

Rightly Dividing the Word

A review of arguments used in 'All One'

Jonathan Burke (revised edition 2012)

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 themselves¹

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.'²

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 1'4 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

| Transliteration scheme | |
|------------------------|--|
| Greek | English |
| α | <i>a</i> |
| β | <i>b</i> |
| γ | <i>g</i> (<i>n</i> before γ, κ, ξ, or χ) |
| δ | <i>d</i> |
| ε | <i>e</i> |
| ζ | <i>z</i> |
| η | <i>ē</i> |
| θ | <i>th</i> |
| ι | <i>i</i> |
| κ | <i>k</i> |
| λ | <i>l</i> |
| μ | <i>m</i> |
| ν | <i>n</i> |
| ξ | <i>x</i> |
| ο | <i>o</i> |
| π | <i>p</i> |
| ρ | <i>r</i> |
| ϱ | <i>rh</i> |
| σ | <i>s</i> |
| τ | <i>t</i> |
| υ | <i>y</i> (<i>u</i> in diphthongs: <i>au</i> , <i>eu</i> , <i>ēu</i> , <i>ou</i> , <i>ui</i>) |
| φ | <i>ph</i> |

⁵ SBL Handbook of Style: for ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and early Christian studies, 5.1.2 (1999).

| Transliteration scheme | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Greek | English |
| χ | <i>ch</i> |
| ψ | <i>ps</i> |
| ω | <i>ō</i> |
| ‘ | <i>h (with vowel or diphthong)</i> |

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.’⁶

‘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.**’⁷

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**.'⁸

'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.'⁹

'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**.'¹⁰

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).'¹¹

⁸ Ibid., p. 5.

⁹ Ibid., p. 72.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 72.

¹¹ Kroeger & Kroeger, 'I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence', p. 38 (1992), in Baugh, 'The Apostle among the Amazons', Westminster Theological Journal (56.1.168), Spring 1994; the Kroegers are egalitarians.

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

- 'Jecooniah 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.

¹⁴ *The NET Bible First Edition* (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

- '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.¹⁵ In Acts 1:16;¹⁶ 2:29, 37; 7:37;¹⁷ 6:3;¹⁸ 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 *pseudadelphois*, '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)

¹⁵ The NET Bible First Edition (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

¹⁶ The footnote reads 'In light of the compound phrase ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (andre" adelfoi, "Men brothers") Peter's words are best understood as directly addressed to the males present, possibly referring specifically to the twelve (really ten at this point – eleven minus the speaker, Peter) mentioned by name in v. 13.', The NET Bible First Edition, footnote on Acts 1:16 (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

¹⁷ The footnote on the use in verse 29 reads 'Since this represents a continuation of the address beginning in v.14 and continued in v. 22, "brothers" has been used here rather than a generic expression like "brothers and sisters."', The NET Bible First Edition, footnote on Acts 2:29 (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

¹⁸ The footnote reads 'It is not clear from a historical standpoint (but it is unlikely) that women would have been involved in the selection process too. For this reason the translation "brothers" has been retained, rather than "brothers and sisters" (used in contexts where both male and female believers are clearly addressed).', The NET Bible First Edition, footnote on Acts 6:3 (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

- **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:** *adelphoi*, 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:** *adelphoi*, 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:** *adelphoi*, 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:** *adelphoi*, 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 *adelphoi* as 'brothers' in each of the verses cited above, even though the NET also recognizes *adelphoi* 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,¹⁹ 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'.²² 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).

²¹ 'Reply 2', p. 71 (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.'²⁵

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.'²⁶

'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.'²⁷

'2. 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).'²⁸

²⁵ 'Reply 2', pp. 68-69 (April 2009).

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

²⁷ Wallace, 'Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics', p. 363 (1997).

²⁸ Osborne, 'The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation', pp. 84-85 (rev. ed. 2006).

'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.

³¹ Cited in 'All One', pp. 65, 119, 126 (2010).

³² 'adelphos (ἄδελφός, 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 not 6:3.', Vine, Unger, & White, 'Vine's complete expository dictionary of Old and New Testament words', volume 2, p. 82 (1996 ed.).

³³ ἄδελφός, -οῦ, ἄ, (fr. a copulative and δελφύς, from the same womb ; cf. γάστωρ),

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.³⁴ 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.

³⁵ ‘...literally, male sibling with at least one parent in common (JN 1.41)...’, Friberg, Friberg, & Miller ‘Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament’, volume 4, p. 34 (2000).

³⁶ ‘a male from the same womb as the reference pers., **brother...**’, Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, ‘A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature’, p. 18 (3rd ed., 2000).

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).

³⁸ ‘**brother Gn 4,2...**’, Lust, Eynikel, & Hauspie, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint’ (electronic rev. ed. 2003).

³⁹ ‘a male having the same father and mother as the reference person—‘**brother.**’, Louw & Nida, ‘Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains’, volume 1, pp. 117-118 (2nd ed. 1989).

⁴⁰ ‘A. **son of the same mother...**’, Liddell, Scott, & Jones, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon’, p.20 (rev. and augm. throughout, electronic ed., 9th ed. with supplement, 1996).

⁴¹ ‘ἑταῖρος, ὁ ἑ m **brother; fellow believer; fellow countryman, fellowman**’, Newman, ‘Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament’, p. 3 (1993).

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'**⁴⁸).

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.

⁴² '... **brother, male sibling**...', Swanson, 'Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)', DBLG 81, #5 (2nd ed. 2001).

⁴³ '1. **Physical Brotherhood.**', Kittel, Bromiley, & Friedrich, 'Theological dictionary of the New Testament', volume 1, pp. 144-146 (1964-c1976).

⁴⁴ **'A brother.** Adelphós generally denotes a fellowship of life based on identity of origin, **e.g., members of the same family**...', Zodiates, 'The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament', G80 (electronic ed., 2000).

⁴⁵ Friberg, Friberg, & Miller 'Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament', volume 4, p. 34 (2000).

⁴⁶ Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, 'A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature', p. 18 (3rd ed., 2000).

⁴⁷ Louw & Nida, 'Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains', volume 1, p. 117 (2nd ed. 1989).

⁴⁸ Liddell, Scott, & Jones, 'A Greek-English Lexicon', p.20 (rev. and augm. throughout, electronic ed., 9th ed. with supplement, 1996).

⁴⁹ Cited in 'All One', pp. 57, 95, 102 (March 2009).

⁵⁰ Vine, Unger, & White, 'Vine's complete expository dictionary of Old and New Testament words', volume 2, p. 82 (1996 ed.).

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,⁵¹ 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/lcj>

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}, it^{a, b, d, k}),⁵⁹ as this demonstrates that these are not even systematic changes to one particular manuscript tradition, let alone the entire Western text type.

⁵⁵ Witherington, 'The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the 'Western' Text in Acts', Journal of Biblical Literature (103.1), 1984.

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^a' 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,⁶⁰ 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'

Latin, and the other letters stand for various specific copies of this Latin manuscript); this same reading is also found in Greek and Latin manuscripts, according to the 4th-5th century Christian writer Augustine.

⁶⁰ The committee responsible for the UBS Greek New Testament, 4th edition, the Greek text from which almost all modern English Bible translations are made.

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,¹⁰ that a line in an ancestor of codex Bezae **had been accidentally omitted**',⁶¹ 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.

⁶¹ Metzger, 'A Textual Commentary On the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)', p. 407 (2nd edition 1994).

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

| Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes ⁶² ⁶³ |
| Matthew 5:32 | Yes ⁶⁴ | NA ⁶⁵ | NA | NA |
| Acts 1:14 | Yes ⁶⁶ | Yes ⁶⁷ | Unclear ^{68 69} | Probable ⁷⁰ |

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^{a, b, d, k,} and other manuscripts omit καὶ through μοιχῶται 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 καὶ 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.

⁶⁷ 'Consequently, Codex D appears to limit the meaning of the text in Acts 1.14 **so as to place women in a more subordinate role** in the early Church.', Malick, 'The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts', Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.166), 2007.

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

| Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Acts 16:14-15, 40 | NA | No ⁷¹ | NA | No (14-15) ⁷² |

there an 'Anti-Priscan' Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila', *Journal of Biblical Literature* (125.1.122), 2007.

⁶⁹ 'The addition of kai; tevknoi" 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

⁷⁰ 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', table on p. 201 (2003).

⁷¹ 'Unlike Codex D's expansion in Acts 1.14, the textual variants in Acts 16.14, 15, and 40 **do not reveal a great deal about Codex D's theological concern for women.**', Malick, 'The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts', *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* (4.170-171), 2007.

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.

| Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Acts 17:4 | Yes ⁷³ | Yes ⁷⁴ | NA | Yes ⁷⁵ |
| Acts 17:12 | Yes ⁷⁶ | Yes ⁷⁷ | | Unclear ⁷⁸ |

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 γυναῖκες τε τῶν πρώτων might be translated "the wives of leading men" instead of rendering "women of the first magnitude"), **D and others** give us the unambiguous καὶ γυναῖκες τῶν πρώτων.’, 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.

⁷⁵ ‘The ‘Western’ reading (kai gunaikes) removes the ambiguity (cf. 1.14): **the women persuaded are clearly wives of leading citizens of the town, not leading citizens in their own right**.’, 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. 191 (2003).

⁷⁶ ‘We find the same phenomenon at 17:12. **D* alters the text so that both the men and women are prominent** (καὶ τῶν ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν ἐπισχημόνων ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες) 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 | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Acts 17:34 | Yes ⁷⁹ | Unclear ⁸⁰ | NA | No ⁸¹ |

⁷⁹ 'W. M. Ramsay has observed rightly that the omission in Codex Bezae of καὶ γυναικὶ ὀνόματι 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).', '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 | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Acts 18:2-3 | Yes ⁸² | Yes ⁸³ | Possible ⁸⁴ | Unclear ⁸⁵ |
| Acts 18:7 | | Yes ⁸⁶ | No ⁸⁷ | No ⁸⁸ |

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.

⁸³ **'In Acts 18.2-3, after introducing Priscilla as the wife of Aquila, he removes her from any discussion of the tent-making work that Paul did with Aquila.'** Malick, 'The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts', Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (4.182), 2007.

⁸⁴ **'Consequently, it is not completely unfounded to interpret the change in the way Prisca is introduced in Acts 18:2 as a put-down.'** Kurek-Chomycz, 'Is there an 'Anti-Priscan' Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila', Journal of Biblical Literature (125.1.122), 2007.

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 Cantabrigiensis 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 | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Acts 18:18 | Yes ⁸⁹ | NA | No ⁹⁰ | NA |
| Acts 18:21-22 | | | Possible ⁹¹ | Yes ⁹² |

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).

| Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Acts 18:26 | Yes ⁹³ | Yes ⁹⁴ | Yes ⁹⁵ | Uncertain ⁹⁶ |
| Acts 18:27 | | NA | No ⁹⁷ | No ⁹⁸ |

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: ἀφκουῶσαντο", 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.**', '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. 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.**', '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. 200 (2003).

| Assessment of Alleged Misogynist Alterations | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| Passage | Witherington | Malick | Kurek-Chomycz | Holmes |
| Romans 16:3-5 | NA | NA | Unclear ⁹⁹ | NA |
| 1 Corinthians 16:19 | | | | |
| Colossians 4:15 | Yes ¹⁰⁰ | | NA | |

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.¹⁰¹ 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^c, 1739, 1881, et al. have αἰτὶς indicating a church in the house of Nympha, D, G pm, et al. have αἰτοῖς 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.**¹⁰²

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 1:14,¹⁰³ 2:17,¹⁰⁴ and 17:12.¹⁰⁵

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.

¹⁰² Brock, 'Scribal Blunder or Textual Plunder? Codex Bezae, Textual-Rhetorical Analysis, And the Diminished Role of Women', in Stichele & Penner (eds.), 'Her Master's Tools?: Feminist and Postcolonial Engagements of Historical-Critical Discourse', *Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship*, p. 257 (2005).

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.”¹⁰⁶

‘Perhaps they were taking part in weighing up what the prophets said (verse 29) **but in a disruptive and arrogant manner.**’¹⁰⁷

‘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.”’¹⁰⁸

‘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.**’¹⁰⁹

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*.⁹ Support is found in v. 35, that if the women wish to learn 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"**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.**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**

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).

¹¹¹ Hays, 'First Corinthians', Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, p. 247 (1997).

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 *γυναῖκες* 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 Thiselton, '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.**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.**¹¹⁵

The fanciful idea that men and women were separated in 1st century synagogues¹¹⁶ has long been refuted by archaeological evidence demonstrating that no such seating arrangements were made.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Soards, '1 Corinthians', New International Bible Commentary, pp. 305-306 (1999).

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

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.

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 (Broton) and that of homes like that in which the Corinthian church met.**'¹¹⁸

have a separate women's section.', Weiss, 'The Sepphoris Synagogue Mosaic', *Biblical Archaeology Review* (26.05), 2000.

¹¹⁸ Keener, 'Man and Woman', in Hawthorne, Martin, & Reid, 'Dictionary of Paul and his letters', p. 590 (1993).

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

The claim made

'Paul quotes his opponents and then refutes them'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.**'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!'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.

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.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 74.

¹²¹ Ibid., p. 76.

'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).'¹²²

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."**¹²³

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.'¹²⁴

'f) The spirit of Gal. 3:28 is not violated by Paul in any way.'¹²⁵

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?**

¹²² Trotter, review of Bilezikian's 'Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible', in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (30.1.101), 1987.

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

¹²⁴ Arichea, 'The Silence of Women in The Church: Theology and Translation in 1 Corinthians 14.33b-36', *The Bible Translator* (46.1.110), 1995.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

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,¹²⁸ 129 130 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.

¹³⁰ **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).

¹³¹ '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.

¹³² '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).

¹³³ '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 Corinthian not Pauline opinion); the particle's 'contrary force' makes much better sense in connection with v. 33.', Horrel, 'The social ethos of the Corinthians correspondence: interests and ideology', p. 187 (1996).

¹³⁴ '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.)

¹³⁵ **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!"¹³⁶

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.¹³⁷ 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 'He [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.

‘advantages’ of this interpretation of the text the fact that it is supportive of the egalitarian case.¹³⁸

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 Pentateuch¹³⁹ or some other part of the Old Testament.¹⁴⁰ Several commentators note that this appeal to ‘the Law’ is a standard form of argument in Paul’s writings.^{141 142 143 144}

¹³⁸ ¹a) **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.

¹³⁹ Paul’s reference to the teaching of “the law” **probably has the Genesis creation narratives in mind, with their implications for order and propriety in relationships between men and women** (see Thiselton 2000: 1153–54; Bruce 1980: 136; Carson 1987: 129; Keener 1992: 86–87; see also commentary on 1 Cor. 11:2–16 above).¹³⁹, Beale & Carson, ‘Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament’, p. 743 (2007).

¹⁴⁰ ‘Against the argument that the use of οὗ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται, 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 ὁ νόμος λέγει, the law indicates**.³⁶³ BAGD, Moulton-Milligan et al. and Grimm-Thayer **provide instances of the verb in the sense of it is permitted** (sometimes with the perfect stative sense, there exists permission) **in the papyri, Josephus, and other first-century sources.**’, Thiselton, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text’, 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,¹⁴⁵ almost all understand this as a reference to the Law of Moses or a general principle from Genesis or the Old Testament.¹⁴⁶ 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” (ὁ 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.**³⁴ 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).

¹⁴⁵ Orr & Walther, ‘1 Corinthians: A new translation’, The Anchor Bible (1976); Robertson, et al, ‘A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians. 2nd ed.’, The International Critical Commentary (1971 ed.); McArthur (complementarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, MacArthur New Testament Commentary (1984); Ellingworth & Hatton, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians’ (2nd ed., 1994); Morris, ‘The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians’, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (2nd ed., 1985); Garland (egalitarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (2003); Beale & Carson, ‘Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament’ (2007); Oster (complementarian), ‘1 Corinthians’, College Press NIV Commentary (1995); Hodge, ‘An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians’ (1980 ed.); Bruce (egalitarian), ‘1 and 2 Corinthians’, New Century Bible Commentary (1971); Kistemaker, ‘Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians’, New Testament Commentary (1986).

