‘A woman is to learn in quietness and full submission.’, Fee (egalitarian), ‘1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 72 (1988).


769 ‘a woman is to ‘learn in silence with full submission’ (v. 11). Then Paul explains more fully what this silence with full submission entails: ‘I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man’ (v. 12).’, Ortlund, ‘Man and Woman’, in Alexander & Rosner, ‘New Dictionary of Biblical Theology’ (electronic ed. 2001).
Gendered distinctions in authority:

- 1 Corinthians 11:3: ‘the **man is the head** of a woman’ 771 772 773 774

---


768 ‘The first specific characteristic in the 1 Timothy list is μι μενον κ κνων, literally “a man of one woman,” or “a husband of one wife.”’, Knight (complementarian), ‘The Pastoral Epistles: A commentary on the Greek text’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 157 (1992).

769 ‘The man who is a failure at one (family) is thereby disqualified for the other (church).’, Fee (egalitarian), ‘New International Biblical commentary: 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, p. 82 (1988).

770 ‘...he seeks to ensure that positions of leadership are **filled by those of an appropriate social standing** – male heads of households.’, Horrell (egalitarian), ‘Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity’, Sociology of Religion, (58.4.331), 1997.

771 ‘What does κεφαλή ‘head’ imply? 1. It implies a hierarchical meaning of authority of one over another [AB, Alf, BAGD, Ed, EGT, Gdt, Herm, Ho, ICC, Lns, MNTC, My, NIC, NTC, TG, TNTC, Vn]’, Trail, ‘An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 10-16’, p. 58 (2nd ed. 2008); the 17 references cited show agreement from a range of standard Bible commentaries and lexicons.


773 ‘(Some interpreters have tried to explain away the hierarchical implications of v.3 by arguing that kephalē means “source” rather than “ruler.”) This is a possible meaning of the word, and it fits nicely with v. 8, in which Paul alludes to the Genesis story that describes the creation of woman out of man; however, in view of the whole shape of the argument, the patriarchal implications of v. 3 are undeniable. Even if Paul is thinking here primarily of man as the source of women rather than authority over woman, this still serves as the warrant for a claim about his ontological preeminence over her, as vv. 7-9 show.’, Hays (egalitarian), ‘First Corinthians’, Interpretation: a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, p. 184 (1997).

774 ‘But Paul reinforces the convention with The claim made that the husband is the woman’s head, which in 1 Cor. 11 is based in the Genesis story of Adam and Eve.'
• 1 Corinthians 14:34: ‘Rather, let them [the women] be in submission, as in fact the law says. If they want to find out about something, they should ask their husbands at home’

• Ephesians 5:22-24: ‘Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord, because the husband is the head of the wife as also Christ is the head of the church – he himself being the savior of the body. But as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything.

‘Head’ means master (see on 1:22); contrary to widespread claims, the word never meant ‘source’ in biblical Greek.’, Carson et al, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

775 ‘The New Testament also instructs women to be silent and not to raise questions within congregational gatherings. Should they have any questions, they are to ask their husbands at home. In short, women are to be silent, and the text assumes a gender perspective: the male/husband is the repository of biblical knowledge.’, Webb (egalitarian), ‘A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic; The Slavery Analogy’, in Pierce & Groothius (eds.), ‘Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without hierarchy’, p. 396 (2nd ed. 2005).

776 (i) Wives prayed and prophesied in Christian gatherings (see 11:5). This was a common practice in all the apostolic churches (33b). The context is crucial viz. the evaluation of prophecy (v 35). (ii) The law requires the acknowledgement of the distinctive roles of men and women (34), a reference to Gn. 2:20–24 or 3:16. Paul has already cited the former in 11:8–9.’, Carson et al, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

777 ‘Women, children, and slaves are instructed to be submissive, the husbands, fathers, and masters are urged to be loving and just in their actions towards those under their care.’, Horrell (egalitarian), ‘Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity’, Sociology of Religion, (58.4.334), 1997.

778 ‘The irony of the household code is that, whereas the early chapters of Ephesians describe a new kind of equality, through Christ, of Jew and Gentile and the breaking down of the dividing walls, these exhortations are clearly not about equals but about hierarchy; they do not break down dividing walls, but rather establish them and teach one to live within hierarchical bounds in the name of Christian unity’, Tanzer (egalitarian), ‘Eph 5:22-33 Wives (and Husbands) Exhorted’, in Meyers, Craven, & Kraemer, ‘Women in Scripture: a dictionary of named and unnamed women in the Hebrew Bible, the apocryphal/deuterocanonical books, and the New Testament’, p. 482 (2001).

779 ‘The call for the wife to obey her husband (and that is roughly what the verb ‘submit’ means in this context; cf. 1 Pet. 3:5–6) was virtually a universal convention
• Colossians 3:18: ‘Wives, submit to your husbands’

• 1 Timothy 2:12: ‘But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man. She must remain quiet.’

• Titus 2:5: ‘being subject to their own husbands’

• 1 Peter 3:1: ‘In the same way, wives, be subject to your own husbands.’


781 The wives, as free and responsible agents, are asked voluntarily to submit themselves to their husbands since this is entirely proper’, Carson et al, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

782 Women and slaves must be submissive and appropriately obedient. Women are forbidden to teach or be in authority over men; they must learn in silent submission (1 Tim 2: 11-15),’ Fee (egalitarian), ‘1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 335 (1988).


784 ‘Finally, he urges that they also be subject to their husbands cf. 1 Tim. 2:11; Col. 3:18; Eph. 5:21–23; 1 Pet. 3:1’., Fee (egalitarian), ‘New International Biblical commentary: 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, p. 188 (1988).


786 The sense of the verse then would be that since Christians are expected to “be submissive,” it is likewise expected that wives should submit to their husbands.’,
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Paul’s consistent teaching concerning sisters

'We would suggest there are indicators in the text itself, contextual markers, that are not there by accident but to guide us toward an objective meaning. An objective meaning is thus mediated by the text itself. The text’s indicators limit the possibilities so that the number of meanings available to the reader is not infinite.'

Seven passages have been identified as containing explicit teaching on the subject of the roles and relationship with men, of women in the eclesia and the family. These passages are widely accepted among complementarians, egalitarians, and unaligned commentators as passages containing such explicit teaching, and all seven passages share a common theme.

Specific content is repeated consistently within these passages. This is not a matter of one or two verses, nor an isolated text of Scripture.


It is well known that certain passages in the New Testament deal with the status, role, attire, and/or general demeanor of women in such a manner as to support the principle of male dominance and female subordination, both in the home and in the church (and by implication in society as well). These passages are seven in number: 1 Cor 11:3–16; 1 Cor 14:34–35; Col 3:18–19; Eph 5:22–33; 1 Tim 2:8–15; Titus 2:4–5; and 1 Pet 3:1–7.1.', ibid., p.106; Walker claims Paul did not write any of these passages.

‘Even more striking, however, is the complete command that wives be “submissive to their (own) husbands,” which occurs with essentially the same wording in Col 3:18; Eph 5:21–22; Titus 2:5; and 1 Pet 3:1,5,9 Other parallels include references to “learning” (1 Cor 14:35; 1 Tim 2:11), “silence” or “silent” (1 Cor 14:34; 1 Tim 2:11,12; 1 Pet 3:4), “not permitting” (1 Cor 14:34; 1 Tim 2:12), “pure” or “holy” (Titus 2:5; 1 Pet 3:2), “adornment,” “adorned,” or “adorning” (1 Tim 2:9; 1 Pet 3:3,5), “clothing” (1 Tim 2:9; 1 Pet 3:3), “gold” (1 Tim 2:9; 1 Pet 3:3), “braided” or “braiding” (1 Tim 2:9; 1 Pet 3:3), “head” (1 Cor 11:3,4,5,7,10; Eph 5:23), and “disgrace” or “disgraceful” (1 Cor 11:4,5,6,14; 1 Cor 14:35).', ibid., p. 104.
Headship:

- 1 Corinthians 11:3, 'the man is the head of a woman'
- Ephesians 5:23, 'the husband is the head of the wife'

Submission:

- 1 Corinthians 14:34: 'let them be in submission'
- Ephesians 5:22: 'Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord'
- Colossians 3:18: 'Wives, submit to your husbands'
- 1 Timothy 2:11: 'A woman must learn quietly with all submissiveness'
- Titus 2:5: 'being subject to their own husbands'
- 1 Peter 3:1, 'wives, be subject to your own husbands.'

Silence and quietness:

- 1 Corinthians 14:3: 'women should be silent in the churches'
- Ephesians 5:24: 'wives should submit to their husbands in everything'
- 1 Timothy 2:12: 'She must remain quiet'

Not permitted:

- 1 Corinthians 14:34: 'they are not permitted to speak'

---

791 This brief survey of 1 Corinthians has shown that there are not only two passages at issue when talking about the role and status of women in this letter (11:2–16; 14:34–35) but five (5:1–5; 7:1–40; 16:19; see also 1:11) or even six (15:5–8), and some references to women in other Pauline letters need to be included as well.', Crocker (egalitarian), 'Reading 1 Corinthians in the twenty-first century', p. 156 (2004).

792 The verb 'submit' is not in the Greek text in this verse, but is implied and therefore supplied in standard modern translations (it appears in the Greek text in verse 24); Bruce (egalitarian), writes 'No verb is expressed in v. 22, the imperative "be subject" (a participle in the Greek text) being understood from v. 21.', 'The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians', New International Commentary on the New Testament, pp. 383-384 (1984), Kistemaker writes, 'The verb is undoubtedly to be supplied from the preceding verse', 'Exposition of Ephesians', Baker New Testament Commentary, volume 7, p. 247 (1990), Bratcher & Nida write, 'In translation the verb must be supplied from the participle of "to submit" in the preceding verse.', 'A Handbook on Paul's letter to the Ephesians', UBS Handbook Series, p. 139 (1993), Boles writes 'The word "submit" is drawn from v. 21', 'Galatians & Ephesians', College Press NIV commentary (1993).
• 1 Corinthians 14:35: ‘it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church’
• 1 Timothy 2:12: ‘I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man’

Teaching supported from other passages of Scripture:793

• 1 Corinthians 11:7-9, ‘For a man should not have his head covered, since he is the image and glory of God. But the woman is the glory of the man. For man did not come from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for the sake of woman, but woman for man.’

• 1 Corinthians 14:34, ‘Rather, let them be in submission, as in fact the law says.’

• 1 Timothy 2:13-14, ‘For Adam was formed first and then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, because she was fully deceived, fell into transgression.’

• 1 Peter 3:5-6, ‘For in the same way the holy women who hoped in God long ago adorned themselves by being subject to their husbands, like Sarah who obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. You become her children when you do what is good and have no fear in doing so.’

From the relevant socio-historical background, we know that private associations were free to decide on their own codes of conduct even if these breached social norms, and that 1st century Christian women (whether Jews or Gentiles), would have had reasonable expectations of participating in the congregational worship as a result of their previous religious experiences.

793 The second point to be considered is that at least four of the passages in question appeal to the OT, and particularly to the book of Genesis, to support their views regarding women. 1 Cor 11:7–9 cites the creation of Adam and Eve, 1 Tim 2:13–14 the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve, 1 Pet 3:6 the story of Sarah and Abraham, and 1 Cor 14:34 simply “the law.” 11 This, too, suggests a common origin or source, or at least a common tradition, underlying the various passages in question.’, Walker (egalitarian), ‘The “Theology of Woman’s Place” And the “Paulinist” Tradition’, Semeia (28.104-105), 1983.
This being the case, Paul would have been aware of how his commandments concerning women sounded, and accordingly sought to soften the message. Egalitarian scholars have noted this particular feature of Paul’s commandments, in the seven passages in which he gives commandments concerning the relationship of men and women in the ecclesia and the family using a formulated style. Walker provides a detailed analysis of these passages.

---

794 a “mitigation,” “softening of the blow,” or “saving phrase” to make the statement, assertion, or command less offensive to women.’ ibid., p. 106.

795 In 11:11–12, however, he backtracks lest the Corinthians become confused and think that he implies that women are inferior to men. He is not attempting to establish a gender hierarchy that places women in a subordinate role. Since he argues from hierarchy to make his case about head coverings, he needs to caution against any misapplication of what he says. Women and men are interdependent in the Lord.’ Garland (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, pp. 508-509 (2003).

796 In some passages, the pattern becomes more complex, and, at times, it is not clear whether element “c” is present at all. Thus, the pattern of 1 Pet 3:1–6 is ‘a’ (v 1a), ‘b’ (vv 1b–2), ‘a’ (vv 3–4a), ‘b’ (vv 4b–6a), with v 6b either a continuation of ‘b’ or perhaps a very subtle form of ‘c.’ The pattern of 1 Cor 14:34–35 is ‘a’ (v 34a), ‘b’ (v 34b), ‘a’ (v 34c), ‘b’ (v 34d), ‘a’ or possibly a subtle form of ‘c’ (v 35a), 16 ‘b’ (v 35b). In Titus 2:4–5, the pattern is a simple ‘a’ (vv 4–5a), ‘b’ (v 5b), with ‘c’ absent altogether. Three of the passages introduce a somewhat modified form of element ‘c’ with a command to husbands that they love their wives. Thus, Col 3:18–19 follows the simple pattern, ‘a’ (v 18a), ‘b’ (v 18b), ‘c’ (v 19), while Eph 5:22–33 has the more complex pattern, ‘a’ (v 22), ‘b’ (v 23), ‘a’ (v 24), ‘c’ (v 25–33a), ‘a’ (v 33b); and 1 Pet 3:1–7 has the pattern, ‘a’ (v 1a), ‘b’ (vv 1b–2), ‘a’ (vv 3–4a), ‘b’ (vv 4b–6 or perhaps 4b–6a) with 6b a very very subtle form of ‘c), ‘c’ (v 7). The analysis of 1 Cor 11:3–16 is again complicated by the question of the unity of the passage. If it is a single unit, then the pattern is apparently ‘a’ (vv 3–6), ‘b’ (vv 7–10), ‘c’ (vv 11–12), ‘b’ (vv 13–16), although the distinctions are not as clear here as they are elsewhere. If, however, the passage is divided into three pericopes, as has been suggested, then the following patterns emerge: “Pericope A” follows the pattern, ‘a’ (v 3), ‘b’ (vv 8–9), ‘c’ (vv 11–12); “Pericope B” the pattern, ‘a’ (vv 4–6), ‘b’ (vv 7,10,13,16), with no ‘c’; and “Pericope C” consists almost entirely of element ‘b,’ with ‘a’ only implied and ‘c’ absent altogether.18’, Walker (egalitarian), ‘The Theology of Woman’s Place’ And the “Paulinist” Tradition’, Semeia (28.107), 1983.

797 a. General Statement, Assertion, or Command (vv8–12) I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling; also that women should adorn themselves modestly and sensibly in seemly apparel, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly attire but by good deeds, as befits women who profess religion. Let me warn women to be silent with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or have authority over men; she is to keep silent. b. Reason or
Correcting error

When correcting errors, answering questions, or providing instructions, Paul consistently appeals to universal practice in order to ensure ecclesias become aligned with the practice which is mandatory for all ecclesias everywhere.  

- 1 Corinthians 7:1, 17, ‘Now with regard to the issues you wrote about... I give this sort of direction in all the churches’. answering questions from the ecclesia

Justification (vv 13–14) For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. c. Mitigation, Softening of the Blow, or Saving Phrase (v 15) Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty,”, ibid., p. 107.

798 “Some interpreters understand Paul’s instructions to be intended for their original Ephesian context only, for the correction of abuses specific to that church. The weakness of this view is that Paul grounds his teaching not in the local situation, as he sometimes does (Titus 1:10–13), but in two primal human events: the creation of the man first, and then the woman (1 Tim. 2:13; cf. Gen. 2); and the deceiving of the woman, not the man (1 Tim. 2:14; cf. Gen. 3:1–7),’, Ortlund, ‘Man and Woman’, in Alexander & Rosner, ‘New Dictionary of Biblical Theology’ (electronic ed. 2001).

799 ‘Moreover, Paul assures the Corinthians that they are not alone in this endeavor, for all the churches are called and directed in this same manner, even as Paul himself lives this way.’, Soards (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 154 (1999).


801 ‘This is my rule... : the Greek is literally “and this in all the churches I commanded” (TEV “teach”). ...In some languages it may be more natural to translate “This is the rule that I teach in all the other churches as well as yours.”, Ellingworth, Hatton, & Ellingworth, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 158 (rev. ed. 1995).

802 ‘It may be taken as an encouragement: I am not simply saying this to you at Corinth; I say it widely wherever I preach and teach. Or it may (more probably) be understood as a reminder that this (possible) lack of realism or “eschatological perfectionism” is peculiar to this idiosyncratic interpretation of the gospel. Or (pace Wire and Castelli) to mean that Paul is not being personally authoritarian, but reflecting the “ordered” realism (τάξις) of the wider church and its varied
1 Corinthians 11:16, ‘we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God’: correction of the Corinthian lack of head coverings.


803 Paul concludes that if any want to contend this apostolic tradition, they need to take note that neither Paul nor the churches of God have any other practice.’, Carson, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

804 Thus, he finishes his remarks on a weighty note: Should someone object to Paul’s arguments, teaching, or reasoning; then that person must realize that Paul’s position is a universal norm, for it is the practice… of the churches of God, and according to the practices of those churches, what was happening in Corinth was inappropriate’, Soards (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 227 (1999).

