

# 3

## A COMPLEX SENTENCE

*The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12*

---

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER

---

What is so difficult to understand about Paul's statement "I do not permit a woman to teach or have authority over a man"? On the face of it, it seems clear that the apostle here sets boundaries for women's roles in the church, not just in ancient Ephesus, but in the church, which he later in the same epistle calls "the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15 NIV). In recent years, however, virtually every aspect of 1 Timothy 2:12 has been explained in a way that either limits the scope of the passage's application or makes the passage say something other than a plain, straightforward reading of it would suggest.

In the first chapter of the present volume, Steven Baugh shows that arguments for limiting the relevance of 1 Timothy 2:12 to the original context based on the ancient background of first-century Ephesus fail to convince. The role of women in first-century Ephesus was not sufficiently peculiar to suggest that Paul intended to curtail the role of women in the *Ephesian* church, but not elsewhere.

In the second chapter, Henry Baldwin carefully analyzes all the extant instances of the word αὐθεντεῖν, meticulously updating his original essay in interaction with subsequent scholarship. Over against efforts to construe the connotation of the term αὐθεντεῖν as negative, so that only women's *negative* exercise of authority would be proscribed by Paul, Baldwin has demonstrated that on the basis of lexical analysis there is no evidence that the word was used with a negative connotation in any of the instances prior to Paul or contemporaneous to him.

At the same time, as Baldwin himself acknowledges, there are limitations to word studies, since it could be argued that Paul used the word in a novel way (though this is not in fact what egalitarians *are* contending) or that an author could invest a basically positive or neutral term with a negative connotation in a particular statement. For this reason we must look at the word αὐθεντεῖν in its context in 1 Timothy 2:12 to confirm or disprove our understanding of Paul's words here.

Just as every nation has laws to govern the life of its citizens, so every language has a system of grammar and syntax that stipulates proper rules and conventions of usage for that language. Unless a writer wants to be accused of breaking the rules (and thus of writing improper Greek, in the present instance), he must conform to these rules of grammar and syntax. As will be seen, a careful study of the Greek grammar and syntax of the present passage goes a long way toward determining the meaning of the word αὐθεντεῖν. Thus the ensuing chapters on the exegesis, hermeneutics, and application of 1 Timothy 2:12 will be set on a firm foundation.

### The Significance of Syntactical Background Studies for the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:12

The passage reads as follows: "I do not permit a woman to teach or have authority over a man" (or, in the original Greek, διδάσκειν δὲ γυναῖκί οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ). The syntactical pattern found in 1 Timothy 2:12 can be laid out as follows:

- a negated finite verb ("I do not permit," οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω)
- governing a (preceding) infinitive ("to teach," διδάσκειν)
- which is connected by the coordinating conjunction οὐδέ ("or")
- with a second infinitive ("to have authority," αὐθεντεῖν);
- this phrase is then contrasted with the adversative ἀλλά ("but")
- and yet another infinitive ("to be in quietness," εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ).

Or, in other words, the pattern is:

- (1) a negated finite verb + (2) infinitive + (3) οὐδέ + infinitive + (4) ἀλλά + infinitive<sup>1</sup>

The need for syntactical background studies to understand 1 Timothy 2:12 has been recognized by P. B. Payne and D. J. Moo, who engaged in a detailed exchange on the syntactical significance of οὐδέ in the verse. Payne argued that οὐδέ connects the two infinitives διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν "in order to convey a single coherent idea," that is, as a hendiadys, so that the passage should be rendered as follows: "I do not permit a woman to teach in a domineering manner."<sup>2</sup> Moo disputed this notion as firmly as Payne asserted it, arguing that, while οὐδέ "certainly usually joins 'two *closely related* items,' it does not usually join together words that restate the same thing or that are mutually interpreting."<sup>3</sup> Moo concluded that, while teaching and having authority are closely related, "they are nonetheless distinct," referring also to 1 Timothy 3:2, 4-5 and 5:17, where these two concepts are distinguished.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, Payne's study is subject to improvement at several points. First, Payne studies only Paul. A more comprehensive study of the uses of οὐδέ in the whole New Testament is needed, if for no other reason than that the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, including 1 Timothy, remains in dispute. Second, Payne studies all the occurrences of οὐδέ in Paul, even where it joins nouns, not verbs. It would seem desirable to sharpen the focus by studying the passages where οὐδέ joins verbs.<sup>5</sup>

Third, Payne does not consider uses of μηδέ in Paul or elsewhere in the New Testament. Only seven instances remain where Paul uses οὐδέ to connect verbs (1 Cor. 15:50; 2 Cor. 7:12; Gal. 1:17; 4:14; Phil. 2:16; 2 Thess. 3:8; 1 Tim. 6:16). However, references including μηδέ in writings traditionally attributed to Paul provide eight further examples alone (Rom. 9:11, 16b; 14:21; 2 Cor. 4:2; Col. 2:21; 2 Thess. 2:2; 1 Tim. 1:3-4; 6:17). Notably, two of these, 1 Timothy 1:3-4 and 6:17, occur in the same letter. Fourth, Payne already starts with the assumption that αὐθεντεῖν means "domineer." However, that is the very thing that needs to be established, not asserted. What is called for is an inductive study of all the instances of οὐδέ joining verbs, both in the New Testament and in extrabiblical Greek literature. This investigation will distill the database for understanding the syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12 with implications for the meaning of αὐθεντεῖν.

Fifth, since Payne presupposes that αὐθεντεῖν means "domineer," he concludes that "teach" and "domineer" by themselves are conceptually too far apart to be joined by οὐδέ (which usually joins closely related terms) in a coordinating manner. Thus, Payne views the second term joined by οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2:12, αὐθεντεῖν, as subordinate to the first,

διδάσκειν. But if αὐθεντεῖν were to mean "to have authority" rather than "to domineer," it would be quite closely related to διδάσκειν, "to teach." In that case, consistent with Payne's own observations on how οὐδέ generally functions, οὐδέ could well link the two closely related terms, "to teach" and "to have authority," in a coordinating fashion. Payne's argument is circular, and his conclusion is unduly predetermined by his presupposition regarding the meaning of αὐθεντεῖν. Sixth, Payne's terminology is ambiguous when he calls two terms "closely related." He seems to use this terminology in the sense of "essentially one" so that he can conclude that in 1 Timothy 2:12 "οὐδέ joins together two elements in order to convey a single coherent idea." However, as will be shown below, two terms can be "closely related" and yet be distinct. For example, Matthew 6:20 refers to heaven, "where thieves neither break in nor steal." While "breaking in" and "stealing" are sequentially related and may be seen as components of essentially one event, burglary, the two activities are not so closely related as to lose their own distinctness. The burglar first breaks in and then steals.

Seventh, Payne is inconsistent in his use of terminology regarding his categories of the usage of οὐδέ. On page 1, he terms his second category "those which specify with greater clarity the meaning of one word or phrase by conjoining it with another word or phrase." Yet in his conclusion on page 10, he calls the same category those in which "οὐδέ joins together two elements in order to convey a single coherent idea." From the beginning of his paper until the end, Payne has subtly shifted from one definition of his crucial category to another. While his definition on page 1 allows for terms to be closely related and yet distinct, Payne's categorization on page 10 unduly narrows his earlier definition so that now closely related yet distinct terms seem excluded. Eighth, on page 10 Payne notes translations that render αὐθεντεῖν with "domineer" or similarly negative connotations. He fails to observe, however, that neither the NASB, the RSV, nor the NIV renders the term with a negative connotation. The NASB has "exercise authority"; the NIV and the RSV translate αὐθεντεῖν with "to have authority."

We may summarize the argument thus far. Two methodological paths have been taken to identify the proper rendering of 1 Timothy 2:12: word studies and syntactical studies. The rarity of the use of αὐθεντεῖν and other limitations impose certain restraints on word studies in the present instance. The major syntactical study on the passage is subject to some significant improvements. Therefore, a fresh study of New Testament syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 needs to be undertaken.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, extrabiblical Greek literature from the period preceding or contemporary with the New Testament should be consulted to supplement the study of syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12.

## Syntactical Parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 in the New Testament

Strictly speaking, there is only one close syntactical parallel to 1 Timothy 2:12 in the New Testament, Acts 16:21, where the same construction, a negated finite verb + infinitive + οὐδέ + infinitive, is found.<sup>7</sup> However, if one allows for verbal forms other than infinitives to be linked by οὐδέ, fifty-two further passages can be identified. These can be grouped into two patterns of the usage of οὐδέ:

- Pattern 1: two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied due to circumstances or conditions adduced in the context.
- Pattern 2: two activities or concepts are viewed negatively, and consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided.

In both patterns, the conjunction οὐδέ coordinates activities of the same order, that is, activities that are both viewed either positively or negatively by the writer or speaker.

Pattern 1, the prohibition or denial of two activities or concepts that are otherwise viewed positively, is found in the following New Testament passages: Matt. 6:26 = Luke 12:24; Matt. 6:28 = Luke 12:27; Matt. 7:6, 18; 10:14 = Mark 6:11; Matt. 13:13; 22:46; 23:13; Mark 8:17; 13:15; Luke 6:44; 17:23; 18:4; John 14:17; Acts 4:18; 9:9; 16:21; 17:24–25; 21:21; Rom. 9:11, 16; 14:21; 1 Cor. 15:50; Gal. 1:16–17; Col. 2:21; 1 Tim. 2:12; 6:16; Heb. 10:8; 1 John 3:6; and Rev. 12:8.

Pattern 2, the prohibition or denial of two activities that are both viewed negatively, can be seen in Matt. 6:20 = Luke 12:33; Matt. 12:19; Luke 3:14; John 4:15; 14:27; Acts 2:27; 2 Cor. 4:2; 7:12; Gal. 4:14; Phil. 2:16; 2 Thess. 2:2; 3:7–8; 1 Tim. 1:3–4; 6:17; Heb. 12:5; 13:5; 1 Pet. 2:22; 3:14; and Rev. 7:16. Overall, in the New Testament there are thirty-three examples of the first pattern and twenty of the second (see table 3.1).

**Table 3.1**  
**Patterns of the Usage of οὐδέ in the New Testament**

Pattern 1: Two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied due to circumstances or conditions adduced in the context.