¹⁴⁶ Of these commentaries only one egalitarian commentary disagrees; Fee, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians’, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (2nd ed., 1987).

- **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.**¹⁴⁷

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'.

¹⁴⁷ 'All One', p. 77 (March 2009).

The KJV is misleading, and creates precisely the false impression which Ian and Averil criticize in their work.¹⁴⁸ Ian and Averil actually correct this language where it occurs elsewhere in the KJV, but¹⁴⁹ 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.^{150 151 152 153 154}

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.

¹⁵⁰ ἁνδροφόνος, ου, ὁ (s. ἁνὴρ, φόνος; Hom. et al.; OGI 218, 99 [III B.C.]; Kaibel 184, 6 [III B.C.]; POslo 18, 4 [162 A.D.]; 2 Macc 9:28; Philo, Just.; Ath. 35, 1; Iren. 1, 6, 3 [Harv. I 55, 14] adj.) **murderer** (lit. ‘man-slayer’; Lex. Vind. p. 192, 13: **a murderer of women and children as well as of men**) **1 Ti 1:9**.—DELG s.v. ἁνὴρ A, θείνω. M-M.’, Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, ‘A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature’, p. 76 (3rd ed., 2000).

¹⁵¹ ἁνδροφόνος, ου, ὁ androphonos **murderer* 1 Tim 1:9 in a vice catalog with reference to the fifth commandment of the Decalogue**; → ἁνδραποδιστής, Balz & Schneider, ‘Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testamen’, volume 1, p. 96 (1990-c1993).

¹⁵² ἁνδροφόνος, -ου+ N2M 0-0-0-0-1=1 2 Mc 9,28 **Murderer**, Lust, Eynikel, & Hauspie, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint’ (electronic rev. ed. 2003).

¹⁵³ ‘20.85 φονεύς, ἕως m; ἁνδροφόνος, ου m; ἁνθρωποκτόνος, ου m: **a person who murders another person—‘murderer’**.: ἁπώλεσεν τοὺς φονεῖς ἁκείνους ‘ he destroyed **those murderers**’ Mt 22:7. ἁνδροφόνος: πατρολῆαις καὶ μητρολῆαις, ἁνδροφόνους ‘**murderers of fathers, murderers of mothers, and murderers of people**’ **1 Tm 1:9**. ἁνθρωποκτόνος: ἁνθρωποκτόνος ἅν ἄρχῃ ‘he was **a murderer** from the

The word is defined consistently as ‘murderer’.¹⁵⁵ Three lexicons specifically identify the word as meaning ‘murderer’ in the context of 1 Timothy 1:9.¹⁵⁶ One explains it means ‘**a murderer of women and children** as well as of men’, identifying this as the meaning in 1 Timothy 2:9,¹⁵⁷ and another similarly says ‘**a person who murders another person**’, identifying this as the meaning in 1 Timothy 1:9.¹⁵⁸

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,¹⁵⁹ ESV,¹⁶⁰ GNB,¹⁶¹ HCSB,¹⁶² Message, NASB95,¹⁶³ NCV,¹⁶⁴ NET,¹⁶⁵

beginning’ Jn 8:44.’, Louw & Nida, ‘Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains’, volume 1, p. 237 (2nd ed. 1989)

¹⁵⁴ ⚙️ ἀνδροφόνος, **ov, man-slaying**, Homeric epith. of Hector, Il.24.724, etc.; of Achilles, χεῖρες 2. 18.317; **homicide**, Pl.Phd.114a; **generally, murderous**, 2. τὴν φύσιν Theopomp.Hist.217:—in Hom. **usu. of slaughter in battle**, but in Od.1.261 φάρμακον 2. **a murderous**; ἀνδροφόνους .. Ἀλιάδης E.Hec.1061; **drug**:—epith. of ἄρμα, Orph.H.65.4. 2. **of women, murdering their husbands**, Pi.P.4.252. II. **as law-term, one convicted of manslaughter, homicide**, Lys.10.7, D.23.29, cf. ib.216:’, Liddell, Scott, & Jones, ‘A Greek-English Lexicon’, p. 129 (rev. and augm. throughout, electronic ed., 9th ed. with supplement, 1996).

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

¹⁵⁶ BDAG, EDNT, Louw/Nida.

¹⁵⁷ Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, ‘A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature’, p. 76 (3rd ed., 2000).

¹⁵⁸ Louw & Nida, ‘Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains’, volume 1, p. 237 (2nd ed. 1989).

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,¹⁶⁶ NIRV,¹⁶⁷ NLT,¹⁶⁸ TLB,¹⁶⁹ and TNIV,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',¹⁷¹ having realized that the Greek word used by Herodotus is not the same Greek word used by Paul.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).¹⁷³

¹⁶² 'those who kill their fathers and mothers, for murderers'.

¹⁶³ 'those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers'.

¹⁶⁴ 'those who kill their fathers and mothers, who murder'.

¹⁶⁵ 'those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers'.

¹⁶⁶ 'those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers'.

¹⁶⁷ 'It is for those who kill their fathers or mothers. It is for murderers'.

¹⁶⁸ 'who kill their father or mother or commit other murders'.

¹⁶⁹ 'attack their fathers and mothers, and murder'.

¹⁷⁰ 'those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers'.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 77; however, they did not tell readers they were correcting their previous error.

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).

¹⁷³ This error remains in the edition of 'All One' 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.

In fact, neither word refers specifically to the killing of males as opposed to females; *androktonos*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.

¹⁷⁶ ἄνδρoκτόνος, ον, (κτείνω) **man-slaying, murdering**, σὺν ἄ. B.18.23 S.-M.; of Amazons, Hdt.4.110.1; of Cyclops, E.Cyc.22. 2. **slayer** of her husband, S.fr.187 R.', Liddell, Scott, & Jones, 'A Greek-English Lexicon', p. 129 (rev. and augm. throughout, electronic ed., 9th ed. with supplement, 1996).

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 *authentēin* 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 *didaskēin* (“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.¹⁸¹ 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.¹⁸² 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,¹⁸³ 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.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.^{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 2:11-15.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴ 'Scholarship must in all likelihood **abandon the hypothesis** that a cohesive Gnostic movement²⁰⁴ is reflected in Paul's letters.', Lüdemann, 'Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals', p. 150 (2003).

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.

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).

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.

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).

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,¹⁹⁰ Marshall and Towner,¹⁹¹ Scholer,¹⁹² Grenz and Kjesbo,¹⁹³ Holmes,¹⁹⁴ and Strelan.¹⁹⁵

referring to the Artemis cult at Ephesus and the role of courtesans as teachers. **Kroeger and Kroeger stand alone in their interpretation.**', Brown, 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', pp. 488-489 (2001).

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 *authentēō* used in a negative sense?

The claim made

‘There is disagreement among scholars as to the meaning of the word *authentēin* 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 *authentēs* and *authentēia*”.¹⁰² Bruce W. Winter (2003)¹⁰³ concludes his discussion on *authentēin*: “... it seems that here the term carries not only the connotation of authority but also an inappropriate misuse of it.”¹⁰⁴¹⁹⁷

Examination

English Bible translations over the years have been generally in agreement when rendering the word *authentēō* 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.

- NASB: **'exercise authority over a man'**
- NET: **'exercise authority over a man'**
- NIV: **'have authority over a man'**
- NLT: **'have authority over them'**
- RSV: **'have authority over men'**

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.^{198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205}

¹⁹⁸ 'αὐθεντέω 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).

¹⁹⁹ '...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) ἄνδρός, w. διδάσκειν, **1 Ti 2:12 (practically = 'tell a man what to do' [Jerusalem Bible].**, Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, 'A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature', p. 150 (3rd ed., 2000).

²⁰⁰ 'αὐθεντέω *authenteō* rule (vb.)* **1 Tim 2:12: women should not rule over men** (gen.).', Balz & Schneider, 'Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testamen', volume 1, p. 178 (1990-c1993).

²⁰¹ '37.21 αὐθεντέω: **to control in a domineering manner—to control, to domineer.**' γυναῖκες οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω ... αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρος **'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-eō , A. **to have full power or authority over**, tinos I **Ep.Ti.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.

²⁰³ 'αὐθεντέω domineer, **have authority over.**', Newman, 'Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament', p. 28 (1993).

Two early papyri using the word *authentēō*, Papyrus BGU 1208 (c.27 BCE), and Papyrus Tebtunis 15 (c.100AD), are significant because they former contains the closest use of the word *authentēō* to the time of Paul and the latter uses the noun *authentēs*, one of the cognates of *authentēō*, and a word which has also been included in a number of lexical studies seeking to establish the meaning of *authentēō* itself. Both are supportive evidence for the recent studies by Baldwin²⁰⁶ 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 *ouk didaskein oude authentein* ('**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 *authentēō* 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 *authentēō* in 1 Timothy 2:12 has been decided conclusively by Köstenberger.

²⁰⁴ '883 ἀϑεντέω (authentēō): vb.; Str 831—LN 37.21 **control, have authority over** (1Ti 2:12+).', Swanson, 'Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)', DBLG 883 (2nd ed. 2001).

²⁰⁵ '... **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).', Zodhiates, 'The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament', G831 (electronic ed., 2000).

²⁰⁶ Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin, eds., 'Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15', (1995).

²⁰⁷ Wolters, 'A Semantic Study of ἀϑέντης and its Derivatives', Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (11.1.54), 2006; originally published in Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism (1.145-175), 2000.

²⁰⁸ Köstenberger et al. (complementarian), 'Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15', (1st ed. 1995).

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 315.

Among the egalitarians supporting Köstenberger's study are Kevin Giles,²¹⁰ Craig Blomberg,²¹¹ Esther Ng,²¹² Craig Keener,²¹³ and Judith Hartenstein.²¹⁴

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.²¹⁵

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 when 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.^{216 217 218}

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 *authentēin* (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 authentēin.** 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 authentēin 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 *authentēō* 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 *authentēin* as "claim to be the originator" has **received some, but not general, acceptance.**'²¹⁹

Examination

Ian and Averil tell readers that the Kroegers' suggestion that *authentēin* (the infinitive form of the verb *authentēō*), means 'claim to be originator' has '**received some, but not general, acceptance.**'²²⁰ 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 ἀρθεύειν.

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.

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

‘αὐθεντέω (s. αὐθέντης; 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) ἐνδρός, w. διδάσκειν, 1 Ti 2:12 (practically = ‘tell a man what to do’ [Jerusalem Bible]).’²²⁴

‘αὐθεντέω authenteō rule (vb.)* 1 Tim 2:12: women should not rule over men (gen.). cf. G. W. Knight, “Αὐθεντέω in Reference to Women in 1 Tim. 2,12,” NTS 30 (1984) 143-57.’²²⁵

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

²²¹ ‘16. “Revisited,” 54. Wilshire observes that his earlier study on αὐθεντεῖν (NTS 34 [1988] 120-34) is missing in the Kroegers’ book, although it is normally cited in discussions of this verb. “The omission,” he says, “would seem to be deliberate” (p. 53).’, Baugh, ‘The Apostle among the Amazons’, Westminster Theological Journal (56.157), Spring 1994.

²²² Ibid., p. 157.

²²³ Friberg, Friberg, & Miller ‘Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament’, volume 4, p. 81 (2000).

²²⁴ Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, ‘A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature’, p. 150 (3rd ed., 2000).

²²⁵ Balz & Schneider, ‘Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testamen’, volume 1, p. 178 (1990-c1993).

LARCHER 1985, 710'²²⁶37.21 ἀϑεντέω: **to control in a domineering manner—to control, to domineer.** γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω ... ἀϑεντέειν ἄνδρός **'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.'²²⁷

'authent-eō , A. **to have full power or authority over**, tinos I 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.'²²⁸

'ἀϑεντέω domineer, have authority over.'²²⁹

'883 ἀϑεντέω (authentēō): vb.; Str 831—LN 37.21 **control, have authority over** (1Ti 2:12+).'²³⁰

'831. ἀϑεντέω authentēō; contracted authentō; fut. authentēsō, 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).**'²³¹

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.

²²⁷ Louw & Nida, 'Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains', volume 1, p. 473 (2nd ed. 1989).

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.

²²⁹ Newman, 'Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament', p. 28 (1993).

²³⁰ Swanson, 'Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)', DBLG 883 (2nd ed. 2001).

²³¹ Zodhiates, 'The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament', G831 (electronic ed., 2000).

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 *authentēin* have been rejected by of scholars across the entire spectrum of views.

'Unfortunately she mars her study **by a questionable linguistic analysis of ἀϑεντέω**, 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" (*authentēin*, *authentēin*) 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.

²³⁴ Liefeld (egalitarian), 'Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View', in Mickelsen, 'Women, Authority & The Bible', p. 245 (1986).

²³⁵ Holmes (egalitarian), 'Text in a Whirlwind', p. 86 (2000).

'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.**'²³⁶

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” 1Timothy 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 (“teknogoneo”), 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 Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament identifies its use in verse 15 as 'childbearing/motherhood'.²⁴¹ The Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament likewise has 'motherhood'²⁴² for its use in verse 15.

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'.²⁴³

Ian and Averil have been too hasty here. There is no evidence that brother Luke has attempted to redefine the word *teknogōnia*; 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 *teknogōnia* as meaning 'bearing children' but representing in this verse part of 'a proper married life'²⁴⁴ (a phrase they insert in their paraphrase of verse 15), there are no good grounds for their objection.

Standard scholarly commentaries understand *teknogōnia* as having a non-literal sense in verse 15, representing the God given role of the woman by a figure of speech.²⁴⁵

²⁴¹ 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 διὰ τὸ τεκεῖν τέκνονόνας, Balz & Schneider, 'Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testamen', volume 3, p. 340 (1990-c1993).

²⁴² 'bearing children, childbearing, **motherhood (1T 2.15)**', Friberg, Friberg, & Miller 'Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament', volume 4, p. 376 (2000).

²⁴³ **5042. τεκνογονία teknogonía**; gen. teknogonías, fem. noun from teknogonéō (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).

²⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 93.

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

functions being the bearing of children (synecdoche).’, Mounce (complementarian), ‘Pastoral Epistles’, Word Biblical Commentary, p. 146 (2002).

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 *teknogōnia* 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

²⁵³24 tn Or "But she will be preserved through childbearing," or "But she will be saved in spite of childbearing." 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, sōthēsētai) 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 (teknogonia) 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 childbearing," 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.’²⁵⁴

‘It appears that **women at the time of Jesus were restricted** by the legal framework and **were discouraged from religious involvement outside the home.**’²⁵⁵

‘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.**’²⁵⁶

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.²⁵⁷ Although recognising that the Talmud was compiled well after the 1st century,²⁵⁸ they still quote from it repeatedly²⁵⁹ 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.²⁶⁰

Such quotes are widely recognized as unrepresentative of general 1st century Jewish attitudes.²⁶¹ Ian and Averil **do** tell readers that the rabbinical literature is **not consistently negative** towards women,²⁶² but the two positive quotes they provide are far outweighed by the long list of negative quotes they have selected.²⁶³

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 Broton 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" (μήτηρ συναγωγῆς, *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. Broton 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).