805 But Paul has no intention of arguing the matter with anyone given to wordy battles (contentious, philoneikos, means someone who loves strife). Such people are capable of prolonging an argument indefinitely. In the face of such an attitude Paul points to universal Christian custom; Christians have no other practice. Exactly who he means by we is not clear; it may mean Paul himself, or the apostles generally, or those with him when he wrote the letter. But the nor do the churches of God shows that what he has outlined is the common practice throughout the churches’, Morris, ‘1 Corinthians: An introduction and commentary’, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, volume 7, p. 153 (1985).

806 b. “We do not have such a custom, nor do the churches of God.” Paul refuses to be challenged on his teachings that are based on the Old Testament Scriptures. He knows that the rest of the apostles support him, and therefore he confidently writes the personal pronoun we. This is not the so-called editorial we, but an inclusive pronoun that embraces other leaders in the churches’, Kistemaker, ‘Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians’, Baker New Testament Commentary, volume 18, p. 383 (1993).


808 Paul reserves one final argument for those unpersuaded by his former points. One philosophical group called the Skeptics rejected all arguments except an almost universally accepted one: the argument from custom—“that’s just not the way it’s done.”, Keener (egalitarian), ‘The IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament’ (1993).
• 1 Corinthians 14:33, ‘As in all the churches of the saints’: correction of the speaking of women in the congregation.

810 \(\text{It seems self-evident that the custom (συνήθειαν) to which Paul alludes concerns gender distinctions in public worship, which, as Murphy-O’Connor urged, are addressed both to men and to women equally. The custom is the acceptance of an equality of status in accordance with which woman may lead in public prayer or preaching (see below on prophecy) side by side with a recognition that gender differences must not be blurred but appreciated, valued, and expressed in appropriate ways in response to God’s unrevoked decree.},\) Thiselton, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 847 (2000).

811 \(33–36\) deals with an aspect of the role of wives in the church. Some commentators get round the problem by stating that this section is a later addition and not by Paul. But every manuscript includes this passage. Three points need to be noted in seeking to understand the passage, (i) Wives prayed and prophesied in Christian gatherings (see 11:5). \(\text{This was a common practice in all the apostolic churches (33b). The context is crucial viz. the evaluation of prophecy (v 35). (ii) The law requires the acknowledgement of the distinctive roles of men and women (34), a reference to Gn. 2:20–24 or 3:16. Paul has already cited the former in 11:8–9. (iii) The wife is to seek the elucidation of points at home, which could well mean that it is her husband who has given the prophecy (35). While there is no absolute certainty, the present writer takes the view that wives, in this public gathering, are not to engage in the public weighing of prophecy which involved the interrogation of its content.},\) Carson, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

811 \(\text{The phrase does seem to fit less awkwardly with verse 34, so that one finds a reference to church custom and then an example of it in the mention of women’s silence.},\) Soards (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 305 (1999).

812 \(\text{‘If As in all the congregations of the saints (cf. 4:17) goes with this verse, Paul is calling on the Corinthians to conform to accepted Christian practice.’},\) Morris, ‘1 Corinthians: An introduction and commentary’, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, volume 7, p. 192 (1985).

813 \(\text{‘However, the expression churches reflects nuances: the first occurrence ("As in all the churches of the saints") alludes to churches in general and the second ("let the women keep silent in the churches") to worship services. Conversely, verse 33b is not the only place in his epistles where Paul exhibits a lack of exemplary style. We assume that he is concerned not about elegance but rather about providing the churches with rules to bolster unity and harmony (compare 4:17; 7:17; 11:16)—concerns that he has emphasized throughout the epistle.’},\) Kistemaker, ‘Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians’, Baker New Testament Commentary, volume 18, p. 511 (1993).
1 Timothy 3:14-15, ‘I am writing these instructions to you in case I am delayed, to let you know how people ought to conduct themselves in the household of God’: directing Timothy to understand how all ecclesias should be organized, a summary of the purpose of this entire letter.\footnote{181} 816 817 818 819 820 821

\footnote{814} One may say, for example, “This is what happens in all the churches of God’s people.\textquoteleft\textquoteright, Ellingworth, Hatton, & Ellingworth, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 324 (1995).

\footnote{815} With these two images, family and temple, Paul expresses the two urgencies of this letter: his concern over proper behavior among believers vis-à-vis the false teachers, and the church as the people entrusted to uphold and proclaim the truth of the gospel.’, Fee (egalitarian), ‘1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 92 (rev ed. 1988)

\footnote{816} These instructions is literally “these things,” which can be taken in a general sense as referring to the whole letter (as in TEV “as I write this letter”), or in a specific sense as referring to the instructions regarding the appointment of church leaders described in this chapter, which is what RSV seems to suggest. The first interpretation seems to be the more likely one and is recommended by this Handbook.’, Arichea (egalitarian), & Hatton, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s letters to Timothy and to Titus’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 79 (1995).

\footnote{817} Paul’s prior admonitions to Timothy, especially in 3:1–13, thus serve a function analogous to the household codes of many ancient writers: providing a specific framework of wisdom for administrating the family unit and society.’, Keener (egalitarian), ‘The IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament’ (1993).

\footnote{818} The \textit{qua} clause then introduces the reason for Paul’s writing: \textit{so that Timothy and the church may know what is proper conduct for God’s household}—with the implicit understanding that such knowledge will result in that kind of conduct.’, Knight (complementarian), ‘The Pastoral Epistles’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 179 (1992).

\footnote{819} In emphasizing how important it is that people conduct themselves properly in the household of God, Paul has already pointed out that the church is the house of God,’ Mounce (complementarian), ‘Pastoral Epistles’, Word Biblical Commentary, volume 46, p. 221 (2002).

\footnote{820} Here Paul breaks off his direct instructions to describe the nature of the church, putting his teaching into perspective.’, Carson, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

\footnote{821} Paul authorizes Timothy to instruct the Ephesian church on ‘how one ought to behave in the household of God’ (1 Tim. 3:15). Included in his instructions are
Paul corrects these local situations in universal terms of the Scripturally 'right way' of doing things, not as temporary emergency measures applied to local circumstances.\textsuperscript{822} \textsuperscript{823}

He aims to standardize practices throughout all the ecclesias, correcting local errors by ensuring they conform to universal practices.

\textbf{guidelines for men and women in church} (ch. 2). Men are to pray without anger or argument (v. 8), and women are to adorn themselves with good works rather than with extravagant dress (vv. 9–10). \textit{Moreover, a woman is to 'learn in silence with full submission' (v. 11).} Then Paul explains more fully what this silence with full submission entails: ‘\textit{I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man}’ (v. 12).’, Ortlund, ‘Man and Woman’, in Alexander & Rosner, ‘New Dictionary of Biblical Theology’ (electronic ed. 2001).

\textsuperscript{822} 1 Corinthians 11:16 If anyone intends to quarrel about this, we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God.

\textsuperscript{823} 1 Corinthians 14: 34 the women should be silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak. Rather, let them be in submission, as in fact the law says.; 37 If anyone considers himself a prophet or spiritual person, he should acknowledge that what I write to you is the Lord’s command. 38 If someone does not recognize this, he is not recognized.
Interpretive errors: misuse of background information

Irrelevant material

One error into which commentators may fall is to apply irrelevant background material to the text, ignoring or overlooking the criteria of 'relevant proximity', criteria which are used to identify whether or not a source is sufficiently close to the text being examined (chronologically, geographically, socio-culturally, and in terms of literary genre), to be relevant to its interpretation.

One very common form of this error is to use anachronistic sources, sources which do not belong to the time frame of the text being studied, and which are separated from the text by so many years as to be irrelevant to it.

In his book ‘Women in the Earliest Churches’ (1998), egalitarian commentator Ben Witherington III commits the error of using sources describing Greek women in 400 BCE as if they were relevant to women in 1st century Judea, who lived more than 400 years later in a completely different time and place.

'The first chapter is disappointing. The author rightly observes that "no study of women in the New Testament can be undertaken without looking at the larger historical context in which the events of NT history transpired" (p. 5).

His chapter on "Women in first-century Mediterranean cultures", however, deals with women in fifth century B.C. Athens and Sparta as if the chronological interval of four or five centuries does not count.825

Later Witherington commits the same error several times. He takes a quote from Herodotus about Macdonian women and quotes it as if it was relevant to Macedon 200 years later, then claims that this is

824 Cited by Ian and Averil, ‘All One’, p. 73 (2010), which is the edition available on the ‘sistersspeak’ website at the time of writing (http://www.sistersspeak.info/images/stories/pdf/AOICJ.pdf); this document is dated 2010 on the cover page, but this web version was created from a Word document in February 2011, according to the document’s metadata.

relevant to the background of 1st century women in Philippi another 300 years later again.

'The chapter abounds in major and minor errors. To give some examples: in the discussion of the prominence of women of the Macedonian dynasties during the Hellenistic period he quotes a passage from the work of Herodotus, who had died two centuries before, as evidence (p. 12 and note 65).

Further, this favourable position of women within Macedonian royal families is taken to be representative for Macedonian women in general and is used as an argument to explain the existence of female cooperators in the propagation of the Gospel at Philippi in the days of the apostles (p. 112).'

Similarly, in attempting to describe 1st century women in Judea Withington omits a large collection of relevant 1st century sources, relying on rabbinic literature written after the 1st century instead.

'He relies almost exclusively on rabbinic literature, especially Mishnaic material which is most easily datable. He makes minimal use of non-literary texts (such as gravestones, government documents, or graffiti), art, or archeological remains, thereby excluding many recent discoveries which broaden the "traditional" view of women in the first century.'

Withington’s selectivity with regard to sources is compounded by his appeal to out of date publications.

Inappropriate use

A typical error is using generalized background material to draw specific conclusions about individual passages.

---


828 ‘Moreover, he cites publications that are outdated, and bases his opinions on a small number of texts which he uses without any regard to their context’, de Blois & Hemelrijk, Review of Women in the Earliest Churches by Ben Witherington III’, Mnemosyne, Fourth Series (45.2.279), 1992.
Arnold rightly documents the pervasiveness of magic in Asia Minor during the period when Colossians was written. What is lacking, however, is any firm evidence that magic was actually the problem in the letter to the Colossians. There is no reference in Colossians itself to magic, spells, invocations, conjurations, sorcery, etc.\textsuperscript{829}

In this case a generalized background of magical practice was misread back into a text which made no specific reference to it.

Specific passages should instead be used to identify specific background material relevant to the passage itself, to avoid reading irrelevant background material into the passage.\textsuperscript{830}

In another example of the same error, the worship of Artemis is assumed as the relevant background of 1 Timothy, despite the fact that the entire letter makes absolutely no reference to it whatsoever.\textsuperscript{831} On the basis of a couple of references to very general sins, an entire argument is built that 1 Timothy is warning of the dangerous influence on the ecclesia of an ‘Artemis cult’.

This kind of selective treatment of the historical evidence is extremely bad historical analysis, and results in completely inaccurate interpretations of the text. Drawing specific conclusions on the meaning of the text from such vague generalizations as ‘sexual impurity’ and ‘greed’ is invalid.\textsuperscript{832,833}

\textsuperscript{829} Schreiner (complementarian), ‘Interpreting the Pauline Epistles’, Southern Baptist Journal of Theology (3.9), 1999.

\textsuperscript{830} ‘Many religious movements vied for the attention of the populace in the first century. We need primary evidence from the letter itself to establish a particular religious influence in the letter under consideration.’, ibid., p. 9.

\textsuperscript{831} ‘Sharon Hodgin Gritz falls prey to the same error in her analysis of 1 Timothy when she posits the influence of the mother goddess Artemis cult. Certainly such a cult functioned in Ephesus, but Hodgin Gritz fails to show that the cult lies behind the situation in 1 Timothy.’, ibid., p. 9.

\textsuperscript{832} ‘To see a connection with the Artemis cult on the basis of sexual impurity (1 Tim 5:11-14) and greed (1 Tim 6:3-5) is unpersuasive, for these sins, as we all know, may emerge in almost any religious movement.’, ibid., p. 9.

\textsuperscript{833} ‘Hodgin Gritz does not explain adequately how myths and genealogies (1 Tim 1:3-4), devotion to the Mosaic law (1 Tim 1:8-11), asceticism (1 Tim 4:1-3), and knowledge (1
Witherington’s reliance on post-1st century rabbinic data results in him treating 1st century Judaism as if all Jewish groups held the same views on women, when in fact a wide variety of views were held. 834

Neglecting the criteria of genre and chronology, Witherington treats various theological expositions, opinions, and diatribes of the post-1st century rabbis, as accurate historical descriptions.

‘Witherington also makes no distinction between reality and what may be the opinions, theological interpretations, and polemics of the rabbis. Instead of meeting its goal, what this chapter provides is a summary of the rabbinic ideal for women and their role in society.’ 835

Adding to these mistakes, Witherington makes historical errors with regard to dates, uncritically reads one source as literal, 836 and mistakes a literary character with a real woman, another example of lack of attention to genre. 837

Tim 6:20-21) relate to the Artemis cult. The features of the Artemis cult appear to be superimposed upon the contents of 1 Timothy. 835

834 ‘While rightly holding that there is no monolithic rabbinic Judaism at this time, he nevertheless treats first-century Judaism as a fairly uniform system. He concludes that, concerning women, “a negative assessment was predominant among the rabbis” (p. 10). No attempt is made to separate out the position of women held by different Jewish sects.’ De George, ‘Reviewed of Women in the Ministry of Jesus: A Study of Jesus’ Attitudes to Women and Their Roles as Reflected in His Earthly Life by Ben Witherington III’, Journal of Biblical Literature (105.4.275), 1986.

835 Ibid., p. 725.

836 ‘He takes Diodorus’ remarks about female dominance in Egypt literally (p. 14), whereas it more probably is part of a widespread Greek topos of Egypt as a world in reverse).’ de Blois & Hemelrijk, Review of Women in the Earliest Churches by Ben Witherington III’, Mnemosyne, Fourth Series (45.2.279-280), 1992; a ‘topos’ in this context is a literary theme which recurs in texts over time, a standardized ‘theme’ or narrative structure, such as the ‘three sons’ who recur in the fairy tales by Hans Christian Andersen and many other fairy tales (the oldest two sons are typically vain, proud, or ignorant and fail as a result, while the youngest is kind, well-mannered, and fortunate and thus succeeds).

837 ‘Some minor errors: Thucydides did not live in about 400 B.C. (p. 6), he died probably around that date, Diotima (p. 7 and note 18) was no historical woman, but a literary fiction (Plato, Symp. 201 D). Sempronia was not the wife of Catilina (written
Witherington also misuses his sources by projecting his own values onto them.\footnote{On p. 14 he regards the Egyptian goddess Isis as “the patron saint of Egyptian’s women’s movement”, \textit{an anachronistic and misleading point of view}. She was a mother goddess\footnote{ibid., p. 279}.}
Paul knew how his statements sounded

As with Jewish society, 1st century Greco-Roman society contained a wide range of attitudes towards women, from the misogynist to the egalitarian.839

From this socio-historical background, we know that private associations were free to decide on their own codes of conduct even if these breached social norms,840 and that 1st century Christian women (whether Jews or Gentiles), would have had reasonable expectations of participating in the congregational worship as a result of their previous religious experiences.

Paul would therefore have been aware of how his commandments concerning women sounded, and accordingly sought to soften the message.841 842 843

839 ‘But studies of Roman society have found a variety of indicators about the status of women, and what was true about women in the eastern part of the empire was not necessarily true about women in the western empire. On the one hand, there was the household headed by the husband/father/master, a hierarchical order-obedience structure that included those who were economically dependent. On the other hand, there were emancipatory ideas about women that allowed them greater freedom and economic independence (some were even the heads of households).’, Tanzer (egalitarian), ’Eph 5:22-33 Wives (and Husbands) Exhorted’, in Meyers, Craven, & Kraemer, ‘Women in scripture: a dictionary of named and unnamed women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament’, p. 481 (2001).

840 ‘Whereas in the larger outside world, both Roman control and residual customs mitigated against mixing men and women, slave and free, foreign and religious practice; in the voluntary associations there was a lively atmosphere in which these mixes could be tried out and experienced without threat of larger social catastrophe or consequences.’, Nerney, & Taussig, ‘Re-Imagining Life Together in America: A New Gospel of Community’, p. 12 (2002).

841 ‘a “mitigation,” “softening of the blow,” or “saving phrase” to make the statement, assertion, or command less offensive to women.’, Walker, (egalitarian) ‘The “Theology of Woman’s Place” And the “Paulinist” Tradition’, Semeia (28.106), 1983.

842 ‘In 11:11–12, however, he backtracks lest the Corinthians become confused and think that he implies that women are inferior to men. He is not attempting to establish a gender hierarchy that places women in a subordinate role. Since he argues from hierarchy to make his case about head coverings, he needs to caution against any misapplication of what he says. Women and men are interdependent in the
Egalitarian scholars have noted this particular feature of Paul's commandments, in the seven passages in which he gives commandments concerning the relationship of men and women in the ecclesia and the family using a formulated style.