Matt. 6:26	οὐ σπείρουσιν (sow)	οὐδέ θερίζουσιν (harvest)
		οὐδέ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας (gather into barns)

Matt. 6:28	οὐ κοπιῶσιν (labor)	οὐδὲ νήθουσιν (spin)
Matt. 7:6	Μὴ δῶτε (give)	μηδὲ βάλλετε (throw)
Matt. 7:18	οὐ δύναται ποιεῖν (can yield)	οὐδὲ ποιεῖν (yield)*
Matt. 10:14	μὴ δέξεται (receive)	μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ (listen)
Matt. 13:13	οὐκ ἀκούουσιν (hear)	οὐδὲ συνίουσιν (understand)
Matt. 22:46	οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο ἀποκριθῆναι (could answer)	οὐδὲ ἐτόλμησεν ἐπερωτήσαι (dared to ask)
Matt. 23:13	οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε (enter)	οὐδὲ ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν (permit to enter)
Mark 6:11	μὴ δέξεται (receive)	μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν (listen; cf. Matt. 10:14)**
Mark 8:17	οὐπὼ νοεῖτε (understand)	οὐδὲ συνίετε (understand)
Mark 13:15	μὴ καταβάτω (go down)	μηδὲ εἰσελθᾶτω (enter)
Luke 6:44	οὐ συλλέγουσιν (pick)	οὐδὲ τρυγῶσιν (gather)
Luke 12:24	οὐ σπείρουσιν (sow)	οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν (harvest; cf. Matt. 6:26)
Luke 12:27	οὐ κοπιᾷ (labor)	οὐδὲ νήθει (spin; cf. Matt. 6:28)
Luke 17:23	μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε (depart)	μηδὲ διώξετε (follow)
Luke 18:4	οὐ φοβοῦμαι (fear [God])	οὐδὲ ἐντρέπομαι (care [about man])
John 14:17	οὐ θεωρεῖ (behold)	οὐδὲ γινώσκει (know)
Acts 4:18	μὴ φθέγγεσθαι (speak)	μηδὲ διδάσκειν (teach)
Acts 9:9	οὐκ ἔφαγεν (eat)	οὐδὲ ἔπινεν (drink)
Acts 16:21	οὐκ ἔξεστιν παραδέχεσθαι (accept)	οὐδὲ ποιεῖν (practice)
Acts 17:24–25	οὐκ κατοικεῖ (dwell)	οὐδὲ θεραπεύεται (be served)
Acts 21:21	μὴ περιτέμνειν (circumcise)	μηδὲ περιπατεῖν (walk [in customs])
Rom. 9:11	μήπω γεννηθέντων (born)	μηδὲ πράξαντων (done)
Rom. 9:16	οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος (wishing)	οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος (running)
Rom. 14:21	μὴ φαγεῖν (eat)	μηδὲ πειν (drink)
1 Cor. 15:50	κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται (can inherit)	οὐδὲ κληρονομεῖ (inherit)*
Gal. 1:16–17	οὐ προσαναθέμην (consult)	οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον (go up)
Col. 2:21	μὴ ἅψῃ (touch)	μηδὲ γεύσῃ μηδὲ θίγῃς (taste, handle)
1 Tim. 2:12	διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω (teach)	οὐδὲ ἀυθεντεῖν ἀνδρός (have authority over a man)
1 Tim. 6:16	εἶδεν οὐδεὶς (see)	οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται (can see)
Heb. 10:8	οὐκ ἠθέλησας (desire)	οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας (be well pleased)
1 John 3:6	οὐχ ἑώρακεν (see)	οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν (know)
Rev. 12:8	οὐκ ἰσχυσεν (prevail)	οὐδὲ τόπος εὐρέθη (place be found)*

Pattern 2: Two activities or concepts are viewed negatively, and consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided.

Matt. 6:20	οὐ διορύσσουσιν (break in)	οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν (steal)
Matt. 12:19	οὐκ ἐρίσει (quarrel)	οὐδὲ κραυγάζει (cry out)
Luke 3:14	μηδὲνα διασείσητε (extort money)	μηδὲ συκοφαντήσητε (accuse falsely)
Luke 12:33	κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει (thief come near)	οὐδὲ διαφθείρει (destroy; cf. Matt. 6:20)*
John 4:15	μὴ διψῶ (thirst)	μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἀντλεῖν (come to draw)
John 14:27	μὴ ταρασσέσθω (let be troubled)	μηδὲ δειλιάτω (be afraid)
Acts 2:27	οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις (abandon)	οὐδὲ δώσεις ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν (give to see decay)
2 Cor. 4:2	μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ (walk in deceit)	μηδὲ δολοῦντες (distort)
2 Cor. 7:12	οὐκ ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος (the wrongdoer)	οὐδὲ ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος (the injured party)
Gal. 4:14	οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε (treat with contempt)	οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε (scorn)
Phil. 2:16	οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον (run in vain)	οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα (labor in vain)
2 Thess. 2:2	μὴ σαλευθῆναι (become unsettled)	μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι (become alarmed)
2 Thess. 3:7–8	οὐκ ἡτακτήσαμεν (be idle)	οὐδὲ ἐφάγομεν (eat another's food)
1 Tim. 1:3–4	μὴ ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (teach error)	μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις (pay attention to myths)
1 Tim. 6:17	μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν (be arrogant)	μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου (put hope in wealth)
Heb. 12:5	μὴ ὀλιγώρει (despise)	μηδὲ ἐκλύου (consider lightly)
Heb. 13:5	οὐ μὴ ἀνῶ (leave)	οὐδ' οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπω (forsake)
1 Pet. 2:22	ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν (commit sin)	οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος (deceit be found)*
1 Pet. 3:14	μὴ φοβηθῇτε (be afraid)	μηδὲ ταραχθῇτε (be disturbed)
Rev. 7:16	οὐ πεινᾶσουσιν (hunger)	οὐδὲ διψήσουσιν (thirst)

\* = change of subject; \*\* = change from sing. to pl. verb form.

The first pattern can be illustrated by a few examples. In Acts 16:21, the closest syntactical parallel to 1 Timothy 2:12 in the New Testament, the two terms in the infinitive, παραδέχεσθαι and ποιεῖν, are conceptual parallels. "Accepting" and "practicing" do not carry negative connotations in and of themselves. However, due to circumstances indicated in the context, "being Romans," the exercise of these otherwise legitimate activities is considered "not lawful." In Acts 4:18, Luke reports that the authorities, because of their antagonism to Christ, forbid the early church

to speak and teach in the name of Jesus (two activities that carry no negative connotations in and of themselves). In Acts 21:21, Paul is told of reports that he forbids Jews living among Gentiles to carry out two activities viewed positively by the speakers, circumcising their children and living according to Jewish customs. In Galatians 1:16-17, to underscore that he had been divinely commissioned, Paul insists that, upon his conversion, he did not immediately consult with others nor go up to Jerusalem, two activities that are not intrinsically viewed negatively. And in Colossians 2:21, the writer quotes the maxim "Do not touch, do not taste, do not handle," as the (legalistic) prohibition of activities not viewed negatively in and of themselves.

The following examples are instances of the second pattern, the prohibition or denial of two activities that are viewed negatively by the writer or speaker. In John 4:15, the Samaritan woman expresses her desire to avoid two things she views negatively, thirsting and having to come to the well to draw water. In Philippians 2:16, Paul states that he wants to avoid two activities he views negatively, running in vain and laboring in vain. In 2 Thessalonians 3:7-8, Paul denies that, at his previous visit, he had engaged in two activities that he views negatively, being idle and eating another's food. A passage in the epistle under consideration, 1 Timothy 1:3-4, instructs Timothy to command certain ones to avoid two activities the author views negatively, teaching error and holding to myths and endless genealogies. Later in the same epistle, in 6:17, one finds the instruction to Timothy to command the rich in his congregation to avoid two things viewed negatively by the writer, being arrogant and setting their hope on the uncertainty of riches.

These examples set forth the New Testament evidence that οὐδέ joins terms denoting activities that are both viewed either positively or negatively by the writer or speaker. The implication of this observation for 1 Timothy 2:12 is that there are only two acceptable ways of rendering that passage: (1) "I do not permit a woman to teach [error] or to domineer over a man," or (2) "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man." In the first instance, both "teaching error" and "domineering over a man" would be viewed negatively by the writer. In the latter case, both "teaching" and "exercising authority" would be viewed positively in and of themselves, yet for reasons to be gleaned from the context, the writer does not permit these.

Before deciding on one of the two patterns for 1 Timothy 2:12, a preliminary clarification needs to be made. A distinction should be drawn, especially in the first scenario, between the fact that two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves and their prohibition due to circumstances. In the case of 1 Timothy 2:12, the writer's "I do not permit" has apparently at times been taken to mean that he

views the two activities, διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν, themselves negatively, in the sense of "teaching in a domineering way," or the like. However, one should keep in mind that it is possible for the writer, due to certain circumstances, to evaluate negatively the exercise of activities he generally views positively without tainting the two terms themselves.

For example, I may tell my pregnant wife that I do not want her to drive alone or be on the road at night. There is nothing wrong with driving alone or being on the road at night. It is just that, under the circumstances, my wife's pregnancy, I prefer for her not to engage in these activities. Or you may tell your child not to climb a ladder or to go near a cliff. There is nothing wrong with climbing a ladder or even going near a cliff. It is just that, since you fear for your children's safety, you do not permit them to engage in two activities that are otherwise viewed as permissible. In short, it remains a legitimate possibility for a writer to deny someone for certain reasons the exercise of activities he otherwise views positively.

In the light of this clarification, 1 Timothy 2:12 could legitimately be seen as an example of the first pattern, that is, the denial of two activities that are viewed positively in and of themselves, under contextually adduced circumstances. That this is indeed the case is strongly suggested by the use of the term διδάσκειν, which is consistently viewed positively in the New Testament, including the Pastorals, when used absolutely, that is, unaccompanied by contextual qualifiers such as those denoting the content of someone's teaching.<sup>8</sup>

The Kroegers' claim that "if the context of 1 Timothy 2:12 is neutral and refers only to the activity of teaching rather than to its positive or negative content, then it is the only time that διδάσκειν is so used in the Pastorals" is contradicted by passages such as the following:

- 1 Timothy 4:11: Παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε (Command and teach these things)
- 1 Timothy 6:2: Ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει (Teach and encourage these things)
- 2 Timothy 2:2: Ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι (Pass on these things to faithful individuals who will be able to teach others also)<sup>9</sup>

In each case, διδάσκειν is clearly viewed positively by the writer and is linked with activities such as encouraging, exhorting, and the passing on of apostolic tradition. And when the Kroegers contend that "the verb here [i.e., in 1 Tim. 2:12] forbids women to teach a wrong doctrine, just as 1 Timothy 1:3-4 and Titus 1:9-14 also forbid false teaching," it

must be asserted that in 1 Timothy 1:3–4, it is ἐπεροδιδάσκαλειν, not διδάσκειν, that is used, while in Titus 1:9–14, there is ample contextual indication that false teaching is in view, a feature that is absent from the context of 1 Timothy 2:12.<sup>10</sup>

It should further be noted that the effort to make αὐθεντεῖν subordinate to διδάσκειν so that it in effect functions as an adverb and to give it a negative connotation, as in “to teach in a domineering way,” is contradicted by the fact that οὐδέ functions not as a subordinating but as a coordinating conjunction. Neither the syntactical parallels in the New Testament nor the extrabiblical parallels lend support to the contention that the second term linked by οὐδέ modifies the first term adverbially. And while “teaching” and “exercising authority” may well be perceived jointly in 1 Timothy 2:12, these concepts do not blend to the extent that they become one concept in which the two constituent elements are no longer distinguishable.

Since, therefore, the term διδάσκειν is used absolutely in the New Testament for an activity that is viewed positively in and of itself, and since οὐδέ coordinates terms that are both viewed either positively or negatively, αὐθεντεῖν should be seen as denoting an activity that is viewed positively in and of itself as well. Thus, 1 Timothy 2:12 is an instance of the first pattern, in which the exercise of two activities is prohibited or the existence of two concepts is denied by the writer due to special considerations.<sup>11</sup>

The immediate context of the passage, 1 Timothy 2:11, supports this conclusion. Framed by the inclusio of ἡσυχία at the beginning of verse 11 and at the end of verse 12, there are two corresponding pairs of terms: “learning” in verse 11 corresponds to “teaching” in verse 12, and “full submission” in verse 11 relates to “having authority” in verse 12. The writer first expresses his desire for a woman to learn in full submission. Conversely, he then registers his prohibition of the opposite, a woman’s teaching or being in authority over a man. He closes by reiterating his desire for a woman to learn in submission. “Learning” and “teaching,” “full submission” and “having authority” are contrasted, the former terms being viewed positively in the case of women, the latter ones negatively. Thus, syntax and context join in suggesting that 1 Timothy 2:12 be rendered as “I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man.”