Inscriptions ascribing synagogue leadership titles to women²⁶⁸ (once disputed,²⁶⁹ now accepted²⁷⁰), prove 1st century Jewish women were active religious participants in private and public,²⁷¹ contradicting Ian and Averil's claim that public religious roles for Christian women were restricted local attitudes.²⁷² Some 1st century Jewish women were even religious leaders,²⁷³ proving this was not a role unavailable to 1st century Christian women.²⁷⁴

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 Voluminius, 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 hierisa, 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.**²⁵ Brooten lists seven Greek inscriptions that contain the epithet *πρεσβύτερα*, and Kraemer adds one more.²⁶ 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', *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*, 'αδελφή [sic] and **possibly**

Similarly, 1st century Greco-Roman society contained a wide range of attitudes towards women, from the misogynist to the egalitarian.²⁷⁵ Paul would thus have been aware of how his commandments sounded to some women.²⁷⁶

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 mētēr 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".'²⁷⁷

'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.'²⁷⁸

Examination

Ian and Averil compare Jesus' attitudes towards women with selected negative comments from Greek and Roman sources,^{279 280} as well as from late Jewish sources,^{281 282} 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.

²⁸⁸ 'feminism-**at least as that word is generally understood**-and Stoicism are fundamentally and essentially **incompatible**', Engel, 'Women's Role in the Home and the State: Stoic Theory Reconsidered', Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, (101.268), 2003.

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}

²⁹¹ 'Perhaps they are better understood as failed proto-liberal feminists', Hill, 'The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?', *History of Political Thought*, (22.1.40), 2001.

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,³⁰¹ and opposed explicitly a range of misogynist prejudices,³⁰² challenging the view of any form of gendered division of tasks,³⁰³ with a statement which has no Biblical parallel.³⁰⁴

Ian and Averil added a very brief reference to Rufus' views on marriage in the February 2010 edition of 'All One',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,^{306 307} and some even held leadership positions.^{308 309 310}

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.

³⁰¹ 'There is no demand on his part for **subordination of the woman**', *ibid.*, p. 28.

³⁰² 'It was a common belief that an educated woman would become 'unpalatable', arrogant and neglectful of her household duties.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.

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.

³⁰⁴ '[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.

³⁰⁵ 'All One', p. 211 (February 2010); also found on page 234 of the current edition (2010).

³⁰⁶ Hove, 'Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute', p. 91 (1999).

³⁰⁷ '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.**', Kraemer, 'Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt', in Juschka, 'Feminism in the study of religion: a reader', p. 227 (2001).

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).

³¹¹ 'the Essenes and the Therapeutai show evidence of influence by Hellenistic utopian thinking (**including the egalitarian aspects of such thought**)', '**egalitarian features** of actual ancient Jewish utopian movements (**Essenes or Therapeutai**)'. Beavis, 'Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia', *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* (23.2.46, 48), 2007.

³¹² Evans, 'Ancient texts for New Testament studies: a guide to the background literature', p. 86 (2005).

³¹³ '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).

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.'³¹⁵

'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.'³¹⁶

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.'³¹⁷

Historian David Horrell acknowledges that women did hold certain positions of responsibility.³¹⁸ 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.

³¹⁷ Horrell, 'The social ethos of the Corinthians correspondence: interests and ideology', p. 124 (1996).

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

‘The ethos of the instruction **may indeed be appropriately labelled "love-patriarchalism," not merely patriarchalism** (Theissen 1982: 107; MacDonald 1988: 102-22).’³²⁰

‘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 legitimization 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 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**.’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.

³²³ Campbell, ‘The elders: Seniority within earliest Christianity’, p. 275 (2004).

³²⁴ Elliott, ‘Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian. A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory’, *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, (32.88.90), 2002.

imagined by Schüssler Fiorenza (1983: 235).'³²⁵

'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 androgynouse statement in Gal. 3:28 nor his admission of women to important positions within his churches

³²⁵ Elliott, 'The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian But Family-Oriented', *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* (11.2.184), 2003.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

³²⁷ Elliott, 'Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian. A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory', *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, (32.88.90), 2002.

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

³²⁸ Martin, in Elliott, 'The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian But Family-Oriented', *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* (11.2.184), 2003.

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.^{338 339} Unlike Paul, Musonius Rufus did not make any call for women to be subject,³⁴⁰ opposed explicitly a range of misogynist prejudices,³⁴¹ and challenged the view of any form of gendered division of tasks,³⁴² with a statement which has no Biblical parallel.³⁴³ Egalitarian views were also present in 1st century Jewish society; women enjoyed active religious participation,³⁴⁴ and some even held leadership positions.^{345 347 348}

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.

³⁴⁴ Hove, 'Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute', p. 91 (1999).

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,³⁴⁹
³⁵⁰ and the Therapeutae^{351 352} 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

Kraemer, 'Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt', in Juschka, 'Feminism in the study of religion: a reader', p. 227 (2001).

³⁴⁶ **'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.

³⁴⁷ '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', *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).

³⁴⁸ 'Bernadette J. Broton 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).

³⁴⁹ '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.

³⁵⁰ Evans, 'Ancient texts for New Testament studies: a guide to the background literature', p. 86 (2005).

³⁵¹ '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).

³⁵² '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'.³⁵³ ³⁵⁴ ³⁵⁵
³⁵⁶

Even the very language of ecclesial fellowship is borrowed from these groups,³⁵⁷ within which social norms could be transgressed without penalty³⁵⁸ (though acknowledging the norms³⁵⁹).

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**.' Nerny, & 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,³⁶⁰ and slaves could even be leaders.³⁶¹ Men and women fraternized without the restraints of social convention,³⁶² ³⁶³ and ethnic and family loyalties were set aside.³⁶⁴

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.³⁶⁵

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.**', Nernny, & 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.'³⁶⁶

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.'³⁶⁷

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.

³⁶⁷ Liefeld (egalitarian), 'Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View', in Mickelsen, 'Women, Authority & The Bible', p. 246 (1986).

'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

³⁶⁸ Marshall & Towner (egalitarians), 'A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On the Pastoral Epistles', p. 463 (2004).

³⁶⁹ Strelan (egalitarian), 'Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus', p. 155 (1996).

³⁷⁰ Grenz & Kjesbo (egalitarians), 'Women In The Church', p. 119 (1995).

³⁷¹ Holmes (egalitarian), 'Text In A Whirlwind', p. 26 (2000).

'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.**'³⁷²

'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 *didaskō* "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

³⁷² Liefeld (egalitarian), 'Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View', in Mickelsen, 'Women, Authority & The Bible', p. 247 (1986).

³⁷³ Oster, review of 'I Suffer Not a Woman. Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence' by Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, in *Biblical Archaeologist* (56:4.226), Nomadic Pastoralism: Past and Present (December, 1993).

³⁷⁴ Baugh (complementarian), 'The Apostle among the Amazons', *Westminster Theological Journal* (56.1.155), Spring 1994.

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 Kroeger 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

³⁷⁵ Liefeld (egalitarian), 'Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View', in Mickelsen, 'Women, Authority & The Bible', p. 247 (1986).

³⁷⁶ Oster, review of 'I Suffer Not a Woman. Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence' by Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, in *Biblical Archaeologist* (56:4.225), *Nomadic Pastoralism: Past and Present* (December, 1993).

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

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:**'³⁸⁰

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 uses 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 εἰς ἑστέ, 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' ('καὶ σχεδὸν εἰς ἑστέ δῆμος καὶ μία πόλις ἐν ᾧ πολλὰ διαστήματα.'). 'Orationes' 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,^{386,387} 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.

³⁸⁵ ‘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.

³⁸⁶ ‘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).

³⁸⁷ ‘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.³⁹⁰ 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.

eliminated but reinforced.³⁹³ He insists that this reading of the passage is in agreement with its context, and Paul's overall teaching.^{394 395 396}

While observing arguments should not be based on what **was not** written,³⁹⁷ 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^{398 399} but noting even such a term would not necessarily mean those referred to had identical roles.⁴⁰⁰

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.**', *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.', *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.

³⁹⁷ Hove, 'Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute', p. 110 (1999).

³⁹⁸ 'Philo, **writing at about the same time as Paul**, uses the phrase πάντες ἐστε ἰσοτίμοι ("you are **all entitled to equal honor**"), which is **almost directly parallel to Galatians 3:28** πάντες εἰς ἐστε ("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 ἴσος ("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 ἴσος 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.⁴⁰¹

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

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 Hammadi Library in English', p. 1 (4th rev. ed., 1996).

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.**’⁴¹⁴

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.^{415 416}

- **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.**’⁴¹⁷

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 Manichaeism 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.

⁴¹⁴ ‘All One’, p. 92 (2010).

⁴¹⁵ ‘Scholarship must in all likelihood **abandon the hypothesis** that a cohesive Gnostic movement²⁰⁴ is reflected in Paul’s letters.’, Lüdemann, ‘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.

⁴¹⁷ ‘All One’, p. 92 (2010).

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.

⁴²¹ ‘All One’, p. 111 (2010).

⁴²² ‘**The early fourth century could possibly** be the time of composition.’, Robinson, Smith, & Coptic Gnostic Library Project, ‘The Nag Hammadi Library in English’, p. 170 (4th rev. ed., 1996).

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.'**⁴²⁴

Examination

Despite the caution they express, Ian and Averil still provide a long list of quotes⁴²⁵ (overwhelmingly negative⁴²⁶), which they consider relevant to identifying 1st century Greek and Roman attitudes affecting sisters.⁴²⁷

However, a number of them are anachronistic⁴²⁸, others say the same as Scripture⁴²⁹, some are positive,⁴³⁰ and some are unrepresentative.⁴³¹

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 Aristotle⁴³⁸ 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 3:4, 12 'keep his children in control without losing his dignity', 'good managers of their children'.

Ian and Averil provide two 1st century quotes⁴⁴⁴ which are very positive in their attitudes towards women,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'.⁴⁴⁶ Egalitarian Stoic views⁴⁴⁷ were widespread in Roman society, influential on Roman law,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,⁴⁴⁹ but still quote Pliny the Younger⁴⁵⁰ (elite Roman historian⁴⁵¹), Philo⁴⁵² (an elite Jewish philosopher living in Greek-

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.'

⁴⁴⁴ Though not necessarily representative, as they are from the Roman elite.

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).

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

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.

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.

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).

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).

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.

⁴⁵⁴ '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.**', Kraemer, 'Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt', in Juschka, 'Feminism in the study of religion: a reader', p. 227 (2001).

⁴⁵⁵ 'Bernadette J. Broonen 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).

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^{460 461}), and the views of other elite 1st century Romans such as Musonius Rufus^{462 463 464} and Seneca the Younger.⁴⁶⁵

⁴⁶⁰ **‘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).

⁴⁶¹ ‘Apollonius son of Ptolemaeus shall furnish to Thermion as his wedded wife all necessities and clothing in proportion to his means and **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.

⁴⁶² ‘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.’, Hill, ‘The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?’, *History of Political Thought*, (22.1.28), 2001.

⁴⁶³ ‘Musonius is probably the most enlightened Stoic in his attitude to women, sex and marriage.’, *ibid.*, p. 27.

⁴⁶⁴ Ian and Averil’s very brief reference to Rufus’ views on marriage in the February 2010 edition of ‘All One’ (p. 211), does not address the full significance of his egalitarian position.

⁴⁶⁵ ‘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."

writings of the **church during the second and third centuries**, except those written by leaders of hetero-dox sects, sanctioned women as teachers of men, as elders, or as those responsible for other typically male functions. Women did, however, **have important ministerial roles as widows and deaconesses**. In these positions they assisted men by **caring for the needs of women**. Classes of women servants of the church already existent in the New Testament in embryonic form **were allowed to expand and became better defined**, but women, in agreement with **New Testament teaching**, were not allowed to have authority over men in the church.', House, 'A Biblical View of Women in the Ministry Part 5: Distinctive Roles for Women in the Second and Third Centuries', *Bibliotheca Sacra*, (146.581.52), 1989; House is a complementarian, but his views here are supported here by the egalitarians quoted subsequently.

⁴⁶⁹ Horrell, 'The social ethos of the Corinthians correspondence: interests and ideology', p. 124 (1996).

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.⁴⁷¹

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.**'⁴⁷²

'Families and households, **patriarchally structured**, 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.'⁴⁷³

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

⁴⁷¹ 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.

⁴⁷² Elliott, 'The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian But Family-Oriented', *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* (11.2.173), 2003.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

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.¹⁹ **Of such changes there is not the slightest evidence in the historical record.**

That this all occurred within some seventy years, as postulated by Schüssler 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.

⁴⁷⁶ Lieu, 'Neither Jew nor Greek? constructing early Christianity', p. 97 (2002).

'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**.⁴⁷⁷

⁴⁷⁷ Campbell, 'The elders: Seniority within earliest Christianity', p. 275 (2004).

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,⁴⁷⁶ the mutual dependency of **husband and wife (or man and woman)**⁴⁷⁷ 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. γυναίη (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. ἄνθρωπος (LN 9.24, 10.53) (BAGD 1. p. 66): **'man'** [AB, BAGD, Herm, HNTC,

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.

⁴⁸⁰ Thiselton, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text', New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 822 (2000).

LN (9.24), Lns, NIGTC, NTC; CEV, ISV, KJV, NET, NIV, NJB, REB, TNT], **'husband'** [ICC, LN (10.53); NAB, NLT, NRSV, TEV].

QUESTION—What is meant by γυνή 'woman/wife' and ἀνὴρ '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 (ἀνὴρ/γυνή, anēr/gynē) 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 anēr 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).

⁴⁸¹ Trail, 'An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 10-16', p. 59 (2008).

⁴⁸² Oster, '1 Corinthians', College Press NIV Commentary, p. 249, (1995).

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" (μὴς γυναικὺς ἄνδρες, 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 - Μαριὰμ 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 ἡ γυναῖκες τοῦ θεοῦ ἁγίου

3. Marking with the reflexive possessive, '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 ὡσαύτως] = 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.’⁴⁸⁵

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.**’⁴⁸⁶

However, Ian and Averil have quoted almost exclusively from Jewish sources written **after** the 1st century.⁴⁸⁷ Although citing the Apocrypha as another possible source,⁴⁸⁸ they do not quote any 1st century apocryphal works. Nor do they refer to the 1st century records of

⁴⁸⁵ ‘All One’, p. 15 (2010).

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 Essenes⁴⁸⁹ and Therapeutae⁴⁹⁰.

Ian and Averil acknowledge that the Mishnah⁴⁹¹ is a 2nd century source, but despite claiming it contains some 1st century material⁴⁹² 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 1st century any more than quotes from the Talmud.⁴⁹³

'Rabbi Juda ben Elai (150 AD, but echoing statements made earlier) said:

There are three Benedictions which one must say every day:

⁴⁸⁹ 'the Essenes and the Therapeutai show evidence of influence by Hellenistic utopian thinking (**including the egalitarian aspects of such thought**)', '**egalitarian features** of actual ancient Jewish utopian movements

(**Essenes** or Therapeutai)'. Beavis, 'Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia', *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* (23.2.46, 48), 2007.

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 **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 **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 **until the sixth century**. Passages in it may be much older or at least reflect reworkings of earlier material. **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 — Proof-text 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,⁵⁰⁰ 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,^{501 502} 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.^{503 504 505}

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 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', Lillith, (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”.’⁵⁰⁶

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*.⁵⁰⁷⁵⁰⁸

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.

11:3 as a reference to pre-eminent status or authority.^{509 510 511 512 513 514}
515

⁵⁰⁹ 'of persons, **designating first or superior rank head (1C 11.3);**', Friberg, Friberg, & Miller 'Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament', volume 4, p. 229 (2000).

⁵¹⁰ **‘in the case of living beings, to denote superior rank** (cp. Artem. 4, 24 p. 218, 8 \square K. is the symbol of the father; Judg 11:11; 2 Km 22:44) **head** (Zosimus of Ashkelon [500 A.D.] hails Demosth. **as his master**: \square $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ κεφαλῇ [Biogr. p. 297]) **of the father as head of the family Hs 7, 3; of the husband in relation to his wife 1 Cor 11:3b; Eph 5:23a.**’, Arndt, Danker, & Bauer, ‘A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature’, p. 541 (3rd ed., 2000).

⁵¹¹ **The meaning of κεφαλὴ as leader, chief, master**, which is attested for the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents (see also QQT 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 patriarchalism (Theissen 107f.) with the theological idea of origin and rule.**⁵ Balz & Schneider, 'Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament', volume 1, p. 285 (1990-c1993).