1 Corinthians 11:3-16:

- **Commandment:** Women's heads should be covered when praying and prophesying
- **Reason:** The woman is the glory of the man, woman came from man, woman was created for man, and because of the angels
- **Mitigation:** In the Lord woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman; just as woman came from man, so man comes through woman, but all things come from God

1 Corinthians 14:34-35:

- **Commandment:** Women should be silent in the ecclesias, they are not permitted to speak
- **Reason:** Let them be in submission, as the Law says; it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church
- **Mitigation:** If they want to find out about something, they should ask their husbands at home

Ephesians 5:22-25:

- **Commandment:** Wives, submit to your husbands
- **Reason:** The husband is the head of the wife
- **Mitigation:** Husbands, love your wives and do not be embittered against them

---


843 'In other contexts, among some gentiles, Paul's moral conservatism and reaffirmation of traditional roles for women would have appeared too confining (this appears to have been the case in Corinth).', Witherington (egalitarian), 'Women (New Testament)', in Freedman (ed.), 'Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary', volume 6, p. 959 (1996).
Colossians 3:18-19:

- **Commandment**: Wives, submit to your husbands
- **Reason**: It is fitting in the Lord
- **Mitigation**: Husbands, love your wives as Christ loved the ecclesia

1 Timothy 2:8-15:

- **Commandment**: Women must learn in all submissiveness; I do not permit a woman to teach or to hold authority over a man, she must remain quiet
- **Reason**: Adam was formed first, and then Eve, and Adam was not deceived but the woman, being deceived, fell into transgression
- **Mitigation**: She will be delivered through ‘childbearing’, if she continues in faith and love and holiness with self-control

Titus 2:4-5:

- **Commandment**: Wives are to be subject to their own husbands
- **Reason**: So that the message of God is not discredited
- **Mitigation**: [not explicit]

---

844 The precise meaning of the Greek word here is a matter of interpretation; the majority of commentators understand it as a figure of speech for the role of the woman as wife and mother, sometimes as ‘motherhood’, such as EDNT, ‘According to 1 Tim 2:15 in its interpretation of Gen 3:16, bearing children / motherhood is the special task of women, including according to v. 15b a life in faith (possibly a reference to the rearing of children in faith; cf. b. Ber. 17a): σωθήσεται δι’ τ’ υἱονευόμενον’, Balz & Schneider, ‘Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament’, volume 3, p. 340 (1990-c1993), and ANLEX, ‘bearing children, childbearing, motherhood (1T 2.15)’, Friberg, Friberg, & Miller ‘Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament’, volume 4, p. 376 (2000); The final interpretation may be termed “the majority view.” 44 This view would hold that Christian women are not saved through teaching and asserting authority, but by attention to their traditional role. “Childbearing” serves as a figure of speech to illustrate Paul’s argument that women need not behave as men but rather fulfill their divinely appointed role to find salvation.’, Moss (complementarian), ‘1, 2 Timothy & Titus’, College Press NIV Commentary (1994).
All these passages contain instructions concerning the role and relationship of women in the ecclesia and in the family which Paul knew would be seen by women themselves as placing limits on their participation in the ecclesia and placing them under the authority of their husbands, and which he sought to soften in some way as a result.

Four of these passages appeal explicitly to other passages of Scripture for support,\(^\text{845}\) and none are explained as a response to an existing local situation, nor justified as just a cultural accommodation.\(^\text{846}\)

\(^{845}\) 1 Corinthians 11:7-9; 14:34, 1 Timothy 2:13-14, 1 Peter 3:5-6.

\(^{846}\) The commandment in Titus 2:5 for wives to submit to their husbands is justified here by 'So that the message of God is not discredited', but the same commandment is also accompanied by two additional reasons elsewhere; Ephesians 5:23, 'The husband is the head of the wife', Colossians 3:18, 'It is fitting in the Lord'.

196
Egalitarians agreeing with complementarians

The following quotations are taken from notable supporters of the egalitarian case for the role of women in the ecclesia;\textsuperscript{847} note that even these supporters of the egalitarian case acknowledge it is not taught in the Bible.

Some of these quotations were presented in my previous work, ‘A Sister’s Role’. Ian and Averil responded with an inaccurate accusation towards the authors of these quotations:

‘Comment: It is illuminating to see Brother Burke’s use here of non-Christadelphian commentators. We examine critically what each says, but their arguments tend to be: “The Bible is patriarchal. It says that men should rule women. We don’t accept that, so we reject the Bible”. We consider that they adopt the traditional, male-clergy-orientated assumptions too uncritically; and examination of their views on traditional orthodox church teachings such as on the Devil and the Trinity would show the same. To quote them, therefore, to back up Brother Burke’s argument is not acceptable to those of us who do believe the Bible.’\textsuperscript{848}

Despite Ian and Averil’s claim that ‘We examine critically what each say’,\textsuperscript{849} none of the authors quoted make the argument Ian and Averil wrongly attribute to them.\textsuperscript{850}

Ian and Averil acknowledge that they haven’t even read the work of one of the authors quoted,\textsuperscript{851} and it is clear that they haven’t read the works of any of the other authors quoted either. If they had, they would certainly not have charged them wrongly with rejecting the Bible.

\textsuperscript{847} All of them are individuals who believe the Bible is inspired, do not believe the Bible is the misogynistic product of a patriarchal society, and believe on the contrary that the Bible is highly liberating of women; they are not ‘anti-Bible’ nor are they ‘feminist’ in the secular meaning of the term.

\textsuperscript{848} ‘Reply 2’, p. 100 (April 2009).

\textsuperscript{849} Ibid. p. 100.

\textsuperscript{850} ‘…their arguments tend to be: “The Bible is patriarchal. It says that men should rule women. We don’t accept that, so we reject the Bible.”’, ibid., p. 100.

\textsuperscript{851} ‘We have not read Professor Sparks’ book’, ibid., p. 113.
In any case, it would be inconsistent of Ian and Averil to object to
these authors even if they did reject the Bible, since Ian and Averil
themselves are content to appeal directly to authors who cast doubt on
significant parts of the Bible, in support of their own arguments.

Although his attitude to authorship differs from the other authors
quoted in this section, Ian Marshall’s comments on the interpretation of
Paul are included here because Ian and Averil are apparently content with
him as a commentator despite the fact that he does not believe Paul wrote
1-2 Timothy and Titus.

Furthermore, Marshall does not reject these letters as non-
canonical, or dismiss them as non-authoritative. Marshall believes they
belong in the canon, and sees them an authoritative part of the Bible,
which he defends completely:852

’Nevertheless, for our part, we must insist that we do hold to
the authority of Scripture, and that the issue is one of the
correct exegesis and interpretation of Scripture.’ 853

Readers can make up their own minds as to the validity of
Marshall’s comments and the relevance of his attitude to the authorship of
1-2 Timothy and Titus. Contrary to what Ian and Averil would have their
readers believe, all of the commentators quoted in this section are
individuals who believe the Bible is inspired, do not believe the Bible is
the misogynistic product of a patriarchal society, and believe on the
contrary that the Bible is highly liberating of women.

They are not ‘anti-Bible’ nor are they ‘feminist’ in the secular
meaning of the term. All of them are egalitarians, and therefore biased in
favour of the egalitarian case, but they are sufficiently honest to
acknowledge that the case simply does not receive textual support from
Scripture.

852 Horrel, quoted later in this section, also believes 1-2 Timothy and Titus were
written by someone other than Paul, but likewise sees them as belonging in the
canon, and an authoritative part of the Bible.

853 Marshall, ’Women in Ministry’, in Husbands & Larsen, ’Women, ministry and the
This does not prevent them supporting the egalitarian case, and indeed all suggest various alternative methods for promoting their cause.

However, it is noteworthy that even these strong supporters of the egalitarian case are willing to acknowledge that it is not taught in the Bible.
Bruce Barron

Barron is a Presbyterian who is entirely in favour of the egalitarian case, and whose denomination has taken steps to enforce it rigorously. However, Barron is unconvinced by a number of egalitarian arguments, identifying 1 Timothy 2 as a clear passage which resists egalitarian efforts to circumvent it.

Barron identifies the fact that egalitarians typically seek to avoid this passage by ‘trumping’ it with alternative texts which (they claim), it contradicts. For Barron, the main problem remains, however:

‘All this helps the egalitarian cause, but a convincing, comprehensive reading of 1 Timothy 2 is still needed.’

Barron notes egalitarian weaknesses in addressing this passage:

‘First, defenders of the traditional view have argued that Paul’s

---

854 ‘My own denomination, the Presbyterian Church (USA), has not stopped at legitimizing women’s ordination, but has actually gone so far as to make it compulsory: Each congregation must have female representation in each year’s contingent of incoming elders. When a Presbyterian church near my home resisted, the presbytery sent an ecclesiastical commission out to berate the congregation until it agreed to nominate woman elders.’ Barron, ‘Putting Women In Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 And Evangelical Views Of Women In Church Leadership ’, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society (33.4.452), December 1990.

855 ‘On the other hand, 1 Timothy 2 is clear in its language, and the egalitarians’ efforts to reinterpret the passage’s intent have often seemed contrived—“hermeneutical oddities,” as our CBMW colleagues have termed them.’ ibid., pp. 452-453.

856 ‘Fully aware that the hypothetical nature of their reconstructions of 1 Timothy 2 remains their Achilles’ heel, egalitarians have sought to neutralize this frontal assault by outflanking their opponents. That is, while awaiting a satisfactory exegesis of the passage they seek to hamstring their critics by pointing out that Gal 3:28 (“In Christ there is... neither male nor female”) is just as clear and justifiable a point of departure on the topic as 1 Timothy 2, that Paul named women leaders and affirmed their ministries several times in the NT, and that if traditionalists want to treat 1 Tim 2:11–12 as normative for today they should also be telling men to lift their hands when they pray (1 Tim 2:8) and resuscitating the category of older widows as a special group in the Church (1 Timothy 5).’ ibid., p. 453.

857 Ibid., p. 453.
blanket statement, "I do not permit a woman to teach," sounds universal. If what he really meant was "I do not permit a woman to teach error," and that he would have no objection to women teaching once they got their doctrine straight, why did he not say that? Kroeger received criticism even from a fellow egalitarian for failing to deal with this point.16 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 858 below]1859

Barron also criticizes the common egalitarian claim that Paul forbade women to teach temporarily because they were insufficiently educated, pointing out that egalitarians also claim (in complete contradiction), that women were teaching in the ecclesias because they were sufficiently educated and doctrinally sound.860

For Barron, the best egalitarian attempt to address the difficulty of 1 Timothy 2 is the argument made by Catherine Kroeger:

"The most promising effort has come from classicist Catherine Kroeger, but her major work on the passage, presented in 1984 and published in 1986, has not been pursued further."861

Barron attempts to extend Kroeger’s argument, apparently unaware that it has been systematically rejected as inaccurate by a consensus of complementarian, egalitarian, and secular scholars due to its historical inaccuracies and lexical errors.

858 16. Liefeld, “Response to Kroeger” 245’.

859 Ibid., p. 455.

860 ‘And egalitarians are in no position to interpret Paul’s dictum as a temporary prohibition, needed until women could surmount cultural obstacles to education—not when, out of the other side of their mouths, these egalitarians are championing women (one of whom, Priscilla, labored in Ephesus) who did fulfill a teaching or leadership role in the NT.17 Not all women of Paul’s day were intellectually impoverished or hopelessly contaminated by pagan practices, yet Paul seems to prohibit all women from teaching in Ephesus. The egalitarians seem forced into the implausible claim that no woman in the Ephesian church was sufficiently orthodox and educated to teach.’, ibid., pp. 455-456.

861 Ibid., p. 453.
Egalitarian scholar Kathleen Corley has spoken of the resistance she has experienced when explaining certain historical facts to the egalitarian public:

'From time to time Corley has given a talk titled 'Feminist Myths of Christian Origins," in which she critiques what she calls ‘the myth that the behaviour and teachings of Jesus established an unprecedented and revolutionary model for the full acceptance of the personhood of women, reversing earlier and stricter Jewish codes which defined women as mere chattel.'

The first time she gave it, she told me, "Many people were deeply disturbed. They would come up to me and they would say, 'But we really want him to be a revolutionary. How would you define him?"

And I would say, 'Interesting. Notable. In this context, notable. It is a notable aspect of Jesus' movement that there are women there. There are not women everywhere. There are women in a lot of places, but they are not everywhere, and they are here, in the Jesus movement. And that is notable. It is a point of interest.' And they would just look at me and confess that they didn't like that.

Corley acknowledges the position of women within the early Christian community, but also draws attention to the fact that none of this was unique.

Corley explains, from personal experience, the dismay many egalitarians feel when confronted by historical findings which contradict the image of Jesus they have built up for themselves:
"There is resistance," Corley went on to say, "because it's such a politically and socially useful thing to be able to say that Jesus was on the side of women in antiquity. It's usable, and in women's history there's always the struggle over finding not just the past but a usable past.

A lot of women like the revolutionary/social-radical model of Jesus. And I could tell that they were uncomfortable with what I had to say, because they needed Jesus to be a social radical for their own personal faith. They were surprised that a feminist biblical scholar got up and said, 'Well, you know, maybe he wasn't.'

Maybe he was just a Jewish guy who had a number of women in his group, like Simon bar Gioras did, and this does not necessarily separate him in a radical way, in a tremendous way, from his Palestinian environment.'

I can understand the resistance. I too wanted to find the egalitarian Jesus. I was a conservative woman driven to study biblical texts, and an egalitarian Jesus would be a tremendously helpful thing, given that I was working in a context in which people followed Paul's model that women are not to speak in church." 864

She contrasts a typically optimistic egalitarian reading of the gospels, with a more realistic approach.865 Corley's conclusion is that Jesus' actions and teachings concerning women have been misrepresented in order to promote a social agenda.866

864 Ibid., p. 143-144.

865 'The story of Martha and Mary, for instance, is often cited approvingly for its implied suggestion that it is not improper to give a woman rabbinic instruction in matters of the law. In this story Mary is described as seated at the feet of Jesus. "Although such a pose does indicate that Mary is receiving instruction," Corley has noted, "her posture also reflects a more conservative, matronly scene, and she remains silent throughout the whole scene. The more radical stance would have been to invite Mary to recline with him like an equal on a banquet couch," as a man would have been invited to do.', ibid., p. 146.

866 While this study affirms the role of women in Jesus' own community and in subsequent Jesus movements, it challenges both the assumption that Jesus himself fought ancient patriarchal limitations on women and the hypothesis that the
Charles Cosgrove

Cosgrove acknowledges that despite the extremely favourable treatment of women by Jesus and Paul, neither issued any commandment for a revision of the roles of men and women. 867 868

On the contrary, Cosgrove continues, in those passages which actually contain specific instructions concerning the theological roles of men and women, the established roles are reinforced rather than overturned. 869

In ‘Reply 2’, Ian and Averil wrongly accuse Cosgrove of saying that the New Testament writers did not practice what they preached:

presence of women among his disciples was unique within Hellenistic Judaism. Rather, an analysis of Jesus’ teaching suggests that while Jesus censured the class and status distinctions of his culture, that critique did not extend to unequal gender distinctions. The notion that Jesus established an anti-patriarchal movement or a “discipleship of equals” is a myth posited to buttress modern Christian social engineering., Corley, ’Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins’ (2002).

867 Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels treats women in ways that go against the status quo; his practice transgresses the cultural norms and boundaries that define gender relations and women’s proper roles in society. Likewise, Paul counts women as his partners, as patrons, as prophets, and apostles; and he teaches his churches that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female. Nevertheless, there are no direct prophetic admonitions or arguments in the Gospels or Paul’s letters calling for new social relations between men and women. Apart from Gospel stories that might be taken as exemplary for Christians (e.g., Jesus with Martha and Mary), instructions on discipleship and community life do not include calls for egalitarian gender practice., Cosgrove, ’Appealing to Scripture in Moral Debate: Five Hermeneutical Rules’, p. 187 (2002).

868 Moreover, where gender relations are directly addressed, the instructions for specific behaviours reinforce the cultural status quo (1 Tim. 2:11-15 being the most notable example). Thus, the New Testament writers, to the extent that they have a vision of gender equality in Christ, do not translate that vision into direct paraenesis, exhortation, or instruction for community formation., ibid., p. 187.

869 Moreover, where gender relations are directly addressed, the instructions for specific behaviours reinforce the cultural status quo (1 Tim. 2:11-15 being the most notable example). Thus, the New Testament writers, to the extent that they have a vision of gender equality in Christ, do not translate that vision into direct paraenesis, exhortation, or instruction for community formation., ibid., p. 187.
'Basically, Professor Cosgrove considers that the New Testament writers don’t practice what they preach.\textsuperscript{870}

On the contrary, Cosgrove makes it clear that he believes the New Testament writers did practice what they preached. He believes they preached a treatment of women which in some ways went ‘against the status quo’, \textsuperscript{871} but not in other ways, and that this is what they practiced.

\textsuperscript{870} ‘Reply 2’, p. 124 (April 2009).

John Elliott

Elliott recognizes that women had some leadership positions, but rejects typical egalitarian claims.\textsuperscript{872} \textsuperscript{873} \textsuperscript{874} In the interests of intellectual honesty he finds that he cannot accept the egalitarian claim:

>'But, as the historical and ideological critic in all of us insists, wishing and politically correct ideology cannot not make it so. Ultimately, this well-intentioned theory is an unhappy example of anachronism and idealist thinking that must be challenged not just because it is indemonstrable or an example of flawed interpretation but also because it is so seductive.'\textsuperscript{875}

>'By imputing to the biblical authors a modern concept of equality that is not found in the Bible and the ancient world and by allowing this imputed concept to determine their interpretation of the New Testament, they have produced an interpretation that distorts and obscures the actual content and thrust of these texts.'\textsuperscript{876}

\textsuperscript{872} With every fibre of my egalitarian being I wish it were demonstrable that the Jesus movement had been egalitarian, at least at some point in its early history,' Elliott, 'The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian but Family-Oriented', Biblical Interpretation (11. 2.204), 2003.