### Syntactical Parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 in Extrabiblical Literature

The study of syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 in the New Testament has yielded significant insights. Two patterns of the use of οὐδέ

were identified, both consisting of coordinated expressions of the same order. However, since the New Testament contains only one exact syntactical parallel where οὐδέ links two *infinitives* governed by a negated finite verb, it seems desirable to extend the scope of this investigation to extrabiblical Greek literature preceding or contemporary with the New Testament era.

The IBYCUS system, a computer program with the capability of searching virtually all the extant ancient Greek literature, has enabled the researcher to study all Greek literature directly relevant to the study of the syntax used in 1 Timothy 2:12 (i.e., literature from the third century BC until the end of the first century AD)—the LXX, the papyri and inscriptions available on the IBYCUS, and all the extant works of Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Philo, and Plutarch.

Forty-eight syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 in extrabiblical Greek literature were found: five in the LXX, two in inscriptions, six in Polybius, three in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, two in Diodorus Siculus, nine in Josephus, one in Philo, and twenty in Plutarch. Plutarch accounts for almost half of the references; Josephus and Polybius together provide another third. Following is a list of syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12.

### LXX

1. 1 Maccabees 15:14: καὶ ἐκύκλωσεν τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τὰ πλοῖα ἀπὸ θαλάσσης συνῆψαν, καὶ ἔθλιβε τὴν πόλιν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ (1) οὐκ εἶασεν οὐδένα (2) ἐκπορεύεσθαι (3) οὐδὲ εἰσπορεύεσθαι. “He surrounded the city, and the ships joined battle from the sea; he pressed the city hard from land and sea, and (1) permitted no one (2) to leave (3) or enter it.”<sup>12</sup>
2. Sirach 18:6: (1) οὐκ ἔστιν (2) ἐλαττώσαι (3) οὐδὲ προσθεῖναι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξιχνιάσαι τὰ θαυμάσια τοῦ κυρίου. “[Who can measure his majestic power? And who can fully recount his mercies?] (1) It is not possible (2) to diminish (3) or increase them, nor is it possible to trace the wonders of the Lord.”
3. Isaiah 42:24b: οὐχὶ ὁ θεός, ᾧ ἡμάρτοσαν αὐτῷ καὶ (1) οὐκ ἐβούλοντο ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ (2) πορεύεσθαι (3) οὐδὲ ἀκούειν τοῦ νόμου αὐτοῦ; “[Who gave Jacob up for spoil, and Israel to plunderers?] Was it not God, against whom they have sinned, and in whose ways (1) they were not willing (2) to walk, and whose law (3) they did not obey?”
4. Ezekiel 44:13: καὶ (1) οὐκ ἐγγιούσι πρὸς με τοῦ (2) ἱερατεῦν μοι (3) οὐδὲ τοῦ προσάγειν πρὸς τὰ ἅγια υἱῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐδὲ πρὸς τὰ

ἀγία τῶν ἁγίων μου καὶ λήμψονται ἀτιμίαν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ πλανήσει, ἢ ἐπλανήθησαν. "And (1) they shall not come near to Me (2) to serve as a priest to Me, (3) nor come near to any of the holy things of the sons of Israel, nor to the holiest of my holy things; but they shall bear their dishonor in their shame by which they have deceived."

5. Daniel 5:8 (Theod.): καὶ εἰσεπορεύοντο πάντες οἱ σοφοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ (1) οὐκ ἠδύναντο τὴν γραφὴν (2) ἀναγνῶναι (3) οὐδὲ τὴν σύγκρισιν γνωρίσαι τῷ βασιλεῖ. "Then all the king's wise men came in, but (1) they could not (2) read the inscription (3) [n]or make known its interpretation to the king."

### Inscriptions

6. Attica.IG II(2).11589 (third century BC): (1) οὐκ ἄνσχετο (2) δῶρα δέχεσθαι (3) οὐδὲ κλύειν ἱκέτου Τισαμενοῖο πατρός. "(1) He did not stand up (2) to receive gifts (3) nor to give ear to the suppliant, Tisamenos the father."
7. PZenPestm.21 (246 BC): Νίκων δὲ ὁ κρινόμενος πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον (1) οὐκ ἔφατο (2) εἰληφέναι τὸ παιδάριον παρ' αὐτῶν (3) οὐδὲ ἔχειν αὐτὸ παρενρέσει οὐδεμιᾷ. "Nikon the judge (1) did not say to Antipater (2) to take the boy from them (3) nor to hold him under any pretense."

### Polybius (202–120 BC)

8. Hist. 2.56.10: (1) δεῖ τοιγαροῦν οὐκ (2) ἐκπλήττειν τὸν συγγραφέα τερατευόμενον διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας (3) οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐνδεχομένους λόγους ζητεῖν καὶ τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι, καθάπερ οἱ τραγωδιογράφοι, τῶν δὲ πραχθέντων καὶ ῥηθέντων κατ' ἀλήθειαν αὐτῶν μνημονεύειν πάμπαν, κἂν πάνυ μέτρια τυγχάνωσιν ὄντα. "A historical author (1) should not (2) try to thrill his readers by such exaggerated pictures, (3) nor should he, like a tragic poet, try to imagine the probable utterances of his characters or reckon up all the consequences probably incidental to the occurrences with which he deals, but simply record what really happened and what really was said, however commonplace."
9. Hist. 5.10.5: (1) οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀπωλείᾳ δεῖ καὶ ἀφανισμῷ τοῖς ἀγνοήσασιν (2) πολεμεῖν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ διορθώσει καὶ μεταθέσει τῶν ἡμαρτημέων, (3) αὐδὲ συναναιρεῖν τὰ μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντα τοῖς ἡδικηκόσιν, ἀλλὰ συσφῶζειν μᾶλλον καὶ συνεξαίρεισθαι τοῖς ἀνοιτίοις τοὺς δοκοῦντας ἀδικεῖν. "For good men (1) should not (2) make war on wrong-doers with the object of destroying and

exterminating them, but with that of correcting and reforming their errors, (3) nor should they involve the guiltless in the fate of the guilty, (4) but rather extend to those whom they think guilty the mercy and deliverance they offer to the innocent."

10. Hist. 6.15.8: τούτους (1) οὐ δύνανται (2) χειρίζειν, ὥς πρέπει, ποτὲ δὲ τὸ παράπαν (3) οὐδὲ συντελεῖν. "[For the processions they call triumphs, in which the generals bring the actual spectacle of their achievements before the eyes of their fellow-citizens,] (1) cannot (2) be properly organized and sometimes even cannot (3) be held at all, [unless the senate consents and provides the requisite funds.]"
11. Hist. 30.5.8.4–6: (1) οὐκ ἐβούλοντο (2) συνδυάζειν (3) οὐδὲ προκαταλαμβάνειν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὄρκους καὶ συνθήκας, (4) ἀλλ' ἀκέραιοι διαμένοντες κερδαίνειν τὰς ἐξ ἐκάστων ἐλπίδας. "[As they wished none of the kings and princes to despair of gaining their help and alliance,] (1) they did not desire (2) to run in harness with Rome (3) and engage themselves by oaths and treaties, (4) but preferred to remain unembarrassed and able to reap profit from any quarter."
12. Hist. 30.24.2.3–4: (1) οὐ δοκοῦσι δὲ (2) γινώσκεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς ἀπαντῶσιν (3) οὐδὲ συνορᾶσθαι διότι λέλυνται σαφῶς, ἐὰν μὴ τι παράλογον ποιῶσι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξηλλαγμένον. "[The inhabitants of Peraea were like slaves unexpectedly released from their fetters, who, unable to believe the truth, take longer steps than their natural ones] and (1) fancy that those they meet will (2) not know (3) and see for certain that they are free unless they behave in some strange way and differently from other men."
13. Hist. 31.12.5–6: τὴν δὲ σύγκλητον (1) οὐ τολμήσειν ἔτι (2) βοηθεῖν (3) οὐδὲ συνεπισχεῖν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Λυσίαν τοιαῦτα διεργασαμένοις. "[For the Syrians would at once transfer the crown to him, even if he appeared accompanied only by a single slave,] while the senate (1) would not go so far as (2) to help (3) and support Lysias after his conduct."

### Dionysius of Halicarnassus (First Century BC)

14. De Thucydide 7.13–15: Θουκυδίδη δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν, ἢ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, (1) οὐκ ἤρμωσεν (2) ἐγκαταμίσειν τῇ διηγήσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας (3) οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάτην ἀρμόττεσθαι τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων, ἣν ἐκεῖνα πεφύκασιν φέρειν αἱ συντάξεις, (4) ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ὠφέλειαν. "Thucydides, however, chose a single episode in which he personally participated: (1) it was therefore inappropriate for him (2) to adulterate his narrative with entertaining fantasies (3) or to arrange it in a way which would confuse his readers, as



his predecessors' compositions would naturally do. His purpose was to benefit his readers."

15. *Antiquitates romanae* 10.12.3–5: ἢ ὥς (1) οὐ δεῖ (2) κοινωνεῖν (3) οὐδὲ παρῆναι τῇ ζητήσῃ τοὺς ἀνειληφότας τὴν τοῦ δήμου ἀρχήν. "Or that the magistrates of the populace (1) ought not (2) to take part in or (3) be present at the inquiry."
16. *De compositione verborum* 23.2–5: (1) οὐ ζητεῖ καθ' ἕνα ἑκάστον ὄνομα ἐκ περιφανείας (2) ὁρᾶσθαι (3) οὐδὲ ἐν ἔδρᾳ πάντα βεβηκέναι πλατεῖα τε καὶ ἀσφαλεῖ οὐδὲ μακροὺς τοὺς μεταξὺ αὐτῶν εἶναι χρόνους. "[The polished style of composition, which I placed second in order, has the following character.] (1) It does not intend each word (2) to be viewed from all sides, (3) nor that every word shall stand on a broad, firm base, nor that the intervals of time between them shall be long."

### *Diodorus Siculus (ca. 40 BC)*

17. *Bibl. hist.* 3.30.2.8–9: (1) οὐ χρή δὲ (2) θαυμάζειν (3) οὐδὲ ἀπιστεῖν τοῖς λεγομένοις, πολλὰ τούτων παραδοξότερα κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην γεγονότα διὰ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἱστορίας παρειληφότας. "(1) Nor is there any occasion (2) to be surprised at this statement (3) or to distrust it, since we have learned through trustworthy history of many things more astonishing than this which have taken place throughout all the inhabited world."
18. *Bibl. hist.* 3.37.9.1–4: διόπερ τηλικούτου μεγέθους ὄψεως εἰς ὄψιν κοινὴν κατηντηκότος (1) οὐκ ἄξιον (2) ἀπιστεῖν τοῖς Αἰθίοσιν (3) οὐδὲ μῦθον ὑπολαμβάνειν τὸ θρυλούμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν. "Consequently, in view of the fact that a snake of so great a size has been exposed to the public gaze, (1) it is not fair (2) to doubt the word of the Ethiopians (3) or to assume that the report which they circulated far and wide was a mere fiction."

### *Josephus (AD 37–100)*

19. *Contra Apionem* 2.6.1–3: (1) ἔστι μὲν οὖν οὐ ῥάδιον αὐτοῦ (2) διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον (3) οὐδὲ σαφῶς γινῶναι τί λέγειν βούλεται. "His argument (1) is difficult (2) to summarize and his meaning (3) to grasp."
20. *Contra Apionem* 2.212.1–2: (1) οὐ γὰρ ἔῃ τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν (2) πυρπολεῖν (3) οὐδὲ τέμνειν ἡμερὰ δένδρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκυλεύειν ἀπείρηκε τοὺς ἐν τῇ μάχῃ πεσόντας καὶ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων προυνόησεν. "(1) He does not allow us (2) to burn up their country (3) or to cut down their fruit trees, and forbids even the spoiling of fallen combatants."