⁵¹² ‘87.51 κεφαλή, ὁ : (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.’ ὁ ἔστιν ὁ κεφαλή, Χριστός ‘who is the head, (even) Christ’ Eph 4.15; παντὶ ἄνδρι ὁ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἔστιν, κεφαλὴ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, κεφαλὴ ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ 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 ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκδεῖναι, ὅτι παντὶς ἄνδρος ὡς κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, κεφαλὴ ὁ ὡς γυναῖκα ὡς ἐκείνη, κεφαλὴ ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός. From 11:7: ὅνυχας μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ἐπαρχῶν• ὡς γυνὴ ὁ δόξα ἄνδρος ἐστιν, **we learn that to the direct subjection of the man to Christ corresponds the fact that the man is ἐκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ, and to the position of man as κεφαλὴ of the γυνή corresponds the fact that she is the δόξα ἄνδρος.**, Kittel Bromiley, & 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

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]

to direct it;', Zodhiates, 'The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament', G2776 (electronic ed., 2000).

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
⁵²¹ 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" (rosh, 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.'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,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.^{527 528}

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.

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).

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

⁵²⁸ **'Sprenger's role in the project is now generally doubted** (Anglo 1977a; Segl 1988; Bibliotheca Lamiarum 1994:107-10).', Jolly et al., 'Witchcraft and Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages', p. 239 (2002).

⁵²⁹ 'Reprinted with every edition of their Malleus, the bull **seemed to bestow papal approval** on their inquisitorial theories as well.', Monter, 'The Sociology of Jura Witchcraft', in Oldridge (ed), 'The Witchcraft Reader', p. 115 (2002).

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.

⁵³³ Mackay, 'Malleus Maleficarum: the hammer of witches' (2006).

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.^{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.⁵³⁹ However, the significance of this is balanced by the fact that in many places men were accused far more frequently than women.^{540 541}

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).

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 (2nd edition 1995).

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).

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).

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, (2nd edition 1995).

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.

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**,^{542 543 544} and female midwives and 'white witches' were particularly responsible.⁵⁴⁵

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.⁵⁴⁶ This was recognized immediately when the work was first published, even by its supporters.⁵⁴⁷ In fact it is now recognized that the anti-women agenda of works on witchcraft has been greatly exaggerated.⁵⁴⁸

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).

⁵⁴⁷ 'Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, **an early devotee of the Malleus**, described it in 1523 as a hammer **for smashing skeptics rather than women**.' Stephens, 'Demon Lovers: witchcraft, sex, and the crisis of belief', p. 35 (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).

⁵⁴⁹ 'Authors **naively assumed** that the book painted **an accurate picture of how the Inquisition tried witches.**' Gibbons, 'Recent Developments in the Study of the Great European Witch Hunt', The Pomegranate (5), 1998.

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 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.**', 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 intemperate 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.⁵⁵⁷ She is unpersuaded by attempts to present Christ or Paul in an egalitarian light,⁵⁵⁸ and unconvinced by the dramatic claims made by egalitarians for Galatians 3:28.⁵⁵⁹

Secular New Testament scholar Gerd Lüdemann is unconvinced by egalitarian claims, and criticizes the revisionist work of the respected Biblical scholar Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza.^{560 561}

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.² [original footnote reproduced in footnote ⁵⁵⁷ 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.¹¹³ [original footnote reproduced in footnote ⁵⁶¹ 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.⁵⁶² Like other secular scholars, Lüdemann is unconvinced by egalitarian claims for Galatians 3:28.⁵⁶³

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

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

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). **That does not emerge from the wording.** Three women, namely Lydia and her companions (cf. Acts 16:15), **are said to have been founders and leaders of the church of Philippi**, with whom 'Paul had entered into a "communal partnership" (societas)' (178). **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.

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 **rather than a statement about the baptized individual**' (213).', *ibid.*, p. 87.

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 **serve to promote patriarchy rather than help eliminate it.**', Ksarjian, 'Trying to Prove that the Bible Is Pro-Woman How some feminists perpetuate patriarchy', *Free Inquiry Magazine*, (19.1), 1999.

⁵⁶⁵ 'In Schüssler Fiorenza's view, Galatians 3:28 is the "magna carta of Christian Feminism."⁹ From the historical point of view, **Schüssler Fiorenza's interpretation is vulnerable.**', *ibid.*

⁵⁶⁶ 'In light of these complexities I do not see how Schüssler Fiorenza's interpretations **can withstand historical scrutiny.**', *ibid.*

⁵⁶⁷ 'Another example of selective privileging can be seen with the way in which Christian communities **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.^{568 569}

Pauline and deuteropauline 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.

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

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-authoritative⁵⁸⁰), Latin Vulgate (third party, non-authoritative⁵⁸¹), 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.'⁵⁸²
- Source: James G Sigountos & Myron Shank (egalitarians)
- Argument: '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.'⁵⁸³
- Argument: 'Other writers continue to maintain the word has a negative meaning.'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

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.

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.

⁵⁸² 'All One', p. 106 (2010).

⁵⁸³ Ibid., p. 118.

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.”⁵⁸⁵

- 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”.’⁵⁸⁶
- Argument: ‘The REB translates “Women in this office”.’⁵⁸⁷
- Argument: ‘TNIV (2004) puts the footnote: “Probably women who are deacons, or possibly deacons’ wives”.’⁵⁸⁸
- 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”.’⁵⁸⁹
- 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 probably) 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.⁵⁹⁰

- Source: Ben Witherington III (egalitarian)

Despite their claim,⁵⁹¹ 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.⁵⁹²

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.

⁵⁹⁰ 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.

⁵⁹¹ '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.', 'Reply 1', p. 7.

⁵⁹² 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 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

⁵⁹³ 'Reply 2', p. 124 (April 2009).

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.

- Servants are to be treated well, like family: Exodus 20:10; 21:20-21, 26-27,^{599 600 601} Deuteronomy 5:14; 12:12; 10:1012; 16:13-14,^{602 603} 604 Ephesians 6:9, 605 606 Colossians 4:1^{607 608 609}

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** [Lns]. 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 [Ea]. They are to live by the same moral principles that the slaves are to live by [ICC]. 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** [Lg, My] because both the masters and the slaves have been redeemed [Lg]. This means that they are to treat them kindly [My]. QUESTION—What is meant by giving what is just and fair to one's slaves? **It means to treat one's slaves justly and fairly** [EG, Herm, NIC, TH, WBC; NRSV, TEV, TNT], **to treat them fairly and give them an honest remuneration** [Mrt], **to deal justly and equitably by them** [Lt], **not to defraud them** [Mrt, WBC], **not to treat them harshly or cruelly** [Ea, Mrt, WBC].', King, 'An Exegetical Summary of Colossians', pp. 303-304 (2nd ed. 2008).

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).

⁶⁰² 'the 4th Commandment contains **an interdiction against forcing the slaves to work on the Sabbath** (Exod 20:10; 23:12; Deut 5:14).', Dandamayev, 'Slavery', in Freedman (ed.), Anchor Bible Dictionary, volume 6, p. 65 (1996).

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**

- 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}

dedicated offerings (Lev. 22:11)', Hanson, 'Slavery: OT', International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, volume 4, p. 541 (rev. ed. 2002).

⁶⁰⁵ '**Christian owners are urged to treat their slaves "justly and fairly," without threatening,**', Bartchy, 'Slavery (New Testament)', in Freedman (ed.), Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary, volume 6. p. 69 (1996).

⁶⁰⁶ 'Paul here commands Christian masters **to be kind and gracious to their slaves,**', Mare, 'New Testament Background Commentary: A New Dictionary of Words, Phrases and Situations in Bible Order', p. 310 (2004).

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**

- Enforced servitude is forbidden: Exodus 21:16, Deuteronomy 24:7,⁶¹⁹
1 Timothy 1:10^{620 621 622}

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).

⁶¹³ ‘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).

⁶¹⁴ ‘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).

⁶¹⁵ ‘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).

⁶¹⁶ ‘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).

⁶¹⁷ ‘**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.**’, Bartchy, ‘Philemon, Epistle to’, in Freedman, Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary, volume 5. p. 308 (1996).

⁶¹⁸ ‘here Paul asks that Philemon **free Onesimus for the service of the gospel.**’, Keener (egalitarian), ‘IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament’ (1993).

⁶¹⁹ ‘Kidnapping for slavery **was deemed an offense worthy of death,**’, Hanson, ‘Slavery: OT’, International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, volume 4, p. 543 (rev. ed. 2002).

⁶²⁰ “Slave traders” (or “kidnappers”; only here in biblical Greek) **denotes those engaged in the business of kidnapping or stealing people and selling them into**

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

slavery., Towner (egalitarian), 'The Letters to Timothy and Titus', New International Commentary on the New Testament, p. 128 (2006).

⁶²¹ **Kidnapers 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.**, Arichea (egalitarian), & Hatton, 'A Handbook on Paul's letters to Timothy and to Titus', UBS handbook series, p. 25 (1995).

⁶²² **'Paul's remark directly assaults the vicious slave trade of his day.'**, Keener (egalitarian), 'IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament' (1993).

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 16:1⁶²⁴, should be translated as a title meaning ‘deacon’⁶²⁵
- **Translations cited:** JB⁶²⁶, NEB⁶²⁷, REB⁶²⁸, RSV⁶²⁹.
- **Translations agreeing:** NRSV⁶³⁰, NLT⁶³¹, TNIV⁶³², CEV⁶³³, NAB⁶³⁴.
- **Translations disagreeing:** ESV⁶³⁵, GNB/TEV⁶³⁶, HCSB⁶³⁷, Message⁶³⁸, NASB95⁶³⁹, NCV⁶⁴⁰, NET⁶⁴¹, ISV⁶⁴², NIV⁶⁴³, NIRV⁶⁴⁴, TLB⁶⁴⁵.

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’.

- **Claim:** The words *anēr* and *gunē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3 should be translated ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ rather than ‘man’ and ‘woman’⁶⁴⁶
 - **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 sisters⁶⁴⁷
 - **Translations cited:** NIV inclusive edition (1996)⁶⁴⁸.
 - **Other translations agreeing:** CEV⁶⁴⁹, GNT⁶⁵⁰, Message⁶⁵¹, NCV⁶⁵², NET⁶⁵³, NIRV⁶⁵⁴, NLT⁶⁵⁵, NRSV⁶⁵⁶.

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’.

- **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 praying⁶⁵⁷
- **Translations cited:** Emphatic Diaglott, modern Greek New Testament, JNT, Vulgate.
- **Other translations agreeing:** CEV⁶⁵⁸.
- **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.

⁶⁶⁰ '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.

⁶⁶¹ 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 'deaconesses' is a possible rendering.

⁶⁶² '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'.

⁶⁶³ 'women', a footnote says 'I.e. either deacons' wives or deaconesses'.

⁶⁶⁴ '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'.

⁶⁶⁵ 'women', a footnote says 'Or Their wives, or Women deacons'.

⁶⁶⁶ 'women', a footnote says 'Probably women who are deacons, or possibly deacons' wives'.

⁶⁶⁷ 'Their wives', a footnote says 'Or Wives, likewise, must, or Women, likewise, must'.

⁶⁶⁸ The text has 'Their wives', a footnote says 'Their wives; or Women helpers'.

⁶⁶⁹ 'their wives', a footnote says 'Or Women'.

⁶⁷⁰ 'their wives', a lengthy footnote includes 'It is possible that this refers to women who serve as deacons, "deaconesses."', but also says 'The translation "wives" - referring to the wives of the deacons - is probably to be preferred'.

⁶⁷¹ 'In the same way, their wives', a footnote says 'Or way, deaconesses'.

⁶⁷² '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.⁶⁷³ 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'⁶⁸⁴), yet they later assert this specifically as fact ('Paul says... because'⁶⁸⁵).

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.'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.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**.'⁶⁸⁸

Despite the appearance their carefully worded statement may give, Ian and Averil are well aware that the scholarly consensus rejects this view completely.⁶⁸⁹

- 'The reference to the law could either be **to a Jewish understanding of the Old Testament, or to the Jewish oral law**...'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).⁶⁹¹

⁶⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 61.

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).

⁶⁸⁸ 'All One', p. 111 (2010).

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.

⁶⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 75.

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’⁶⁹²

Readers are not told this argument has been overwhelmingly rejected by scholars, including even a number of egalitarians.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” (kephalē) in Greek **has been taking place for several decades in the evangelical world...**’⁶⁹⁴

Although the meaning of the word *kephalē* has been debated extensively **among evangelical commentators** for years, what Ian and Averil do not tell readers are that **among professional lexicographers** there is no debate whatever.⁶⁹⁵

No standard lexicon has accepted the egalitarian definition of the word *kephalē*,⁶⁹⁶ although a number of them have been updated recently

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).

⁶⁹² ‘All One’, p. 73 (2010).

⁶⁹³ Thiselton, ‘The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek text’, New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 1151 (2000).

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 169.

⁶⁹⁵ 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’.

⁶⁹⁶ An entry in the 1968 edition of LSJ9 has been cited by egalitarians as evidence for their understanding of KEFLAH, but the editor has explained that this was not the intended meaning of the entry (which has been misinterpreted), that the entry was badly worded, and that the meaning ‘source’ for *kephalē* as asserted by egalitarians does not exist.

with additional information derived from new studies or the discovery of new sources.⁶⁹⁷

- 'I Suffer Not a Woman – Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence, Richard & Catherine Kroeger (1992).' ⁶⁹⁸
- "Their suggested translation of *authentēin* as "claim to be the originator" has **received some, but not general, acceptance.**'⁶⁹⁹

Readers are told that the Kroeger's suggestion that *authentēin* 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 *authentēin* has been rejected by professional lexicographers.

⁶⁹⁷ BDAG, Louw/Nida, LSJ9, and Swanson, for example.

⁶⁹⁸ 'All One', p. 118 (2010).

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 authentēo 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 Foreman⁷⁰² and brother Colin Byrnes,^{703 704} rules with which Ian and Averil agree.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.'^{706 707 708}

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).

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).

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.

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).

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.

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.**'^{709 710}
- Colossians 3:18, 'Wives, **submit to your husbands**, as is fitting in the Lord.'^{711 712}

with lower status to those above them (see Thiselton 2000: 812–22; Watson 2000: 43–44n3; Loader 2004: 100).', Beale & Carson, 'Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament', p. 731 (2007).

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).

⁷⁰⁹ 'Should be subordinate: TEV replaces RSV's positive expression by a negative one: "they must not be in charge." **One may also say "they must not hold positions of leadership."**', Ellingworth, et al, 'A handbook on Paul's first letter to the Corinthians', UBS Handbook Series, p. 326 (1995).

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 (ὑποτάσσομαι, "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. Phps "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.'⁷²¹ ⁷²²
⁷²³

⁷¹⁷ 'Although women were not prohibited from teaching altogether, **their relationship with men was clearly to remain a subservient one.**', Brown (egalitarian), '2 Timothy 2:9-15 Women Who Profess Reverence for God', 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. 489 (2001).

⁷¹⁸ 'That Paul was influenced by circumstances and framed his words to meet specific situations, however, is not to deny that in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, the house rules of Colossians and Ephesians, and, particularly, 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 and 1 Timothy 2:11-15, **there are statements that assert the subordination of women, exhort women to submission, and command women to be silent in the churches.**', Longnecker (egalitarian), 'New Testament social ethics for today', p. 87 (1984).

⁷¹⁹ '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.**), Arichea (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,'^{724 725 726}

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.'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.**'⁷³¹

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).