\textsuperscript{873} That women were prophets is no indication of an egalitarian revolution (against Schüssler Fiorenza 1983:235), since women prophets existed in the patriarchal world prior to the Jesus movement (Luke 2:36-38). That women assumed leadership roles in the Jesus movement likewise can be attributed to their prior social status rather than to the egalitarian revolution imagined by Schüssler Fiorenza (1983: 235).', ibid, p. 184.

\textsuperscript{874} The claim made that the Jesus movement was egalitarian involves flawed reasoning and an anachronistic, ethnocentric, and ideologically-driven reading of the New Testament. Feminist scholars including Mary Rose D'Angelo (1992), Amy-Jill Levine (1994), and Kathleen E. Corley (1998), are likewise rejecting the egalitarian theory, objecting, inter alia, to its lack of historical support and its isolation of Jesus from his Israelite matrix', Elliott, 'Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian. A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory', Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology (32.2.90), 2002.

\textsuperscript{875} Ibid., pp. 205-206.

Elliott also points out that the egalitarian case has experienced strong opposition from feminist scholars, not on the basis of prejudice but due to lack of historical evidence:

'The claim that the Jesus movement was egalitarian involves flawed reasoning and an anachronistic, ethnocentric, and ideologically-driven reading of the New Testament. Feminist scholars including Mary Rose D’Angelo (1992), Amy-Jill Levine (1994), and Kathleen E. Corley (1998), are likewise rejecting the egalitarian theory, objecting, inter alia, to its lack of historical support and its isolation of Jesus from his Israelite matrix.'

877 Ibid., p. 90.
Richard Hays

Hays insists readers of Paul's words must acknowledge Paul's theological views concerning the role of women in the ecclesia are not in harmony with the egalitarian case, and cannot be made to fit.\textsuperscript{878 879 880}

He sees in 1 Corinthians 11 a hierarchy in which man is placed by God as the head of the woman.\textsuperscript{881 882}

Since the context carries no markers indicating that only husbands and wives are spoken of in 1 Corinthians 11, Hays sees the passage as applying to all men and women in the congregation.\textsuperscript{883}


\textsuperscript{879} In his missionary work he joyfully acknowledges the contributions of female colleagues, fellow 'workers in the Lord.' Yet in some passages, such as 1 Corinthians 11:3-16, he insists — with labored and unpersuasive theological arguments — on the maintenance of traditional markers of sexual distinction; despite the ingenious efforts of exegetes at the end of the twentieth century, it is impossible to deny the hierarchical implications of such symbolic markers., ibid., p. 55.

\textsuperscript{880} Indeed, Paul seems to have found the Corinthian church's experiments in gender equality somewhat unsettling; consequently, he sought to constrain what he saw as excess., ibid., p. 55.

\textsuperscript{881} Paul comes at the Corinthians' question about head coverings indirectly, by first positing a hierarchical chain of being in verse 3 in which the word "head (kephalē)" is given a metaphorical sense. (Some interpreters have tried to explain away the hierarchical implications of v.3 by arguing that kephalē means "source" rather than "ruler." This is a possible meaning of the word, and it fits nicely with v. 8, in which Paul alludes to the Genesis story that describes the creation of woman out of man; however, in view of the whole shape of the argument, the patriarchal implications of v. 3 are undeniable. Even if Paul is thinking here primarily of man as the source of women rather than authority over woman, this still serves as the warrant for a claim about his ontological preeminence over her, as vv. 7-9 show.), Hays, 'First Corinthians', Interpretation: a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, p. 184 (1997).

\textsuperscript{882} The covering or uncovering of the head is not merely a sign of individual freedom, Paul insists; rather, it signifies either respect or disrespect for one's superior in the hierarchy., ibid., p. 184.
Hays understands Paul to be reinforcing gender differentiation markers, even as he reinforces ‘functional’ equality. Hays is critical of egalitarian attempts to evade the force of this text:

‘Any honest appraisal of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 will require both teacher and students to confront the patriarchal implications of verses 3 and 7-9. Such **implications cannot be explained away by some technical move, such as translating kephalē as “source,” rather than “head,”** because the patriarchal assumptions **are imbedded in the structure of Paul’s argument**.’

---

883 ‘In the absence of any indicators to the contrary, it is **preferable to understand Paul’s directives here as applying to everyone in the community, married or unmarried**: women should have covered heads in worship; men should not.’, ibid., p. 185.

884 **The result is that Paul supports a functional equality of men and women in the church.** Women are free to pray and prophesy and exercise leadership of all sorts through the guidance of the Spirit, **so long as they maintain the external markers of gender difference, particularly with regard to head coverings.**, ibid., p. 189.

885 Ibid., p. 192.
David Horrell

Egalitarian historian David Horrell has written extensively on the leadership patterns in the early ecclesias. He is not motivated by any determination to depict the Bible unfavourably, or to argue that it is ‘anti-women’. On the contrary, he acknowledges that women did hold certain positions of responsibility within the early ecclesias.

However, Horrell points out that the 1st century ecclesial ‘Haustafeln’ (‘household code’), placed males at the head. Having said this, Horrell then goes on to make the point that this leadership given to men was not of the unrestrained patriarchalism of the surrounding culture, but a well balanced responsibility which ensured the care of those under the protection of the male leadership:

‘While these codes do indeed add theological legitimation to the established patterns of domestic domination, providing an ideology for the household, the demand for subordination on the part of the socially inferior is balanced by the demand for justice and consideration on the part of the powerful (see Horrell 1995: 230-33). The ethos of the instruction may indeed be appropriately labelled "love-patriarchalism," not merely patriarchalism (Theissen 1982: 107; MacDonald 1988: 102-22).’

Horrell finds that women did not occupy leadership positions within the apostolic ecclesias. On the contrary, he believes that such leadership was identified in Scripture as heretical, a contradiction of apostolic teaching.

---

886 Phoebe, for example, a diakonos of the church at Cenchreae, is described as a patron of many (Rom 16: 1-2),’ Horrell, ‘Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity’, Sociology of Religion, p. 326 (58.4.97).

887 ‘The Colossian and Ephesian Haustafeln address the same social groups in the same order: wives, husbands, children, fathers, slaves, masters (Col 3: 18-4: 1; Eph 5: 22-6:9). Women, children, and slaves are instructed to be submissive, the husbands, fathers, and masters are urged to be loving and just in their actions towards those under their care.’, ibid., p. 334.

888 Ibid., p. 334.

889 ‘Thus the author of the Pastoral Epistles supports and strengthens the position of the resident leaders in the churches of his time; he seeks to ensure that positions of
Discussing the 'household code', Horrell makes the point that the commandments for the ordering of the household are directed towards families rather than congregations, they still demonstrate the deliberate placing of leadership in the hands of males. Horrell demonstrates that the congregation was established on this same pattern of leadership, placing males at the head:

‘In these letters it becomes clear that the "household" pattern of instruction informs the pattern for the whole church and for the behavior of its subordinate members in relation to the church’s leadership.”

leadership are filled by those of an appropriate social standing – male heads of households. The Pastoral Epistles are also fiercely polemical letters that expend considerable energy in labelling the opponents as "despicable deviants”13 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 889 below] (e.g., 1 Tim 1: 4-7, 4: 1-3, 6: 3-10; 2 Tim 2: 14-26, 3: 1-9; Titus 1: 10-14).’ ibid., p. 331.

However, it seems clear that the "false" forms of the faith allow women to take leading roles, or at least, that women regard themselves as legitimate teachers and propagators of this faith. Why else would the author of 1 Timothy need to make the stern declaration: "I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent" (1 Tim 2: 12), a declaration which is then undergirded with legitimation drawn from the Genesis creation narratives (2: 13-14)? ibid., p. 331.

This can hardly with confidence be described as an itinerant form of missionary activity (though it may be that), but at the very least what we seem to encounter is a form of the faith, branded by the author of the Pastorals as false and Satanic, to which women are attracted and which they spread as they move from house to house (MacDonald 1988: 187-89). For the author of the letters, who sees an intimate connection between the structure of the household, leadership in the churches, and socially respectable behavior, such younger widows should "marry, bear children, and manage their households" (5: 14). Forms of the faith which operate outside of, or present a challenge to, the structure of the household are a threat,’ ibid., p. 331.

These Haustafeln relate to the domestic structure of the Greco-Roman household and display no explicit connection with church leadership or structure. Nevertheless, as MacDonald points out, "The Colossian and Ephesian Haustafeln represent a placing of power more firmly in the hands of the rulers of the households (husbands, fathers, masters), ensuring that leadership positions fall to members of this group’ (1988: 121-22). The significance of this is something to which we shall return.’ ibid., p. 334.

Ibid., p. 334.
Horrell is not alone in this view, and he cites repeatedly from the scholarly consensus to support his position.\textsuperscript{894} \textsuperscript{895} Horrell acknowledges that Paul may have had an egalitarian orientation in some way, but points out that even if he did, this was never reflected in ecclesial reality:

'This is not to deny that Paul \textit{may} have had a vision of the community as in some way 'egalitarian', \textit{but it certainly cannot simply be assumed that this ever or anywhere approximated to the reality encountered}.\textsuperscript{896}

\textsuperscript{894} In 1 Clement it is the men of the community who are addressed and given the responsibility for ensuring that the others, women and children, behave appropriately (Jeffers 1991: 123; Bowe 1988: 102; Lindemann 1992: 29; Horrell 1996 §6.4). As Campbell has argued, here (and in 1 Peter) the "elders" seem to comprise a group of men who are senior in faith and prominent in social position (1 Peter 5: 5; Campbell 1994: 210-16; cf., Maier 1991: 93, 100). The prominent (male) heads of households have their responsibility qua leaders of the community. This is most clear in the \textit{Pastoral Epistles}, especially 1 Timothy, where the main duties mentioned for the bishop and the deacon are their responsibilities for respectable citizenship and good household management (1 Tim 3: 1-13; Titus 1: 5-9). \textit{This is where the instruction to the socially prominent men of the community is found}. The corollary of these requirements is the instructions in the Pastors that women and slaves must be submissive and appropriately obedient. Women are forbidden to teach or be in authority over men; they must learn in silent submission (1 Tim 2: 11-15). The church community is shaped according to the household model; indeed, it is described as the "household of God" (1 Tim 3: 15), and so the ecclesiastical hierarchy mirrors the domestic and social hierarchy. "The role of leaders as relatively well-to-do householders \textit{who act as masters of their wives, children, and slaves} is inseparably linked with \textit{their authority in the church}" (MacDonald 1988: 214).\textsuperscript{1}, ibid., p. 335.

\textsuperscript{895} ibid., p. 335.

\textsuperscript{896} As the resources of scriptural, dominical, and apostolic tradition are used to legitimate the pattern of resident leadership (as we have seen in 1 Timothy, 1 Clement, and Ignatius) so at the same time the resources of the household code are used to insist that the subordinate members of the household, women and slaves, \textit{must for the Lord’s sake be obedient and submissive}. The power struggle to establish such a pattern of leadership is one in which the Haustafeln play a part, \textit{conferring power upon the male heads of household} and providing theological legitimation for the subordination of those who are to be \textit{excluded from positions of power and leadership}. Horrell, ‘The social ethos of the Corinthians correspondence: interests and ideology’, p. 125 (1996).
L. Ann Jervis

Jervis is frank about the fact that re-interpretations of Paul's commandments are motivated by the offense they give to modern egalitarians, identifying 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 as a case in point:

'For two reasons the words of 1 Cor. 14:34-35 impress many modern readers as offensive: they deny freedom of speech and they appear to do so on the basis of gender. Several recent interpreters have sought to lessen this passage's offense by interpreting it as an interpolation by a post-Pauline editor.'897

In an extended argument, Jervis makes a detailed case against the claim that this passage is an interpolation.898

'in fact, however, Paul regularly uses the aforementioned warrants in support of his directives, especially in 1 Corinthians. 21 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 900


898 Such a gloss is not best explained, however, as the product of an editor with a viewpoint different from Paul’s for (1) there is no precedent in the Pauline letters that I know of for a gloss intended to contradict directly Paul’s own view; (2) there is precedent for Paul adding words late in the process of composing a letter and for this resulting in a variety of textual traditions; and (3) the passage appears in every extant manuscript, which should caution us against too readily adopting an interpolation hypothesis. The best interpretation of the textual evidence is that of Antoinette Clark Wire who concludes that the words were originally a gloss either by Paul, an amanuensis or the first person to copy the letter.99 ibid., p. 51.

899 Moreover, there are problems with the interpolation theory’s typical presentation of the passage’s warrants. The theory argues that the passage uses the warrants of ‘law’, ‘shame’, and ‘what is permitted’/’custom’ in an ‘unPauline’ way and that the reference to ‘all the churches’ indicates a general rule which fits uncomfortably in Paul’s very particular letter’, ibid., p. 56.

900 21. J.C. Hurd points out that Paul typically appeals, especially in 1 Cor. 7-16, to five warrants for his directives: Jesus, Scripture, common sense, custom and his own authority. The Origin of 1 Corinthians [Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983], p. 74). Cf. P.J. Tomson, Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles (Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp.81-86. The appeals of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 can be seen to correspond to two of these typically
Jervis makes the point in particular that appeals to ‘the Law’ and what is shameful, are typical of Paul:

‘In 1 Cor. 7.19 Paul appeals to ‘the commandments of God’ in a similarly abstract way and for the purpose of persuasion.

Furthermore, it is far from self-evident that the reference to law in v. 34 is at odds with Paul’s other appeals to law, that is, that the appeal to law in this passage indicates that the author had a view of the role of law in Christian ethics different from Paul’s. P.J. Tomson has demonstrated that an appeal to law for the purpose of directing behaviour is typical of Paul, who claimed the authority of law without at the same time being obligated to it.23’

‘The appeal to shame in 1 Cor. 14.35 is not unusual. Paul appeals to shame for specific reasons in 1 Cor. 11.6.’

Jervis is equally dismissive of the claim that this passage is a quotation from Paul’s opponents, and cites Fee in support:

‘31. The proposition that these verses (and perhaps also v. 36) are Paul’s quotation of his opponents’ opinion (e.g. N.M. Flanagan and E.H. Snyder, ‘Did Paul Put Down Women in 1 Cor. 14.34-36?’, BTB 11 [1981], pp. 10-12; and P.F. Ellis, Seven Pauline Letters [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1982], pp. 102-103) founders when it is noticed that, in passages where Paul quotes his opponents’slogan, both the slogan and the retort relate to issues in the surrounding verses (e.g. 1 Cor. 6.12-13; 7.1). The verses surrounding our passage, on the other hand, are not about gender-specific actions in worship.’

Pauline appeals, i.e. law = Scripture; shame = custom; what is permitted = custom; and, all the churches = custom.’.

901 Ibid., p. 57.

902 Ibid., p. 58.

903 Ibid., p. 58.
Another difficulty with this proposition is the lack of supporting evidence that the Corinthians held the view of the supposed slogan. In fact, the opposite evidence presents itself – at the Corinthian worship men and women prophesy together (1 Cor. 11.2-16) (cf. Fee, Corinthians, p. 705).

Fee points out further that ‘there is no precedent for such a long quotation that is also full of argumentation’ (Corinthians, p. 705).”

904 Ibd., pp. 59-60.
Walter Liefeld has been highly critical of the historical reconstructions and word meanings proposed by egalitarians Catherine and Richard Kroeger.905

'I Suffer Not a Woman is filled with efforts to find “sex reversal,” “female dominance,” and “sex and death” motifs in Ephesian society, because the Kroegers believe that, in the end, all these things are implied in Paul’s prohibition that women should not αθεντεν.

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 authenteo and its variants.”16 [original footnote reproduced in footnote 906 below]907

Liefeld dismisses the proposed definition ‘source’ for the Greek word kephalê, and offers significant support for complementarian Wayne Grudem’s analysis.908 909 910

905 The second part of the thesis is that the other verb, authenteo, “represents either a ritual act or a doctrinal tenet propounded by the heretical teachers.” This does not seem to fit any of the meanings proposed for authenteo in her first paragraph: “begin,” “be... responsible for,” “rule,” “dominate,” “usurp power or rights.” “claim ownership, sovereignty or authorship.” Further, it is a bit of a twist to claim that authenteo, which is a verb, could “represent a doctrinal tenet,” when "tenet" is a noun.

Liefeld, ‘Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist’s View’, in Mickelsen, ‘Women, Authority & The Bible’, p. 245 (1986); Liefeld is particularly valuable because he is himself an egalitarian, who would naturally be more sympathetic to the Kroeger argument, so his criticism carry considerable weight.


907 Ibid., p. 157.

908 The meaning “source,” adduced by Bedale as a clue to some of Paul’s passages, lacks clear evidence.

Liefeld likewise rejects the suggestion that only false teaching is prohibited.911

Liefeld opposes strongly the speculative reconstructions of Catherine Kroeger in her earlier work, demonstrating that her supposed Gnostic background for the first letter to Timothy is unsupported by historical evidence.912 913

910 ‘In my judgment, however, it is no longer possible, given Grudem’s research, to dismiss the idea of “rulership” from the discussion.’, ibid., p. 139.

911 ‘However, in the only passage in the Pastoral Epistles that combines a clear reference both to heretical teachings and to women, women are not the promulgators but the victims of false teaching (2 Tim 3:6-7). The question still remains, therefore, why Paul does not leave matters with the general prohibition against false teaching in 1 Timothy 1:3-4, but adds a paragraph directed specifically against women teachers. He thus restricts the recipients, rather than the originators, of the false doctrine. Of course, since the women—whether because of poor education, pagan influence or whatever—were being easily deceived in that culture, that fact connects with the reference in 2:14 to the deceiving of Eve. But that relates to the problem of women being deceived rather than to the problem of heresy itself.’, Liefeld, ‘Response to David M. Scholer’, in Mickelsen, ‘Women, authority & the Bible’, p. 220 (1986).

912 ‘It is precarious, as Edwin Yamauchi and others have shown, to assume gnostic backgrounds for New Testament books. Although the phrase, “falsely called knowledge,” in 1 Timothy 6:20 contains the Greek word gnostos, this was the common word for knowledge. It does seem anachronistic to transliterate and capitalize it “Gnosis” as Kroeger does.’, Liefeld, ‘Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist’s View’, in Mickelsen, ‘Women, Authority & The Bible’, p. 246 (1986).

913 Kroeger presents a wide range of material relating to the pervasive presence of the serpent in ancient religion. Here again, caution is needed. The serpent motif was so common that we must not read too much into its appearance. Its presence in the Timothy passage is only an inference. Kroeger develops a network of phenomena without carefully explaining how closely these items truly are to each other and to the text in 1 Timothy,’ ibid., p. 247.
Likewise, Liefeld objects to Kroeger’s interpretation of the phrase ‘I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man’:

"The first part of the thesis is that the verb didasko “prohibits the erroneous teaching.” This is related to the earlier observation that in the Pastorals "both didasko and didaskalos... generally refer to the content [emphasis mine] of the message.” Naturally a teacher teaches content, but it is true that in the Pastorals there is a great emphasis on what is taught. Further, mention of the act of teaching in these epistles is, as Kroeger realizes, usually accompanied by a specific reference to the content of the teaching.

But in contrast, neither of the Greek words used for the content of teaching (didaskalia, didache) is used in the verse under consideration.

The two nouns occur a total of seventeen times in the Pastorals and could easily have been used here. Kroeger’s task is to explain how one can maintain that the verb didasko "prohibits the erroneous teaching" when Paul, who could have said clearly, "I do not permit women to teach error," omitted any such reference to the content.

Then, too, the verb itself is usually used in connection with good, rather than with erroneous, teaching in the Pastorals. To propose that the verb refers in a special way to the content, and specifically to erroneous content, goes beyond the natural meaning of the text.

Also, while the verb teach is used absolutely, without an object expressing content, it does have a subject, woman, which is not mentioned in Kroeger’s initial thesis statement at all. In summary, the Greek reader of this text would naturally understand the emphasis of the first words to be "I do not permit a woman to teach," whereas Kroeger proposes to demonstrate that its emphasis is "I do not permit a woman to teach error.""914

914 Ibid., p. 247.
William Lillie

Lillie is an egalitarian who acknowledges that the 1st century ecclesia was non-egalitarian. He observes that ecclesial 'house tables' present a balanced and nurturing hierarchy which seeks to preclude abuse:

'Most prominent among the particular exhortations is that to obedience in the case of children and slaves, and to submission in the case of wives. In Ephesians the whole house‐table is prefaced by a general command, 'Be subject to one another out of reverence to Christ.'\textsuperscript{915}

'Those in authority, husbands, parents and masters are called to be subject to one another - an unusual requirement in the ancient, and even in the modern, world.'\textsuperscript{916}

In Paul’s writings, Lillie sees only 'steps in the right direction', rather than an egalitarianism.\textsuperscript{917} \textsuperscript{918} For this reason, Lillie suggests that the Biblical example is not necessarily to be followed by modern Christians.\textsuperscript{919}

\textsuperscript{915} Lillie, ‘The Pauline House‐tables’, The Expository Times (86.179.181), 1975.

\textsuperscript{916} Ibid., p. 182.

\textsuperscript{917} The house‐tables clearly envisage a hierarchical ordering of the household, but even in them we have aspirations to a more egalitarian order. The subordinate parties have reciprocal rights, - the wife to her husband’s love and kindly treatment, the children to encouragement and freedom from senseless teasing, and slaves to just and fair treatment. Not very much we may think, but at least steps in the right direction.', ibid., p. 182.

\textsuperscript{918} The house‐tables are not concerned with the changing of the social order, although, as has already been suggested, there may be in them the seeds of such change.', ibid., p. 182.

\textsuperscript{919} The subordinate place given to wives in the house‐tables and the whole institution of slavery taken for granted there are no longer acceptable in the more egalitarian society of today.', ibid., p. 182.

\textsuperscript{920} ‘It would be wrong to think, however, that, because the hierarchical ordering of the household is accepted without question by Paul, it is necessarily the pattern for all time for the life of the Christian home.', ibid., p. 182.
Egalitarian I Howard Marshall describes his gradual change of views:

'So I was now a member of a church with ordained women ministers. Subsequently I served for a period as a member of the church’s selection committee for candidates for the ministry and had to assess the qualities of applicants regardless of whether they were male or female.

Throughout this process I faced the dilemma of whether I could reconcile the practice of the church and my own involvement in it with my acceptance of the authority of Scripture, and I confess that I did not find it easy to do so at that time.' \(^\text{921}\)

Marshall is particularly honest in acknowledging that he sought to reconcile his church’s practice with Scripture, rather than look to Scripture to determine how his church should practice:

'You will observe, for I’m trying to be honest, that I was looking for a reconciliation of church practice with Scripture rather than necessarily for a direct encouragement and legitimation of church practice by Scripture.' \(^\text{922}\)

However, Marshall remains dedicated to the authority of the Bible:

'Nevertheless, for our part, we must insist that we do hold to the authority of Scripture, and that the issue is one of the correct exegesis and interpretation of Scripture.' \(^\text{923}\)

Marshall typically does not dispute what the Biblical text actually says, even if he disputes its present day application. He also acknowledges certain complementarian arguments.\(^\text{924}\)


\(^{922}\) Ibid., p. 54.

\(^{923}\) Ibid., p. 54.

\(^{924}\) But then, third, Paul goes further and states that he does not allow a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man. It is generally assumed by traditionalists...
Marshall likewise resists attempts to read the 1st century ecclesia outside its historical context. In doing so, Marshall concedes key points usually contested by egalitarians:

‘The passages must also be seen in their historical context. There is a background in the social/moral teaching of contemporary ethicists who summed up life in the typical Graeco-Roman household in terms of three relationships: husband/wife; parent/child; master/slave, where one and the same person can be husband, father and master.

In such relationships this patriarchal figure had authority, and the three other types of person were required to be submissive and obedient. The Christian teaching assumes this situation and gives similar instructions, requiring the authoritarian figure not to abuse his position and those under him to be submissive. In particular the husband is to treat his wife lovingly.’

Marshall however argues that today the cultural background is different, and application of the Biblical commandments must be altered in accommodation of the contemporary social environment.

that, since elsewhere older women are encouraged to be good teachers (Tit 2:3) and the young Timothy was taught by his mother and grandmother (2 Tim 1:5; 3:15), the prohibition is of women teaching adult men, perhaps thinking especially of their husbands, and/or that the prohibition is of public teaching in a congregational meeting rather than in the privacy of a home, and/or that the reference is thus to what might be regarded as the “official, authoritative” setting forth of Christian doctrine rather than something less formal. In such ways the prohibition here might be harmonized with indications of their teaching functions elsewhere.’, ibid., p. 59.


926 ‘There is a concealed danger of thinking that all of this instruction can be taken over basically unchanged into the world of today, whereas in fact there are significant differences. The nature of parental authority over children has somewhat changed and is not so absolute as it was. We no longer have slavery, but a much more complicated system of employment with important rights for workers. Slavery is no longer considered a legitimate system that is compatible with Christian ethics. Although not mentioned here, the concept of the absolutist ruler and the totally submissive subjects (1 Peter 2:13-17) has been rejected in favour of some kind of democracy. Thus in each of these relationships the structures have changed, and we have to ask how the first-century teaching is to be reapplied to them.’, ibid., p. 3.
ED L. Miller

Miller believes egalitarianism can at best only be extrapolated from Paul’s teachings, and that Christians must acknowledge Paul did not have an egalitarian aim:

‘That is not to say that we today, as others before us, cannot work that out and draw the implication on Paul’s behalf. But it seems not to have been done in the Pauline texts themselves, and certainly not the one before us. [Galatians 3:28] We have to try to be honest about that.’

Rejecting the egalitarian interpretation of Galatians 3:28, he accepts the complementarian view:

‘It must be admitted, though, for better or for worse, that this view of Galatians 3:28 coheres both with its immediate context and with the rest of what we know of Paul. This includes his notion of the priority of the true Israel over Gentile Christians who are merely grafted on to it, his implicit condoning of slavery, and his hierarchical view of husband-wife relations.’

927 My own view is that Paul was inclined, as it were, in the direction of social egalitarianism in the case of Gentiles, slaves, and women, and we are all aware of the oft-cited texts containing the germs of such a teaching., Miller, ‘Is Galatians 3:28 the Great Egalitarian Text?’, The Expository Times (114.9.11), 2002.

928 Ibid., p.11.

929 Ibid., p.11.
Murphy speaks of Galatians 3:28 as an egalitarian formula, but her interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 agrees with complementarians:

'Paul may have expressed sentiments in Galatians that an egalitarian would hail — and perhaps those sentiments are the most important ones for women in the Pauline corpus — but in 1 Corinthians he showed himself to be clearly disturbed by the powerful and independent women in the Christian community at Corinth.

He did not forbid the Corinthian women to prophesy, but he demanded that they cover their heads when they prayed in public, and in 1 Corinthians 11:8-9 he added a statement — "For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man" — that uses Genesis, a sacred text, to define women as subordinate to men.

Later, in 1 Corinthians 14, he employed a reprise of the same argument to single out women and insist that they should keep silent in church.'

---

930 In the epistle to the Galatians, he not only embraces an egalitarian formula but grounds it in the very essence of Christianity, Murphy, 'The Word According to Eve: Women and the Bible in Ancient Times and Our Own', p. 219 (1999).

931 Ibid., p. 225; the motives she ascribes to Paul are disputable.
Clark Pinnock

Pinnock acknowledges the challenge egalitarians face:

'An enormous obstacle confronts biblical feminists in the area of hermeneutics. Some scholars, both on the feminist side and on the nonfeminist sides, agree that the Bible as presently constituted does not teach a feminist position.'\(^{932}\)

'The situation is not made easier by the apparent fact that biblical feminists have not yet produced many works that can stand on a level with these four [complementarian] books and show where they are mistaken. Biblical feminists say it can be done, but has it been done? When may we expect it to be done?'\(^{933}\)

Pinnock also notes that the egalitarians who find it easiest to deal with the Biblical teaching on men and women are those who find reasons to simply remove the texts, either by treating them as interpolations or by arguing that they do not reflect the overall teaching of Scripture:

'Evangelicals such as Jewett and Mollenkott, on a more modest scale, perform the same kind of content criticism. Perhaps it is necessary to reject parts of the Bible in order to come up with the feminist belief. If it were not, why would these two engage in it?'\(^{934}\)

Pinnock sees the main problem a credibility issue. Those egalitarian scholars attempting to argue that the Bible actually contains explicit egalitarian teaching (or at least that it does not contain complementarian teaching), necessarily read the text in ways which most people (including scholars), find unnatural, contrived, and unconvincing:

\(^{932}\) Pinnock, 'Biblical Authority & The Issues In Question', in Mickelson (ed.), 'Women, Authority, And the Bible', p. 52 (1986); by ‘biblical feminists’ Pinnock means egalitarians.

\(^{933}\) Ibid., p. 52.

\(^{934}\) Ibid., pp. 54-55.
'Of course, the biblical feminist interpretation is possible; the problem is that it does not strike many people, either scholarly or untutored, as plausible.935

Recognizing the strength of the complementarian case, Pinnock asks his fellow egalitarians to be genuinely openminded and accept the possibility that they are wrong:

'What if it does appear that the more plausible interpretation of the Bible as a whole sustains the category of male headship?'936

'On the other side, the biblical feminists must stop depicting the traditional view in such dark colors. If it should turn out true that God did intend males to exhibit strength in leadership roles and females to excel more as the guardians of society’s emotional resources, why should this be viewed ipso facto as an evil arrangement?

I worry that the biblical feminists are painting themselves into a corner. It would be wiser for all concerned to be respectful of both the traditional and the biblical feminist models.'937

After his survey of selected literature, Pinnock concludes that the egalitarian case is difficult to sustain from Scripture alone, and equally difficult to present convincingly.938 939

935 Ibid., p. 55.

936 Ibid., p. 57.

937 Ibid., p. 58.

938 'Based on my reading for this report, I have come to believe that a case for feminism that appeals to the canon of Scripture as it stands can only hesitantly be made and that a communication of it to evangelicals at large is unlikely to be very effective’, ibid., p. 57.

939 'My own experience in preparing for this panel has been a slight loss of confidence that Biblical feminism can make its case or be able to sell it effectively among evangelicals.’, ibid., p. 58.
Judith Gundry-Volf

Gundry-Volf agrees with complementarians that although gender equality in the sense of equal value is promoted by Paul, gender distinctions (in the form of specific gender roles, behavior, and hierarchy within the ecclesia), are upheld and reinforced.940 941 942

‘Judith Gundry-Volf concludes: “Paul’s main point is that man and woman are both the glory of another and therefore both have an obligation not to cause shame to their ‘heads’ ... since they are the glory of different persons — man is the glory of God, and woman is the glory of man — they must use different means to avoid shaming their ‘heads.’”

But Paul appeals to creation to show their obligation to bring glory — each to the particular one whose glory they are by creation — which they do through distinctive masculine and feminine hairstyles [or head coverings]” (her italics).943

Gundry-Volf also sees no contradiction in Paul insisting on hierarchical gendered relationships, whilst at the same time reinforcing social equality between men and women:

940 Further, in Gal 3:28 he affirms gender equality (“there is no longer male and female, for you are all one in Christ”) and in 1 Cor 11:2-16 he expects women to pray and prophesy just as men do in public worship. Yet there also he insists on distinct headdress for men and women in worship, which symbolized traditional gender boundaries and had hierarchical implications.’, Gundry-Volf, ‘Putting the Moral Vision of the New Testament into Focus: A Review’, Bulletin for Biblical Research (9.278), 1999.

941 ‘When we come to Paul’s explicit discussion of gender issues in 1 Corinthians, we find that he takes the same basic view as in Gal 3:28 (as I have just described it). Sexual distinctions are not erased (as implied in Paul’s statements about marriage, sex, and gender-specific headdress).’, ibid., p. 281

942 It would be wrong to claim that Paul rejects all conventional, patriarchal interpretations of sexual difference and their corresponding expressions in cultural and religious practice.’, ibid., pp. 281-282.

In whatever way we choose to translate κεφαλή, however, Judith Gundry-Volf formulates the fundamental principle that since Paul is setting up a complex and conscious dialectic between a gender-distinctive creation order and a gospel order of reciprocity and mutuality, neither of these two aspects of the arguments should be selected atomistically and accorded privilege as representing the whole.

Paul can appeal “to creation to support instructions which presume a hierarchical relationship of man and woman as well as undergird their new social equality in Christ without denying their difference.”

944 Ibid., p. 811.
Kenton Sparks

Kenton Sparks has written an extensive work on the interpretation of Scripture, with particular regard to methods of re-interpreting Scripture in order to take into account new historical, archaeological, and scientific knowledge, as well as new legal, social, ethical, and cultural developments. His comments on gender equity and gender roles in Scripture are detailed and extensive.

Repeatedly he acknowledges the strength of the complementarian case:

'**Thoughtful egalitarians will admit** what every complementarian is quick to point out: that the Bible contains numerous texts that are patriarchal in orientation.'\(^{945}\)

'**The context of these biblical texts reveals that, in the game of proof-text poker, the traditionalists have a far stronger hand than the egalitarians.** Whereas the traditionalist verses speak very directly and specifically to the issue at hand ("wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands, as to the Lord"), the egalitarian texts seem strained to the breaking point.'\(^{946}\)

'**The biblical evidence in support of the traditional viewpoint spans the canon from the creation to the General Epistles, and the resulting perspective is remarkably consistent.**'\(^{947}\)

'**That the woman was made from man to be his helper, and that he twice names her (Gen. 2:23; 3:20), as he does the animals (2:20), suggests his priority and authority over her - just as 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 11:5-10 indicate.** As for Genesis 3:16, despite egalitarian objections, it remains very likely that the subordination of Eve to Adam is a prescription from God rather than a mere description of the fall's natural consequences.'\(^{948}\)


\(^{946}\) Ibid., p. 343.

\(^{947}\) Ibid., p. 344.

\(^{948}\) Ibid., p. 348.
Ian and Averil claim that Adam did not name Eve twice,949 but standard commentaries on the Hebrew by both complementarians and egalitarians agree with Sparks on this point,950 and agree with the significance of Adam naming Eve.951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958

949 ‘It is incorrect to say that Adam “names” Eve in Genesis 2:23 “as he does the animals (2:20)” before the fall. As we point out, the expressions and circumstances are very different. He does name her in 3:20, after the fall, though even then it is not reasonable to suggest that this is intended to expresses authority over her. It is a statement of fact, not a declaration of authority.’, ‘Reply 2’, p. 81 (April 2009).

950 The same Hebrew verb is used in Genesis 2:20 when Adam names the animals, Genesis 2:23 when he names Eve, and Genesis 3:20 when he names Eve again; it is the verb commonly used throughout the Old Testament when people are given names by their parents, or by those in authority over them.

951 ‘Here the first man names the first woman in a similar fashion. Though they are equal in nature, that man names woman (cf. 3:20) indicates that she is expected to be subordinate to him, an important presupposition of the ensuing narrative (3:17),’ ‘20-21 Like the second scene (2:18–25), this, the penultimate scene, has the man’s naming of his wife and a mention of their clothing,’, Wenham, ‘Genesis 1-15’, Word Biblical Commentary, volume 1, pp. 70, 93 (2002).

952 ‘Now, however, the man gives out the name: she shall be called Woman because she was taken out of Man.’, ‘The man called his wife’s name Eve: because the Hebrew for man contains the article, RSV switches back to The man. However, TEV now calls him “Adam,” since the woman is named for the first time here also.’, Reyburn & Fry, ‘A Handbook on Genesis’, UBS Handbook Series, pp. 75, 97 (1997).

953 ‘Insofar as the power of naming implies authority, the text voices the social reality of the ancient Near East. Yet the terminology used here differs from that employed in verse 20 for naming the animals. Here the man gives her a generic, not a personal, name, and that designation is understood to be derived from his own, which means he acknowledges woman to be his equal,’ ‘20. The man named his wife Previously he had given her a generic name (2:23). Now she acquires a personal one that expresses her nature and destiny positively and sympathetically.’, Sarna, ‘Genesis’, JPS Torah Commentary, pp. 23., 29 (1989).


955 ‘Adam gives his wife a name, but she already has a name (2:23b)’, Coats, ‘Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature’, Forms of the Old Testament Literature, volume 1, p. 56 (1983).
Sparks further points out that male headship is also found in the New Testament, not just in the Old Testament:

"Moreover, we have seen already that many biblical texts either assert or imply male headship in the home and church, even in the New Testament." 959

"So, while to say that "this is the lone New Testament reference to Adam's seniority", good theology requires that this text be read in light of the many other biblical texts that highlight male authority in the home and church.

Belleville's egalitarian treatment of this very important text from 1 Timothy is far inferior to that offered by a cadre of complementarian scholars, who have recently thrown their support behind a more patriarchal interpretation of the text.

A considerable mass of convincing exegetical, theological, and historical evidence supports this traditional reading, as is admitted even by egalitarians like William Webb. Webb can admit this because, unlike Belleville, he feels no compulsion to make 1 Timothy say something that it clearly does not say.‘

956 'Fourthly, the wife is under the authority of her husband: he names her woman (23) and later Eve (3:20), just as earlier he had named the animals (19). This concept of the man’s headship is taken for granted elsewhere in the Bible (e.g. 1 Cor. 11:3; 1 Pet. 3:1–6).’, Carson et al, ‘New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition’ (4th rev. ed. 1994).

957 'Adam earlier had named the animals, which was a demonstration of his authority over them. Here his naming of Eve suggests Adam’s position of rule, as referred to in verse 16.’, Walton, Matthews, & Chavalas, ‘IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament’ (electronic ed. 2000).


959 Ibid., p.348.

960 Ibid., p. 349.
Sparks even has some very stern words for egalitarians and the feminist movement, despite being a supporter: 961

'Modern feminism has played an important role in curtailing the tyranny and oppression caused by sinful twists of this male authority, but insofar as feminism wishes to remove these domestic authority structures altogether, it is surely a movement that runs out of bounds. As some egalitarians now admit, it may be that extreme expressions of feminism have unwittingly contributed to the family crisis so prevalent in the United States.' 962

Despite acknowledging that they have not even read Sparks’ book, 963 Ian and Averil claim that when it comes to Genesis 1, 2 and 3, ‘The view he expresses is that of traditional church misogyny’. 964 It is unwise to make sweeping generalizations of an author without having read their work. In reality, Sparks does no such thing. He is a dedicated egalitarian who agrees with Ian and Averil with regard to the participation of sisters in the ecclesia. 965 966

Far from taking his view from ‘traditional church misogyny’, Sparks draws it explicitly from Scripture. 967

---

961 Egalitarians who assume that equality and authority are mutually exclusive categories have succumbed to an interpretive myopia, which cannot get beyond the oppressive examples of authority present in human society. Scripture gives us every reason to believe that authority need not be oppressive.’, ibid., p. 351.

962 Ibid., p. 352.

963 ‘We have not read Professor Sparks’ book’, ‘Reply 2’, p. 113 (April 2009).

964 Ibid., p.81 (April 2009).

965 ‘...I am prepared to accept a larger role for women in church leadership than church tradition has heretofore permitted’, Sparks, ‘God’s Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship’, p. 354 (2008).

966 ‘...the ordination of women to the ministry seems to me entirely suitable as Christian practice’, ibid., p. 354.

967 ‘That the woman was made from man to be his helper, and that he twice names her (Gen. 2:23; 3:20), as he does the animals (2:20), suggests his priority and thus authority over here - just as 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 11:5-10 indicate.’, ibid., p. 349.
Obviously unaware of Sparks’ egalitarian position (even though I made it clear), Ian and Averil claim ‘Kenton Sparks is adopting a traditional church view of these two passages’, though Sparks is not doing any such thing. The fact that his view is in agreement with traditional church interpretations of these passages is irrelevant to the more important question of whether or not his view is correct. Ian and Averil instead attempt to discredit him with guilt by association.

Readers should ask themselves why a committed egalitarian such as Sparks agrees with complementarians on the interpretation of these passages. It certainly has nothing to do with personal bias, or what Sparks wishes the passages to say, contrary to what Ian and Averil claim. Why do Ian and Averil believe that Sparks, an egalitarian, wants to insert into the text a meaning which contradicts his own beliefs? Where is the evidence for their claim?

Sparks agrees with the consensus of complementarian and egalitarian commentators that ‘women lost ground in the post-fall economy of power’, referring to God’s announcement to Eve that now her husband would ‘rule over her’, a position not prescribed previously.

Though Adam had already been placed in a position of priority and leadership over Eve, now he was given a position to exercise authority over her.

968 Reply 2’, p.82 (April 2009).

969 Note what Kenton Sparks says: “we can surmise that the issue was authority”, he has to “surmise” because this is the interpretation he wishes to insert into the text.’, ibid., p. 83.


971 In that woman was made from man to be his helper and is twice named by man (2:23; 3:20) indicates his authority over her’, Wenham, ‘Genesis 1-15’, Word Biblical Commentary, volume 1, p. 81 (2002).

972 Fundamentally, the man and his mate were equals. This is indicated in the following facts: (1) she was a “helper” corresponding to him (2:18); (2) she received the creation mandate as much as he (1:28–30); (3) Adam recognized her as “bone of my bone”—as fundamentally like him; (4) she was the special handiwork of God as much as he; and (5) both the man and the woman were made in the image of God. In that first marriage, however, the man was the first among equals, i.e., he was the leader in the relationship. He was created first and therefore had a certain priority for that reason (cf. 1 Cor. 11:3, 8, 12). Adam asserted (and Eve accepted) his leadership when he gave his bride a name (2:23): “She shall be called Woman
It is wrong for Ian and Averil to characterize the interpretation of Sparks as 'traditional church misogyny', as if it is a product of a traditionalist (which Sparks is not), a misogynist (which Sparks is not), or someone who does not believe that women are permitted to hold the leadership positions traditionally held by men (Sparks firmly believes they are permitted). Their association of Sparks' comments with 'traditional church misogyny' is an attempt to discredit him with guilt by association.

('ishshah) because she was taken from man ('ish). A woman who chooses to marry chooses to subordinate herself in some measure to the leadership of the man of her choice. Adam was the head; Eve was the helper.', Smith, 'The Pentateuch', Old Testament Survey Series, (2nd ed.), 1993.

973 'Far from being a reign of co-equals over the remainder of God's creation, the relationship now becomes a fierce dispute, with each party trying to rule the other. The two who once reigned as one attempt to rule each other.', Hamilton (egalitarian), 'The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17', New International Commentary on the Old Testament, p. 202 (1990).

974 'The woman will desire to dominate in the relationship and will frustratingly lose the battle for control to which history amply testifies. Some have argued that in the wider context women do not act out the predicted subservient role. Both Eve and Sarah name their sons. But that is only an argument for the fact that the curse is not mechanical in its outworking and that the effects of the curse can be mitigated at various times and in various ways. This text is not telling us what should be, but what is. The subjugation of the woman is a sad effect of the Fall.', Kissling (egalitarian), 'Genesis', College Press NIV Commentary, p. 204 (2004).

975 'The social aspect of the punishment was that the woman would be in subordination to her husband (cf. 1 Tim 2:14). She who sought to control her husband by leading him into temptation would now be the one controlled. Women have suffered much because sin entered the world. They have been subjected to degradation, to moral and physical slavery in many cultures. The dominion of the husband in the marriage is not harsh and unbearable where the spirit of Christ abides.', Smith, 'The Pentateuch', Old Testament Survey Series, (2nd ed.), 1993.

976 'Furthermore, instead of marriage being a relationship of mutual care, tension was often to characterize it. Your desire may be a desire for sexual intercourse or for independence, but ultimately the husband's headship will prevail. He will rule over you may indicate harsh domination, but it may simply be reaffirming the chain of authority (God—man—woman) established at creation but reversed at the fall (1). The latter interpretation is more likely in view of the introduction to Adam's sentence of Because you listened to your wife (17).', Carson et al, 'New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition' (4th rev. ed. 1994).
Ian and Averil also object that Sparks’ line of argument means that as a result of Adam and Eve’s sin, God placed both them and the creation in a situation which was no longer ‘very good’, a result which Ian and Averil say is unworthy of God.977

Ian and Averil are certainly wrong to say Sparks’ argument means that the oppression of women by men is the deliberate intention of God. In fact not Eve’s pain and suffering, not the conflict between good and evil, not the oppression of women by men, not the unsatisfactory toil, none of these were the intention of God. But they were the direct result of the curse which God deliberately inflicted as punishment on Adam and Eve.

Ian and Averil claim it is wrong to read Scripture in a way which interprets God as deliberately implementing what He also declares is contrary to His will.978 This is surprising not least because they believe God, Christ, and the apostles all deliberately implemented what was contrary to God’s will for women, in order to capitulate to the social and cultural sensitivities of misogynist men.979 980 981 982 983

977 ‘If we follow Kenton Sparks’ line of argument, then the world with which God was pleased and declared to be very good (Genesis 1:31) is now by the deliberate act of God no longer “very good”. The pain and suffering, the conflict between good and evil, the oppression of women by men, the unsatisfactory toil – all these are the deliberate intention of God. Kenton Sparks’ interpretation suggests that God has deliberately arranged that the world should not be “very good”, rather than that it is like this because of what man and woman have brought upon themselves by their disobedience and sin. This is an unworthy concept of God, as well as being a direct opposite to His intention as stated in the beginning (Genesis 1:31) and at the end: —the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea (Isaiah 11:9, Habakkuk 2:14).

And

And —death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more, for the former things have passed away (Revelation 21:4).’ ‘Reply 2’, p. 82 (April 2009).

978 ‘It cannot be right to read Genesis, Exodus, Isaiah or John in the sense that God deliberately implements what is elsewhere declared to be contrary to His will.’ ibid., pp. 82-83.

979 ‘Male leadership was often the outcome of society, and was approved by God for that time.’ ‘All One’, p. 216 (2010).

980 ‘In view of the above it might be expected that Jesus would have appointed at least one woman among the twelve disciples. Considering, however, the common religious
William Webb

Egalitarian William Webb is just as frank as Sparks in his analysis of the Biblical texts which he identifies as ‘difficult’ for egalitarians:

‘As various problematic components surface within the biblical texts on slaves and women, one strong impression emerges: a less-than-ultimate ethic in the treatment of slaves and women is reflected in various parts of Scripture. But rather than avoid these texts, we need to embrace them—even the difficult parts.’

‘As with the slavery texts, we need honestly to acknowledge numerous “not so pretty” biblical texts that illustrate a less-than-ultimate ethic in the treatment of women. In these areas, better actions or dispositions toward human beings are both possible and desirable.’

Webb believes that the Bible’s guidance on the treatment of women can be improved on:

and social attitudes towards women, it would be surprising if he had done so.’, ibid., p. 27.

981 ‘Little success could have been expected if Jesus had attempted to appoint women followers in general in a preaching mission, for Jewish attitudes towards woman’s authority would have hindered his message. Although Jesus’ mission was soon to spread to the whole world, it started among the Jews, and was therefore restricted to what was possible within the Jewish environment.’, ibid., p. 27.

982 ‘Since the elders would have a public profile in dealing with authorities, we would not expect a woman to be appointed among them.’, ibid., p. 124.

983 ‘In view of the general male leadership which existed in society in the first century, and in view of the problems in Crete which Paul was aiming to tackle, it is not surprising if the elders there were all male’, ibid., p. 128.


985 Ibid., p. 385.
To speak of this portrait of women as “sexist” would be anachronistic; indeed, relative to its culture the biblical treatment of women as a whole was redemptive. Yet it does not take a lot of imagination to figure out how one might improve on the treatment of women in these examples.footnote{986}

Webb also concedes without controversy a number of issues which Ian and Averil contest. He believes the New Testament instructs women to wear head coverings in worship, and to be silent and not raise questions in the congregation:

‘Head coverings on women in worship. It is broadly conceded within the contemporary church that Paul’s urging women to have some sort of head covering in worship (1 Cor 11) reflects a cultural component of life in Corinth.’footnote{987}

‘Silenced women. The New Testament also instructs women to be silent and not to raise questions within congregational gatherings. Should they have any questions, they are to ask their husbands at home. In short, women are to be silent, and the text assumes a gender perspective: the male/husband is the repository of biblical knowledge.’footnote{988}

Webb notes the typical egalitarian practice of attempting to reinterpret these instructions so as to weaken them, and make them appear less offensive:

‘The submission of wives to husbands. In Paul’s “household codes” he instructs women to “submit to” their husbands (Eph 5:22; Col 3:18). Some Christian interpreters water down the idea of submission in an attempt to make it more palatable today.’footnote{989}

footnote{986} Ibid., p. 387.

footnote{987} Ibid., p. 396.

footnote{988} Ibid., p. 396.

footnote{989} Ibid., p. 397.
Do complementarian views encourage domestic abuse?

The idea that ‘patriarchal’ societies and families would result in greater likelihood of domestic abuse by males seems entirely logical, and has been a standard argument of feminists and even some evangelical egalitarians.990

Repeated detailed studies of domestic violence have demonstrated that there is no connection (as claimed by various feminist and egalitarian scholars), between ‘patriarchal’ or complementarian views, and domestic violence perpetrated by males.991 992

‘Only a minority of batterers are misogynistic (Dutton and Browning, 1988), and few are violent to non-intimate women;’993

‘If feminist analysis is correct, we should expect greater violence directed toward women in more patriarchal cultures. However, this prediction is not supported. Campbell (1992) reports that “there is not a simple linear correlation between female status and rates of wife assault” (p. 19).’994

990 The claim made from a feminist analytical perspective, therefore, is twofold: that society is patriarchal and that the use of violence to maintain male patriarchy is accepted.’, Dutton, ‘Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The ecological fallacy’, Violence & Victims (2.125-140), 1994.

991 ‘If patriarchy is the main factor contributing to wife assault, then the majority of men raised in a patriarchal system should exhibit assaultiveness. However, given the four major surveys of incidence of wife assault that have been implemented to date, the vast majority of men are non-assaultive for the duration of their marriage (Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz, 1980; Schulman, 1979; Straus and Gelles, 1985; Kennedy and Dutton, 1989).’, ibid.

992 ‘Also, studies of the general population do not appear to suggest that faith groups that endorse hierarchical marital structures report higher rates of IPV [Inte Personal Violence] (Brinkerhoff, Gradnin, & Lupri, 1992; Cunradi, Caetano, & Shafer, 2002; Ellison & Anderson, 2001; Ellison, Bartowski, & Anderson, 1999).’, Levitt & Ware, ‘“Anything With Two Heads Is a Monster” Religious Leaders’ Perspectives on Marital Equality and Domestic Violence’, Violence Against Women (12.12.1170), 2006.


994 Ibid, p. 171.
'But after carefully analyzing numerous studies of violence among married and cohabiting couples, psychologist Donald G. Dutton ["Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The Ecological Fallacy," in Violence and Victims Vol. 9, No. 2 (1994): 167-82] has concluded that "no direct relationship exists between patriarchy and wife assault" and that, therefore, feminists will have to find another explanation of wife abuse. [Emphasis ours]."995

"That men have used a patriarchal vocabulary to account for themselves doesn't mean that patriarchy causes their violence, any more than being patriarchs prevents them from being victimized. Studies of male batterers have failed to confirm that these men are more conservative or sexist about marriage than nonviolent men. To the contrary, some of the highest rates of violence are found in the least orthodox partnerships — dating or cohabiting lovers."996

'...most of the studies that have been conducted do not support the global feminist hypothesis. For instance, a comprehensive meta-analysis of various studies showed that adult male batterers could not be differentiated from non-abusive men on the sole basis of traditional (patriarchal) gender attitudes. 41 [footnote reproduced in footnote 997 below]998

995 Editor, 'Patriarchy And Abuse: No Direct Link', Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (2.2), 1996.


998 Tracy, 'Patriarchy and Domestic Violence: Challenging Common Misconceptions', Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society (50.3.580), 2007; he also notes 'While patriarchy may not be the overarching cause of all abuse, it is an enormously significant factor, because in traditional patriarchy males have a disproportionate share of power' (pp. 582-583), and 'So while patriarchy is not the sole explanation for violence against women, we would expect that male headship would be distorted by insecure, unhealthy men to justify their domination and abuse of women.' (p. 583).
'They found that: (a) religious involvement is correlated with reduced levels of domestic violence; (b) levels of domestic violence vary by race/ethnicity; (c) the effects of religious involvement on domestic violence vary by race/ethnicity; and (d) religious involvement, specifically church attendance, protects against domestic violence...'

'Some have speculated that traditionalist or patriarchal religious ideologies may legitimate, or at least fail to adequately condemn, the practice of partner violence (e.g., Nason-Clark 1997, 2000). This may be particularly true for certain variants of conservative Protestantism that emphasize male headship; however, to date, studies of domestic violence that have examined the role of religion have not identified any clear support for this claim (Brinkerhoff, Grandin, & Lupri, 1992; Ellison, Bartkowski, & Anderson, 1999; Wilcox, 2004).'

Van Leeuwen notes that spousal abuse among conservative Protestant husbands is strongly related to lack of involvement in their congregation, a mere nominal claim to be Christian, rather than related to complementarian views on men and women.

It is true that 'patriarchal', 'hierarchialist' or complementarian beliefs are used to justify domestic violence.

---


1000 Ibid., pp. 1095-1096.

1001 'However, using data from the National Survey of Families and Households (1992–1994) Wilcox also found that a little bit of conservative religion—like a little bit of knowledge—is a dangerous thing. Some of the worst fathers and husbands are men who are nominal evangelicals. “These are men who have, say, a Southern Baptist affiliation, but who rarely darken the door of a church. They have ... the highest rates of domestic violence of any group in the United States. They also have high divorce rates. But evangelical and mainline Protestant men who attend church regularly are ... much less likely to divorce than married men who do not attend church regularly.”61', Van Leeuwen, ‘Opposite Sexes or Neighbouring Sexes? What Do the Social Sciences Really Tell Us?’, in Husbands & Larsen, ‘Women, ministry and the Gospel: Exploring new paradigms’, p. 190 (2007).

1002 'As well, studies of women who have been victimized suggest that batterers use these beliefs to support their abuse (e.g., Adelman, 2000; Giesbrecht & Sevcik, 2000; Hassouneh-Phillips, 2001; Knickmeyer, Levitt, Horne, & Bayer, 2004).', Levitt & Ware, “Anything With Two Heads Is a Monster” Religious Leaders’ Perspectives on Marital
However, the evidence demonstrates strongly that complementarian husbands and fathers (what Van Leeuwen refers to as a ‘traditionalist ideology of gender relations), are the least likely to commit domestic violence, as long as they are regular church attendees and genuinely involved in their congregation.1004

Summarizing the scholarly data, Van Leeuwen contradicts flatly the claim made by egalitarians and feminists. Complementarian views are not demonstrably related to domestic abuse.1005

Even further to the contrary, Van Leeuwen points out that complementarian males (‘gender hierarchicalist’, as she calls them), often function in an egalitarian manner, even while they assume the responsibility of headship over their households.1006

---

1003 ‘Reports of IPV repeatedly describe male partners as holding an imbalance of power (e.g., Giesbrecht & Sevcik, 2000; Knickmeyer et al., 2004; Yllo, 1993), and individuals who hold traditional beliefs about gender roles have been found to blame victims more and perpetrators less when wife abuse is reported (Haj-Yahia, 1998; Hillier & Foddy, 1993), as do clergy who endorse these beliefs (Wood & McHugh, 1994). Abused women who hold more traditional beliefs about relationships have been found to be more likely to justify their abuse, remain in the relationship, and allow their partner to control them (Folingstad, Rutledge, McNeill-Hawkins, & Polek, 1992). Also, research suggests that higher rates of incest have been found in families with hierarchical marital relationships (Draucker, 1996).’’, ibid., p. 1186.


1005 ‘The upshot is that we have no evidence so far that a gender-traditionalist ideology—at least of the soft patriarchal variety—is a strong predictor of domestic physical abuse.’, ibid., p. 190.

1006 ‘Gender hierarchicalist males—at least those who have frequent and active church involvement—turn out, on average, to be better men than their theories: more often than not, they are functional egalitarians, and the rhetoric of male headship may actually be functioning as a covert plea for greater male responsibility and nurturant involvement on the home front.’, ibid., p. 190.
Benefits of complementarianism

The following quotation is taken from a review of a work typical of attacks on the complementarian position:

‘Accordingly, we note how Grady routinely suggests that the “traditional” or “hierarchical” view is so deeply prejudiced against women that it actually encourages abuse and other harmful effects. Consider the following samples:

“. . . the church seems powerless to protect women because its misguided theology actually encourages abuse” (viii). “This pagan, hierarchical view of marriage has resulted in a skyrocketing divorce rate among Bible-believing Christians, as well as a growing problem with domestic abuse that Christian leaders don’t like to talk about” (xi-xii, italics added). “This warped view has created a fragile foundation in many Christian homes, leading to strife, mistrust and, in some cases, abuse” (10, italics added).’

It is certainly true that traditional ‘hierarchical’ and complementarian views of the respective roles of men and women have been used to justify unScriptural abuse, and have been taught in such a way as to encourage such abuse, just as the Biblical teaching on slaves and servants has been historically abused.

However, readers of Grady’s claims may be wondering what evidence there actually is for his claims that the complementarian view of women in ‘the church’ has, in and of itself, caused ‘a skyrocketing divorce rate among Bible-believing Christians, as well as a growing problem with domestic abuse’.

Egalitarian Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen notes that authoritative male role models and an involved fathering style (which complementarians encourage), are of demonstrable value to families.

---


1008 Ibid., p. 102.
'In cultures and subcultures where fathers are absent or uninvolved in hands-on parenting, boys tend to define themselves in opposition to their mothers and other female caretakers, and to engage in misogynist, hypermasculine behaviors as a way to shore up a fragile gender identity.46

And girls who are not sufficiently affirmed as persons by available and nurturing fathers are at risk of becoming developmentally “stuck” in a mindset that sees their sexuality and reproductive potential as the only criteria of feminine success.47

The bottom line appears to be this: children of both sexes need to grow up with stable, nurturant and appropriately authoritative role models of both sexes to help develop a secure gender identity.46\textsuperscript{1009}

Interestingly, she notes that the absence of such authoritative male role models are a concern not only for boys raised in lesbian households, but also in home-schooling households where the mother is the primary point of contact for boys in the family:

'This might be grounds for worrying not only about the development of misogyny in boys raised in lesbian households, but boys in conservative Christian homeschooling households, given that almost all such homeschooling is done by mothers.'\textsuperscript{1010}

Van Leeuwen notes that studies of pre-industrial societies (with traditional pre-modern complementarian views, rather than modern egalitarian views), show that the involved and nurturing role of authoritative fathers has a demonstrably positive impact, notably reducing abuse of women, and actually contributing to their empowerment:

'Scott Coltrane’s analysis of almost a hundred preindustrial societies (n. 42) shows that nurturant fathering of children also correlates strongly with reduced abuse of women and


\textsuperscript{1010} Ibid., p. 190.
greater empowerment and voice for women in the cultures where involved fathering takes place.'1011

'University of Virginia sociologist Bradford Wilcox has shown that conservative Protestant fathers are more likely to report using corporal punishment than other groups, but also (in keeping with a "soft patriarchal" ideology) more likely to praise and hug their children and less likely to yell at them than other groups, both churched and unaffiliated.'1012

Leeuwen notes the complementarian view of the role of the man in the family has been shown to have positive life outcomes for children:

'He concludes that conservative Protestant fathers' neotraditional parenting style seems to be closer to the authoritative style—characterized by moderately high levels of parental control and high levels of parental supportiveness—that has been linked to positive outcomes among children and adolescents.'1013

Van Leeuwen concludes that claims of abuse leveled at complementarian parenting models have been exaggerated:

'In any case, the accusations about authoritarian and abusive parenting by conservative Protestants appear overdrawn. The findings paint a more complex portrait of conservative Protestant fathering that reveals a hybrid of strict, puritanical and progressive, child-centered approaches to child rearing—all in keeping with the logic of "expressive traditionalism" guiding this subculture.60'1014

Van Leeuwen's balanced study does not ignore the incidence of abusive behaviour in some conservatively based marriages, but demonstrates that the data does not lead to the conclusions claimed by egalitarians such as Grady.
On the contrary, Van Leeuwen notes that spousal abuse among conservative Protestant husbands is strongly related to lack of involvement in their congregation, a mere nominal claim to be Christian, rather than related to complementarian views on men and women.

"These are men who have, say, a Southern Baptist affiliation, but who rarely darken the door of a church. They have ... the highest rates of domestic violence of any group in the United States. They also have high divorce rates.

But evangelical and mainline Protestant men who attend church regularly are ... much less likely to divorce than married men who do not attend church regularly."\textsuperscript{1015}

The evidence demonstrates strongly that complementarian husbands and fathers (what Van Leeuwen refers to as a 'traditionalist ideology of gender relations), are the least likely to commit domestic violence, as long as they are regular church attendees and genuinely involved in their congregation:

'And conservative Protestant husbands and fathers (including those who espouse, among other things, a traditionalist ideology of gender relations) are—provided they attend church regularly—the group that is actually least likely to commit domestic violence.\textsuperscript{1016}

Summarizing the scholarly data Van Leeuwen demonstrates (contrary to the claim made by egalitarians such as Grady), that complementarian views are not demonstrably related to domestic abuse:

'The upshot is that we have no evidence so far that a gender-traditionalist ideology—at least of the soft patriarchal variety—is a strong predictor of domestic physical abuse."\textsuperscript{1017}

\textsuperscript{1015} Ibid., pp. 194-195.

\textsuperscript{1016} Ibid., p. 195.

\textsuperscript{1017} Ibid., p. 195.


Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning of Terms Used</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical feminist</td>
<td>As for ‘egalitarian’. The terms are used synonymously in the relevant literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarian</td>
<td>‘Male and female were created by God as equal in dignity, value, essence and human nature, but also distinct in role whereby the male was given the responsibility of loving authority over the female, and the female was to offer willing, glad-hearted and submissive assistance to the man. Gen. 1:26-27 makes clear that male and female are equally created as God’s image, and so are, by God’s created design, equally and fully human. But, as Gen. 2 bears out (as seen in its own context and as understood by Paul in 1 Cor. 11 and 1 Tim. 2), their humanity would find expression differently, in a relationship of complementarity, with the female functioning in a submissive role under the leadership and authority of the male.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Both Adam and Eve were created in God’s image, equal before God as persons and distinct in their manhood and womanhood (Gen 1:26-27, 2:18).

2. Distinctions in masculine and feminine roles are ordained by God as part of the created order, and should find an echo in every human heart (Gen 2:18, 21-24; 1 Cor 11:7-9; 1 Tim 2:12-14).

3. Adam’s headship in marriage was established by God before the Fall, and was not a result of sin (Gen 2:16-18, 21-24, 3:1-13; 1 Cor 11:7-9). |

1018 These are the meanings to be understood when these terms are used throughout this work, but it is not an attribution of any of these positions as described here either to Ian and Averil, or to myself; generally speaking Ian and Averil may be regarded as egalitarians, myself as a complementarian, but their and my respective views within each position may differ from the specific views described here (the terms are defined here because they are used to describe the position of commentators quoted in this work other than Ian and Averil).

1019 The term has been defined here using complementarian writers.

1020 Ware, ‘Summaries of the Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions on the Role of Women in the Home and in Christian Ministry’, p. 2 (n.d.).
4. The Fall introduced **distortions into the relationships between men and women** (Gen 3:1-7, 12, 16).

- In the home, the husband’s loving, humble headship tends to be replaced by domination or passivity; the wife’s intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility.
- In the church, sin inclines men toward a worldly love of power or an abdication of spiritual responsibility, and inclines women to resist limitations on their roles or to neglect the use of their gifts in appropriate ministries.

5. The Old Testament, as well as the New Testament, **manifests the equally high value and dignity which God attached to the roles of both men and women** (Gen 1:26-27, 2:18; Gal 3:28). Both Old and New Testaments also **affirm the principle of male headship in the family and in the covenant community** (Gen 2:18; Eph 5:21-33; Col 3:18-19; 1 Tim 2:11-15).\(^{1021}\)

7. In all of life Christ is the supreme authority and guide for men and women, **so that no earthly submission-domestic, religious, or civil-ever implies a mandate to follow a human authority into sin** (Dan 3:10-18; Acts 4:19-20, 5:27-29; 1 Pet 3:1-2).\(^{1022}\)

8. In both men and women a heartfelt sense of call to ministry should never be used to set aside Biblical criteria for particular ministries (1 Tim 2:11-15, 3:1-13; Tit 1:5-9). **Rather, Biblical teaching should remain the authority for testing our subjective discernment of God’s will.**\(^{1023}\)

---


\(^{1022}\) Ibid.

\(^{1023}\) Ibid.
"The first is the "egalitarian or egalitarian" view, which holds that the image of God in men and women assures equality in essence and hence in function for men and women in the church."¹⁰²⁵

Evangelical egalitarians would argue that there is some correlation between one's status in the body of Christ and one's function or role in the smaller society of the Church and consequently the larger society of the culture.⁴

Not only is there equality of being or nature between man and woman, there is also, importantly, equality of function or task - both are commanded to rule. And note: no distinction is made to give the man a superior position in this rulership."¹⁰²⁸

"Since God's spiritual gifting is gender-neutral, and since God expects His gifts to be used in the church, it follows that men and women alike are equal in their exercise of gifts in the church."¹⁰²⁹

¹⁰²⁴ The term has been defined here using both egalitarian and complementarian writers.


¹⁰²⁷ Ibid., p. 59.

¹⁰²⁸ Ware, 'Summaries of the Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions on the Role of Women in the Home and in Christian Ministry', p. 2 (n.d.).

¹⁰²⁹ Ibid., p. 2.
2. The Bible teaches that woman and man were created for full and equal partnership. The word "helper" (ezer), used to designate woman in Genesis 2:18, refers to God in most instances of Old Testament usage (e.g. 1Sam 7:12; Ps 121:1-2). Consequently the word conveys no implication whatsoever of female subordination or inferiority.\(^{1030}\)

5. The Bible teaches that the rulership of Adam over Eve resulted from the Fall and was therefore not a part of the original created order. Genesis 3:16 is a prediction of the effects of the Fall rather than a prescription of God's ideal order.\(^{1031}\)

8. The Bible teaches that both women and men are called to develop their spiritual gifts and to use them as stewards of the grace of God (1Peter 4:10-11). Both men and women are divinely gifted and empowered to minister to the whole Body of Christ, under His authority (Acts 1:14, 18:26, 21:9; Rom 16:1-7, 12-13, 15; Phil 4:2-3; Col 4:15; see also Mark 15:40-41, 16:1-7; Luke 8:1-3; John 20:17-18; compare also Old Testament examples: Judges 4:4-14, 5:7; 2Chron 34:22-28; Prov 31:30-31; Micah 6:4).

9. The Bible teaches that, in the New Testament economy, women as well as men exercise the prophetic, priestly and royal functions (Acts 2:17-18, 21:9; 1Cor 11:5; 1Peter 2:9-10; Rev 1:6, 5:10). Therefore, the few isolated texts that appear to restrict the full redemptive freedom of women must not be interpreted simplistically and in contradiction to the rest of Scripture, but their interpretation must take into account their relation to the broader teaching of Scripture and their total context (1Cor 11:2-16, 14:33-36; 1Tim 2:9-15).

10. The Bible defines the function of leadership as the empowerment of others for service rather than as the exercise of power over them (Matt 20:25-28, 23:8; Mark 10:42-45; John 13:13-17; Gal 5:13; 1Peter 5:2-3).\(^{1032}\)

11. The Bible teaches that husbands and wives are heirs together of the grace of life and that they are bound together in a relationship of mutual submission


\(^{1031}\) Ibid.

\(^{1032}\) Ibid.

\(^{1033}\) Ibid.
and responsibility (1Cor 7:3-5; Eph 5:21; 1Peter 3:1-7; Gen 21:12). The husband’s function as “head” (kephale) is to be understood as self-giving love and service within this relationship of mutual submission (Eph 5:21-33; Col 3:19; 1Peter 3:7).

12. The Bible teaches that both mothers and fathers are to exercise leadership in the nurture, training, discipline and teaching of their children (Exod 20:12; Lev 19:3; Deut 6:6-9, 21:18-21, 27:16; Prov 1:8, 6:20; Eph 6:1-4; Col 3:20; 2Tim 1:5; see also Luke 2:51).\textsuperscript{1033} The terms are used synonymously in the relevant literature.

Evangelical feminist

As for ‘egalitarian’. The terms are used synonymously in the relevant literature.

Revisionism, revisionist

‘advocacy of revision (as of a doctrine or policy or in historical analysis) — re•vi•sion•ist \‐nist\ n or adj.’\textsuperscript{1034}

\textsuperscript{1033} Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (11\textsuperscript{th} ed. 2003); readers will note that this is a non-derogatory sense of the word.
Sources used in this work

In this section key sources in this work and the reasons for their use are described.

Bible translations

The following is a list of Bible translations which have been used in this work. Of the English Bible translations, only those dating from 1970 onwards have been used, in order to ensure that bias from traditionally minded and outdated scholarship is minimized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation method</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Good News Bible (1976)</td>
<td>Semi-formal dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>GNB/TEV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translations used in this work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation method</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible (1970)</td>
<td>Formal dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>NAB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1035 The 1982 New King James Version has not been included because it made minimal revisions to the text and does not reflect modern textual criticism and scholarship; paraphrases have been included in order to represent a broad spectrum of views.

1036 Translations marked with an asterisk use gender accurate, gender neutral, or gender inclusive language; readers will note that the balance of translations used is strongly in favour of such Bibles.

1037 Also known as ‘Good News Translation’, or ‘Today’s English Version’.

1038 New Testament only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation method</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard Bible (1995)(^{1039})</td>
<td>Semi-formal dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>NASB95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New English Translation (1(^{st}) edition 2005)</td>
<td>Semi-formal dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>NET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (1978)</td>
<td>Semi-formal dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>NIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New International Reader's Version (1998)</td>
<td>Informal dynamic equivalence</td>
<td>NIRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New Living Translation (1996)</td>
<td>Paraphrase (very informal dynamic equivalence)</td>
<td>NLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*The Living Bible (1971)</td>
<td>Paraphrase (very informal dynamic equivalence)</td>
<td>TLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vulgate (5(^{th}) century)(^{1040})</td>
<td>Formal equivalence</td>
<td>Vulgate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bibles listed here are all recognized as standard modern English translations, though some of them contain renderings with marginal or no scholarly support.\(^{1041}\)

These Bibles represent the full spectrum of translations from formal dynamic equivalence to full paraphrase, in order to encompass as broad a view as possible.

---

\(^{1039}\) Revised edition known as ‘NASB95 Update’.


\(^{1041}\) Typically the paraphrases: Message, NLT, and TLB.
On this point I am complete agreement with Ian and Averil:

"Translation is not straightforward; words have different meanings according to context, and translations are influenced by the background and understanding of the translators and commentators. It is important, therefore, never to rely on just one translation or on one commentator."  

Lexicons & dictionaries

Reference to a concordance, Bible dictionary, or lexicon is a standard method of determining word meaning. On this subject readers should note the importance of the following modern professional lexicons, as lexical tools used commonly in our community (such as Thayer’s, Strong’s, Young’s, and Vine’s), are little respected by modern scholarship, and are considered inadequate for serious study and commentary on contested word meanings.

A number of professional scholarly Greek lexicons and dictionaries have been used in this work. Differing in scope, depth, and presentation, they nevertheless represent the lexical scholarly consensus. These are the standard professional Greek lexicons recognized and used in the scholarly literature. Their agreement on the meaning of a given word is considered effectively conclusive.

1043 Thayer’s ‘A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Being Grimm’s Wilke’s Clavis Novi Testamenti Translated, Revised, and Enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, corrected edition’ (1886), has also been quoted but is not listed here as it is not a professional scholarly lexicon (in fact it was rendered out of date by new lexical discoveries less than 10 years after it was printed), and because it is not used in this work to define any particular words nor appealed to as a legitimate authority.

1044 The scholarly consensus is the general collective agreement of professionals in a given field, but it is not synonymous with ‘unanimity’; it refers to a view which has consistently been examined and is agreed on as accurate by the overwhelming majority of qualified professionals in the field (views outside the scholarly consensus are always minority views, and are almost invariably dismissed by professionals as suspect at best, unworthy of notice at worst).

1045 Standard works are highly regarded sources typically representing the scholarly consensus; their conclusions are not to be accepted completely without question, but are highly reliable (a comparison of standard works on a given subject renders a balanced view).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Lexicon¹⁰⁴⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This student lexicon provides the reflex forms of the Greek alongside a simplified analysis of meanings. |
This standard technical lexicon includes extensive references to extra-Biblical usage. |
This standard technical lexicon is the principal lexicon for the LXX. |
This standard technical lexicon has a focus on the Greek Fathers. |
This lexicon is aimed at translators working in the field. |
This standard technical lexicon mainly indexes words appearing in the non-Biblical Greek literature, between approximately 600 BCE and 600 CE. The focus is on classical and attic forms. |

¹⁰⁴⁶ Descriptions by brother Andrew Perry.

¹⁰⁴⁷ This lexicon only indexes words appearing in the LXX.
## Modern Professional Lexicons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Modern Professional Dictionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Scholarly & non-scholarly journals

A number of scholarly journals and non-scholarly journals have been used in this work. While some are generally conservative in their tone, the majority of them contain articles from a broad range of viewpoints, including submissions from egalitarian and complementarian commentators, as well as unaligned third parties. These journals survey the full spectrum of views, and the scholarly consensus.

**Scholarly Biblical journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ISSNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Theological Inquiry</td>
<td>1942-2709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland Theological Journal</td>
<td>1991-2005 1044-6494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Bible and Critical Theory</em></td>
<td>2004-2009 1832-3391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible and Spade</td>
<td>1972-2000 1079-6959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Bible Translator; Technical Papers</em></td>
<td>1950-2008 0260-0935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Archaeology Review</td>
<td>1975-2005 0098-9444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bibliotheca Sacra</em></td>
<td>1934-2007 0006-1921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scholarly Biblical journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ISSNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Ground Journal</td>
<td>2003-2009 1547-9129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Currents in Biblical Research</em> April 2003-October 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal</td>
<td>1996-2005 1094-8473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Expository Times</em> August 1999-October 2010 1745-5308 (Internet edition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1048 Identified as academic/scholarly by Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory, the authoritative serials catalogue; these journals meet the academic standard for use in professional works; non-scholarly journals are still of value, as although they do not have formal scholarly status they include many articles from well recognized scholars and professional academics belonging to a broad range of disciplines.

1049 Identified as non-academic/scholarly by Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory, or else not registered in Ulrich’s.

1050 For example, the ‘Conservative Theological Journal’, ‘Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood’, and ‘Southern Baptist Journal of Theology’; JBMW in particular is written specifically to defend the complementarian perspective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly Biblical journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emmaus Journal, 1991-2004 (ISSN 1546-6973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Mission, 1983-2004 (ISSN 0740-0659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Theological Journal, 1980-1991 (ISSN 0198-666X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal for Christian Theological Research, 1996-2007 (ISSN 1087-1624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal for the Renewal of Religion and Theology, 2006-2009 (ISSN 1834-3627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal for the Study of the New Testament, April 1999-September 2010 (ISSN 0142-064X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, December 2001-September 2010 (ISSN 0309-0892)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, April 1999-September 2010 (ISSN 1745-5286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Biblical Studies, 2001-2006 (ISSN 1534-3057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, 1996-2007 (ISSN 1203-1542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Late Antique Religion and Culture, 2007-2008 (ISSN 1754-517X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Men, Masculinities and Spirituality, 2007-2009 (ISSN 1177-2484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Ministry and Theology, 1997-2007 (ISSN 1092-9525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Philosophy &amp; Scripture, 2003-2008 (ISSN 1555-5100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Journal of Religion and Society, 1999-2009 (ISSN 1522-5658)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lectio Difficilior, 2000-2008 (ISSN 1661-3317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marburg Journal of Religion, 1996-2009 (ISSN 1612-2941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Journal of Theology and Ministry, 1997-2009 (ISSN 1481-0794)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation and Revival, 1992-2004 (ISSN 1071-7277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Expositor, 1962-2007 (ISSN 0034-6373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Journal of Law and Religion, 1999-2008 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*The Saint Anselm Journal, 2003-2008 (ISSN 1545-3367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Semeia Studies, 1974-2002 (ISSN 1567-200X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Society of Christian Ethics Journal, 1975-2009 (ISSN 1540-7942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Baptist Journal of Theology, 1997-2007 (ISSN 1520-7307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Biblical journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*T C: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism, 1996-2009 (ISSN 1089-7747)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Trinity Journal, 1980-2006 (ISSN 0360-3032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Theological Journal, 1950-2007 (ISSN 0043-4388)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Biblical journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist, 1938-1988 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bible Quarterly, 1966-1979 (ISSN 0008-9311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafer Theological Seminary Journal, 1995-2003 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Apologetics Journal, 1998-2000, 2005 (ISSN 1930-9074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian History Magazine, 1982-2008 (ISSN 0891-9666)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Theological Journal, 2000-2004 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Journal of Classical Theology, September 1998-August 2001 (ISSN 1521-6055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Journal, 1960-1973 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, 1995-2010 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Biblical Apologetics, 2000-2003 (ISSN 1938-6397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Christian Apologetics, 1997-1998 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 1966-2007 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society, 1998-2007 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Seminary Journal, 1990-2007 (ISSN 1066-3959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Theological Inquiry, 2008 (ISSN 1942-2709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Theological Journal, 1990-1994 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Baptist Theological Review, 2004-2005 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin, 1956-2006 (no ISSN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard works

A number of standard works have been used. Standard works are highly regarded sources typically representing the scholarly consensus. A knowledge of the standard works in a field is of considerable importance in order to assess sources used for research in that field. The unwary, uninformed, or undiscerning reader can be misled into treating works or authors as authoritative, when in fact they may be biased, inaccurate, or rejected by the scholarly consensus.

‘One should guard against some rather particularistic views, that is, **views held only by one or two scholars**. Often such views present the eccentricities of scholars rather than **serious contributions to the interpretation of a text**.”

Early Christian writings


  A standard Greek text of the early Christian writers, produced by the 19th century French Catholic Jacques-Paul Migne. Still cited in the scholarly literature, especially since it contains various texts which have not yet been translated into English.


  These are the three standard collections and translations of the earliest Christian writings. The Holmes edition is a revision of the edition by Lightfoot and Harmer, and is frequently cited in scholarly literature. These are still recommended to students of early Christian literature in academic subject guides.

---


These are the standard collections and translations of the early Christian writings from the 1st to the 8th centuries. Although somewhat dated in places, they remain the collection most commonly cited in the scholarly literature, and are still recommended in academic subject guides.

• De Ferrari (ed.). (1947-). *Fathers of the Church – A New Translation*. Catholic University of America Press.

A more recent collection and translation of early Christian writings from the 1st to the 8th centuries. Increasingly found cited in scholarly literature, and also recommended to students of early Christian literature in academic subject guides.
Greek source texts


  This is a large collection of Greek inscriptions, and is a standard source for scholarly literature on a range of subjects including lexicography, palaeography, and historical studies. It is commonly cited as ‘SIG’, followed by the volume number and inscription number.


  This is a collection of Greek texts from the 8th century BCE to 1453. TLG is the largest electronic collection of Greek texts, and it is used by scholars in many different fields to identify word meanings and patterns of grammatical usage in Greek.

  My edition is the collection published in 2000 (the last CDROM published), which has since been surpassed by the online collection (containing twice as many texts as CDROM E), but which is still used as a scholarly reference source.

1052 Details of the collection may be found at the project’s website: http://www.tlg.uci.edu.
Jewish religious writings


  This is the standard English edition of early to late medieval Jewish commentaries on various books of the Bible.


  This is the standard English edition of the Mishnah (a collection of law and tradition in rabbinic Judaism), as referred to in the relevant scholarly literature.


  This is a standard English edition of Talmud Babylon (also known as 'Talmud Bavli'), the most influential and extensive collection of the Mishnah (see previous entry), and the Babylonian Gemara (rabbinical commentaries on the Mishnah). It has recently been superceded by the modern edition of Neusner.1053

Flavius Josephus


  This is the standard English edition of Josephus, as translated by 18th century Biblical scholar (and friend of Isaac Newton), William Whiston. Each text is catalogued with a book number, section number, and paragraph number for ease of reference.

  Some style guides require all of these to be cited, but a common citation method (as used for example by the Westminster Theological Seminary, and found in many academic journals), is to omit the section number and give the reference in the form '[abbreviated book title].[book number].[paragraph number]'. Thus 'Wars. 5.199’ refers to Josephus’ book 'The Wars of the Jews', book 5, paragraph 199. This is the citation method followed in this work.

---

Some electronic editions of Josephus do not include the paragraph numbers (only the section numbers), resulting in improper citations when the book and section number is given instead of the book and paragraph number.


  This is the standard critical edition (not a translation), of the Greek text of Josephus, by 19th century German Biblical scholar Benedict Niese. It contains Niese’s introduction to the text, in which he explains the various manuscript sources he used, and contains also Niese’s text critical notes, in which he notes the various manuscript readings and gives his reason for the reading he prefers.

  Niese's critical edition differs from the standard English edition in various places, as the Greek text he compiled was different to the text used by Whiston.

**The Nag Hammadi Library (Gnosticism)**


  This is the standard collection of the Nag Hammadi Library in English, and is the work typically referred to in scholarly works on Gnosticism and the Nag Hammadi Library. Robinson’s conclusions typically follow the scholarly consensus, and he identifies his departure from it when necessary.

**Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**


  The standard English edition of the Old Testament apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works.

The standard Greek edition of the Old Testament apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works.

**Philo of Alexandria**


The standard English edition of the works of 1st century Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, by the 19th century English classicist Charles Yonge.
Textual commentary

These textual commentaries were written specifically for the purpose of providing information on the social, historical, and linguistic background of the Old and New Testament texts, in order to assist its interpretation.

They include both egalitarian and complementarian scholars, as well as secular and religious commentators, providing a well balanced perspective, and are useful for identifying the scholarly consensus, as the volumes typically discuss the broad spectrum of academic views and translations. They are cited frequently in the relevant scholarly literature, and are used by professional Bible translators to provide commentary in the footnotes of such Bibles as the New English Translation.

Old Testament Commentaries

- Tyndale Old Testament Commentary. InterVarsity Press.

New Testament Commentaries

Old and New Testament Commentaries


Exegetical Summaries


Textual commentary for translators


This series of textual commentaries on the Old and New Testaments was written specifically for the purpose of informing translators of various textual issues (including the social, historical, and linguistic background of the text), in order to assist their translation of the Hebrew and Greek text into English.

It is not an interpretive commentary, but a guide to the Bible translator to help them assess the text on the basis of the scholarly consensus. Its contributors include both egalitarian and complementarian scholars, as well as secular and religious commentators, providing a well balanced perspective. It is useful for identifying the scholarly consensus, as the volumes are typically discuss the broad spectrum of scholarly views and different translations.
The following review of the volume on Genesis, provides some information on how the series presents information on each of the Biblical books:

"The goal of the series is "to assist practicing Bible translators as they carry out the important task of putting God's Word into the many languages spoken in the world today." To do this they provide "valuable exegetical, historical, cultural, and linguistic information" (i). They thus have a much more practical than academic purpose. This is illustrated, for example by the inclusion of sections on translating Adam and the names of God, but none on hypotheses concerning composition and transmission of the text.

The layout of the commentary is to provide sections in both the Revised Standard version and Today's English Version. Then comment is provided, usually on every word or phrase of each verse. There are no foreign languages used, nor are there many references to secondary sources apart from other translations (and E. Speiser's Anchor Bible commentary volume), which is both boon and bane.

Attention is drawn directly to the text, rather than what many others have said about it, so there is more immediacy to the commentary. A disadvantage is not knowing in every case whether the interpretation presented is generally accepted, unanimous, or idiosyncratic.

The volume will probably not be the sole source which readers will consult in studying the book, but it provides a good commentary in a succinct and readable form. All theological libraries need the volume, and many teachers and preachers will surely consult it often."

---
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**Textual criticism** (the text of the New Testament)


  This is the authoritative critical text of the Greek New Testament which is used by virtually all modern English Bible translations. It contains the judgment of a large group of recognized professionals on the New Testament texts, and individual Bible translation teams very rarely depart from its reconstruction of the text. Dispute with the text is a matter for professionals, not amateurs, and is typically undertaken with considerable caution by professional Bible translation committees.


  This is the standard professional commentary on the Greek New Testament text mentioned previously. It was written by Bruce Metzger, a recognized textual criticism authority, and a member of the Greek New Testament committee.

  Metzger provides insight into the decision making process of the committee where the text was substantially in doubt or in dispute, or there were a number of sufficiently plausible reconstructions to make extended discussion necessary.

  Metzger explains the textual issue, refers to the various arguments discussed, and describes which decision was reached, together with the committee’s level of certainty that the decision was correct.

  This commentary is extremely useful for assessing alternative reconstructions of the text. If the committee rejected a particular reconstruction, it cannot be asserted with any degree of force without new information or a significant scholarly support from professional textual critics. If a given reconstruction was not even considered plausible by the committee, it should not even be suggested at all, still less by amateurs.

---

1055 Textual criticism aims to determine what the correct text of the New Testament actually is, rather than what it means, though some interpretative issues are occasionally involved since if a proposed reconstruction of the text actually makes no sense it is highly unlikely to be accurate.
The Vulgate


  A critical edition of the 4th century Latin Vulgate (Clementine edition, 1592). This is widely used and well recognized as adequate for general research purposes. The authoritative modern critical edition with text critical apparatus (used for text critical research), is published by United Bible Societies.\(^{1057}\)

\(^{1056}\) Details of this text can be found at the project’s website: [http://vulsearch.sourceforge.net/gettext.html](http://vulsearch.sourceforge.net/gettext.html).

\(^{1057}\) Details of this text can be found at the UBS website: [http://www.ubs-translations.org/cat/biblical_texts/latin_texts](http://www.ubs-translations.org/cat/biblical_texts/latin_texts).
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