21. *Bellum judaicum* 5.199.3–5: κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἄλλας (1) οὐκ ἐξῆν (2) παρελθεῖν γυναιξίν, ἀλλ' (3) οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν σφετέραν ὑπερβῆναι τὸ διατείχισμα. "For women (1) were not permitted (2) to enter by the others (3) nor yet to pass by way of their own gate beyond the partition wall."
22. *Ant.* 2.116.3–5: ὥς (1) οὐ προσήκε μὲν αὐτὸν περὶ τὰδελφοῦ (2) δεδιέναι (3) οὐδὲ τὰ μὴ δεινὰ δι' ὑποψίας λαμβάνειν. "[Judas, ever of a hardy nature, frankly told him] that (1) he ought not (2) to be alarmed for their brother (3) nor harbour suspicions of dangers that did not exist."
23. *Ant.* 6.20.3–5: (1) οὐκ (2) ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐλευθερίας (1) δεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιεῖν δι' ὧν ἂν ἔλθοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, (3) οὐδὲ βούλεσθαι μὲν ἀπηλλάχθαι δεσποτῶν ἐπιμένειν δὲ πράττοντας ἐξ ὧν οὗτοι διαμενοῦσιν. "(1) Ye ought not to be content (2) to yearn for liberty, but should do also the deeds whereby ye may attain it, (3) nor merely long to be rid of your masters, while continuing so to act that they shall remain so."
24. *Ant.* 6.344.5–6: (1) οὐκ ἔγνω (2) φυγεῖν αὐτὸν (3) οὐδὲ φιλοψυχῆσας προδοῦναι μὲν τοὺς οἰκείους τοῖς πολεμίοις καθυβρίσαι δὲ τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ἀξίωμα, ἀλλὰ. "[For he, although he knew of what was to come and his impending death, which the prophet had foretold,] yet (1) determined not (2) to flee from it (3) or, by clinging to life, to betray his people to the enemy and dishonour the dignity of kingship; instead."
25. *Ant.* 7.127.1–3: Τοῦτο τὸ πταῖσμα τοὺς Ἀμμανίτας (1) οὐκ ἔπεισεν (2) ἡρεμεῖν (3) οὐδὲ μαθόντας τοὺς κρείττοντας ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν, (4) ἀλλὰ πέμψαντες πρὸς Χαλαμάν. "This defeat (1) did not persuade the Ammanites (2) to remain quiet (3) or to keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior. (4) Instead they sent to Chalamas."
26. *Ant.* 14.346.1–3: ὁ δὲ Ὑρκανὸν (2) ἀπολιπεῖν (1) οὐκ ἤξιον (3) οὐδὲ παρακινδυνεύειν τὰδελφῷ. "Phasaël, however, (1) did not think it right (2) to desert Hyrcanus (3) or to endanger his brother."
27. *Ant.* 15.165.3–4: ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ὑρκανὸς ἐπεικεῖα τρόπου καὶ τότε καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον (1) οὐκ ἤξιον (2) πολυπραγμονεῖν (3) οὐδὲ νεωτέρων ἅπτεσθαι. "Now Hyrcanus because of his mild character (1) did not choose either then or at any other time (2) to take part in public affairs (3) or start a revolution."<sup>13</sup>

### *Philo (ca. 25 BC–AD 40)*

28. *Posterity and Exile of Cain* 84.5–7: (1) οὐ γὰρ (2) ἀναπτῆναι, θησί, εἰς οὐρανὸν (3) οὐδὲ πέραν θαλάσσης ἀφικέσθαι (1) δεῖ κατὰ ζήτη-



σιν τοῦ καλοῦ. "For (1) it is not necessary,' he says, (2) 'to fly up into heaven, (3) nor to get beyond the sea in searching for what is good.'"

### Plutarch (AD 40–120)

29. *Romulus* 9.2.4–5: ὅτι γὰρ (1) οὐκ ἤξιουν οἱ τὴν Ἄλβην οἰκοῦντες (2) ἀναμιγνύναι τοὺς ἀποστάτας ἑαυτοῖς (3) οὐδὲ προσδέχεσθαι πολίτας. "For that the residents of Alba (1) would not consent (2) to give the fugitives the privilege of intermarriage with them, (3) nor even receive them as fellow citizens [is clear]."
30. *Marcus Coriolanus* 27.4.1: τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα πάντα λυμαίνόμενος καὶ διαφθείρων, τοὺς ἐκείνων ἀγροὺς ἰσχυρῶς ἐφύλαττε, καὶ (1) οὐκ εἶα (2) κακουργεῖν (3) οὐδὲ λαμβάνειν ἐξ ἐκείνων οὐδέν. "For while he maltreated and destroyed everything else, he kept a vigorous watch over the lands of the patricians, and (1) would not suffer anyone (2) to hurt them (3) or take anything from them."
31. *Timoleon* 37.2.1: ὧν Λαφυστίου μὲν αὐτὸν πρὸς τινα δίκην κατεγγυῶντος (1) οὐκ εἶα (2) θορυβεῖν (3) οὐδὲ κωλύειν τοὺς πολίτας. "Of these, Laphystius once tried to make him give surety that he would appear at a certain trial, and Timoleon (1) would not suffer the citizens (2) to stop the man (3) by their turbulent disapproval [lit., nor to prevent him]."
32. *Comparatio Aristidis et Catonis* 4.2.1: (1) οὐ γὰρ ἔστι (2) πράττειν μεγάλα φροντίζοντα μικρῶν, (3) οὐδὲ πολλοῖς δεόμενοις βοηθεῖν πολλῶν αὐτὸν δεόμενον. "(1) It is impossible for a man (2) to do great things when his thoughts are busy with little things; (3) nor can he aid the many who are in need when he himself is in need of many things."
33. *Pyrrhus* 33.6.4: σπασάμενον γὰρ τὸ ξίφος ἢ κλίναντα λόγχην (1) οὐκ ἦν (2) ἀναλαβεῖν (3) οὐδὲ καταθέσθαι πάλιν, ἀλλ' ἐχώρει δι' ὧν ἔτυχε τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα, καὶ περιπίπτοντες ἀλλήλοισι ἔθνησκον. "For when a man had drawn his sword or poised his spear, (1) he could not (2) recover (3) or sheathe his weapon again, but it would pass through those who stood in its way, and so they died from one another's blows."
34. *Agesilaus* 32.3.3–4: ἐπεὶ δὲ φιλοτιμούμενος ὁ Ἐπαμεινώνδας ἐν τῇ πόλει μάχην συνάψαι καὶ στήσαι τρόπαιον (1) οὐκ ἴσχυσεν (2) ἐξαγαγεῖν (3) οὐδὲ προκαλέσασθαι τὸν Ἀγησίλαον, ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἀναξεύξας πάλιν ἐπόρθει τὴν χώραν. "Ephialtes was ambitious to join battle in the city and set up a trophy of victory there, but since (1) he could (2) neither force (3) nor tempt Agesilaus out of his positions, he withdrew and began to ravage the country."

35. *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* 64.E.7–8: Ὁρᾷ τὸν πίθηκον; (1) οὐ δύναται τὴν οἰκίαν (2) φυλάττειν ὡς ὁ κύων, (3) οὐδὲ βαστάζειν ὡς ὁ ἵππος, οὐδ' ἄρουν τὴν γῆν ὡς οἱ βόες. "You must have noticed the ape. (1) He cannot (2) guard the house like the dog, (3) nor carry a load like the horse, nor plow the land like oxen."
36. *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 115.E.3.: ἀνθρώποις δὲ πάντων (1) οὐκ ἔστι (2) γενέσθαι τὸ πάντων ἄριστον (3) οὐδὲ μετασχεῖν τῆς τοῦ βελτίστου φύσεως (ἄριστον γὰρ πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι). "But for men (1) it is utterly impossible (2) that they should obtain the best thing of all, (3) or even have any share in its nature (for the best thing for all men and women is not to be born)."
37. *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 185.A.2: πρὸς δὲ τοὺς θαυμάζοντας τὴν μεταβολὴν ἔλεγεν ὡς (1) "οὐκ ἔα με (2) καθεύδειν (3) οὐδὲ ῥαθυμεῖν τὸ Μιλτιάδου πρόπαιον." "[Themistocles while yet in his youth abandoned himself to wine and women. But after Miltiades, commanding the Athenian army, had overcome the barbarians at Marathon, never again was it possible to encounter Themistocles misconducting himself.] To those who expressed their amazement at the change in him, he said that 'the trophy of Miltiades (1) does not allow me (2) to sleep (3) or to be indolent.'"
38. *Aetia romana et graeca* 269.D.8–9: (1) οὐ δεῖ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν ἀκριβέστατον ἀριθμὸν (2) διώκειν (3) οὐδὲ τὸ παρ' ὀλίγον συκοφαντεῖν. "But (1) we must not (2) follow out the most exact calculation of the number of days (3) nor cast aspersions on approximate reckoning [since even now, when astronomy has made so much progress, the irregularity of the moon's movements is still beyond the skill of mathematicians, and continues to elude their calculations]."
39. *Aetia romana et graeca* 273.E.9–10: Διὰ τί τοῖς μὴ στρατευομένοις μὲν ἐν στρατοπέδῳ δ' ἄλλως ἀναστρεφομένοις (1) οὐκ ἔξῃν ἄνδρα (2) βαλεῖν πολέμιον (3) οὐδὲ τρώσαι; "Why were men who were not regularly enlisted, but merely tarrying in the camp, (1) not allowed (2) to throw missiles at the enemy (3) or to wound them?"
40. *Aetia romana et graeca* 291.B.3–4: Διὰ τί τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τούτοις ἀρχὴν (1) οὐκ ἐφέιτο (2) λαβεῖν (3) οὐδὲ μετελθεῖν; "Why were these priests (1) not allowed (2) to hold office (3) nor to solicit it?"
41. *De E apud Delphos* 385.A.9: (1) οὐκ ἦν εὐπρεπὲς (2) παράγειν (3) οὐδὲ παραιτεῖσθαι. "[On many other occasions when the subject had been brought up in the school, I had quietly turned aside from it and passed it over, but recently I was unexpectedly discovered by my sons in an animated discussion with some strangers, whom, since they purposed to leave Delphi immediately,] (1) it was not seemly (2) to try to divert from the subject, nor was it seemly for

me (3) to ask to be excused from the discussion [for they were altogether eager to hear something about it]."