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**" (προσλαμβάνομαι, 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

⁷³² The NET footnote says 'Grk "faithful men"; but here ἄνθρωποις (anthrōpois) 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 [parathou] [these things] to **reliable people**,"⁹ 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, ἀκούσας παρὰ ἡμοῦ (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" (ἄνθρωποι, 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**

- 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.’⁷³³

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’.⁷³⁴

Ian and Averil acknowledge that sisters were not explicitly included in aspects of leadership,⁷³⁵ were not appointed to all the same positions of leadership and teaching as men,⁷³⁶ were not appointed as elders,⁷³⁷ ⁷³⁸ ⁷³⁹ and that teaching and praying were performed by

for younger women (Titus 2:4–5). **Priscilla had a part in the teaching of Apollos** (Acts 18:24–26).’, ‘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).’, ‘1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 240 (1988).

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; Arichea (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.**’, ‘A Handbook on Paul’s letters to Timothy and to Titus’, UBS Handbook Series, p. 234 (1995), Fee (egalitarian), writes ‘There are two reasons for Timothy to stay by what he has learned: First, you know those from whom you learned it. This curious plural, changed to the singular in the majority of later manuscripts, may reflect the plural of 2:2 (“through many witnesses”). **More likely it refers both to Paul (vv. 10–11) and to Timothy’s mother and grandmother (1:5), who had taught him from infancy ... the Holy Scriptures.**’, ‘1 and 2 Timothy, Titus’, New International Biblical Commentary, p. 278 (1988).

⁷³⁴ ‘All One’, p. 4 (2010).

⁷³⁵ ‘Reply 1’, p. 20 (February 2008).

⁷³⁶ Ibid., p. 27.

⁷³⁷ ‘All One’, p. 124 (2010).

⁷³⁸ Ibid., pp. 128-129.

brothers to a larger extent than by sisters. These are the practices approved by the inspired writers.

⁷³⁹ 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 and 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.

⁷⁴⁵ Ephesians 5:22, 'wives', 5:25, 'husbands', referring to all wives and all husbands.

⁷⁴⁶ Colossians 3:18, 'wives', 3:19, 'husbands', referring to all wives and all husbands.

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.

⁷⁴⁸ Titus 2:2, 'Older men', 2:3, 'Older women', 2:4, 'the younger women', 'their husbands', referring to all older men and women, all younger women and their husbands.

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 6:20⁷⁵² 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.⁷⁵³

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.⁷⁵⁴

The 'selective fallacy' occurs when 'parallels' are drawn only from those sources which the interpreter has previously determined are relevant.^{755 756}

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'^{758 759 760 761 762}

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 parallelomania, ... 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**'⁷⁶³
- 1 Timothy 2:11: 'A woman must learn **quietly with all submissiveness**.'⁷⁶⁴
- 1 Timothy 2:12: 'But I do not allow a woman **to teach or exercise authority over a man. She must remain quiet.**'^{765 766}
- 1 Timothy 3:2, 4: 'The overseer then must be above reproach, the **husband of one wife... He must manage his own household well**'^{767 768 769 770}

⁷⁶⁰ 'he insists on **distinct headdress for men and women in worship**, which symbolized **traditional gender boundaries and had hierarchical implications**.' Gundry-Volf (egalitarian), 'Putting the Moral Vision of the New Testament into Focus: A Review', Bulletin for Biblical Research (9.278), 1999.

⁷⁶¹ '**Sexual distinctions are not erased** (as implied in Paul's statements about **marriage, sex, and gender-specific headdress**).', *ibid.*, p. 281.

⁷⁶² '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).

⁷⁶³ '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).

⁷⁶⁴ '**A woman is to learn in quietness and full submission**.' Fee (egalitarian), '1 and 2 Timothy, Titus', New International Biblical Commentary, p. 72 (1988).

⁷⁶⁵ 'Paul goes further **and states that he does not allow a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man**.' Marshall (egalitarian), 'Women in Ministry', in Husbands & Larsen, 'Women, ministry and the Gospel: Exploring new paradigms', p. 59 (2007).

⁷⁶⁶ '**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).

- 1 Corinthians 11:3: 'the **man is the head** of a woman' ^{771 772 773 774}
-

⁷⁶⁷ 'The domestic assumptions of the code, which may respond to a heretical tendency (4:3), **present the overseer as a husband and father.**', Towner (egalitarian), 'The Letters to Timothy and Titus', New International Commentary on the New Testament, p. 251 (2006).

⁷⁶⁸ 'The first specific characteristic in the 1 Timothy list is **μὴς γυναικὶς ἄνδρα**, **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 κεφαλὴ '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.

⁷⁷² '**his language and the flow of the argument seem to reflect an assumed hierarchy through which glory and shame flow upward from those with lower status to those above them**', Beale & Carson, 'Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament', p. 731 (2007).

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**'^{775 776}
- 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.'^{777 778 779}

'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**.¹⁹ 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 & Grootius (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**'^{780 781}
- 1 Timothy 2:12: 'But I do not allow a woman **to teach or exercise authority over a man. She must remain quiet.**'^{782 783}
- Titus 2:5: 'being **subject to their own husbands**'^{784 785}
- 1 Peter 3:1: 'In the same way, wives, **be subject to your own husbands.**'⁷⁸⁶

of Paul's world.', Carson et al, 'New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition' (4th rev. ed. 1994).

⁷⁸⁰ '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.**', Webb (egalitarian), 'A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic; The Slavery Analogy', in Pierce & Groothuis (eds.), 'Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without hierarchy', p. 397 (2nd ed. 2005).

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).

⁷⁸³ 'But then, third, Paul goes further **and states that he does not allow a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man.**', Marshall (egalitarian), 'Women in Ministry', in Husbands & Larsen, 'Women, ministry and the Gospel: Exploring new paradigms', p. 59 (2007).

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).

⁷⁸⁵ 'As elsewhere **Paul assumes that the Christian wife should be submissive to her husband.**', Carson et al, 'New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition' (4th rev. ed. 1994).

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.**',

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.'⁷⁸⁷

Seven passages have been identified as containing explicit teaching on the subject of the roles and relationship with men, of women in the ecclesia 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.^{788 789}

Specific content is repeated consistently within these passages.⁷⁹⁰ This is not a matter of one or two verses, nor an isolated text of Scripture.⁷⁹¹

Arichea (egalitarian), & Nida, 'A Handbook on the first letter from Peter', UBS Handbook Series, p. 88 (1994).

⁷⁸⁷ Dockery, 'Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary hermeneutics in the light of the early church', p. 179 (1992).

⁷⁸⁸ Walker (egalitarian), 'The "Theology of Woman's Place" And the "Paulinist" Tradition', Semeia (28.101), 1983.

⁷⁸⁹ '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.

⁷⁹⁰ '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'⁷⁹²
- 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.⁷⁹⁴ 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.⁷⁹⁵ Walker provides a detailed analysis of these passages.^{796 797}

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' (vv 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.¹⁷ 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** (vv 8-12) 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 a woman learn in silence 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.⁷⁹⁸

- 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^{799 800 801 802}

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).

⁸⁰⁰ 'He makes this rule on the strength of his apostolic authority and applies it in all the churches (see 4:17; 14:34; 16:1).', Kistemaker, 'Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians', Baker New Testament Commentary, volume 18, p. 230 (1993).

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 (τάσσω) 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^{803 804 805 806 807 808 809}

congregations.', Thiselton, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 550 (2000).

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).

⁸⁰⁷ 'Phps has "we and the churches of God generally..." meaning "most churches." **This last is the most likely solution... A good sample translation is: "neither I nor the churches of God generally..."**', Ellington, Hatton, & Ellington, 'A Handbook on Paul's first letter to the Corinthians', UBS Handbook Series, p. 252 (1995).

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^{810 811 812 813 814}

⁸⁰⁹ '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).

⁸¹⁰ '**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). **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 '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 '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 '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^{815 816 817 818 819 820 821}

⁸¹⁴ 'One may say, for example, "**This is what happens in all the churches of God's people.**"', Ellingworth, Hatton, & Ellingworth, 'A Handbook on Paul's first letter to the Corinthians', UBS Handbook Series, p. 324 (1995).

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)

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).

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).

⁸¹⁸ 'The ἵνα clause then introduces the reason for Paul's writing: **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).

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).

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).

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.^{822 823}

He aims to standardize practices throughout all the ecclesias, correcting local errors by ensuring they conform to universal practices.

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). **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: **'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).

⁸²² 1 Corinthians 11:16 If anyone intends to quarrel about this, **we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God.**

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),⁸²⁴ 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.

⁸²⁵ de Blois & Hemelrijk, Review of Women in the Earliest Churches by Ben Witherington III', Mnemosyne, Fourth Series (45.2.279), 1992.

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).'⁸²⁶

Similarly, in attempting to describe 1st century women in Judea Witherington 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.'⁸²⁷

Witherington's selectivity with regard to sources is compounded by his appeal to out of date publications.⁸²⁸

Inappropriate use

A typical error is using generalized background material to draw specific conclusions about individual passages.

⁸²⁶ Ibid, pp. 279-280.

⁸²⁷ 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.

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.'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.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.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.^{832 833}

⁸²⁹ Schreiner (complementarian), 'Interpreting the Pauline Epistles', Southern Baptist Journal of Theology (3.9), 1999.

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.

⁸³¹ 'Sharon Hodgkin Gritz falls prey to the same error in her analysis of 1 Timothy when she posits the influence of the mother goddess Artemis cult.¹⁵ Certainly such a cult functioned in Ephesus, but Hodgkin Gritz **fails to show that the cult lies behind the situation in 1 Timothy.**', *ibid.*, p. 9.

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.**¹⁶', *ibid.*, p. 9.

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.', *ibid.*, p. 9.

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 reverse2)**,' 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 reoccurs in texts over time, a standardized 'theme' or narrative structure, such as the 'three sons' who reccur 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). **Sempronius was not the wife of Catiline** (written

Witherington also misuses his sources by projecting his own values onto them.⁸³⁸

as Catalina) (p. 18) and **the Bacchanalia were not introduced, but suppressed in 186 B.C.** (p. 20)*).', *ibid.*, p. 280.

⁸³⁸ 'On p. 14 he regards the Egyptian goddess Isis as "the patron saint of Egyptian's women's movement", **an anachronistic and misleading point of view**. She was a mother goddess1).', *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

Lord.', Garland (egalitarian), '1 Corinthians', Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, pp. 508-509 (2003).

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',⁸⁴⁴ 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 διὰ τοῦ τεκεῖν τεκνογονίας.', Balz & Schneider, 'Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testamen', 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,⁸⁴⁵ and none are explained as a response to an existing local situation, nor justified as just a cultural accommodation.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'.

Egalitarians agreeing with complementarians

The following quotations are taken from notable supporters of the egalitarian case for the role of women in the ecclesia;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.**'⁸⁴⁸

Despite Ian and Averil's claim that 'We examine critically what each say',⁸⁴⁹ none of the authors quoted make the argument Ian and Averil wrongly attribute to them.⁸⁵⁰

Ian and Averil acknowledge that they haven't even read the work of one of the authors quoted,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.

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.

⁸⁴⁸ 'Reply 2', p. 100 (April 2009).

⁸⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 100.

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.

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 Gospel: Exploring new paradigms', p. 54 (2007).

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.⁸⁵⁴ 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.⁸⁵⁵

Barron identifies the fact that egalitarians typically seek to avoid this passage by 'trumping' it with alternative texts which (they claim), it contradicts.⁸⁵⁶ For Barron, the main problem remains, however:

'All this helps the egalitarian cause, but a convincing, comprehensive reading of I Timothy 2 is still needed.'⁸⁵⁷

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).6', *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]⁸⁵⁹

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 1986,⁷ 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.

Kathleen Corley

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.**"⁸⁶²

Corley acknowledges the position of women within the early Christian community, but also draws attention to the fact that none of this was unique.⁸⁶³

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:

⁸⁶² Murphy, 'The Word According to Eve: Women and the Bible in Ancient Times and Our Own', p. 143 (1999).

⁸⁶³ '**Corley does not dispute the contention that women were intimately associated with the Jesus movement, or that they participated in inclusive meals.** These characteristics are attested to in all of the gospel traditions, and as "facts" are as historically reliable as anything in the Gospels can be. **But are these characteristics unique to the Jesus movement?** Corley points out that women had been involved in other ancient religious and philosophical movements, **such as the Therapeutae, the Cynics, the Pythagoreans, the Stoics, and the Epicureans.**', *ibid.*, p. 145 .

"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.'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', ⁸⁷¹ but not in other ways, and that this is what they practiced.

⁸⁷⁰ 'Reply 2', p. 124 (April 2009).

⁸⁷¹ Cosgrove, 'Appealing to Scripture in Moral Debate: Five Hermeneutical Rules', p. 187 (2002).

John Elliott

Elliott recognizes that women had some leadership positions, but rejects typical egalitarian claims.^{872 873 874} 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.'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.'⁸⁷⁶

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.

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.

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.

⁸⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

⁸⁷⁶ Elliott, 'Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian. A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory', *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, p. 90 (32.2.2002).

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

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.^{878 879 880}

He sees in 1 Corinthians 11 a hierarchy in which man is placed by God as the head of the woman.^{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.⁸⁸³

⁸⁷⁸ 'Regardless of our judgment concerning the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, **we must recognize a certain built-in tension concerning the role of women in Paul's symbolic world.**', Hays, 'The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics', p. 55 (1996).

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.

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.

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).

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.⁸⁸⁴ 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.'⁸⁸⁵

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.⁸⁸⁶

However, Horrell points out that the 1st century ecclesial 'Haustafeln' ('household code'), placed males at the head.⁸⁸⁷ 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).⁸⁸⁸

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.^{889 890891}

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.⁸⁹² 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.'⁸⁹³

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.

⁸⁹⁰ '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.

⁸⁹¹ '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.

⁸⁹² '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.

⁸⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 334.

Horrell is not alone in this view, and he cites repeatedly from the scholarly consensus to support his position.⁸⁹⁴ ⁸⁹⁵ 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 *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**".⁸⁹⁶

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 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).', *ibid.*, p. 335.

⁸⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

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, 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, **conferring power upon the male heads of household** and providing theological legitimation for **the subordination** of those who are to be **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.⁸⁹⁸⁸⁹⁹

'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

⁸⁹⁷ Jervis, '1 Corinthians 14.34-35: a Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (17.51), 1995.

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**

below]’⁹⁰¹

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.**²³⁹⁰²

‘The appeal to shame in 1 Cor. 14.35 is not unusual. **Paul appeals to shame for specific reasons in 1 Cor. 11.6.**’⁹⁰³

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

⁹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 59-60.

Walter Liefeld

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 $\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ v.

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 *kephalē*, 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.

⁹⁰⁶ '16. "Revisited," 54. Wilshire observes that his earlier study on $\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ v (NTS 34 [1988] 120-34) **is missing in the Kroegers' book**, although it is normally cited in discussions of this verb. **"The omission," he says, "would seem to be deliberate"** (p. 53).', Baugh, 'The Apostle among the Amazons', Westminster Theological Journal (56.157), Spring 1994; Wilshire is an egalitarian.

⁹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 157.

⁹⁰⁸ 'The meaning "source," adduced by Bedale as a clue to some of Paul's passages, **lacks clear evidence.**' Liefeld, 'Women, Submission, and Ministry in 1 Corinthians', in Mickelsen, 'Women, authority & the Bible', p. 139 (1986).

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}

⁹⁰⁹ 'Perhaps Paul beings 1 Corinthians 11 by using kephalē in a less technical sense than either authority or source, introducing those overtones only later as he writes about women's authority in verse 10 and about woman coming from man and vice versa in verses 11-12. **In my judgment, it is not only methodologically correct but also proves exegetically fruitful** to keep to the mainstream of Greek and Septuagintal thought and see kephalē as that part of the body that was (1) **prominent**, because, given the ancient mode of dressing from neck to foot, most easily observed, (2) **representative** of the whole body and, less frequently, (3) the **eminent** or most honored part of the body.', *ibid.*, p. 139.

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 *gnosis*, **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'.'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.'⁹¹⁶

In Paul's writings, Lillie sees only 'steps in the right direction', rather than an egalitarianism.⁹¹⁷ ⁹¹⁸ For this reason, Lillie suggests that the Biblical example is not necessarily to be followed by modern Christians.⁹¹⁹
⁹²⁰

⁹¹⁵ Lillie, 'The Pauline House-tables', The Expository Times (86.179.181), 1975.

⁹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 182.

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.

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.

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.

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.

I. Howard Marshall

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.**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 legitimization of church practice **by Scripture.**’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.**’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.⁹²⁴

⁹²¹ Marshall, ‘Women in Ministry’, in Husbands & Larsen, ‘Women, ministry and the Gospel: Exploring new paradigms’, p. 54 (2007).

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.⁹²⁵

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.⁹²⁶

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),¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ 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.

⁹²⁵ Marshall, 'Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage', *Double Image: The Bulletin of Men Women and God* (12.1.3), 2007.

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,⁹²⁷ 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.**'⁹²⁸

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.**'⁹²⁹

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.

Cullen Murphy

Murphy speaks of Galatians 3:28 as an egalitarian formula,⁹³⁰ 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.**⁹³¹

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 as 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.

⁹⁴³ Thiselton, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', New International Greek Testament Commentary, p. 837 (2000).

'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.**"⁴¹⁹⁴⁴

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

⁹⁴⁵ Sparks, 'God's Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship', p. 339 (2008).

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 express 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).

⁹⁵⁴ 'The man has already called her "woman" (2:23); **why a double naming?**', Hamilton (egalitarian), The Book of Genesis: chapters 1-17', New International Commentary on the Old Testament, p. 206 (1990).

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.'⁹⁶⁰

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 head-ship 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).

⁹⁵⁸ **'The one with authority to name (2:19), in his climactic act,** captures the essence of this newest creature.', Ortlund, 'Man and Woman', in Alexander & Rosner, 'New Dictionary of Biblical Theology' (electronic ed. 2001).

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 her - **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',⁹⁶⁸ 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.⁹⁶⁹ 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',⁹⁷⁰ 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,^{971 972} now he was given a position to exercise authority over her.^{973 974 975 976}

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.

⁹⁷⁰ Sparks, 'God's Word In Human Words', p. 349 (2008).

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. Some³⁸ 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.**'⁹⁸⁴

'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.⁴ **In these areas, better actions or dispositions toward human beings are both possible and desirable.**'⁹⁸⁵

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.

⁹⁸⁴ Webb, 'A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic; The Slavery Analogy', in Pierce & Groothuis (eds.), 'Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without hierarchy', p. 384 (2nd ed. 2005).

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.**”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.’⁹⁸⁷

‘Silenced women. The New Testament also instructs women **to be silent and not to raise questions within congregational gatherings**.¹⁹ 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.’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.**’⁹⁸⁹

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 387.

⁹⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 396.

⁹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 396.

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** [Inter Personal Violence] (Brinkerhoff, Gradnir, & 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.

⁹⁹³ Dutton, 'Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The ecological fallacy', *Violence & Victims* (9.2.174), 1994.

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.

⁹⁹⁶ Pearson, quoted in Brownridge & Halli, ‘Explaining Violence Against Women in Canada’, p. 27 (2001).

⁹⁹⁷ ‘D. B. Sugarman and S. L. Frankel, “Patriarchal Ideology and Wife-Assault: A Meta-Analytic Review,” *Journal of Family Violence* 11 (1996) 13-40; see also Lisa Jeanne Battaglia, “Conservative Protestant Ideology and Wife Abuse: Reflections on the Discrepancy between Theory and Data,” *Journal of Religion and Abuse* 2 (2001) 31-45.’, *ibid*.

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...**'⁹⁹⁹

'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).'

¹⁰⁰⁰

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.¹⁰⁰¹

It is true that 'patriarchal', 'hierarchialist' or complementarian beliefs are used to justify domestic violence.^{1002 1003}

⁹⁹⁹ Ellison, et al, 'Race/Ethnicity, Religious Involvement, and Domestic Violence', Violence Against Women (13.11.1094), 2007.

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; Hassounah-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

Equality and Domestic Violence', Violence Against Women (12.12.1170), 2006.

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.

¹⁰⁰⁴ '**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**.⁶²', 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).

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”⁵ 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).¹⁰⁰⁷

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’.¹⁰⁰⁸

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.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Lister, ‘J. Lee Grady’s 25 Tough Questions About Women and the Church: A Review Article’, *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (9.1.102), 2004.

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'}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 home-schooling households**, given that almost all such home-schooling **is done by mothers.**'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**

¹⁰⁰⁹ 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).

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 church 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.**’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.

¹⁰¹¹ Ibid., p. 190.

¹⁰¹² Ibid., p. 194.

¹⁰¹³ Ibid., p. 194.

¹⁰¹⁴ Ibid., p. 194.

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.**”⁶¹¹⁰¹⁵

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.**”⁶²¹⁰¹⁶

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.**”¹⁰¹⁷

¹⁰¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 194-195.

¹⁰¹⁶ Ibid., p. 195.

¹⁰¹⁷ Ibid., p. 195.

Glossary

| |
|--|
| Meaning of Terms Used ¹⁰¹⁸ |
| Biblical feminist |
| As for 'egalitarian'. The terms are used synonymously in the relevant literature. |
| Complementarian ¹⁰¹⁹ |
| <p>'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.</p> <p>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.'¹⁰²⁰</p> <p>'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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> |

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

¹⁰²¹ The Danvers Statement (1988), Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, retrieved from <http://www.cbmw.org/Danvers>.

¹⁰²² Ibid..

¹⁰²³ Ibid.

Egalitarian¹⁰²⁴

'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 [original footnote reproduced in footnote ¹⁰²⁶ below]'¹⁰²⁷

'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.

¹⁰²⁵ Jelinek, 'Review of The Role of Women in the Ministry Today. By H. Wayne House', Michigan Theological Journal (1.2.184), Fall 1990.

¹⁰²⁶ '4. K. Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966); R. Scroggs, "Woman in the NT," IDBSup 966-968; P. K. Jewett, Man as Male and Female (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); V. Mollenkott, Women, Men and the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1977); L. Scanzoni and N. Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be (rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1986); J. K. Howard, "Neither Male nor Female: An Examination of the Status of Women in the New Testament," EvQ 55/1 (1983) 31-42; J. A. Grassi, The Teacher in the Primitive Church and the Teacher Today (Santa Clara: University of Santa Clara, 1973); E. S. Fiorenza, "Toward a Feminist Biblical Hermeneutic: Biblical Interpretation and Liberation Theology," in A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics (ed. D. K. McKim; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).', Lowe, 'Rethinking The Female Status/Function Question: Jew/Gentile Relationship As Paradigm', Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society (34.1.59), 1991

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

¹⁰³⁰ Christians for Biblical Equality: Statement on Men, Women and Biblical Equality (1989), retrieved from http://www.cbeinternational.org/new/about/biblical_equality.shtml

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).¹⁰³³

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.'¹⁰³⁴

¹⁰³⁴ Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (11th 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,¹⁰³⁵ in order to ensure that bias from traditionally minded and outdated scholarship is minimized.¹⁰³⁶

| Translations used in this work | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| Translation | Translation method | Abbreviation |
| *Contemporary English Version (1995) | Informal dynamic equivalence | CEV |
| English Standard Version (2001) | Formal dynamic equivalence | ESV |
| *Good News Bible (1976) ¹⁰³⁷ | Semi-formal dynamic equivalence | GNB/TEV |
| Holman Christian Study Bible (2004) | Formal dynamic equivalence | HCSB |
| International Standard Version (2000) ¹⁰³⁸ | Semi-formal dynamic equivalence | ISV |
| Translations used in this work | | |
| Translation | Translation method | Abbreviation |
| *The Message (2002) | Paraphrase (very informal dynamic equivalence) | Message |
| New American Bible (1970) | Formal dynamic equivalence | NAB |

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.

| Translations used in this work | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| Translation | Translation method | Abbreviation |
| New American Standard Bible (1995) ¹⁰³⁹ | Semi-formal dynamic equivalence | NASB95 |
| *New Century Version (1991) | Informal dynamic equivalence | NCV |
| *New English Translation (1 st edition 2005) | Semi-formal dynamic equivalence | NET |
| New International Version (1978) | Semi-formal dynamic equivalence | NIV |
| *New International Reader's Version (1998) | Informal dynamic equivalence | NIRV |
| *New Living Translation (1996) | Paraphrase (very informal dynamic equivalence) | NLT |
| *New Revised Standard Version (1989) | Formal dynamic equivalence | NRSV |
| *The Living Bible (1971) | Paraphrase (very informal dynamic equivalence) | TLB |
| *Today's New International Version (2005) | Informal dynamic equivalence | TNIV |
| The Vulgate (5 th century) ¹⁰⁴⁰ | Formal equivalence | Vulgate |

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'.

¹⁰⁴⁰ My edition is Tweedale's 'Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam' (Logos Research Systems, electronic ed. 2005).

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.**'¹⁰⁴²

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.¹⁰⁴³ Differing in scope, depth, and presentation, they nevertheless represent the lexical scholarly consensus.¹⁰⁴⁴ These are the standard professional Greek lexicons recognized and used in the scholarly literature.¹⁰⁴⁵ Their agreement on the meaning of a given word is considered effectively conclusive.

¹⁰⁴² 'All One', p. iv (2010).

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).

| Modern Professional Lexicons | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Abbreviation | Lexicon ¹⁰⁴⁶ |
| ANLEX | Friberg, Friberg, & Miller. (2000). <i>Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament</i> . Baker Books. This student lexicon provides the reflex forms of the Greek alongside a simplified analysis of meanings. |
| BDAG | Arndt, Danker, & Bauer. (2000). <i>A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature</i> . (3 rd ed.). University of Chicago Press. This standard technical lexicon includes extensive references to extra-Biblical usage. |
| GELS ¹⁰⁴⁷ | Lust, Eynikel, & Hauspie. (2003). <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . (electronic rev. ed.). Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (German Bible Society). This standard technical lexicon is the principal lexicon for the LXX. |
| Lampe | Lampe, Geoffrey. (1961-1968). <i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Clarendon Press. This standard technical lexicon has a focus on the Greek Fathers. |
| Louw/Nida | Louw & Nida. (1989). <i>Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains</i> . (2 nd ed.). United Bible Societies. This lexicon is aimed at translators working in the field. |
| LSJ9 | Liddell, Scott, & Jones. (1996). <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . (electronic ed., 9 th rev. ed. with supplement.) 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 | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Abbreviation | Lexicon |
| Newman | Newman. (1993). <i>Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (German Bible Society), United Bible Societies. |
| Swanson | Swanson. (2001). <i>Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament</i> . (2 nd ed.). Logos Research Systems, Inc. |
| Zodhiates | Zodhiates. (2000). <i>The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament</i> . (electronic ed.). AMG Publishers. |
| Modern Professional Dictionaries | |
| Abbreviation | Lexicon |
| EDNT | Balz & Schneider. (1990-c1993). <i>Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament. Translation of: Exegetisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testamen</i> . T&T Clark. Shorter reference dictionary which attempts to update TDNT and serve as a supplement. |
| Spicq | Spicq. (1994). Ernst. (trans.). (ed.). <i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . Hendrickson. A popular theological dictionary aimed at clergy rather than scholars. |
| TDNT | Kittel, Bromiley, & Friedrich. (1964-c1976). <i>Theological dictionary of the New Testament</i> . (electronic ed.). Wm. B. Eerdmans. This is the main dictionary cited in scholarship. |

Scholarly & non-scholarly journals

A number of scholarly journals¹⁰⁴⁸ and non-scholarly journals¹⁰⁴⁹ have been used in this work. While some are generally conservative in their tone,¹⁰⁵⁰ 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 |
| American Theological Inquiry, 2008 (ISSN 1942-2709) |
| Ashland Theological Journal, 1991-2005 (ISSN 1044-6494) |
| *The Bible and Critical Theory, 2004-2009 (ISSN 1832-3391) |
| Bible and Spade, 1972-2000 (ISSN 1079-6959) |
| *The Bible Translator. Technical Papers, 1950-2008 (ISSN 0260-0935) |
| Biblical Archaeology Review, 1975-2005 (ISSN 0098-9444) |
| *Bibliotheca Sacra, 1934-2007 (ISSN 0006-1921) |
| Scholarly Biblical journals |
| *Bulletin for Biblical Research, 1991-2008 (ISSN 1065-223X) |
| Common Ground Journal, 2003-2009 (ISSN 1547-9129) |
| *Critical Review of Books in Religion, 1988-1997 (ISSN 0894-8860) |
| *Currents in Biblical Research, April 2003-October 2010 |
| Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal, 1996-2005 (ISSN 1094-8473) |
| *Expository Times, August 1999-October 2010 (ISSN 1745-5308; Internet edition) |

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.

| Scholarly Biblical journals |
|--|
| Emmaus Journal, 1991-2004 (ISSN 1546-6973) |
| Faith and Mission, 1983-2004 (ISSN 0740-0659) |
| Grace Theological Journal, 1980-1991 (ISSN 0198-666X) |
| *Journal for Christian Theological Research, 1996-2007 (ISSN 1087-1624) |
| *Journal for the Renewal of Religion and Theology, 2006-2009 (ISSN 1834-3627) |
| *Journal for the Study of the New Testament, April 1999-September 2010 (ISSN 0142-064X) |
| *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, December 2001-September 2010 (ISSN 0309-0892) |
| *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, April 1999-September 2010 (ISSN 1745-5286) |
| *Journal of Biblical Studies, 2001-2006 (ISSN 1534-3057) |
| *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, 1996-2007 (ISSN 1203-1542) |
| Journal of Late Antique Religion and Culture, 2007-2008 (ISSN 1754-517X) |
| *Journal of Men, Masculinities and Spirituality, 2007-2009 (ISSN 1177-2484) |
| Journal of Ministry and Theology, 1997-2007 (ISSN 1092-9525) |
| *Journal of Philosophy & Scripture, 2003-2008 (ISSN 1555-5100) |
| *Journal of Religion and Society, 1999-2009 (ISSN 1522-5658) |
| *Lectio Difficilior, 2000-2008 (ISSN 1661-3317) |
| Marburg Journal of Religion, 1996-2009 (ISSN 1612-2941) |
| McMaster Journal of Theology and Ministry, 1997-2009 (ISSN 1481-0794) |
| Reformation and Revival, 1992-2004 (ISSN 1071-7277) |
| Review and Expositor, 1962-2007 (ISSN 0034-6373) |
| Rutgers Journal of Law and Religion, 1999-2008 (no ISSN) |
| *The Saint Anselm Journal, 2003-2008 (ISSN 1545-3367) |
| *Semeia Studies, 1974-2002 (ISSN 1567-200X) |
| *Society of Christian Ethics Journal, 1975-2009 (ISSN 1540-7942) |
| Southern Baptist Journal of Theology, 1997-2007 (ISSN 1520-7307) |

| |
|---|
| Scholarly Biblical journals |
| *T C: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism, 1996-2009 (ISSN 1089-7747) |
| *Trinity Journal, 1980-2006 (ISSN 0360-3032) |
| Westminster Theological Journal, 1950-2007 (ISSN 0043-4388) |
| Other Biblical journals |
| Biblical Archaeologist, 1938-1988 (no ISSN) |
| Central Bible Quarterly, 1966-1979 (ISSN 0008-9311) |
| Chafer Theological Seminary Journal, 1995-2003 (no ISSN) |
| Christian Apologetics Journal, 1998-2000, 2005 (ISSN 1930-9074) |
| Christian History Magazine, 1982-2008 (ISSN 0891-9666) |
| Conservative Theological Journal, 2000-2004 (no ISSN) |
| Global Journal of Classical Theology, September 1998-August 2001 (ISSN 1521-6055) |
| Grace Journal, 1960-1973 (no ISSN) |
| Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, 1995-2010 (no ISSN) |
| Journal of Biblical Apologetics, 2000-2003 (ISSN 1938-6397) |
| Journal of Christian Apologetics, 1997-1998 (no ISSN) |
| Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 1966-2007 (no ISSN) |
| Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society, 1998-2007 (no ISSN) |
| Master's Seminary Journal, 1990-2007 (ISSN 1066-3959) |
| American Theological Inquiry, 2008 (ISSN 1942-2709) |
| Michigan Theological Journal, 1990-1994 (no ISSN) |
| Reformed Baptist Theological Review, 2004-2005 (no ISSN) |
| Tyndale Bulletin, 1956-2006 (no ISSN) |

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**.'¹⁰⁵¹

Early Christian writings

- Migne. (1856-1866). *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Imprimerie Catholique.