42. *De defectu oraculorum* 426.B.1: (1) οὐ γὰρ ὥς σμήνους ἡγεμόνας δεῖ (2) ποιεῖν ἀνεξόδους (3) οὐδὲ φρουρεῖν συγκλείσαντας τῇ ὕλῃ μᾶλλον δὲ συμφράξαντας. "[Yet such an organization is altogether appropriate for the gods.] For (1) we must not (2) make them unable to go out, like the queens in a hive of bees, (3) nor keep them imprisoned by enclosing them with matter, or rather fencing them about with it."
43. *De tranquillitate animi* 474.A.12: (1) οὐ δεῖ τοῖς ἑτέροις (2) ἐξαθυμεῖν (3) οὐδ' ἀπαγορεύειν. "(1) We should not (2) be disheartened (3) or despondent in adversity [but like musicians who achieve harmony by consistently deadening bad music with better and encompassing the bad with the good, we should make the blending of our life harmonious and conformable to our own nature]."
44. *De tranquillitate animi* 475.D.3: ὅθεν (1) οὐ δεῖ παντάπασιν (2) ἐκταπεινοῦν (3) οὐδὲ καταβάλλειν τὴν φύσιν. "Therefore (1) we should not altogether (2) debase (3) and depreciate Nature [in the belief that she has nothing strong, stable, and beyond the reach of Fortune, but, on the contrary, . . . we should face the future undaunted and confident]."
45. *Quaestionum convivialum libri IX* 706.D.5: ἐρῶντι μὲν γὰρ πολυτελοῦς (1) οὐκ ἔστι τὴν Πηνελόπην (2) προσαγαγεῖν (3) οὐδὲ συνοικίσει τὴν Πάνθειαν. "If a man has a passion for a costly harlot, (1) we cannot (2) bring Penelope on stage, (3) nor marry Pantheia to him [but it is possible to take a man who is enjoying mimes and tunes and lyrics that are bad art and bad taste, and lead him back to Euripides and Pindar and Menander, 'washing the brine from the ears with the clear fresh water of reason,' in Plato's words]."
46. *Quaestionum convivialum libri IX* 711.E.3: ὥσθ' ὁ οἶνος ἡμᾶς (2) ἀδικεῖν (1) οὐκ ἔοικεν (3) οὐδὲ κρατεῖν. "The wine (1) seems not (2) to be harming us (3) or getting the best of us."
47. *Aetia physica* 918.B.4: ἡ δ' ἄγαν περίψυξις πηγνύουσα τὰς ὁσμάς (1) οὐκ ἔῳ (2) ῥεῖν (3) οὐδὲ κινεῖν τὴν αἴσθησιν; "[Why is ground that has become dewy unfavorable for hunting so long as the cold lasts? . . . A spoor does this when there is warmth to free and release it gently] whereas excessive chill freezes the scents and (1) does not allow them (2) to flow (3) and affect [i.e., move] our perception."
48. *Bruta animalia ratione uti* 990.A.11: καὶ (1) οὐκ ἔῳ (2) θιγεῖν (3) οὐδὲ λυπῆσαι τὴν γεῦσιν ἀλλὰ διαβάλλει καὶ κατηγορεῖ τὴν φαυλότητα πρὶν ἢ βλαβῆναι. "[It (our sense of smell) admits what is proper,

rejects what is alien] and (1) will not let it (2) touch (3) or give pain to the taste, but informs on and denounces what is bad before any harm is done."

Confirming the earlier study of the use of οὐδέ in the New Testament, these instances suggest that the construction "negated finite verb + infinitive + οὐδέ + infinitive" is used to link two infinitives denoting concepts or activities that are both viewed either positively or negatively by the writer. The same two patterns of the usage of οὐδέ are found: pattern 1, where two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied due to circumstances or conditions adduced in the context; and pattern 2, where two activities or concepts are viewed negatively, and consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided. Table 3.2 documents these two patterns.

**Table 3.2**  
**Patterns of the Usage of Οὐδέ in Ancient Greek Literature**

Pattern 1: Two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied due to circumstances or conditions adduced in the context.

1. LXX: 1 Macc. 15:14	ἐκπορεύεσθαι (leave)	εἰσπορεύεσθαι (enter)
2. LXX: Sir. 18:6	ἐλαττώσαι (diminish)	προσθεῖναι (increase)
3. LXX: Isa. 42:24b	πορεύεσθαι (walk)	ἀκούειν (obey)
4. LXX: Ezek. 44:13	ἱερατεῦειν (serve as priest)	προσάγειν (come near)
5. LXX: Dan. 5:8 (Theod.)	ἀναγνῶναι (read)	γνωρίσαι (make known)
6. Inscr.: Attica	δέχεσθαι (receive gifts)	κλύειν (give ear to supplication)
10. Polyb., <i>Hist.</i> 6.15	χειρίζειν (be organized)	συντελεῖν (be held at all)
12. Polyb., <i>Hist.</i> 30.24	γινώσκεισθαι (know)	συνοράσθαι (see)
13. Polyb., <i>Hist.</i> 31.12	βοηθεῖν (help)	συνεπισχύειν (support)
15. Dion Hal., <i>Ant. rom</i> 10.12	κοινωνεῖν (take part in)	παρεῖναι (be present at)
19. Jos., <i>C. Ap.</i> 2.6.13	διελθεῖν (discern)	γνῶναι (know)
21. Jos., <i>B.J.</i> 5.199	παρελθεῖν (enter)	ὑπερβῆναι (pass by)
23. Jos., <i>Ant.</i> 6.20	ἐπιθυμεῖν (yearn for)	βούλεσθαι (want)*
25. Jos., <i>Ant.</i> 7.127	ἡρεμεῖν (remain quiet)	ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν (keep quiet)
28. Philo, <i>Post.</i> 84.5	ἀναπτῆναι (fly up)	ἀφικέσθαι (go beyond)*

\* = preceding infinitive

29. Plut., <i>Rom.</i> 9.2	ἀναμιγνύναι (intermarry)	προσδέχεσθαι (receive as citizen)
32. Plut., <i>Comp. Arist. Cat.</i> 4.2	πράττειν (do great things)	βοηθεῖν (help)
33. Plut., <i>Pyrrh.</i> 33.6	ἀναλαβεῖν (take again)	καταθέσθαι (sheathe again)
35. Plut., <i>Adul. amic.</i> 64.E	φυλάττειν (guard)	βαστάζειν (carry)
36. Plut., <i>Cons. Apoll.</i> 115.E	γενέσθαι (obtain)	μετασχεῖν (have a share)
40. Plut., <i>Aet. rom.</i> 291.B	λαβεῖν (hold office)	μετελθεῖν (solicit office)
45. Plut., <i>Quaest. conv.</i> 706.D	προσαγαγεῖν (bring on stage)	συνοικίσαι (marry)
47. Plut., <i>Aet. phys.</i> 918.B	ρεῖν (flow)	κινεῖν (move)

Pattern 2: Two activities or concepts are viewed negatively, and consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided.

7. Inscr.: PZenPestm.	εἰληφέναι (take away)	ἔχειν (hold in pretense)
8. Polyb., <i>Hist.</i> 2.56	ἐκπλήττειν (thrill)	ζητεῖν (seek to imagine)
9. Polyb., <i>Hist.</i> 5.10.5	πολεμεῖν (make war)	συναναιρεῖν (involve guiltless)
11. Polyb., <i>Hist.</i> 30.5	συνδύζειν (run in harness)	προκαταλαμβάνειν (engage)
14. Dion. Hal., <i>Thuc.</i> 7.13	ἐγκαταμίσγειν (adulterate)	ἀρμόττεσθαι (confuse)
16. Dion. Hal., <i>Comp.</i> 23	ὀρᾶσθαι (be viewed)	βεβηκέναι (stand)
17. Diod. Sic., <i>Bibl. hist.</i> 3.30	θαυμάζειν (be surprised)	ἀπιστεῖν (distrust)
18. Diod. Sic., <i>Bibl. hist.</i> 3.37	ἀπιστεῖν (doubt)	ὑπολαμβάνειν (view as fictional)
20. Jos., <i>C. Ap.</i> 2.212.1	πυρπολεῖν (burn)	τέμνειν (cut down)
22. Jos., <i>Ant.</i> 2.116	δεδίεναι (be alarmed)	λαμβάνειν (harbor suspicions)
24. Jos., <i>Ant.</i> 6.344	φυγεῖν (flee)	προδοῦναι (betray)
26. Jos., <i>Ant.</i> 14.346	ἀπολιπεῖν (desert)	παρακινδυνεύειν (endanger)*
27. Jos., <i>Ant.</i> 15.165	πολυπραγμονεῖν (intrigue)	ἄπτεσθαι (start a revolution)
30. Plut., <i>Cor.</i> 27.4	κακουργεῖν (hurt)	λαμβάνειν (take from)
31. Plut., <i>Tim.</i> 37.2	θορυβεῖν (stop)	κωλύειν (hinder)
34. Plut., <i>Ages.</i> 32.3	ἐξαγαγεῖν (force)	προκαλέσασθαι (tempt)
37. Plut., <i>Reg. imp. apophth.</i> 185.A	καθεύδειν (sleep)	ῥαθυμεῖν (be idle)
38. Plut., <i>Aet. rom.</i> 269.D	διώκειν (follow out)	συκοφαντεῖν (cast aspersions)

39. Plut., <i>Aet. rom.</i> 273.E	βαλεῖν (throw missiles)	τρωσαι (wound)
41. Plut., <i>E Delph.</i> 385.A	παράγειν (try to divert)	παρατεῖσθαι (be excused)
42. Plut., <i>Def. orac.</i> 426.B	ποιεῖν ἀνεξόδους (make unable)	φρουρεῖν (keep imprisoned)
43. Plut., <i>Tranq. an.</i> 474.A	ἐξαθυμεῖν (be disheartened)	ἀπαγορεύειν (be despondent)
44. Plut., <i>Tranq. an.</i> 475.D	ἐκταπεινοῦν (debase)	καταβάλλειν (depreciate)
46. Plut., <i>Quaest. conv.</i> 711.E	ἀδικεῖν (harm)	κρατεῖν (get the best of)*
48. Plut., <i>Brut. an.</i> 990.A	θιγεῖν (touch)	λυπήσαι (give pain to)

\* = preceding infinitive

Again, we may consider a few examples of each pattern. Pattern 1 can be illustrated by the following instances. Polybius writes (10) that victory processions cannot be properly organized or sometimes be held at all unless the senate consents and provides the requisite funds. While Polybius views both "organize" and "hold" positively in and of themselves, he indicates that holding these processions is not possible unless certain conditions are met: the senate's consent and the requisition of appropriate funds. At another occasion (13) Polybius writes that "the senate would not go so far as to help or support Lysias after his conduct." Again, the writer views the two activities (here synonyms), "helping" and "supporting," positively in and of themselves, but the help is denied because of Lysias's (unacceptable) conduct. Josephus writes (23), "You ought not to be content to yearn for liberty . . . nor merely long to be rid of your masters." While the writer views his readers' yearning for liberty and their longing to be rid of their masters positively in and of themselves, he indicates in the context why these longings by themselves are insufficient unless accompanied by action and change in behavior.

A few examples of pattern 2 show instances where two activities or concepts are both viewed negatively by the writer and where consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided. An inscription (7) indicates that a judge ordered Antipater not "to take the boy from them or to hold him under any pretense." Clearly, both activities, taking the boy away from them as well as holding him under any pretense, are viewed negatively by the judge, who consequently denies the exercise of these activities. Josephus writes (27), "Hyrcanus because of his mild character did not choose . . . to meddle in state affairs or start a revolution." "Meddling in state affairs" and "starting a revolution" are both viewed negatively by the writer, who asserts that it was Hyrcanus's "mild character" that

kept him from engaging in these undesirable activities. In a writing by Plutarch (46 above; note the preceding infinitive), the existence of two negative effects of wine is denied: "The wine seems not to be harming us or getting the best of us."

## Conclusion

In analogy to the observations made in the study of New Testament syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 above, the following conclusions may be drawn.<sup>14</sup> The implication of the identified patterns of the usage of οὐδέ for 1 Timothy 2:12 is that the activities denoted by the two infinitives διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν will both be viewed either positively or negatively by the writer. That is, the passage should be rendered either "I do not permit a woman to teach [error] or to usurp a man's authority" or "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have (or exercise) authority over a man."

The meaning of διδάσκειν in 1 Timothy 2:12 is therefore an important preliminary issue in determining the meaning of αὐθεντεῖν. As was argued above, διδάσκειν, when used absolutely, in the New Testament always denotes an activity that is viewed positively by the writer, to be rendered "to teach" (cf. esp. 1 Tim. 4:11; 6:2; 2 Tim. 2:2). If the writer had intended to give the term a negative connotation in 1 Timothy 2:12, he would in all likelihood have used the term ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (as in 1 Tim. 1:3; 6:3) or some other contextual qualifier specifying the (inappropriate or heretical) content of the teaching (as in Titus 1:11).

Since the first part of 1 Timothy 2:12 reads, "But I do not permit a woman to teach," and the coordinating conjunction οὐδέ requires the second activity to be viewed correspondingly by the writer, αὐθεντεῖν should be regarded as viewed positively as well and be rendered "to have (or exercise) authority," and not "to flout the authority of" or "to domineer."

## Interaction with Responses to this Essay since Its Original Publication

### 1996-98

Responses to the present essay in the first few years subsequent to the publication of *Women in the Church* were very positive, both overseas and in North America. Peter O'Brien, in a review published in Australia,

concurred with the findings of this study,<sup>15</sup> as did Helge Stadelmann in an extensive review that appeared in the German *Jahrbuch für evangelikale Theologie*.<sup>16</sup> Both reviewers accepted the results of the present study as valid.

Even Alan Padgett, in a generally negative review in the egalitarian *Priscilla Papers*, calls the present chapter "a convincing syntactical analysis of v. 12," though he favors reading both infinitives as conveying a negative connotation.<sup>17</sup> Padgett disagrees that διδάσκω is always used positively in Paul, citing Titus 1:11; 1 Tim. 1:3; and 6:3, without, however, mentioning that in the second and third instances the word used is not διδάσκειν, but ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν.

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')." <sup>18</sup>

### 1999-2001

#### I. H. MARSHALL

The first substantive interaction did not appear until the publication of Howard Marshall's commentary on the Pastorals in 1999.<sup>19</sup> Marshall indicates his acceptance of the findings of the present study by noting that it has "argued convincingly on the basis of a wide range of Gk. usage that the construction employed in this verse is one in which the writer expresses the same attitude (whether positive or negative) to both of the items joined together by οὐδέ."

Marshall proceeds to suggest, however, that matters are "not quite so simple." In response to the point that Paul would have used the word ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν had he wanted to convey a negative connotation, Marshall avers that doing so would have implied that while women were not permitted to engage in false teaching, men were allowed to do so. However, as Blomberg points out in a later piece, this objection does not carry force, because the prohibition still could have been clearly framed to avoid this conclusion.<sup>20</sup>

Consequently, Marshall opts for a negative sense of both words because of the reference to Eve in verse 14, which he maintains would be pointless unless Paul here has "some particular false teaching by some women" in mind. Marshall concedes that the text does not say that Eve gave false teaching to Adam, but he claims such is nonetheless implied.

Again, however, Blomberg notes that, while women were clearly victimized by false teaching in Ephesus, "no passage ever suggests that they were numbered among the false teachers themselves."<sup>21</sup>

In a lengthy footnote, Marshall says the present study does not appreciate the point that, if the second unit is seen pejoratively, this will also be the case with the first unit. To the contrary, this is one of the two patterns shown throughout the entire essay. According to Marshall, Paul is using διδάσκειν with the same connotation as ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, so the apostle is in fact telling women—but not men—not to teach falsely. How would that not still allow the same implication Marshall disavows, namely, that women and men are here treated inequitably?

As to the relationship between διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν, Marshall presents two options: either these two terms are separate (citing Moo and the present study as favoring this option), or the former term represents a specific instance of the latter (i.e., teaching is an act by which authority is exercised). However, this does not quite capture matters accurately. The present analysis sees teaching as included in the exercise of authority, not as entirely separate. There is a partial overlap between the two terms, though exercising authority is the broader concept.

Finally, regarding the relation between verses 11 and 12, Marshall claims that the contrast is between learning in a submissive attitude and teaching in a manner "which is heavy-handed and abuses authority." However, there is no need to import the alleged negative sense of διδάσκειν into the way in which the contrast between verses 11 and 12 is construed.<sup>22</sup>

Overall, it appears that Marshall is not prepared to follow his acknowledgment that the present study "argued convincingly" for a particular understanding of the syntax of verse 12 to a conclusion that would require a nonegalitarian reading of the text. Hence, he opts for a negative sense of both "teaching" and "exercising authority" on the basis of his construal of the background and reading of the context, particularly verse 14.<sup>23</sup>

#### WILLIAM MOUNCE

Shortly after the publication of Marshall's commentary, William Mounce, in his contribution to the WBC series, comes to rather different conclusions than Marshall.<sup>24</sup> Mounce draws extensively on the present syntactical analysis of 1 Timothy 2:12 (quoting at length from its critique of Payne) and integrates it into a full-orbed and coherent exegesis of the passage. While there is no need to rehearse here all the details of his cogent discussion of the verse, it should be noted that Mounce frequently adduces data not adequately (or at all) considered or acknowledged by Marshall:

- διδάσκειν is almost always used in a positive sense in the Pastorals.
- If Paul is prohibiting women merely from teaching error, verse 13 seems irrelevant.
- The fact that διδάσκειν has no object strongly suggests that the verse is a positive command.
- διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν are best seen as distinct yet related concepts.<sup>25</sup>

Mounce also points out that the two verbs are separated by five words in 1 Timothy 2:12, which further speaks against viewing them as forming a hendiadys, where words are usually placed side by side (citing BDF §442 [16]).<sup>26</sup> Following my identification of the pattern as from specific to general, Mounce concludes that "Paul does not want women to be in positions of authority in the church; teaching is one way in which authority is exercised in the church."<sup>27</sup>

#### KEVIN GILES

Remarkably, even Kevin Giles, who lodges a thirty-eight-page critique against the first edition of *Women in the Church*, finds himself in essential agreement with the present syntactical analysis of 1 Timothy 2:12.<sup>28</sup> However, by way of special pleading, Giles maintains that "people, even apostles, break grammatical rules at times," so that οὐδέ may function differently in the present passage than everywhere else in attested contemporary Greek literature.<sup>29</sup>

This, of course, is possible but highly unlikely. In my extensive research in both biblical and extrabiblical Greek literature, I found no evidence of anyone "breaking the rules" in his or her use of οὐδέ. It seems that even Giles himself does not trust this kind of reasoning, for he later floats the possibility that both διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν are to be understood negatively—in keeping with the pattern of usage identified in the present study.<sup>30</sup>

#### LINDA BELLEVILLE

The most—in fact, the only—negative response to the present study comes from Linda Belleville.<sup>31</sup> She contends that the two verbs in 1 Timothy 2:12 connote "a single coherent idea in Greek."<sup>32</sup> In a discussion that blends instances of the noun αὐθεντης and the verb αὐθεντεῖν, Belleville maintains that the latter has a negative connotation.

Belleville also claims that the order of teaching first, and then authority, favors her interpretation: "If Paul had the exercise of authority in mind, he would have put it first, followed by *teaching* as a specific

example." However, it is unclear why Belleville disallows the converse word order, especially in light of the occurrence of this pattern in Acts 21:21.<sup>33</sup> The upshot of her discussion is that she restates Payne's view that we here deal with a hendiadys, translating the phrase as "to teach a man in a domineering way."<sup>34</sup>

Belleville reiterates her opposition in her 2001 essay in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*. She charges that the present study "ignore[s] both the literary form and the nature of Greek correlatives."<sup>35</sup> According to Belleville, (1) infinitives are not verbs; (2) 1 Timothy 2:12 has to do with ideas, not grammar; and (3) "neither/nor" in 1 Timothy 2:12 constitutes a "poetic device." Belleville also contends that (4) the two infinitives modify "a woman" and that (5) the question answered by these infinitives is "What?" In response, however, it should be noted that Belleville herself misconstrues the grammar and syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12. What is more, her objection to the present study misses the mark in that the forty-eight syntactical parallels to 1 Timothy 2:12 identified in extrabiblical literature (as well as the one exact parallel in the New Testament, Acts 21:21; see above) all feature the construction negated finite verb + infinitive + οὐδέ + infinitive and in every instance yield the pattern positive/positive or negative/negative, confirming the conclusion that 1 Timothy 2:12 is to be rendered either "I do not permit a woman to teach [error] or to usurp a man's authority" or "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have (or exercise) authority over a man," the latter being preferred owing to the positive connotation of διδάσκειν elsewhere in the Pastorals. Hence, the question of whether infinitives are verbs or nouns is really irrelevant in the present case, since—however infinitives are classified—the present study focuses on exact syntactical parallels, comparing infinitives with infinitives. Beyond this, Henry Baldwin, in the preceding essay, has responded convincingly to Belleville's contention that nouns, rather than verbs, should be studied in relation to the syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12.

In addition, (1) Belleville's contention that infinitives are not verbs is hardly borne out by a look at the standard grammars. Her arguments (2) that 1 Timothy 2:12 has to do with ideas, not grammar and (3) that οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2:12 constitutes a "poetic device" are unfounded, in that grammar is clearly involved, and the genre of the present passage is that of epistle, not poetry. As to Belleville's contention (4) that the two infinitives modify "a woman" and that (5) the question answered is "What?" it must be noted that, to the contrary, the infinitives modify the main verb in verse 12, ἐπιτρέπω (I permit), and the question answered is "To do what?"—the answer being "to teach or exercise authority." Hence, the two infinitives are found to convey the *verbal* notion of actions to be performed or not performed. This finds support in the standard Greek

grammar by Daniel Wallace, who cites 1 Timothy 2:12 as an example of the "complementary" use of the adverbial infinitive, meaning that the infinitives work with the finite verb to convey the verbal notion.<sup>36</sup>

For these reasons Belleville's critique must be judged to be unpersuasive and unable to overturn the assured results of the present study.<sup>37</sup>

#### CRAIG BLOMBERG

Craig Blomberg, in an appendix included in the same volume, differs from Belleville and renders the following assessment:

Decisively supporting the more positive sense of assuming appropriate authority is Andreas Köstenberger's study of pairs of infinitives in "neither . . . nor" constructions both throughout the New Testament and in a wide-ranging swath of extrabiblical Greek literature. Without exception, these constructions pair either two positive or two negative activities. So if the "teaching" in view in 1 Timothy 2:12 is not false teaching but proper Christian instruction, then *authentēin* must be taken as appropriate authority as well.<sup>38</sup>

Blomberg proceeds to discuss the question of whether the two infinitives form a hendiadys. He contends that he has identified a "largely overlooked" "informal pattern throughout 1 Timothy of using pairs of partly synonymous words or expressions."<sup>39</sup> However, virtually all these examples are nouns. Blomberg concludes that the two terms are "closely related" (agreed) and "together help to define one single concept" (this may go a bit too far).

Blomberg finds it "overwhelmingly likely" that in 1 Timothy 2:12 Paul is referring to "one specific kind of authoritative teaching rather than two independent activities." However, this represents a false dichotomy, since no allowance is made for partially overlapping terms as in a pattern from specific to general.<sup>40</sup> Pointing to related passages such as 1 Timothy 3:2; 5:17; and Titus 1:5–7, Blomberg contends that the import of the two verbs in 1 Timothy 2:12 is one thing only: women "must not occupy the office of elder/overseer."<sup>41</sup>

To be sure, the parallels adduced by Blomberg suggest that 1 Timothy 2:12 clearly means at least that women ought not to serve in the office that epitomizes teaching and ruling authority.<sup>42</sup> Yet it appears that Blomberg's position, by reducing the issue solely to that of "no women elders/overseers," may be unduly minimalistic. The principles adduced by the quotations of Old Testament Scripture in 1 Timothy 2:13–14 would seem to suggest that 1 Timothy 2:12 is grounded in more foundational realities than a mere surface prohibition of women occupying a given office. For this reason a more nuanced application of the passage seems to be needed.<sup>43</sup>



## WILLIAM WEBB

While critical of the chapter on hermeneutics in the first edition (see Robert Yarbrough's response in the present edition below), William Webb wrote that "I must commend the book for its exegesis in a number of the other chapters, written by other authors."<sup>44</sup> Later, he remarks, "In one of the finest *exegetical* treatments of 1 Timothy 2 available today, the authors of *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15* develop the text in its lexical and grammatical aspects in much the same way as I would be inclined."<sup>45</sup> Elsewhere, Webb comments that "the exegesis by Schreiner, Baldwin, Köstenberger, etc. is persuasive and will make a lasting contribution."<sup>46</sup> One surmises that this would include the syntactical analysis in the present chapter. This is all the more remarkable as William Webb is an egalitarian.

## 2002–4

## ESTHER NG

In her critique of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's reconstruction of Christian origins, Esther Ng notes that Fiorenza apparently takes both infinitives in 1 Timothy 2:12 as having a neutral sense (meaning "teaching" and "having authority" respectively) and as linked to οὐδέ to mean two separable actions, though both related to men. This, she notes, puts the matriarch of feminist hermeneutics in agreement with "the more historical and conservative interpretation."<sup>47</sup> In the same note, Ng also refers to Wilshire's and Baldwin's studies and to the present study.

Later, Ng acknowledges that some "scholars with feminist inclinations" take αὐθεντεῖν in a negative sense (e.g., Payne, Fee) and then see the two infinitives as so closely related as to mean "teaching in a domineering way." She continues, "However, since a negative connotation of διδάσκειν is unlikely in this verse (see below), the neutral meaning for αὐθεντεῖν (to have authority over) seems to fit the οὐδέ construction better. . . . While the οὐδέ joins two separate activities, teaching and exercising authority are still closely associated, as the contrast with 'quiet learning in submission' makes clear."<sup>48</sup>

Hence it is clear that Ng follows the conclusions reached in the present study precisely and in their entirety.

## JUDITH HARTENSTEIN

In a review published in the *Review of Biblical Literature*, May 2004, Judith Hartenstein of Marburg University, Germany, interacts with the reprint of my essay on 1 Timothy 2:12 in the essay collection *Studies on John and Gender: A Decade of Scholarship*.<sup>49</sup> She notes that "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. . . . This teaching of 1 Timothy is consistent with the praxis in Pauline churches, as Köstenberger [in an essay on women in the Pauline mission] cannot find any evidence of contrary roles of women in the Pauline epistles. In Köstenberger's opinion, this role of women—where men bear ultimate responsibility—should be authoritative in the modern church."

While this reviewer has accurately summarized the contention of the present study, however, she proceeds to state: "I certainly do not agree with this result. My theological position is very different from that of Köstenberger. Nevertheless, I often find his analysis of texts and exegetical problems convincing and inspiring, especially if he uses linguistic approaches. . . . Likewise, I agree with Köstenberger's reading of 1 Tim 2. Köstenberger shows that the text demands a hierarchy between men and women and is meant as normative teaching. But with a different, far more critical view of the Bible, I need not accept it as God's word. (It helps that I do not regard 1 Timothy as written by Paul.)"

In a remarkably honest and candid fashion, therefore, Hartenstein affirms the present analysis of 1 Timothy 2:12 and acknowledges that she differs not for exegetical or linguistic reasons but because she holds a "far more critical view of the Bible." Especially since she does not regard 1 Timothy as having been written by Paul, she need not accept the teaching of 1 Timothy 2 as God's word, though it "is meant as normative teaching." While space does not permit a full-fledged critique of her stance toward Scripture in general or 1 Timothy 2 in particular, it seems clear that Hartenstein's presuppositions are problematic for, and unacceptable to, even inerrantist evangelical egalitarians.

This is not to say that *every* disagreement with the present essay by egalitarians must necessarily stem from an errantist stance toward Scripture, nor is it to imply that no exegetical or linguistic arguments could be advanced within an inerrantist framework. Nevertheless, Hartenstein's candor makes explicit what may often be an unacknowledged factor in feminist or egalitarian interpretations of 1 Timothy 2:12, namely, presuppositions that in fact override the actual exegesis of the passage. Whether or not this is acknowledged by egalitarian or feminist interpreters, their choice of which exegetical arguments to embrace may be (and often seems to be) motivated by their prior commitment to egalitarianism. How refreshing it is when this is openly acknowledged, as in the case of Hartenstein's review.<sup>50</sup>

## LINDA BELLEVILLE—AGAIN

In the 2004 essay collection *Discovering Biblical Equality*, Linda Belleville ups the ante by claiming that I consider "a hierarchical interpretation



of this passage [1 Tim. 2:12]" "a litmus test for the label *evangelical* and even a necessity for the salvation of unbelievers."<sup>51</sup> Belleville claims that I say (attributing a statement solely to me in a section that is signed by all three editors) "that a hierarchical view of men and women is necessary for 'a world estranged from God' to 'believe that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.'"

In context, however, the statement cited by Belleville refers not to the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:12 but to "one's view of male and female gender identities and roles in the church" in general as of "the apprehension and application of his [God's] good gift of manhood and womanhood." A renewal of this understanding of what it means to have been created male and female in God's image in the beginning is presented as vital for our own deeper fulfillment and for our witness in the world.

Doubtless, Belleville and other egalitarians would see their vision of gender equality as vital for people's deeper fulfillment and witness in the world; it is unclear why the editors of the first edition of this volume are denied the same hope and conviction. In any case, contrary to Belleville's assertion, neither I nor the other contributors to this volume believe that what Belleville calls a "hierarchical" view of men and women is necessary for a person to claim the label "evangelical" or that such a view is "a necessity for the salvation of unbelievers."

In her discussion of the grammar of the present verse, Belleville states at the outset that "Andreas Köstenberger claims that it is the correlative that *forces translators in this direction*."<sup>52</sup> It is unclear, however, what in the original essay suggests to Belleville a claim that the correlative "forces translators" in a certain direction. I did not claim that a certain understanding of the Greek coordinating conjunction motivated translators in the past, but rather that a certain understanding of the Greek conjunction in 1 Timothy 2:12 most properly conforms to the way in which Greek grammar actually functions.

Belleville also misunderstands the argument of the original essay when she says that it "argues that the Greek correlative pairs synonyms or parallel words and not antonyms."<sup>53</sup> This is not in fact the argument I make. Rather, my point is that there are two patterns of usage found with regard to οὐδέ in the New Testament and extrabiblical Greek literature:

Pattern 1: Two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied due to circumstances or conditions adduced in the context.

Pattern 2: Two activities or concepts are viewed negatively, and consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided.

The issue here is not that of synonyms versus antonyms but that of a particular type of perception of a given activity by a writer or speaker. For example, in 1 Maccabees 15:14, we read that "he pressed the city hard from land and sea, and permitted no one to leave or enter it." Clearly, "leave" and "enter" are antonyms, but this is not the crucial point in the present analysis, but rather the fact that both "leaving" and "entering" are viewed positively (rather than one being viewed positively and the other being viewed negatively) by the perpetrator of a given action. This point may be subtle, but an understanding of it is crucial for one to appreciate the argument being made in the present essay.

Beyond this, Belleville merely repeats her earlier argument (noted above) that infinitives are nouns, not verbs, and disallows a progression from particular to general in 1 Timothy 2:12. Once again, however, it must be noted that the categorization of infinitives as verbs or nouns is not the critical issue, since the present study identifies a total of forty-nine exact syntactical parallels (negated finite verb + infinitive + οὐδέ + infinitive) in the New Testament and extrabiblical literature, so that infinitives are compared with infinitives, which clearly is the most accurate comparison possible. None of Belleville's arguments overturns the syntactical patterns identified and the implication of these patterns for the proper rendering of 1 Timothy 2:12.<sup>54</sup>

#### WAYNE GRUDEM

In his encyclopedic work *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than 100 Disputed Questions*, Wayne Grudem accurately summarizes the contribution of the original essay and concurs with its findings.<sup>55</sup>

Grudem properly interacts with Sarah Sumner's objection that I have made a "mistake" in saying that the word διδάσκω in 1 Timothy 2:12 has a positive force, because the same word is used negatively in 1 Timothy 6:3 and Titus 1:11.<sup>56</sup> In fact, in 1 Timothy 6:3 it is not the same word but the word ἐπεροδιδάσκειν (to teach falsely) that is used, and in Titus 1:11 the context clearly indicates a negative connotation by the qualifier "teaching for shameful gain what they ought not to teach." No such negative qualifier is found in 1 Timothy 2:12, however.

Grudem also deals with I. H. Marshall's objection to my taking the word διδάσκω in 1 Timothy 2:12 in a positive sense, claiming that this "overlooks the fact that to say 'But I do not permit women to give false teaching' in this context would imply 'But I do allow men to do so.'" Yet as Grudem rightly points out, Marshall himself argues that ἀθηντέω has a negative nuance of "exercising autocratic power."<sup>57</sup> Hence the same objection he lodges against my essay would apply equally to his interpretation.<sup>58</sup>

## Conclusion

As the above survey of scholarly responses to the original essay on the syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12 has shown, the identification of two distinct syntactical patterns has met with virtually unanimous acceptance and has held up very well. Only Keener hinted at, and Belleville expressed, criticisms. Belleville alleged that (1) διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν are not verbs, (2) the construction is a poetic device following grammatical rules of its own, and (3) there are no parallels for a pattern from specific to general.

However, all three objections can be met. First, Greek grammars regularly and rightly treat infinitives under the rubric of verbs. Second, poetic device or not, Belleville has not overturned the clear and consistent syntactical patterns demonstrated in the present study, a pattern that has been accepted as valid even by virtually all other egalitarian scholars, including Marshall, Keener, Padgett, Giles, and Webb. Third, Belleville does not consider Acts 21:21, which constitutes a parallel. What is more, even if no parallel existed, this still would not mean that the pattern is illegitimate.

Marshall, finally, while accepting the overall validity of our syntactical analysis, contends that διδάσκειν is negative (see also Padgett, Giles). His arguments have been effectively refuted by Mounce and Blomberg.<sup>59</sup> For this reason, even after a decade of scrutiny, the results of the present study not only should be upheld as valid but also should now be considered as an assured result of biblical scholarship and hence ought to constitute the foundation upon which a sound exegesis of the present passage is conducted.

# 4

## AN INTERPRETATION OF 1 TIMOTHY 2:9-15

*A Dialogue with Scholarship*

---

THOMAS R. SCHREINER

---

The role of women in the church is probably the most emotionally charged issue in American evangelicalism today. I have been in public forums where the question has been debated, and the tension in the room is palpable. It is particularly difficult when I lecture on the issue at a seminary, for there are often women in the class who feel called to serve as pastors. To have a professor question the legitimacy of this call in a public setting is, to say the least, emotionally agonizing for women who feel called to pastor.<sup>1</sup> It also smacks of a public attack on a minority group since in my classes men usually outnumber women. Most of these women students have already been subjected somewhere in their journey to insensitive and cruel comments by men. Thus, the public examination of the issue by a professor who holds to the complementarian view can be almost unbearable.<sup>2</sup> Those of us who support the complementarian view on this question must bend over backward to love those with whom we disagree, and to assure them that we still hope and pray that God

51. With affirmation from William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, Word Biblical Commentary 46 (Nashville: Nelson, 2000), 128.

52. Further, the grammatical structure, as will be shown in the next chapter, also makes this impermissible.

### Chapter 3: A Complex Sentence

1. This final element (ἀλλά + infinitive) may not always be found in the examples selected for comparison.

2. P. B. Payne, "Οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2:12" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, November 1986), 10.

3. D. J. Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority over Men? 1 Timothy 2:11–15," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. J. Piper and W. Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway, 1991), 187.

4. Ibid.

5. Preliminary studies of οὐδέ linking nouns yielded results similar to those in the present study of οὐδέ linking verbs. The imprecision of Payne's work is also characteristic of the study by R. C. Kroeger and C. C. Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), 83–84, 189–92, whose examples are either passages in which οὐδέ joins two nouns or in which the word is not οὐδέ but οὐδέν. The Kroegers' suggestion that αὐθεντεῖν in 1 Tim. 2:12 may be an "infinitive of indirect discourse" must be rejected since they do not provide a single example of an infinitive of indirect discourse following οὐδέ in the New Testament or elsewhere.

6. A few constraints should be noted. Although the subject of this chapter is *syntactical* background studies, the conclusions drawn from the syntax as found in 1 Tim. 2:12 will involve *semantic* judgments (especially in the two patterns of the usage of οὐδέ that will be identified). There are also other syntactical (as well as semantic) issues raised by 1 Tim. 2:12 that will not be dealt with in this study, such as the question of whether or not ἀνδρός should be read with both διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν or exactly how the ἀλλά clause at the end of verse 12 relates to the preceding clause and which verb should be supplied there. Even the aspect or tense of the verbs involved will not be dealt with at this stage of the investigation, since, as will become evident, the major thesis of this essay is not materially affected by the aspect or tense of the verbs.

7. This syntactical pattern is not necessarily always found in this particular sequence. For example, in 1 Tim. 2:12, the first infinitive precedes the negated finite verb so that the order there is (2), (1), (3), and (4). A study of preceding infinitives in the Pauline literature, however, indicates that it is hard to find any consistent significance in preceding rather than following infinitives. Cf. the nineteen instances of preceding infinitives in the Pauline writings: Rom. 7:18; 8:8; 1 Cor. 7:36; 14:35; 15:50; 2 Cor. 8:10; 11:30; 12:1; Gal. 4:9, 17; Phil. 1:12; 2 Thess. 1:3; 1 Tim. 2:12; 3:5; 5:11, 25; 6:7, 16; 2 Tim. 2:13. Either way, the central thesis of this essay is not affected by whether the first infinitive precedes or follows the negated finite verb. Likewise, the presence or absence of element 4 does not substantially affect the thesis of this essay.

8. This is one major reason why, after screening less-close syntactical parallels, this study will proceed to search extrabiblical Greek literature for more exact parallels involving, as in 1 Tim. 2:12, two infinitives governed by a negated finite verb. The fact that, strictly speaking, there is only one close syntactical parallel to 1 Tim. 2:12 in the New Testament does not mean that New Testament passages in which a negated finite verb governs two verb forms other than infinitives are without value for identifying general patterns of the usage of οὐδέ. Rather, the New Testament allows one to identify a basic pattern of the usage of οὐδέ that can then be tested and refined by resorting to extrabiblical Greek literature. This is the approach followed in the present study.

9. Contrast the use of ἐπεροδιδάσκαλεῖν in 1 Tim. 1:3–4 and 6:3, on which see further discussion below.

10. Cf. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, 81. See also Payne ("Οὐδέ," 6–8), who argues that teaching is an activity viewed positively in and of itself in the New Testament and in Paul.

11. Cf. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, 81.

12. Translations for texts 1, 2, and 5 are taken from Bruce M. Metzger, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977); translations for texts 3, 4, 6, and 7 are my own; and translations for texts 8–48 are taken from the Loeb Classical Library series.

13. Note that "to take part in public affairs" is not as neutral as this translation might suggest. Cf. LSJ, 1442: πολυπραγματέω: "mostly in bad sense, to be a meddlesome, inquisitive busybody; esp. meddle in state affairs, intrigue."

14. The primary thesis that this chapter seeks to establish is that the two concepts connected by οὐδέ are both viewed either positively or negatively. The following subcategories of this basic pattern may be identified: (1) synonymous concepts: Matt. 7:18; Mark 8:17; John 14:27; Acts 2:27; 1 Cor. 15:50; Gal. 4:14; Phil. 2:16; 2 Thess. 2:2; 1 Tim. 6:16; Heb. 10:8; 12:5; 13:5; 1 Pet. 3:14; (2) conceptual parallels: Matt. 6:28 = Luke 12:27; Matt. 7:6; 10:14 = Mark 6:11; Matt. 12:19; Luke 3:14; 6:44; 18:4; John 14:17; Acts 4:18; 17:24–25; Rom. 9:16; 2 Cor. 4:2; Col. 2:21; 2 Thess. 3:7–8; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 John 3:6; Rev. 12:8; (3) complementary concepts: Acts 9:9; Rom. 14:21; 2 Cor. 7:12; Rev. 7:16; (4) sequential concepts: Matt. 6:20, 26 = Luke 12:24; Matt. 13:13; Mark 13:15; Luke 12:33; 17:23; John 4:15; Rom. 9:11; (5) ascensive concepts: Matt. 22:46; 23:13; Acts 16:21; (6) specific to general or general to specific: (a) specific to general: Acts 21:21; 1 Tim. 2:12; (b) general to specific: Gal. 1:16–17; 1 Tim. 1:3–4; 6:17. Note that there may be some overlap among these categories so that they should not be understood to be totally mutually exclusive but rather as indicating the most likely emphasis on the relationship between the two concepts linked by οὐδέ.

15. *Southern Cross Newspaper* (September 1996), published by Anglican Media in Sydney, Australia.

16. *Jahrbuch für evangelikale Theologie* 6 (1996): 421–25.

17. Alan G. Padgett, "The Scholarship of Patriarchy (on 1 Timothy 2:8–15): A Response to Women in the Church," *Priscilla Papers* 11, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 24.

18. *JETS* 41, no. 3 (1998): 513–16. In a perceptive comment that anticipates Craig Blomberg's 2001 essay (see below), Keener suspects that this reading would represent a challenge for "the more moderate complementarian view that allows women to teach men provided they [the women] are under male authority."

19. *The Pastoral Epistles*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: Clark, 1999), 454–60, esp. 458–60.

20. Such as, "I do not permit the women to continue their false teaching." See Craig L. Blomberg, "Neither Hierarchalist nor Egalitarian," in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, ed. James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 361n137.

21. Ibid., 359, noting that this is conceded by the egalitarian Walter Liefeld in "Response," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1986), 220.

22. See pp. 62–63 above.

23. See further the objection dealt with and answered by Wayne Grudem discussed below.

24. *The Pastoral Epistles*, Word Biblical Commentary 46 (Nashville: Nelson, 2000), 120–30, esp. 124–26 and 128–30.

25. Ibid., 125, 129.

26. *Ibid.*, 128.
27. *Ibid.*, 130.
28. Kevin Giles, "A Critique of the 'Novel' Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 Given in the Book, *Women in the Church*: Parts I and II," *EQ* 72, no. 2 (2000): 151–67; 72, no. 3 (2000): 195–215. See my response, "Women in the Church: A Response to Kevin Giles," *EQ* 73 (2001): 205–24.
29. Giles, "Critique," 153.
30. *Ibid.*, 212.
31. There is no need here to reproduce my interaction with Belleville in *JETS* 44, no. 2 (2001): 344–46. While my tone was perhaps a bit forceful, I continue to believe that my critique was essentially sound.
32. Linda Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church: Three Crucial Questions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 173 (the same assertion is made on 175).
33. See note 14, above.
34. Hence, the critique of Payne in the original essay also applies to Belleville.
35. Belleville, "Women in Ministry," in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, ed. J. R. Beck and C. L. Blomberg (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 135–36. But see esp. the reviews by Andreas J. Köstenberger (cited above) and Thomas R. Schreiner in the *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 6, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 24–30.
36. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 598–99, and 599n29.
37. See further the interaction with Belleville's subsequent critique below.
38. Blomberg, "Neither Hierarchalist nor Egalitarian: Gender Roles in Paul," in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 363.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*, 364.
41. *Ibid.*
42. It is not entirely clear to me how this conclusion renders Blomberg "neither hierarchicalist nor egalitarian," as he suggests in the title of his essay. I see how he wants to avoid some of the negative connotations associated with the term "hierarchicalist" and how he is more open to women in leadership than strict nonegalitarians, but he clearly shares with the latter their central tenet and thus hardly occupies a true middle position between those who believe in women holding positions of ultimate authority in the church and those who do not. Also, in his title he erects somewhat of a straw man by positing "hierarchicalist" as one of the two polar opposites. This is accomplished only by stereotyping his fellow-complementarians. Is Blomberg implying that Thomas Schreiner or Ann Bowman, for example, the authors of the two nonegalitarian essays in the same volume, are "hierarchicalists"? Blomberg appears able to occupy the center in the debate only by pushing further to the right others with whom he shares their central tenet.
43. On issues of application, see Dorothy Patterson's chapter in the present volume.
44. William J. Webb, *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 35. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to respond to Webb's categorization of the first edition of the present work as "patriarchal" (282 et passim), other than to note that the label is tendentious, inflammatory, and inaccurate.
45. *Ibid.*, 225.
46. *Ibid.*, 244n3.
47. Esther Yue L. Ng, *Reconstructing Christian Origins? The Feminist Theology of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza: An Evaluation* (Carlisle, Eng.: Paternoster, 2002), 285n170.
48. *Ibid.*, 287n184.

49. *Studies in Biblical Literature* 38 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 261–82. The reprinted essay is "Syntactical Background Studies to 1 Tim 2:12 in the New Testament and Extrabiblical Greek Literature," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 113 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 156–79 (a slightly modified version of the essay that appeared in the first edition of the present work). Hartenstein's review can be accessed at [http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/1587\\_814.pdf](http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/1587_814.pdf).
50. See Tom Schreiner's comment in chapter 4 of the present volume that "those scholars who embrace the feminist position, such as Paul Jewett, but argue that Paul was wrong or inconsistent in 1 Timothy 2, are exegetically more straightforward and intellectually more convincing than those who contend that Paul did not actually intend to restrict women teaching men in 1 Timothy 2."
51. "Teaching and Usurping Authority: 1 Timothy 2:11–15," in *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, ed. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 205, with reference to the first edition of the present work, 11–12.
52. Belleville, "Teaching and Usurping Authority," 217 (emphasis added).
53. *Ibid.*
54. This includes her argument that ἀϑεντεῖν is rendered negatively throughout the history of translation and that only recent English translations have rendered the term positively (209–10; though she notes that both Martin Luther and William Tyndale translated the term positively as "des Mannes Herr sei" and "to have authoritie over a man" respectively). However, even if this argument were true, this would no more prove the accuracy of such a rendering than the abundance of Greek New Testament manuscripts supporting the Majority Text proves the superiority of the Byzantine text tradition. Nor can this argument overturn the demonstrable rules of Greek grammar and syntax with regard to 1 Tim. 2:12. What is more, Belleville's argument that the positive renderings of ἀϑεντεῖν in 1 Tim. 2:12 in virtually all the major recent and current English translations is "partly to blame" for a "hierarchical, noninclusive understanding of leadership" is open to debate as well.
55. (Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004), 314–16.
56. *Ibid.*, 315n111, with reference to Sarah Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church: Building Consensus on Christian Leadership* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 253n21, who in turn cites Padgett, "Scholarship of Patriarchy," 24. See also Tom Schreiner's similar critique of Sumner in his essay in the present volume.
57. *Ibid.*, 316, with reference to Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 458. See also Tom Schreiner's critique of Marshall in his essay in the present volume and Grudem's interaction with the views of Blomberg and Belleville on the syntax of 1 Tim. 2:12 (Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than 100 Disputed Questions* [Sisters, OR: Multnomah, 2004], 316–19).
58. For detailed interaction with Marshall, see the earlier discussion above.
59. As discussed, Blomberg himself, while concurring with the overall thrust of the present study, takes its implications in a somewhat different direction than seems warranted.

#### Chapter 4: An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15

1. I make a distinction between a call to the ministry and a call to be a pastor/overseer/elder. Women attend seminary because they are called to the former, but some misinterpret their call in terms of being called to the latter.

2. I follow the convention today in identifying the position that sees no ministry limitations for women as the egalitarian view, and the view that women should not serve as