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.

- Lightfoot & Harmer (eds.). (1898). *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Texts with Short Introductions and English Translations*. Macmillan & Co.
- Lake (trans.) & Gould (ed.). (1912). *The Apostolic Fathers, with an English Translation*. Harvard University Press.
- Holmes (ed.). (1999). *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Baker.

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.

¹⁰⁵¹ Arichea, 'Taking Theology Seriously in the Translation Task', p. 316, in Barrick, 'The Integration Of OT Theology With Bible Translation', *The Master's Seminary Journal* (12.1.26), The Master's Seminary (2001).

- Roberts, Donaldson & Coxe (eds.). (1885). *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Christian Literature Company. (electronic ed. 1997)
- Schaff & Wace (eds.). (1885). *A Select Library Of Nicene And Post Nicene Fathers Of The Christian Church. Second Series*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. (electronic ed. 1997)

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

- Dittenbeger, Wilhelm. (3rd ed., 1915-1920). *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. S. Hirzelium.

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.

- *Thesaurus Linguae Graece. CDROM E*. (2000). University of California.

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 collection¹⁰⁵² (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

- Freedman & Simon (trans., eds.). (1983). *The Soncino Midrash Rabbah*. Soncino Press.

This is the standard English edition of early to late medieval Jewish commentaries on various books of the Bible.

- Neusner, Jacob. (ed.). (1988). *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. Yale University Press.

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.

- Epstein, Isidore. (ed.). (1990 ed.). *The Soncino Talmud*. Soncino Press.

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 superseded by the modern edition of Neusner.¹⁰⁵³

Flavius Josephus

- Josephus & Whiston. (1996). *The Works of Josephus: Complete and unabridged*. Hendrickson.

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.

¹⁰⁵³ Neusner (ed.), 'The Babylonian Talmud, A translation and Commentary' (2010); see also Neusner (ed.), 'The Jerusalem Talmud, A Translation and Commentary' (2006), both published by Hendrickson.

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.

- Niese, Benedict. (1887-1895). *Flavii Iosephi Opera Recognovit Benedictvs Niese. Didit et apparatu criticoi instruxit.* (electronic ed. 2008). Logos Research Systems.

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)

- Robinson, Smith, & Coptic Gnostic Library Project. (1996). *The Nag Hammadi Library In English.* (4th rev. ed.). E.J. Brill.

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

- Charles, RC. (ed.). (1913). *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with introductions and critical and explanatory notes. Edited in conjunction with many scholars by R.H. Charles.* (2004 electronic ed.). Logos Research Systems.

The standard English edition of the Old Testament apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works.

- Penner & Heiser. (2008). *Old Testament Greek Pseudepigrapha With Morphology.* Logos Research Systems.

The standard Greek edition of the Old Testament apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works.

Philo of Alexandria

- Yonge, Charles. (1854-1955). *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. HG Bohn.

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

- Alexander & Baker. (2003). *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. InterVarsity Press.
- *Forms of the Old Testament Literature*. Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- *JPS Torah Commentary*. Jewish Publication Society.
- *New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Smith, James. (1992-1996). *Old Testament Survey Series*. College Press.
- *Tyndale Old Testament Commentary*. InterVarsity Press.
- Walton, Matthews, & Chavalas. (2000). *IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*. InterVarsity Press.

New Testament Commentaries

- *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Baker Academic.
- *Baker New Testament Commentary*. Baker House.
- Keener, Craig. (1993). *IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. InterVarsity Press.
- *New International Biblical Commentary*. Hendrickson Publishers.
- *New International Commentary on the New Testament*. W.B. Eerdmans.
- *New International Greek Testament Commentary*. W.B. Eerdmans.
- *Tyndale New Testament Commentary*. InterVarsity Press.
- Ware, W. (2004). *New Testament Background Commentary: A New Dictionary of Words, Phrases and Situations in Bible Order*.

Old and New Testament Commentaries

- Alexander & Rosner. (electronic ed. 2001). *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. InterVarsity Press.
- Bromiley (ed.). (rev. ed. 2002). *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Carson, France, Motyer, & Wenham. (4th ed. 1994). *New Bible Commentary: 21st century edition*. InterVarsity Press.
- *College Press NIV Commentary*. College Press.
- Freedman, David. (1996). *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Doubleday.
- Martin & Davids. (1997). *Dictionary of the Later New Testament & Its Developments*. InterVarsity Press.
- *Word Biblical Commentary*. Thomas Nelson.

Exegetical Summaries

- *Exegetical Summaries*. (2nd ed., 2008). Summer Institute of Linguistics.

This is a series of volumes on different Bible books, providing summaries of interpretations on each verse from various standard commentaries referred in the relevant scholarly literature. It is a useful reference source for finding a range of academic commentary on a passage.

Textual commentary for translators

- *UBS Handbook Series; Helps for translators*. United Bible Societies.

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 ʔadam 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.**¹⁰⁵⁴

¹⁰⁵⁴ Baker, ‘Approaches to Genesis: A Review Article’, Ashland Theological Journal (31.104), 1999

Textual criticism¹⁰⁵⁵ (the text of the New Testament)

- Aland, Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger, & Wikgren. (4th ed. 1993, c1979). *The Greek New Testament*. Federal Republic of Germany: United Bible Societies.

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.

- Metzger, Bruce (2nd ed. 1994). *Textual Commentary On the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*. United Bible Societies.

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

- Tweedale, Michael. (2005). *Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam*. (electronic ed.). Logos Research Systems.

A critical edition of the 4th century Latin Vulgate (Clementine edition, 1592).¹⁰⁵⁶ 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>.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Details of this text can be found at the UBS website: http://www.ubs-translations.org/cat/biblical_texts/latin_texts.

Bibliography

Alexander, P. H., & Society of Biblical Literature. (1999). *The SBL handbook of style: for ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and early Christian studies*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers.

Arichea, Daniel C. (1995). The Silence of Women in The Church: Theology and Translation in 1 Corinthians 14.33b-36. *The Bible Translator*, 46(1), 101–112.

Arichea, Daniel C.; Hatton, H. (1995). *A handbook on Paul's letters to Timothy and to Titus*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Arichea, Daniel C.; Nida, E. A. (1980). *A Handbook on the First Letter from Peter*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Arndt, William; Danker, Frederick W.; Bauer, W. (2000). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ascough, R. S. (2008). *Forms of Commensality in Greco-Roman Associations: draft paper for the SBL Greco-Roman Meals Consultation*. Presented at the SBL Greco-Roman Meals Consultation.

Balz, Horst Robert; Schneider, G. (1990). *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Barrick, W. D. (2001). The Integration Of OT Theology With Bible Translation. *Master's Seminary Journal*, 12(1), 15–31.

Barron, B. (1990). Putting Women In Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 And Evangelical Views Of Women In Church Leadership. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 33(4), 449–459.

Bartchy, S. (1996a). Philemon, Epistle to. *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (Vols. 1-6, Vol. 5, pp. 305–309). Yale University Press.

Bartchy, S. (1996b). Slavery (New Testament). *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (Vols. 1-6, Vol. 6, pp. 1093–1104). Yale University Press.

Baugh, S. M. (1994). The Apostle among the Amazons. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 56(1), 153–172.

Beale, G. K.; Carson, D. A. (2007). *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI; Nottingham, UK: Baker Academic; Apollos.

Beavis, M. A. (2007). Christian Origins, Egalitarianism, and Utopia. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 23(2), 27–49.

Black, Allen; Black, M. C. (1998). 1 & 2 Peter. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO: College Press Pub.

Board, C. of C. D. B. of T. C. C. N. C. of C. B. U. S. C. C. A. (1996). *The New American Bible: translated from the original languages with critical use of all the ancient sources and the revised New Testament*. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

Boles, K. L. (1993). Galatians & Ephesians. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO: College Press.

Bratcher, Robert G.; Nida, E. A. (1993). *A handbook on Paul's letter to the Ephesians*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Briggs, R. (1998). *Witches & Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft*. New York: Penguin Books.

Brock, A. G. (2005). Scribal Blunder or Textual Plunder? Codex Bezae, Textual-Rhetorical Analysis, And the Diminished Role of Women. In C. Vander Stichele & T. C. Penner (Eds.), *Her Master's Tools? feminist and postcolonial engagements of historical-critical discourse*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Brown, L. (2001). 2 Timothy 2:9-15 Women Who Profess Reverence for God. In C. L. Meyers, T. Craven, & R. S. Kraemer (Eds.), *Women In Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids (Mich.); Cambridge (U.K.): W.B. Eerdmans Pub.

Bruce, F. F. (1971). 1 and 2 Corinthians. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Bruce, F. F. (1984). *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

- Bruce, F. F. (1988). *The Book of the Acts*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Byrnes, C. (2010). *God Christ Man Woman*. Christadelphian Scripture Study Service.
- Callender, D. (1998). Servants of God (S) and Servants of Kings in Israel and the Ancient Near East. *Semeia*, 83/84, 67–82.
- Campbell, R. A. (2004). *The Elders: seniority within earliest Christianity*. London; New York: T&T Clark.
- Challoner, R. (2009). *The Holy Bible, Translated from the Latin Vulgate*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software.
- Charles, R. H. (1913). *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, with introductions and critical and explanatory notes*. Edited in conjunction with many scholars by R.H. Charles. Logos Bible Software.
- Christians for Biblical Equality. (1989). *Christians for Biblical Equality: Statement on Men, Women and Biblical Equality*. Retrieved from http://www.cbeinternational.org/new/about/biblical_equality.shtml.
- Clark, S. (1999). *Thinking with Demons: the idea of witchcraft in early modern Europe*. Oxford [etc.]: Clarendon Press.
- Coats, G. W. (1983). *Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature*. *Forms of the Old Testament Literature* (Vol. 1). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Combs, W. W. (1987). Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and New Testament Interpretation. *Grace Theological Journal*, 8(2), 195–213.
- Corley, K. E. (2002). *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins*. Santa Rosa, Calif.: Polebridge Press.
- Correy, C. E. (2002). *The Role Of Patriarchy In Domestic Violence*.
- Cosgrove, C. H. (2002). *Appealing to Scripture in Moral Debate: Five Hermeneutical Rules*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub.

Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. (1988). The Danvers Statement on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. Retrieved from <http://www.cbmw.org/Danvers>.

Crawford, S. W. (2003). Mothers, Sisters, and Elders: Titles for Women in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Communities. Presented at the The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/66>.

Crocker, C. C. (2004). Reading 1 Corinthians in the twenty-first century. London; New York: T&T Clark.

Dandamayev, M. (1996). Slavery. The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary (1996th ed., Vols. 1-6, Vol. 6, pp. 1093–1104). Yale University Press.

Dauids, P. H. (1990). The First Epistle of Peter. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

de Blois, L., & Hemelrijk, E. A. (1992). Review of Women in the Earliest Churches by Ben Witherington III. *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, 45(2), 279–281.

De Ferrari, R. J. (1947). Fathers of the Church – A New Translation. [New York]: Cima Pub. Co.

De George, S. G. (1986). Review 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), 724–726.

Dio Chrysostom. (1946). Dio Chrysostom. IV, [Discourses XXXVII-LX]. (H. L. Crosby, Trans.). London; Cambridge, Mass.: W. Heinemann; Harvard University Press.

Dittenberger, W., & Hiller von Gaertringen, F. (1915). *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Lipsiae: apud S. Hirzelium.

Dockery, D. S. (1992). Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: contemporary hermeneutics in the light of the early church. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Duke University. Divinity School. (2008). Bulletin of Duke University. The Divinity School. Bulletin of Duke University. The Divinity School.

Dunn, J. D. G. (1996). The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: a commentary on the Greek text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Carlisle: William B. Eerdmans Pub.; Paternoster Press.

Editor. (1996). Patriarchy And Abuse: No Direct Link. Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, 2(2).

Ellingworth, P., & Hatton, H. (1995). A Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Elliott, J. H. (2002). Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian. A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory. Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology, 32(2), 75–91.

Elliott, John H. (2003). The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian but Family-oriented. Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches, 11(2), 173–210.

Engel, D. M. (2003). Women's Role in the Home and the State: Stoic Theory Reconsidered. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 101, 267–288.

Evans, C. A. (2004). From Prophecy to Testament: the function of the Old Testament in the New. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers.

Evans, C. A. (2005). Ancient texts for New Testament studies: a guide to the background literature. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers.

Fee, G. D. (1987). The First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Fee, G. D. (1988). 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Friberg, Timothy; Friberg, Barbara; Miller, N. F. (2000). Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Frymer-Kenski, T. (2003). Anatolia and the Levant: Israel. In R. Westbrook & G. M. Beckman (Eds.), A History of Ancient Near Eastern law (Vol. 2, pp. 975–1046). Brill.

- Gaertner, D. (1995). Acts. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO: College Press.
- Garland, D. E. (2003). 1 Corinthians. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Gibbons, J. (1998). Recent Developments in the Study of the Great European Witch Hunt. The Pomegranate, 5.
- Gould, G. P. (Ed.). (1912). The Apostolic fathers. (K. Lake, Trans.). London; New York: Heinemann; Macmillan.
- Grenz, S. J., & Kjesbo, D. M. (1995). Women in the Church: a biblical theology of women in ministry. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.
- Grimm, C. L. W., Thayer, J. H., & Wilke, C. G. (1886). A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Grudem, W. A. (2001). The Meaning Of κεφαλή ("Head"): An Evaluation Of New Evidence, Real And Alleged. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 44(1).
- Gundry-Volf, J. (1999). Putting the Moral Vision of the New Testament into Focus: A Review. Bulletin for Biblical Research, 9, 277-287.
- Hamilton, V. P. (1990). The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Hanson, K. (2002). Slavery: OT. In G. W. Bromiley & K. Hanson (Eds.), International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (rev. ed., Vols. 1-4, Vol. 4). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Hays, R. B. (1996). The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics. [San Francisco]: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Hays, R. B. (1997). First Corinthians. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching & Preaching. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press.
- Hill. (2001). The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists? History of Political Thought, 22(1), 13-40.

Hodge, C. (1980). *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House.

Holmes, J. M. (2000). *Text in a Whirlwind: a critique of four exegetical devices at 1 Timothy 2:9–15* (Vol. 196). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Holmes, M. (2003). Women and the “Western” Text of Acts. In T. Nicklas & M. Tilly (Eds.), *The Book of Acts as Church History: text, textual traditions and ancient interpretations = Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte*. Berlin [u.a.]: de Gruyter.

Holmes, M. W. (1999). *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek texts and English translations* (Updated ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Horrell, D. (1997). Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity. *Sociology of Religion*, 58(4), 323–341.

Horrell, D. G. (1996). *The Social Ethos of the Corinthians Correspondence: interests and ideology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

House, H. W. (1988). 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View. *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

House, H. W. (1989). A Biblical View of Women in the Ministry Part 5: Distinctive Roles for Women in the Second and Third Centuries. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 146(581), 40–54.

Hove, R. (1999). Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the gender dispute. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books.

Hunt, A. S., & Edgar, C. C. (1956). *Select Papyri I: Non-Literary Papyri, Private Affairs*. London: William Heinemann.

International standard version New Testament: version 1.1. (2000). (Print on Demand ed.). Yorba Linda, CA: The Learning Foundation.

Jackson, G. (1998). Jesus as First-Century Feminist: Christian Anti-Judaism? *FEMINIST THEOLOGY*, (19), 85–98.

Jaskow. (1980). Blaming Jews for Inventing Patriarchy. *Lillith*, 11, 11–12.

Jelinek, J. (1990). Review of *The Role of Women in the Ministry Today*. By H. Wayne House. *Michigan Theological Journal*, 1(2), 184–189.

Jervis, L. A. (1995). 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: a Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 17(58), 51–73.

Jolly, K., Peters, E., & Raudvere, C. (2001). *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe, Volume 3: The Middle Ages. Witchcraft and Magic in Europe (Vol. 3)*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Josephus, F. (2008). *Flavii Iosephi Opera*: Recognovit Benedictus Niese. Dedit et apparatu criticoi instruxit. (B. Niese, Ed.). Berolini: Logos Research System, Inc.

Josephus, Flavius; Whiston, W. (1987). *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Keener, C. S. (1993). Man and Woman. In D. G. Hawthorne, Gerald F.; Martin, Ralph P.; Reid (Ed.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Keener, C. S. . I. P. (1993). *The IVP Bible background commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

King, M. (2008). *An Exegetical Summary of Colossians (2nd ed.)*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Kissling, P. J. (2004). *Genesis. College Press NIV Commentary*. Joplin, MO: College Press Pub. Co.

Kistemaker, Simon J.; Hendriksen, W. (1953). *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles. Baker New Testament Commentary (Vol. 17)*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Kistemaker, Simon J.; Hendriksen, W. (1986). *New Testament commentary: Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New Testament Commentary (Vol. 18)*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Kittel, Gerhard; Bromiley, Geoffrey W.; Friedrich, G. (Ed.). (1964). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (electronic ed.)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Knight, G. W. (1992). *The Pastoral Epistles: a commentary on the Greek text. New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI; Carlisle, England: W.B. Eerdmans; Paternoster Press.

Köstenberger, A. J., Schreiner, T. R., & Baldwin, H. S. (1995a). *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books.

Köstenberger, A. J., Schreiner, T. R., & Baldwin, H. S. (1995b). *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Baker Books.

Kraemer, R. S. (2001). Jewish Women in Rome and Egypt. In D. M. Juschka (Ed.), *Feminism in the Study of Religion: a reader*. London; New York: Continuum.

Kroeger, R. C., & Kroeger, C. C. (1992). *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House.

Ksarjian, L. (1999). Trying to Prove that the Bible Is Pro-Woman: How some feminists perpetuate patriarchy. *Free Inquiry Magazine*, 19(1).

Kurek-Chomycz, D. A. (2006). Is There an "Anti-Priscan" Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila. *Journal of Biblical literature*, 125(1), 107.

Levack, B. P. (1995). *Witch-Hunt In Early Modern Europe* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Levitt, H. M., & Ware, K. (2006). "Anything With Two Heads Is a Monster": Religious Leaders' Perspectives on Marital Equality and Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12(12), 1169–1190.

Liddell, Henry George; Scott, Robert; Jones, Henry Stuart; McKenzie, R. (1996). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press;

Liefeld, W. (1986a). Response to David M. Scholer. In A. Mickelsen (Ed.), *Women, Authority & the Bible*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

Liefeld, W. (1986b). Response: 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View. In A. Mickelsen (Ed.), *Women, Authority & the Bible*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

- Liefeld, W. (1986c). Women, Submission, and Ministry in 1 Corinthians. In A. Mickelsen (Ed.), *Women, Authority & the Bible*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.
- Lieu, J. M. (2002). *Neither Jew nor Greek? constructing early Christianity*. London; New York: T&T Clark.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber; Harmer, J. R. (1891). *The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Lillie, W. (1975). The Pauline House-tables. *The Expository Times* *The Expository Times*, 86(6), 179–183.
- Lister, R. (2004). J. Lee Grady's 25 Tough Questions About Women and the Church: A Review Article. *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 9(1), 100–106.
- Long, A. A. (2007). Stoic Communitarianism And Normative Citizenship. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 24(02), 241–261.
- Longenecker, R. N. (1984). *New Testament Social Ethics for Today*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Louw, Johannes P.; Nida, E. A. (1996). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: based on semantic domains* (electronic ed. of the 2nd ed.). New York: United Bible Societies.
- Lowe, S. D. (1991). Rethinking the female status/function question the Jew/Gentile relationship as a paradigm. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 34(1), 59–75.
- Lüdemann, G. (2003). *Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals*. London; New York: T&T Clark.
- Lust, Johan; Eynikel, Erik; Hauspie, K. (2003). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*: Revised Edition. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart.
- MacArthur, J. (1984). *1 Corinthians*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Mackay, C. S. (2006). *Malleus Maleficarum: the hammer of witches*. Cambridge University Press.
- Malick, D. (2007). The Contribution of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis to an Understanding of Women in the Book of Acts. *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, 4, 158–283.

Mare, W. H. (2004). *New Testament Background Commentary: A New Dictionary of Words, Phrases and Situations in Bible Order*. Ross-shire, UK: Mentor.

Marshall, H. (2007a). Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage. *Double Image: The Bulletin of Men Women and God*, 12(1), 1–5.

Marshall, H. (2007b). Women in Ministry. In M. Husbands & T. Larsen (Eds.), *Women, Ministry and the Gospel: Exploring new paradigms*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic.

Marshall, I. H., & Towner, P. H. (2004). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. London; New York: T & T Clark International.

Martin, C. (2011). How to Read an Interpretation: Interpretive Strategies and the Maintenance of Authority. *The Bible and Critical Theory*, 5(1), 06.1–06.26.

Matthews, Victor Harold; Chavalas, Mark W.; Walton, J. H. (2000). *The IVP Bible background commentary: Old Testament* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Mayer, A. (2002). *The Women Should Keep Silence in the Churches*. Resources for Sustenance and Renewal. [s.n.].

Merriam-Webster, I. (2003). *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (Eleventh ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Metzger, B. M. U. B. S. (1994). *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament, second edition a companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* (4th rev. ed.). London; New York: United Bible Societies.

Miller, E. L. (2002). Is Galatians 3:28 the Great Egalitarian Text? *The Expository Times* *The Expository Times*, 114(1), 9–11.

Monter, E. W. (2002). The Sociology of Jura Witchcraft. In D. Oldridge (Ed.), *The Witchcraft Reader*. London; New York: Routledge.

Morris, L. (1985). *1 Corinthians: an introduction and commentary*. *The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* (2nd ed., Vol. 7). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Moss, C. M. (1994). *1, 2 Timothy & Titus*. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO: College Press.

- Motto, A. L. (1972). Seneca on Women's Liberation. *The Classical World*, 65(5), 155-157.
- Mounce, W. D. (2000). *Pastoral Epistles*. Word Biblical Commentary (Vol. 46). Dallas: Word, Incorporated.
- Murphy, C. (1999). *The Word According to Eve: Women and the Bible in Ancient Times and Our Own*. London: Allen Lane.
- Nerney, C. T., & Taussig, H. (2002). *Re-Imagining Life Together in America: A New Gospel of Community*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Neusner, J. (1988). *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- New American Standard Bible: 1995 update. (1995). LaHabra, CA: The Lockman Foundation.
- New International Reader's Version. (1998). (1st ed.). Zondervan.
- Newman, B. M. (1993). *A Concise Greek-English dictionary of the New Testament*. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; United Bible Societies.
- Newman, Barclay Moon; Nida, E. A. (1972). *A Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Orr, W. F., & Walther, J. A. (1976). *I Corinthians: A New Translation*. Anchor Yale Bible (Vol. 32). Doubleday.
- Ortlund, R. (2001). Man and Woman. In B. S. Alexander, T. Desmond; Rosner (Ed.), *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (electronic ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Osborne, G. R. (2006). *The Hermeneutical Spiral: a comprehensive introduction to biblical interpretation* (Rev. and expanded, 2nd ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Osiek, C. (2004). Did Early Christians Teach, or Merely Assume, Male Headship? In D. Blankenhorn, D. S. Browning, & M. S. Van Leeuwen (Eds.), *Does Christianity Teach Male Headship?: the equal-regard marriage and its critics*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Oster, R. (1993). Review: I Suffer Not a Woman. Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence. *Biblical Archaeologist*, 56(4), 225–227.

Oster, R. (1995). 1 Corinthians. Joplin, MO: College Press Pub. Co.

Patzia, A. G. (1990). New International biblical commentary: Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Penner, Ken; Heiser, M. S. (2008). Old Testament Greek pseudepigrapha with morphology. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software.

Peters, E. (1978). The Magician, the Witch, and the Law. [Philadelphia]: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Peterson, E. H. (2002). The Message: the Bible in contemporary language. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.

Philo of Alexandria; Yonge, C. D. (1995). The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Pinnock, C. (1986). Biblical Authority & The Issues In Question. In A. Mickelsen (Ed.), Women, Authority & the Bible. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

Pitt. (2008). Review: PORTER Paul and his Theology. *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, 5, 130–135.

Press, B. S. (2006). The NET Bible First Edition; Bible. English. NET Bible.; The NET Bible. Biblical Studies Press.

Publishers, T. H. (2007). Holy Bible: New Living Translation (3rd ed.). Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

Purkiss, D. (1996). The Witch in History: Early Modern and Twentieth-Century Representations. Routledge.

Reyburn, William David; Fry, E. M. (1998). A Handbook on Genesis. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Roberts, A., Donaldson, J., & Coxe, A. C. (Eds.). (1885). The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325. Buffalo (etc.): Christian Literature Co.

Robertson, A., & Plummer, A. (1971). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Robinson, J. M., Smith, R., Coptic Gnostic Library Project, & Logos Research Systems, I. (1996, rev. ed). *The Nag Hammadi library in English*. E.J. Brill.

Sandmel, S. (1962). Parallelomania: the presidential address given before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in St. Louis, Missouri, December 27, 1961. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 81(1), 1–13.

Sarna, N. M. (1989). *Genesis*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Schaff, P., & Wace, H. (1886). *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series*. Buffalo [etc.]: The Christian literature company.

Schemm, P. (2003). Galatians 3:28 —Proof-text or Context? *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 8(1), 23–30.

Schreiner, T. R. (1999). Interpreting the Pauline Epistles. *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*, 3(3), 4–21.

Smith, J. E. (1993). *The Pentateuch*. Old Testament Survey Series (2nd ed.). Joplin, MO: College Press Pub. Co.

Soards, M. L. (1999). *1 Corinthians*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Society, A. B. (1992). *The Holy Bible: The Good news Translation* (2nd ed.). New York: American Bible Society.

Sparks, K. L. (2008). *God's Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship*. Baker Academic.

Stephens, W. (2002). *Demon Lovers: witchcraft, sex, and the crisis of belief*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strelan, R. (1996). Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter.

Sullivan, F. A. (2001). *From Apostles to Bishops: the development of the episcopacy in the early church*. New York: Newman Press.

Swanson, J. (1997). *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)* (electronic ed.). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Tanzer, S. J. (2001). Eph 5:22-33 Wives (and Husbands) Exhorted. In C. L. Meyers, T. Craven, & R. S. Kraemer (Eds.), *Women In Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids (Mich.); Cambridge (U.K.): W.B. Eerdmans Pub.

Taylor, J. (2004). The Women “Priests” of Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa*; Reconstructing the *Therapeutae*. In E. Schüssler Fiorenza, J. Schaberg, A. Bach, & E. Fuchs (Eds.), *On the Cutting Edge: the study of women in biblical worlds: essays in honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*. New York: Continuum.

Taylor, J. E., & Davies, P. R. (1998). The So-Called *Therapeutae* of “*De Vita Contemplativa*”: Identity and Character. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 91(1), 3–24.

The Everyday Bible: New Century Version. (2005). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

The Holman Student Bible: [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. (2007). Nashville, TN: Holman Bible Publishers.

The Holy Bible: English Standard Version. (2001). Wheaton: Standard Bible Society.

The Holy Bible: New International Version. (1984). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version. (1989). Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

The Holy Bible: The Contemporary English Version. (1995). Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

The Holy Bible: Today’s New International Version. (2005). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

The New International Version. (2011). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

The Soncino Midrash Rabbah. (1992). Institute for Computers in Jewish Life: Davka Corp.

Thesaurus Linguae Graece: CDROM E. (2000). University of California, Irvine.

Thiselton, A. C. (2000). The First Epistle to the Corinthians: a commentary on the Greek text. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.

Thomas, J. (1859). Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come. Herald of the kingdom and age to come.

Tigay, J. H. (1996). Deuteronomy. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Towner, P. H. (2006). The Letters to Timothy and Titus. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Trail, R. (2008). An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 10–16 (2nd ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Trotter, D. (1987). Review: Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 30(1), 101–104.

Tucker, R. (1986). What does kephale mean in the New Testament: A Response. In A. Mickelsen (Ed.), Women, Authority & the Bible. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

Tweeddale, M. (Ed.). (2005). Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam (Ed. electronica.). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

Unger, M. F. (1996). The Role of Archaeology in the Study of the New Testament. Bibliotheca Sacra, 116(462), 153–155.

Van Leeuwen, M. S. (2007). Opposite Sexes or Neighbouring Sexes? What Do the Social Sciences Really Tell Us? In T. Husbands, Mark; Larsen (Ed.), Women, ministry and the Gospel: exploring new paradigms (pp. 171–199). Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.

Vine, W. E., Unger, M. F., & White, W. (1996). Vine's complete expository dictionary of Old and New Testament words: with topical index. Nashville: T. Nelson.

Virkler, Henry A.; Ayayo, K. G. (2007). Hermeneutics: principles and processes of Biblical interpretation (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Vos, H. F. T. N. P. (1980). Archaeology and the Text of the New Testament. *Bible and Spade*, 9(2), 51–64.

Walker, W. (1983). The “Theology of Woman’s Place” And the “Paulinist” Tradition. *Semeia*, 28, 101–111.

Wallace, D. B. (1996). *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: an exegetical syntax of the New Testament with scripture, subject, and Greek word indexes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Ware, B. A., & Equality, A. C. (2008). Summaries of the Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions on the Role of Women in the Home and in Christian Ministry. The Council on Biblical Manhood & Womanhood. (accessed February 2, 2011). Retrieved from http://experiencetherock.com/mp3/message/2009/broken/gender_roles.pdf

Watson, F. (2000). The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11.216. *New Test. Stud. New Testament Studies*, 46(4), 520–536.

Webb, W. J. (2005). A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic; The Slavery Analogy. In R. M. Pierce, Ronald W.; Groothuis (Ed.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Weiss, Z. (n.d.). The Sepphoris Synagogue Mosaic. *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 26(05).

Wenham, G. J. (2002). *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary (Vol. 1). Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

Williams, D. J. (1990). *Acts*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Willis, D. (1995). *Malevolent Nurture: Witch-Hunting and Maternal Power in Early Modern England*. Cornell University Press.

Witherington, B. (1984). The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the “Western” Text in Acts. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 103(1), 82–84.

Witherington, B. (1996). Women (New Testament). In A. B. Freedman, David Noel; Herion, Gary A.; Graf, David F.; Pleins, John David; Beck (Ed.), *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (Vol. 6). New York: Doubleday.

Wolters, A. (2006). A Semantic Study of ἀνθήντης and its Derivatives. *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 11, 45–56.

Wright, B. (1998). Ebed/doulos: Terms and Social Status in the Meeting of Hebrew Biblical and Hellenistic Roman Culture. *Semeia*, 83/84, 83–112.

Wright, N. T. (2004). Women's Service in the Church: The Biblical Basis. A conference paper for the Symposium, "Men, Women and the Church." Presented at the Men, Women and the Church.

Zodhiates, S. (2000). *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament* (electronic ed.). Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers.