

office or taught, not because it was forbidden by domineering men, but because they did not care to do so. They had their own spheres of influence.<sup>153</sup>

There is still work to be done to allow ancient women to speak for themselves as much as our limited sources allow. But the important points relevant to 1 Timothy may be considered as adequately attested in the sources reported here. These sources by their very nature refer to predominantly upper-class people. But there is good evidence that at least some women from such elite circles were part of the Ephesian congregation.<sup>154</sup>

In the course of our discussion, we have seen Ephesian girls and women in traditional Greco-Roman roles. Aristocratic women participated alongside their husbands as managers of sometimes extensive households:<sup>155</sup> "This memorial and the outlying area belongs to Pomponia Faustina, *kosmeteira* of Artemis (inherited) from her forebears,<sup>156</sup> and to Menander her husband. Myrrachis, Nico, and the rest of Menander's freedmen care for the tomb" (*IvE* 1655). Ephesian women's official functions were expressed almost entirely in the sacred priesthoods. Most, though, whose names would never be inscribed on stone, were much like women encountered anywhere else at the time: wives, mothers, and midwives; farmers, fullers, and fishmongers; scullery maids, bar-girls, and prostitutes; mediums, fortunetellers, and slaves. These women hardly had time for Amazonian phantasies.

In 1 Timothy 2, after reminding the wealthy women of Ephesus in particular about true piety in contrast to outward show, Paul anticipates that such women might misunderstand their inherited, worldly privileges to imply that they could step outside their divinely ordered role in the new covenant community. He points them instead to their distinct, profound, and significant roles in the church. And Paul's teaching on distinctly feminine virtues would have resonated with the ideals of their culture through the light of general revelation: "A woman's particular virtue is modesty (*σωφροσύνη*), for by it she is enabled to honor and love her husband" (Phintys, daughter of Callicrates, a Pythagorean philosopher).<sup>157</sup>

## 2

### AN IMPORTANT WORD

*Ἀυθεντέω* in 1 Timothy 2:12

---

HENRY SCOTT BALDWIN

---

**T**he total vocabulary of the New Testament is a little over 5,400 words. With a knowledge of only 170 of the most frequently used words, the student of biblical Greek is able to recognize more than 70 percent of all the words in the Greek New Testament. With a vocabulary of 500 Greek words, one can read the New Testament without great difficulty. However, for careful study and exegesis of the text, a problem arises with the words that appear only once in the New Testament. These hapax legomena present a problem for both the reader and the scholar. The reader discovers that to learn every word in the New Testament, nearly 2,000 hapax legomena must be memorized. It is a formidable task to learn so many words so infrequently encountered in the text! But for the scholar, hapax legomena can present an even greater challenge. Since language usage is the key to understanding the meaning of a word, how does the New Testament scholar determine the meaning of words that appear only once in the New Testament or even in the whole Bible? Often context reveals the basic sense of a word. If the general flow of the text is understood, usually the meaning of the word will be

evident. Occasionally, however, the context may make several different meanings for a hapax legomenon seem appropriate or at least possible. The scholar must then turn to sources outside the New Testament and evaluate other uses of the word to narrow the meaning. Such is the case with *αὐθεντέω*, which appears in 1 Timothy 2:12.

First Timothy 2:12 declares, "I do not permit a woman to teach or *αὐθεντεῖν* a man." What Paul intends to say by use of the word *αὐθεντεῖν* has been much debated in the past. The various definitions proposed resulted in surprisingly different interpretations of the verse. Thus, a careful analysis of the term is warranted. However, since the first edition of this volume was published, significant scholarly effort has been expended to understand the meaning of *αὐθεντέω* in 1 Timothy 2:12 and its larger usage and history among Greek speakers of the ancient world. Given the work offered here and the fine studies of Al Wolters<sup>1</sup> and David Huttar,<sup>2</sup> the time is now past for exegetes to claim lexical justification in support of idiosyncratic or tendentious interpretations of this critical text in 1 Timothy.<sup>3</sup>

Since *αὐθεντεῖν* is a New Testament hapax legomenon, the exegete must investigate extrabiblical materials to assist in analyzing Paul's meaning. Often turning to sources outside the New Testament can be as easy as consulting one of the standard New Testament or ancient Greek lexicons. However, in the case of the word *αὐθεντέω*, it is evident that many lexicons do not provide as thorough or comprehensive an explanation of the term as we might desire. A precise consensus as to the meaning of the word has not been achieved among well-known lexicographers. (Table 2.1 provides a summary of the conclusions of several modern lexicons.)

Partly because of the uncertainty in the lexicons, partly because of theological and practical concerns, scholars in the last decade undertook to study afresh this difficult word. There had been five significant word studies on the origin and meaning of *αὐθεντέω* in the fifteen years previous to the first edition. Some insight had been gained from each. However, methodological or technological shortcomings limited the extent to which each had been able to contribute to a satisfactory resolution of the meaning of the term.

In 1979 Catherine C. Kroeger asserted that *αὐθεντέω* was an erotic term whose essential meaning was "to thrust oneself."<sup>4</sup> Further, she asserted that the word was associated with fertility practices. Three years later, Carroll Osburn convincingly demonstrated that Kroeger's position was "more curious than substantive."<sup>5</sup> Osburn went on to make his own case for the meaning of *αὐθεντέω*: "to dominate or domineer." George W. Knight III produced a careful and detailed study of *αὐθεντέω*.<sup>6</sup> He concluded that the translation of the KJV ("to usurp authority") was

**Table 2.1**  
***Αὐθεντέω* in Modern Lexicographers**

Sophocles	1. to be in power, to have authority over 2. to be the originator of anything 3. to compel 4. mid: to be in force
Preisigke	1. beherrschen (to rule, control, dominate) 2. verfügberechtigt sein (to have legitimate authority to dispose of something) 3. Herr sein, fest auftreten (to be master, to act confidently) <sup>a</sup>
Lampe	1. hold sovereign authority, act with authority 2. possess authority over 3. assume authority, act on one's own authority 4. be primarily responsible for, instigate, authorize
Moulton and Milligan	1. from the word "master, autocrat" <sup>b</sup>
LSJ	1. to have full power or authority over 2. to commit murder
Mayser	1. Herr sein, fest auftreten (to be master, to act confidently)
BDAG <sup>c</sup>	1. to assume a stance of independent authority <sup>d</sup>
Louw and Nida <sup>e</sup>	1. to control in a domineering manner—"to control, to domineer"
DGE	1. tener autoridad sobre andros [como algo prohibido a la mujer] (to have authority over a male [as something prohibited for a woman])

a. These English renderings are those of *The Oxford-Duden German Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

b. This is found under the heading *αὐθεντέω*. However, Moulton and Milligan begin their article with a discussion of the noun and cite only one instance of the verb.

c. For the use at 1 Tim. 2:12, Danker notes with the Jerusalem Bible that the word "practically = 'tell a man what to do,'" and suggests as a gloss for *αὐθεντέω* "give orders to, dictate to," the later gloss having the unfortunate connotation of meaning something socially undesirable. Danker acknowledges the articles of George Knight ("*ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ*") and Leland Wilshire ("TLG Computer"), cited by me below, but

evidences no knowledge of the first edition of this present article, nor does he, understandably, have knowledge of Wolters ("*Semantic Study*") or Huttar ("*ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΙΝ*").

d. The use of the term "domineer" appeared somewhere between the fifth edition of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958) and the English adaption and translation by BAGD. The negative term "domineer" became included perhaps mistakenly in the definition for *αὐθεντέω*. Bauer's German rendering, "herrschen über jemand," does not of necessity demand the negative "domineer" but merely "rule over" or "have absolute sway over."

e. Louw and Nida, 474.

"evidently erroneous" and that "the RSV, NAB, NIV and The Translator's Testament have caught the essence of the meaning of *αὐθεντέω* and present probably the most satisfactory rendering with their phrase 'to

have authority.'” However, Knight’s work, though exactly executed, was not comprehensive enough to resolve the debate since it focused on a limited database.

In his study, Leland Wilshire remedied the deficiency of data.<sup>7</sup> Using the computer database of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Wilshire was able to identify “314 or so references to αὐθεντέω and its cognates.” Wilshire concluded that

the 314 literary citations of the TLG computer (plus the pertinent references in BAGD analyzed by Knight along with others in the papyri) may be of help in understanding the meaning of 1 Tim. 2.12. Sometime during the spread of koine, the word αὐθεντέω went beyond the predominant Attic meaning connecting it with murder and suicide and into the broader concept of criminal behavior. It also began to take on the additional meanings of “to exercise authority/power/rights” which became firmly established in the Greek Patristic writers to mean “exercise authority.”<sup>8</sup>

In this article, Wilshire came to no solid conclusion with respect to the definition of αὐθεντέω. However, he seemed to indicate that a notion of “exercising authority” should be associated with the term.<sup>9</sup> In a later clarifying article, Wilshire offered “instigating violence” as the best definition and averred that it was not until the time of the patristic fathers that the meaning “exercise authority” appeared.<sup>10</sup>

In 1992, Richard and Catherine Kroeger published an extensive study of αὐθεντέω as part of their treatise on 1 Timothy 2:12.<sup>11</sup> They concluded that αὐθεντέω has “a wide range of meanings.” Among them are “(1) to begin something, to be responsible for a condition or action, (2) to rule, to dominate, (3) to usurp power or rights from another, (4) to claim ownership, sovereignty, or authorship.” In particular, they find αὐθεντέω “has implications of killing, beginning, and copulating.” Specifically, they preferred that at 1 Timothy 2:12 αὐθεντεῖν be taken to mean “proclaim oneself author of man.”

Looking over the results of these studies, it seems their effect was to make the real meaning of αὐθεντέω more obscure than ever! Hence was born the need for this chapter. In it we seek to identify the most probable meaning of the verb in 1 Timothy 2:12 and to obtain data to critique the contributions of other scholars. This will also provide the basis for the syntactical and exegetical evaluation of 1 Timothy 2:12 in the chapters that follow. Specifically, (1) we will suggest a satisfactory method for analyzing αὐθεντέω. This may offer us a clue why scholars have reached widely differing conclusions about the meaning of the verb. (2) We will present an analysis of the meanings derived from every currently known instance of the use of the verb

in ancient Greek literature with a summary in table 3.2.<sup>12</sup> (3) Finally, we will draw conclusions concerning the possible meanings of the word in 1 Timothy 2.

### The Limitations of Word Studies

Before we begin, it is important to recognize the limitations of lexical studies. Following the older linguistic theories of the nineteenth century, there was a strong presumption that word studies would yield the meaning of a word with indisputable certainty. Newer linguistic investigations have brought this assumption under suspicion. Ferdinand de Saussure noted that in language, “tout se tient” (all things hold together). That is, language must be viewed as an interconnected system wherein the *context* provides the clues to the meaning of the words used.<sup>13</sup>

This principle has important implications. On the one hand, the competent user of a language can contextualize most anything. Every competent English speaker knows that “raise” may have several distinct meanings: “to raise the flag,” “to raise corn in Nebraska,” “to raise children.” Our ability to contextualize alerts us to the fact that by “raise” we do not mean “nurture the flag,” “hoist corn,” or “plant and water children.”

On the other hand, no word has a meaning value of zero, that is, no word is an entirely blank check, able to mean anything we choose depending on the context in which we choose to put it. Linguist Rudolf Carnap’s sentence “Pirots karulize elatically!”<sup>14</sup> is perfect according to normal English syntax. Yet it means nothing at all because the three words have no known meanings from any other context. Linguist Roland Barthes points out that speech is not an act of pure creativity. (If it were, we would understand in what way the pirots are karulizing!) Rather, a speaker uses and combines what is already in the language to accomplish his or her ends.<sup>15</sup>

At the same time, speakers can use words in unusual or unique ways. This occurs regularly with metaphors or in poetry. Consider the following scene: “The caravan navigated the last stretch of sandy waste, piloting their sulking and knock-kneed ships safely into the harbor of the oasis.” It is precisely because “ship” and “camel” have distinctive meanings that the unexpected substitution of one word for the other gives metaphor its memorable quality. But no reputable word study should conclude from such a use as this, for example, that one legitimate meaning of “ship” must be “camel.”

All this places three practical limitations on word studies:

1. Lexical studies (properly conducted) are nothing more than summaries of contemporaneous uses of the word under consideration. Lexis is not a prescription of what a word must mean nor an absolute proscription of what a word cannot mean in a given context. Rather, it is a *description* of what people who use the word normally mean to indicate by its use.
2. No lexical study is a 100 percent guarantee that a word has a specific meaning in any given passage. The presence of poetics, metaphor, or the specialized use of a word by a subculture unknown to the lexicographer prohibits such certainty. However, when the semantic range of a word is established across a wide spectrum of language use, the burden of proof lies on the exegete to show why, in this particular case, the normal and well-attested usage should not be taken as the meaning in the passage at hand. With respect to the use of *αὐθεντέω* in 1 Timothy 2:12, this principle particularly has been repeatedly violated by exegetes.<sup>16</sup>
3. Understanding the meaning of a word in a specific context is a trial-and-error process. This process goes through the following steps: (a) We have a preunderstanding of the word based on its use in other contexts. This is the dictionary meaning (or denotation) we carry around in our heads or lexicons. (b) We attempt to apply the denotation to the present context. (c) We then check to see if the resulting sentence makes sense using this meaning. (d1) If it does, we search for the precise nuance of the context at hand. (d2) If it does not, we investigate why not. We may ask questions such as, Is the word misspelled? Is there a denotation to the word we did not know about? Is the writer using metaphor?

Limitation 3 will become particularly important to us in subsequent chapters after we have the results of our study of *αὐθεντέω* in hand.

### Methodology of Word Studies

Any formal attempt to discover the meaning of *αὐθεντέω* must be based on sound methodology. In particular, in analyzing *αὐθεντέω* confusion has arisen when some scholars have failed to distinguish the verbal forms from the noun and adjectival forms of the word. Further, failure to analyze the data by genre and date has resulted in unwarranted assertions. These difficulties have led to faulty conclusions in some of the word studies mentioned above.

The methodology employed in this study (separating verb and noun) is justified for several reasons. First, there are numerous examples in

Greek where the verbal form does not correspond to all the meanings of the noun.<sup>17</sup> We cannot uncritically assume *αὐθεντέω* is exactly equivalent to “be an *αὐθέντης*” in every one of its senses. Our driving principle must be how people actually use language, not some theory about the origin of this or that word (etymology).<sup>18</sup> Second, this methodology (separating verb and noun) is the same methodology employed by all recent lexicographers. Third, we have precedent to separate verb and noun forms—particularly in the case of *αὐθεντέω*—from the ancient lexicographer Hesychius.<sup>19</sup> His is an important datum and a caution against careless etymologizing. Finally, though the verb *αὐθεντέω* is relatively rare,<sup>20</sup> the eighty-five references examined in this study are believed to be sufficient to give an adequate understanding of the meaning of the verb.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, the oft-repeated argument—i.e., since the word is so infrequently found, Paul must have chosen it for some esoteric meaning it might carry—will be shown to be without merit.<sup>22</sup> This argument has more weight in light of the fact that the material presented here is drawn from an exhaustive list of the ancient uses of the verbal form known to scholars to date.<sup>23</sup> For these reasons we shall confine our study to the verbal form alone. This is a sound methodology.<sup>24</sup>

### Results and Analysis of the Study

Upon analyzing these eighty-five<sup>25</sup> currently known occurrences<sup>26</sup> of the verb *αὐθεντέω*, it becomes evident that the one unifying concept is that of *authority*. Four outworkings of authority are reflected in the distinct meanings of the verb. Table 2.2 gives a summary of the meanings of *αὐθεντέω* for quick reference.

**Table 2.2**  
**The Meanings of *Αὐθεντέω***

1. To rule, to reign sovereignly
2. To control, to dominate
  - a. to compel, to influence someone/something
  - b. middle voice: to be in effect, to have legal standing
  - c. hyperbolically: to domineer/play the tyrant
  - d. to grant authorization
3. To act independently
  - a. to assume authority over
  - b. to exercise one's own jurisdiction
  - c. to flout the authority of
4. To be primarily responsible ~~for~~, to do or to instigate something<sup>27</sup>

Meaning 1, "to rule, to reign sovereignly," reflects unhindered authority to act based on inherent or divine right. Its thirteen uses are intransitive (simply, "I rule"). Philodemus uses it of officials, that is, of those who have authority by right of office. Chrysostom uses it of both humanity and deity. The church fathers use it frequently of members of the Godhead.

Meaning 2, "to control, to dominate," reflects authority from the standpoint of actually having control or ability to dominate an object. It may be used in this sense either transitively or intransitively. Ptolemy writes that Saturn dominates Mercury and the moon.<sup>28</sup> Didymus the Blind reports on the practice of his church, saying that women pray and prophesy just as Mary did. But though Mary did these things, she did not write Scripture so as not to exercise control over men. This meaning may imply a kind of control that can be employed in the legitimate exercise of an office.<sup>29</sup> This also, apparently, is the meaning Origen found for ἀϋθεντέω in 1 Timothy.<sup>30</sup>

Meaning 2a, "to compel, to influence someone/something," is to seek to exercise authority and/or possibly gain the ability to exercise authority/control. Athanasius employs this sense when speaking of the activity of the Holy Spirit. Chrysostom uses it of Jesus, who can compel dead bodies to rise. Ammonius uses it of the apostles, who write letters that compel obedience. These are clearly positive examples. However, the three remaining examples probably should not be understood to prove a negative meaning for ἀϋθεντέω in and of themselves. That is, they may not indicate "coercion" in its worst sense. In BGU 1208 the influence the writer exercises is based on his authority over his own funds and property. He is seeking to get what he considers an honest payment made to a boatman for services rendered in transferring his sheep across the Nile. In the other two cases, though the results of the act are negative (the fall, the crucifixion), we cannot say more than that the context indicates a negative connotation. There is not sufficient warrant to postulate a new meaning such as "tyrannize" or "coerce." To the contrary, Chrysostom says that Eve "exercised authority once *wrongly*" (ἡϋθεντησεν ἁπαξ κακῶς). The implication, obviously, is that Chrysostom could not make the negative force felt without the addition of κακῶς, and he therefore did not regard the verb ἀϋθεντέω as negative in itself. Malalas's use is somewhat different: though the Jews pressured Pilate, influencing his decision, it cannot be said that they usurped his position or coerced his complicity in Jesus' death, as if Rome were subservient to Jerusalem. But at least we must say that "compel" is the intended meaning, if not something stronger.

Meaning 2b, "to be in effect, to have legal standing," occurs with the use of the middle voice. It is exceedingly rare, occurring only three

times. Hippolytus uses it to describe the legal authority of a master over a slave. It is also found twice in the *Chronicon Paschale* with respect to a decree becoming authoritative at a certain point in time.

Meaning 2c, "to domineer/play the tyrant," is substantiated by only a single instance. From the context it is clear that Parker's translation ("do not act the despot") for ἀϋθένται is correct. This is the sole unambiguous instance I have found where ἀϋθεντέω is plainly intended to convey the negative denotation "tyrannize." In this unique usage of the verb, Chrysostom has apparently transformed "exercise sole authority" into the intransitive, "play the tyrant."<sup>31</sup>

Meaning 2d, "to grant authorization," is found in the letters of Marcian and Pulcheria to Leo of Rome. The idea is that Leo has control and can say yes or no to a calling of a synod or a council. Athanasius tells us that Christ did not rain fire down on Sodom of himself, but that the Father authorized it.

Meaning 3, "to act independently," carries the idea of being one's own authority. This meaning appears eight times. The idea is not intrinsically negative. As Knight has pointed out, it does not mean in and of itself "usurp authority."<sup>32</sup> In PLond 1708, Psates has apparently acted on his own authority to cheat his siblings, and Chrysostom says we should not seek "to have our own way." Chrysostom also has Jesus say that he does not need to rebuild the temple of his own body by command of the Father but "exercises his own authority in the matter."

Meaning 3a, "to assume authority over," is a positive term that appears to imply that one moves forward to fill the leadership role. In BGU 103 the request is that the bishop "assume authority" over the matter and resolve a domestic squabble. The term appears to be used as an equivalent of the colloquial phrase "step up to the plate" or "take charge."

Meaning 3b, "to exercise one's own jurisdiction," is only found where ἀϋθεντέω is intransitive.<sup>33</sup> It occurs several times in negative contexts, where it refers to a condition that results when one has taken to himself or herself the judgments or authority belonging to another. Thus, the word is used three times to speak of an underlord who carries out an execution that ought to have been sanctioned by the king. It is used of other officials who release prisoners, lighten tribute, or convene assemblies without full authorization. In this it is like "usurp." However, "usurp" refers to the *action* of wrongfully appropriating or supplanting, while ἀϋθεντέω refers to the *state* in which one is when he or she has achieved independent jurisdiction. Further, for a speaker of English to say "to usurp wrongly" would be pleonastic, for "usurp" always has a negative denotation. In contrast ἀϋθεντέω with this meaning can be viewed positively. For example, when Victor Antiochenus discusses Jesus' rehearsal of David eating the holy bread, he says "For if a prophet as-

sumes his own authority against the law . . . should you be vexed and judge the law?"<sup>34</sup> If the text has been properly reconstructed, the infinitive αὐθεντεῖν appears as a definition of αὐτοδικεῖν in Moeris's second-century AD lexicon. There he seems to indicate that the Attic αὐτοδικέω, "having independent jurisdiction," can be rendered by the Hellenistic αὐθεντέω. The sum of the above leads to the conclusion that the intransitive αὐθεντέω, with the meaning "to exercise one's jurisdiction," is not of itself positive or negative. What the author is trying to say must be determined from the context.

Meaning 3c, "to flout the authority of," is found three times. These all have a clearly negative denotation. John Malalas (ca. AD 690) uses αὐθεντέω transitively to indicate that the army has "sidestepped" the authority of the senate and, on its own, has selected an emperor. The same phrase as that used by Malalas is also found in the tenth-century work *About Strategy* with a similar sense. The transitive use with negative meaning may well be a later development arising from meaning 3b.

Meaning 4 is "to be primarily responsible for, to do or to instigate something." The meaning "to do" is claimed by Wolters in the sense of initiating an action.<sup>35</sup> The simple "to do" is a specific subset of "to be responsible for" and is defensible in the case of Eusebius<sup>36</sup> and the scholia on Homer's *Iliad*.<sup>37</sup> However, the instances in Leo's *Epistle 30*<sup>38</sup> and the *Second Council of Nicea*<sup>39</sup> require the meaning "instigate."<sup>40</sup> In the *Suda Lexicon*<sup>41</sup> "be responsible for" is taken as a meaning for the verb in contradistinction to "to do the thing with one's own hand." It then goes on to explain the word by the action of King Mithridates (the VI), who ordered murder to be done by letter but did not bear the sword himself.

Under this rubric αὐθεντεῖ has been erroneously taken by the Kroegers<sup>42</sup> to mean "to be the organic origin of something" with a sense analogous to the biological meanings of γεννάω or τίκτω.<sup>43</sup> This is clearly erroneous. A close examination of the eight occurrences of αὐθεντέω with this meaning shows they could all properly be subsumed under the meaning recognized by Lampe, "to be responsible for, to instigate." Indeed, in two of the eight uses under this meaning, αὐθεντέω is directly paralleled in the text by the verb προϊστέμι, "to be the leader, to direct, to be the ringleader."<sup>44</sup>

We may note that the sometimes asserted meaning for αὐθεντεῖν, "to murder," is not substantiated for any period even remotely close to the period of the writing of the New Testament, and then by a single datum, a Byzantine scholarly note on a play by Aeschylus (d. 456 BC) from the fourteenth century AD.<sup>45</sup> As Huttar concludes, "The meaning 'murder' for αὐθεντεῖν is not attested in any living, natural Greek used in ordinary discourse, but only in the ingenuity of an etymologizing hypothesis on the past of some comparably late Byzantine scholar."<sup>46</sup>

Since the publication of the first edition, there has been significant discussion of what constitutes a "negative use," a "negative connotation," "positive meaning," and so on, for a particular use of αὐθεντέω. It is well to note that there are two definitions of αὐθεντέω offered here that are "morally negative," the intransitive meaning 2c "play the tyrant," which is attested by only a single datum, and the transitive meaning 3c, "flout the authority of," attested by three data. There are some six to ten instances, depending on how one interprets the larger discourse, where a positive meaning of αὐθεντέω is used in an overall negative context.<sup>47</sup> These, however, do not thereby create a transferable meaning that is "morally negative." Consider, for example, the English word "heal." In Luke 6:7 when the Pharisees wonder "if on the Sabbath Jesus heals,"<sup>48</sup> there is no question that, in the context, the enemies of Jesus would view it as a grievous moral error to heal on the Sabbath day. But that context would provide no justification to define "to heal" and use it in other contexts with a meaning such as "to commit grievous moral error." Much of the discussion of αὐθεντέω has been bedeviled by exegetes failing to recognize the difference between a transferable lexical meaning and the meaning that the total passage bears when a legitimate, transferable meaning is inserted in the context under investigation.<sup>49</sup>

A final observation may be made from the data of table 2.3. Among these data, there appears only limited historical development of the meaning of αὐθεντέω across fourteen centuries. The use of the word by Christian sources certainly brought it into a whole new sphere of application with respect to God and Christ. From the data presented here, it is possible that some of the meanings 2b through 3b *may* have developed after the New Testament period, and especially 3c, "to flout the authority of." What we can say with certainty is that we have no instances of a pejorative use of the verb before the fourth century AD.<sup>50</sup> The data available, however, provide clear indication that the widely understood meanings of αὐθεντέω were based on the idea of the possession or exercise of authority.

**Table 2.3**  
**Chronological Distribution of Various Meanings of αὐθεντέω**

1. To rule, to reign sovereignly  
(1st cent. BC) Philodemus  
(AD 325) Eusebius  
(ca. AD 390) Chrysostom  
(6th cent. AD) Romanus Melodus
2. To control, to dominate  
(2nd cent. AD) Ptolemy  
(ca. AD 390) Chrysostom

- (AD 790) Second Council of Nicea  
(12th cent. AD) Michael Glycas
- 2a. To compel, to influence  
(27 BC) BGU 1208  
(AD 390) Chrysostom  
(AD 690) John Malalas
  - 2b. Middle voice: to be in effect, to have legal standing  
(AD 235) Hippolytus  
(7th cent. AD) Chronicon Paschale
  - 2c. Uniquely: to domineer  
(ca. AD 390) Chrysostom
  - 2d. To grant authorization  
(ca. AD 350) Athanasius  
(AD 451) Marcian  
(d. AD 638) Sophronius
  3. To act independently  
(ca. AD 390) Chrysostom  
(5th cent. AD) Ammonius Alexandrius  
(6th cent. AD) PLond 1708
  - 3a. To assume authority over  
(ca. AD 390) Chrysostom  
(6th–7th cent. AD) BGU 103  
(9th cent. AD) Photius
  - 3b. To exercise one's own jurisdiction  
(2nd cent. AD) Moeris  
(AD 450) Olympiodorus  
(9th cent. AD) Photius  
(13th–14th cent. AD) Thomas Magister
  - 3c. To flout the authority of  
(ca. AD 690) John Malalas  
(10th cent. AD) Constantine VII
  4. To be primarily responsible for, to do, or to instigate  
(ca. 1st cent. BC–1st cent. AD) Aristonicus  
(ca. AD 325) Eusebius  
(AD 449) Leo I  
(10th cent. AD) Scholia on Homer

## Conclusions

The four definitions (with seven subsets) for αὐθεντέω stand on firm ground. Further investigations will, no doubt, provide additional insights,

but both the broad contours of meaning as well as the key details can be said to be understood with a high degree of clarity.<sup>51</sup>

With respect to αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12 and the meanings identified in table 2.2, it may be concluded:

1. The root meaning involves the concept of authority.
2. The context of 1 Timothy 2 appears to make meaning 1, “to rule, to reign sovereignly,” impermissible.
3. Meanings 2 or 2a, “to control, to dominate” or “to compel, to influence someone/something,” are entirely possible.
4. Meaning 2c, “to play the tyrant,” could only correspond to Chrysostom’s unique usage if the context could be shown to intend the same clear use of hyperbole, and the context does not seem to do that. Of the possible choices, this would definitely be the *least* probable.<sup>52</sup>
5. Noting that αὐθεντεῖν in 1 Timothy 2:12 is transitive, a translation of “assume authority over” (i.e., meaning 3a) could be appropriate, while 3 or 3b, which are intransitive, are not possible. If a negative meaning were intended, meaning 3c, “to flout the authority of,” could be possible, yet we have seen this meaning appears only well after the New Testament period.
6. It is difficult to imagine how meaning 2d, “to grant authorization,” or meaning 4, “to instigate,” could make sense in 1 Timothy.
7. Further syntactical/contextual studies of 1 Timothy (see chap. 3 below) are required to decide with certainty among meanings 2, 2a, 3a, and 3c.

We have come a long way in our understanding of the meaning of αὐθεντέω as it was used by speakers of Koine Greek. We have even been able to narrow the range of meanings that might be appropriate in 1 Timothy 2:12. But before we can enter into the trial-and-error process of identifying the meaning of αὐθεντέω in that verse (which we will do in chapter 4), we must examine the sentence structure of 1 Timothy 2:12 in the next chapter.

3051, 3080–81), “a most illustrious man,” prominent building donor, and city councilor (Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 2.23); Hadrianus of Tyre, “the sophist” (*IvE* 1539); P. Hordeonius Lollianus (*IvE* 20), the sophist who “was the first to be appointed to the chair of rhetoric at Athens” (Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 1.23), whose daughter was a priestess of Artemis (*IvE* 984); Ofellius Laetus, a Platonic philosopher (*IvE* 3901); (?) ius Secundinus of Tralles, “the Platonic philosopher” (*IvE* 4340); L. Vevius Severus, “the teacher” (*IvE* 611); Soterus of Athens, known by his disciples as the “chief sophist” (*IvE* 1548), but as a mere “plaything of the Greeks” in Philostratus’s opinion (Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 2.23). Note that the list of μαθηταί of Soterus are all males (*IvE* 1548). See Neue Inschriften VIII, 149–50, for an inscribed philosophical diatribe originating from an Ephesian school; *ibid.*, 136–40, discusses sophists’ tax exemptions. Cf. G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), and Broughton, RAM, 853–55.

All doctors named on Ephesian stones are male; for instance, Tib. Claudius Demostratus Caelianus, *asiarch*, *grammateus*, *prytanis*, and priest of Asclepius (*IvE* 278, 643, 719, et al.); cf. *IvE* 1162, 2304, and 4101A; and Broughton, RAM, 851–53.

137. Obviously, the feminist Ephesus construct falters again at this point.

138. See H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (1956; repr., New York: New American Library, 1964), 76. Contrast, for example, Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 97n66.

139. “The private house seems to have been the most popular place for philosophers and sophists to hold their classes” (Stanley Stowers, “Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul’s Preaching Activity,” *Novum Testamentum* 26 [1984]: 66). A wall painting of Socrates in a first-century Ephesian home may mark the house as a lecture salon. The mural appears on the cover of a Penguin volume of Plato (*Early Socratic Dialogues*, ed. T. Saunders [Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1987]). There was also an “auditorium” at Ephesus for public lectures (*IvE* 3009); cf. C. J. Hemer, “Audeitorium,” *TynBul* 24 (1973): 128. For the “school of Tyrannus” of Acts 19:9, see Baugh, “Paul and Ephesus,” 120–25.

140. See William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 252; cf. Susan Guettel Cole, “Could Greek Women Read and Write?” in *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. H. Foley (New York: Gordon & Breach Science, 1981), 219–45.

141. For example, Telesilla of Argos (Plutarch, *Mor.* 245C–F); cf. women poets in Lefkowitz and Fant, *Women’s Life*, 4–10. Samuel Dill’s classic work is still helpful for Roman women here: *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (London: Macmillan, 1905), 79–80.

142. We possess the thanksgiving dedication from the girl-*prytanis* Aurelia Juliane (*IvE* 1066; see above), though we can only suppose that it was actually written by her. It is not particularly inspired and follows standard lines. We also have two dedicatory prayers of the *prytanis* Tullia (see below), which are metrical with distinctly poetic vocabulary (*IvE* 1063–64). See Dill (*Roman Society*, 80) for a reference to “Balbilla, a friend of the wife of Hadrian,” who wrote Greek verses on the Colossus of Memnon. This is Julia Balbilla, the Ephesian (?) granddaughter of Tib. Claudius Balbillus, an Ephesian who served as prefect of Egypt and was probably Nero’s court astrologer (Suetonius, *Nero* 36; *IvE* 3041–42), founding the Balbilleia games at Ephesus; cf. PWSup 5:59–60.

143. In light of Acts 19:19, these *litterae* may have included works on magic and spells.

144. See J. J. Pollitt in *The Oxford History of Classical Art*, ed. J. Boardman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 247, no. 242. See photos no. 89, 92, 94–95, 116A, 126, 130, 132, et al. for Greek women shown on coins, vases, and statuary, and plate xxii, no. 325A, for a gold hair ornament with sapphires and pearls from a later period. Cf. “Haartracht. Haarschmuck,” *Kl. Pauly*.

145. For example, a portrait of Livia (with a somewhat elaborate hairstyle) was found in a private dwelling in Ephesus; see Maria Aurenhammer, “Römische Porträts aus Ephesos: Neue Funde aus dem Hanghaus 2,” *JÖAI* 54 (1983): Beiblatt, 105–12 (photos 1–3). See also Jale Inan and Elisabeth Rosenbaum, *Roman and Early Byzantine Portrait Sculpture in Asia Minor* (London: British Academy, 1966) for Asian portraits of Livia (plate VII), Octavia (plate VIII—very elaborate coiffure), and Agrippina the elder and the younger (plates XI–XII).

146. For instance, the portrait of an Ephesian woman mirrors the hairstyle of Octavia and Livia (cf. Inan and Rosenbaum, *Roman and Early Byzantine Portrait Sculpture*, plate LXXXI, no. 140, and plates VII–VIII, nos. 11–12, and the remarks on p. 123). See plate LXIV, no. 109, for another provincial woman with the same style.

147. For men, Paul’s equivalent exhortation was to avoid obsession with “body-sculpting” in gymnasia in place of piety (1 Tim. 4:8).

148. “Elaborate hairdressing and makeup were part of the self-presentation for the better-class whores” (i.e., “loose-living society ladies” as described by Juvenal [*Satire* 6]) (Gardner, *Women in Roman Law*, 251).

149. Cf. D. W. J. Gill, “Corinth: A Roman Colony in Achaea,” *BZ* 37 (1993): 259–64.

150. Sharon Hodgkin Gritz, “The Role of Women in the Church,” in *The People of God: Essays on the Believers’ Church*, ed. P. Basden and D. S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman, 1991), 308.

151. See, for example, the varied and challenging responsibilities outlined for a fourteen-year-old Greek bride (Xenophon, *Oeconomicus*, book 7). See also the many areas of expertise of the homemaker in Prov. 31.

152. Laura Ingalls Wilder, *The Long Winter* (1940; repr., New York: HarperCollins, 1971), 4; emphasis added.

153. See esp. David Cohen, “Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens,” *G&R* 36 (1989): 3–15.

154. Gerd Theissen’s seminal conclusions on the varied social strata represented in the Corinthian church can be maintained for Ephesus also. This was one of the main conclusions of my “Paul and Ephesus” (e.g., p. 202). See Theissen, “Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde,” *ZNW* 65 (1974): 232–72; translated as “Social Stratification in the Corinthian Community,” in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 69–119. Cf. Alan Padgett, “Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Timothy 2:8–15 in Social Context,” *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 19–31 (although I cannot agree with his exegesis of the target passage).

155. The “slope house” (*Hanghaus*) complex of Ephesus is a distinctly rich archaeological find. Originating in the first century AD, the connected, multistoried private dwellings measure as much as 3,000 square feet each, and contain rich frescoes and other works of art, peristyle courtyards, and indoor plumbing. Cf. Elliger, *Ephesos*, 71–78.

156. Was the tomb inherited or the office of *kosmeteira*?

157. From book 4 of Joannes Stobaeus’s anthology, accessed through the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* of University of California, Irvine.

## Chapter 2: An Important Word

1. Al Wolters, “A Semantic Study of Αὐθεντής and Its Derivatives,” *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 1 (2000): 145–75.

2. David Huttar, “ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΙΝ in the Aeschylus Scholium,” *JETS* 44 (2001): 615–25.

3. It is indeed discouraging that, after the scholarly advances in our knowledge during the last decade, apparently well-intentioned and certainly well-trained scholars such as Richard Kroeger and Catherine Kroeger still cling to incongruous and unsupported definitions of αὐθεντέω. For a recent example, see Richard Kroeger and Catherine Kroeger,

"Unit 6: Now for the Hard One," in *Women Elders: Called by God?* Online at <http://firstpresby.org/womenelders.htm#Unit6> (accessed March 1, 2005). Somewhat earlier, L. L. Belleville evidenced no knowledge of the gains in our understanding that have been achieved subsequent to works thoroughly critiqued in the first edition of this article. See *Women Leaders and the Church: 3 Crucial Questions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000) and the nearly identical arguments in James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg, eds., *Two Views on Women in the Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 120-30.

4. C. C. Kroeger, "Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb," *Reformed Journal* 29 (1979): 12-15.

5. Carroll Osburn, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (1 Timothy 2:12)," *Restoration Quarterly* 25 (1982): 1-12. See also A. J. Panning, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΙΝ—A Word Study," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78 (1981): 185-91, who also takes issue with Kroeger's *Reformed Journal* article.

6. G. W. Knight III, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12," *NTS* 30 (1984): 143-57.

7. L. E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1 Timothy 2.12," *NTS* 34 (1988): 120-34.

8. *Ibid.*, 131.

9. His whole series of questions about 1 Timothy 2, ending with the question "Does not the extended passage in 1 Timothy argue that the concept of 'authority' is under consideration?" gives evidence of this. See *ibid.*, 130-31.

10. L. E. Wilshire, "1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited: A Reply to Paul W. Barnett and Timothy J. Harris," *EQ* 65 (1993): 53.

11. 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, 1992), 84-104, 185-88.

12. The specialist is directed to appendix 2 of the first edition of this volume for a complete citation of each instance in Greek along with translations.

13. The reverse side was also acknowledged by Saussure: While any individual speaker has his or her immediate and intended use of the language, there is an overall pattern of how language is used in sum or aggregate. The personal use of language Saussure calls *la parole* and the widespread pattern he titles *la langue*. *La langue* must exist or no one could ever communicate with another and society would lapse into linguistic solipsism. One *can* talk about what "English speakers" say, not merely what "an English speaker" says.

14. Rudolf Carnap, *The Logical Syntax of Language* (London: Kegan, 1937), 2.

15. "The combinative aspect of speech is, of course, of capital importance, for it implies that speech is constituted by the recurrence of identical signs: it is because the signs are repeated in successive discourses [with different speakers] and within one and the same discourse (although they are combined in accordance with the diversity of various people's speech) that each sign becomes an element of the language; and it is because speech is essentially a combinative activity that it corresponds to an individual act and not to pure creation." See Roland Barthes, *Elements of Semiology*, trans. A. Lavers and C. Smith (New York: Hill & Wang, 1968), 15.

16. The same must be said where a word appears in different places with distinct meanings. If one well-attested meaning is seemingly appropriate to the context under investigation, and the other rare meaning(s) strange or bizarre, the entire burden of proof is on the exegete to show why the apparently appropriate meaning should not be adopted.

17. Compare λογίζομαι/λόγος, δύναμαι/δύναμις, παρακαλέω/παρακλητος, επιστατέω/ἐπιστάτης, δεσποτέω/δεσπότης.

18. By ignoring this important caveat, Belleville is not the first exegete to get stuck in a lexical quagmire. After attempting to synthesize the meanings of the noun, the adjective, and the verb found in the Greek Bible, she can only pessimistically agree with Philip

Payne that "it is precarious to deny women anything on the basis of the uncertain meaning of a verb that occurs nowhere else in the Bible. It is even more precarious to assume the meaning is 'to have authority over'" (*Women Leaders*, 175). Eventually, she concludes with "suggestions" as to what the verb might mean, even asserting that "to instigate violence" is the "most widely found meaning of this word group" (*ibid.*, 176). In fact, not a single case can be found of the *verb* ever meaning this. A careful review of the separate histories of the cognate nouns, adjective, and verb will provide adequate clarification. The excellent chart of Wolters ("Semantic Study," 171) will remove the doubts of all but the most ardent skeptics.

19. Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth century AD) noted in his lexicon:

αὐθεντεῖν ἐξουσιάζειν

αὐθέντης ἐξουσιαστής. αὐτόχειρ, φονεὺς

Or, to render this into English,

αὐθεντεῖν = to exercise authority

αὐθέντης = person in authority, doer of a thing, murderer

Hesychius is only known to us in a fifteenth-century AD manuscript, and the work is known to have suffered redaction in many places. Therefore, it is not useful as a primary resource for our purposes. However, it at least corroborates the important distinction between verb and noun that I have attempted to underscore here. See entries A8259-60 of *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. 1, ed. Kurt Latte (Hauniae, Den.: Munksgaard, 1953), 279.

20. The Greek corpus includes at a minimum some 60 million words of text (*The-saurus Linguae Graecae Newsletter* 20 [May 1992]: 3) when the known edited papyri are included. The verb αὐθεντέω appears about 110 times, including its use in various citations of 1 Tim. 2.

21. Compare the number of citations found in other lexicographers: Lampe (30), BDAG (14+), Sophocles (11), and LSJ (4), including citations of 1 Tim. 2:12.

22. See, for example, Belleville, who argues that because Paul did not use the more frequent word ἐξουσιάζειν, there must be some esoteric meaning for αὐθεντεῖν unique to the Ephesian situation (*Women Leaders*, 175). This is surely belied by the use of αὐθεντεῖν in BGU 1208, which is an ordinary, private correspondence from one brother to another about "happenings down on the farm" dated to 27 BC. It was certainly written by a literate individual, but it could hardly be a more mundane, ordinary piece from among the papyri of Egypt. It uses our verb with the sense "I used my authority to insist he do what was right and just to do."

23. I have made two exceptions to this. Among the church fathers, we find direct quotation of 1 Tim. 2:12 appearing more than twenty times. Obviously, such quotation offers little lexical help in understanding the meaning of αὐθεντέω and therefore has not been considered. There are also ten uses of the verbal αὐθεντέω in four separate recensions of the *Alexander Romance*. While this "history" of Alexander the Great is believed to have been written by a certain Pseudo-Callisthenes around AD 300, it is not at all clear to what century we should date the texts at hand. Michael Grant (*Greek and Latin Authors* [New York: Wilson, 1980], 81) asserts that the "work is only available in editions of the later Roman Empire." But the citations in question are Middle Greek and appear to come from the late Byzantine MSS mentioned by A. P. Kazhdan, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 58. Thus, they lie beyond the period of consideration for this study.

24. At the same time, we note that there is a practical limitation to our approach. Because of the relatively smaller number of references to the verb αὐθεντέω in Greek

literature, at one or two smaller points our results do lack the level of clarity we would desire. Hence, other approaches with a greater reliance on word origins and the history of its usage have proved useful in providing further insights. A comparison with the history of the cognate nouns can offer explanation for the occasional wayward datum that appears to fall outside the clear and predictable boundaries. The results of the best of such studies are included in forming our conclusions in this second edition.

25. This is an increase of three from the previous edition. I am indebted to Wolters ("Semantic Study," 157) for identifying that not only is there a use of αὐθεντέω in the tenth-century *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, which I cited, but the origin of that scholium is from the first-century BC to first-century AD writer Aristonicus Alexandrinus, *De signis Iliadis*, 9.694. Thus, this latter citation provides an attestation of my meaning number 4 in table 2.2 much nearer to the time of the New Testament than I had recognized. A second addition, also found by Wolters (*ibid.*, 159) is from A. S. Hunt and E. J. Goodspeed, *The Tebtunis Papyri: Part 2* (London: Frowde, 1907), P.Tebt. 276.28, found on page 31. If the textual reconstruction is correct, it is an instance of the future tense of αὐθεντέω with the meaning "will rule." The third addition is a scholium that Huttar believes to be the origin of a subsequent late-Byzantine scholium. (This late-Byzantine scholium is cited in my first edition with the meaning "murder." It is found in this form in Manuscript T [Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, cod. II.F.31<sup>7</sup>], dated to around AD 1325.) The earlier scholium is now included as an independent occurrence (number 85). According to Huttar ("AYΘENTEIN," 624), this participial usage of αὐθεντέω has the sense "the one having just initiated this thing," my meaning number 4, below. The text in which this additional instance occurs is found in the Medicean Manuscript in Florence (Florence, R. Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, cod. 32, 9), dated to around AD 1000, which contains Aeschylus's play *Eumenides*. The scholium is upon the word στάζοντα at line 42.

26. This material was originally gathered by computer searches of two CD-ROMs: (1) *Greek Documentary* (CD-ROM 6) and (2) *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (CD-ROM D). The first-named resource includes documentary papyri (as well as ostraca) prepared by Duke University, with the help of the University of Michigan, and Greek inscriptions prepared at Cornell University, Ohio State University, and the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton, NJ). CD-ROM 6 contains more than 130 editions of papyri, including major collections such as BGU, POxy, PLond, PFamTebt, etc. The *Greek Documentary* CD-ROM is published by the Packard Humanities Institute, Los Altos, CA. The second-named resource, CD-ROM D of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, was prepared by the University of California, Irvine. The current edition of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, CD-ROM E, can be searched using any Pentium PC and a wide range of software, including the *TLG Workplace 9.0* from Silver Mountain Software (info@silvermnt.com). Searches were conducted to find all occurrences of αὐθεντέω (αὐθεντ-, ἡυθεντ-). The results of these searches were then collated with the results of manual searches of published lexicographers, ancient and modern, including those listed in table 2.1.

27. In the first edition of this chapter, I proposed a fifth meaning for αὐθεντεῖν, that is, "to murder," based on a single datum found in a reputed ninth-century AD scholium at line 40 of the play *Eumenides* by Aeschylus (see note 25, above). I found this datum odd since it fell completely outside the trajectory of the other eighty-one instances of the verb. Yet, having no better way to evaluate it at the time, I included it as a separate meaning. I am deeply indebted to David Huttar and his insightful article, "AYΘENTEIN," for bringing scholarly light to bear on the matter. Actually, the supposed meaning "murder" is attested in a form of the scholium found in two MSS. It is, according to Huttar, even much later than I had believed—probably as late as the fourteenth century AD—and its meaning "murder" is most likely due to a *misunderstanding* of the text

and late etymologizing of the scholiast that "created" this meaning for the verb. In his independent analysis, Wolters comes to a similar conclusion about the origins of this supposed meaning: "It is best to take this unusual usage to be an Atticistic hypercorrection on the part of a Byzantine scholar" ("Semantic Study," 169). According to Huttar, the other form of the scholium is much earlier, perhaps ultimately finding its origins in the first or second century AD. He sees no reason why the meaning there should not be the same as my number 4 above. I believe Huttar has convincingly shown that the meaning "to murder" does not exist for the verb. This judgment is further supported on etymological grounds following on Wolters's conclusion: "By the first century AD, αὐθέντης in the living language meant 'master,' and the meaning 'murderer' was largely forgotten"; and "the cognates of αὐθέντης . . . are all based on αὐθέντης in the meaning 'master'" ("Semantic Study," 153).

28. This should not be confused with "domineer." The distinction between "domineer" and "dominate" becomes an important one in the exegesis of 1 Timothy 2. Therefore, the two terms should not be taken as interchangeable. For "to dominate," a transitive verb, *The Compact Oxford Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), ad loc., gives the meaning as "to bear rule over, to have a commanding influence on, to master." In the context of some human relationships, this could have a negative connotation, but it is not intrinsically so. In contrast, "domineer" is defined as an intransitive verb meaning "to rule or govern arbitrarily or despotically . . . to exercise authority in an overbearing manner." Therefore, dominate and domineer are not synonyms unless it is shown that the domination is considered improper. Belleville appears to have fallen prey to this confusion and in all cases has certainly confused the noun for the verb when she says, "Second-century astronomers [*sic*] talk about the 'dominance' of Saturn over Mercury and the moon" (*Women Leaders*, 175). The reference is to Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* 3.13. In fact, Ptolemy uses the verb at this point. F. E. Robbins in the Loeb Classical Library series translates the fuller passage this way (italics added to indicate the verb): "If Saturn alone is ruler of the soul and *dominates* Mercury and the moon, if he has a dignified position with reference to the universe and angels, he makes his subjects lovers of the body." Robbins clearly does not mean anything pejorative like "domineer" here. For confirmation, see E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (New York: Scribner's, 1887), 276, who lists this same instance under the meaning "be in power over, to have authority over."

29. The *Lexicon* of Hesychius agrees with this assessment. Under the entry for ἡγεῖτο, the imperfect of ἡγεομαι (I lead), Hesychius defines this with "ἡυθενται, ἡρχεν," from αὐθεντέω and ἄρχω, respectively. See Hesychius, entry H49.

30. Origen (died ca. AD 253), in what may be the earliest extant commentary on 1 Tim. 2:12, cites the verse and then appears to go on to define αὐθεντεῖν with the words ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ [τοῦ ἀνδρός], "be a ruler [over a man] in speaking." See p. 42 of the text quoted in C. Jenkins, "Documents: Origen on I Corinthians," *Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1909): 29–51.

31. Parker's choice of "despot" illustrates a closely related phenomenon in English: "despot" denotes "sole ruler." Through repeated hyperbole it has come to connote something like "tyrant." Therefore, I do find it somewhat disappointing that I. H. Marshall and P. H. Towner, in their otherwise magisterial and lucid commentary (*The Pastoral Epistles*, International Critical Commentary [Edinburgh: Clark, 1999], 454–71), do not seem to have fully appreciated my point here—though I must confess that in the first edition I did not make my case as clearly as it should have been made. As noted under meaning 2a, "to compel, to influence," when Chrysostom seeks to use the word αὐθεντέω in a pejorative sense in his *Sermons in Genesis*, he finds it necessary to add the

word “wrongly.” Thus, when we turn to Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Colossians* (the sole supporting datum for meaning 2c), we are on firm ground in assuming he is using the word there *hyperbolically*, to mean “play the tyrant.” And as we noted above, hyperbole is an exaggerated use of language, beyond its normal meaning, for rhetorical effect. We further note that the passage from *Homilies on Colossians* is found in a highly rhetorical context. Therefore, the burden of proof is squarely on the exegete if he or she wishes to claim meaning 2c at 1 Tim. 2:12, for this would be precisely *contrary* to normal usage. I fear Marshall and Towner have not successfully borne the burden of that proof for a number of reasons:

(1) In their analysis of ἀυθεντέω in 1 Tim. 2:12, after acknowledging that the definitions I presented in the first edition of this chapter were “broadly convincing” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 456), they go on to build their exegesis on what is a priori the *least* probable definition for the word, claiming the word has “the nuance of exercising autocratic power which is present in several examples. This meaning fits best into the context, which is characterized by argumentation and dogmatic intimidation” (ibid., 458). But is this so? The character and texture of Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Colossians* is compassionate and tender, and particularly in the section concerned, it is aimed to tug on the emotional heart strings of his hearers. About Chrysostom and these transcripts of his oral preaching, John A. Broadus writes, “You very soon find he is profoundly in earnest, and all alive. Christianity is with him a living reality. . . . We may discern what seem to us grave errors of doctrinal opinion, but we feel the quickening pulses of genuine Christian love and zeal. And how he fully sympathizes with his hearers! He thoroughly knows them, ardently loves them, has a like temperament, shares not a little in the faults of his age and race, as must always be the case with a truly inspiring orator or poet. Even when severely rebuking, when blazing with indignation, he never seems alien, never stands aloof, but throws himself among them, in a very transport of desire to check, and rescue, and save” (“Saint Chrysostom as a Homilist,” in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, 1st series [repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979], 13:v–vii). Is 1 Timothy cast in the same rhetorical mold as these works of Chrysostom? It does not seem so. Rather, what we have throughout all of 1 Tim. 2 seems to be far more dispassionate in tone. In 1 Tim. 2, what we find structurally is a command followed by the theological basis for that command. Marshall and Towner themselves superbly show how the instruction for prayer in 1 Tim. 2:1 (with its digression in v. 2) is predicated on the character of God the Savior, who desires all to be saved (vv. 3ff). The analogous structure exists in vv. 11 and 12, where commands are predicated on the theological principles of vv. 13 and 14. There is no shift in tone from the well-reasoned, almost dispassionate arguments of vv. 1–7 to rhetorical passion or “dogmatic intimidation” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 458) in vv. 8–15.

(2) Noting that for both George W. Knight III and me “the essential motif that unites the various uses of the verb is the exercise of authority” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 456), Marshall and Towner go on to controvert that position: “The conclusion that this is the basic meaning or normal sense has rightly been questioned” (ibid., 457). After the recent work by Wolters, Huttar, and this second edition, it is hard to imagine how such skepticism will be tenable in the future. First, each of the questioners cited (ibid.) was addressing Knight’s older work, not mine, for they were all prior to the first complete study of the verb ever undertaken, that is, this essay in the first edition of this work. Second, it is difficult to see how any impartial reader of the data of appendix 2 of the first edition would conclude, after reading the eighty-two extant usages from the ancient world found there, that the “purely neutral sense” is not the basic and normal sense of the word ἀυθεντέω. The most basic sense is the positive exercise of authority. There are two denotations that are “morally negative,” the hyperbolic 2c (“to play the tyrant”

[intransitive]), which appears once, and 3c (“to flout the authority of” [transitive]), which appears three times. Definition 3b (“to exercise one’s own jurisdiction”), while appearing about five times in contexts that are negative, is not of itself negative, for in the other eight instances or so the meaning must be positive or is “neutral.” (That a word with a positive definition can be used in a negative context without acquiring a negative definition is discussed below.) Eighty-one of eighty-five known examples would appear to be adequate to prove the point: “exercise authority” is the basic sense of the word.

(3) Marshall and Towner argue that “so unusual a word (only four instances before the Christian era) [actually, only three instances, as Wolters (“Semantic Study,” 171) and I would reckon it] is used here is surely significant” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 458), and they believe that this fact therefore lends additional credence to finding a negative meaning in 1 Tim. 2. This argument can be made to stand on its head. As Wolters observes, “Although it is possible to identify isolated cases of the pejorative use of both ἀυθεντέω and ἀυθεντία, these are not found before the fourth century AD” (“Semantic Study,” 171). Further, if one wishes to cite BGU 1208 as controversion to this, the discussion of this passage offered below (see note 50) and the verdict both of Wolters (“Semantic Study,” 157) and the LSJ lexicon about the passage appear to be sufficient to call for, at the minimum, a judgment of “undecided.” All current evidence suggests that negative denotations with regard to authority arise after the New Testament era.

(4) It seems infelicitous to state, as Marshall and Towner do, that “the verb characterizes the nature of the teaching rather than the role of the women in church leadership in general” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 460). From a lexical standpoint, this appears to be untenable. Not a single example can be evidenced from anywhere that ἀυθεντέω is ever used of anything other than the exercise of authority (whether rightly or, in a few cases, wrongly), certainly not of teaching. Further, if indeed the exegete feels compelled by the case at hand to find that a negative denotation is required in 1 Tim. 2:12 (which, we argue, the grammar would not allow—see chapter 3 of this volume), then the only transitive option would be “flout the authority of men.” This in turn would yield a meaning such as “Let a woman learn in silence, in all submissiveness. I do not allow a woman to teach a man or to flout the authority of a man.” It does not seem that this would be vastly different from the traditional interpretation, when all entailments are considered.

(5) A final consideration involving context, rather than lexical matters, should be noted. Marshall and Towner state, “In the context the fact that Eve was deceived is cited as a parallel, and this strongly suggests the conclusion that behind the present prohibition lies some particular false teaching by some women” (*Pastoral Epistles*, 458). With due respect, this borders on being an error of fact. The prohibition is paralleled *most nearly* by a positive parallel, “for Adam was formed first.” This is clearly a pre-fall event and therefore a sinless and positive thing in Paul’s reckoning. Secondly, and more remotely, the prohibition is paralleled with Eve’s deception. This is not just an oversight on the part of Marshall and Towner, for this same lapse is seen in the introduction to the section containing vv. 8–15 (ibid., 437).

32. This investigation employs many sources from the church of the early centuries AD, where the concept of “independence” is one that would not have found wholehearted acceptance. Submission to authority, not independence, was one of the driving values of the early church. So several of the examples given are in a context where the author undoubtedly intends the context to have negative connotations.

33. Hesychius provides a confirming note here in his definition of αὐτοδικεῖ (see entry A8049). He says, αὐτοδικεῖ = ἀυθεντέι ὅταν αὐτός λέγῃ. That is, “he has independent jurisdiction = ἀυθεντέι, when he speaks himself/on his own authority.”

34. Victor Antiochenus, *Catenae in Evangelia S. Matthaei et S. Marci ad fidem Codd. MSS.*, vol. 1 of *Catenae Graecorum Patrium in Novum Testamentum*, ed. J. A. Cramer (Oxford, 1840; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1967), 292–329.

35. Wolters, "Semantic Study," 160. Wolters (*ibid.*, 157n69) was correct in questioning my translation of the Scholia Vetera on Homer's *Iliad*. There, under this meaning, I translated the present participle "the one originating [the writing]." This is clearly confusing and should be rendered, as he does, "the one doing [(as Huttar has it) the speech]."

36. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, in F. Winkelman, ed., *Eusebius Werke*, Band 1.1: *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975), 2.48.1.8. Though Lampe has this listed under "instigate; authorize," it is not clear from the context if God is the one simply "doing" judgment or "instigating" it.

37. As explained above (note 25), the same scholium is found in two locations: Aristonicus Alexandrinus, *De signis Iliadis*, in *Aristonici περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquae emendatiores*, ed. L. Friedländer (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1853), 9.694; and H. Erbse, ed., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971), book 10, entry 694.

38. Pope Leo I, *Epistle 30* (To Pulcheria), 54.788A.

39. Nicolao (Sebatian) Coleti, ed. *Sacrosancta Concilia ad Regium additionem exacta*, vol. 8 (Venice, 1728–33), 721D.

40. In these texts, "doing" and "instigating" are clearly distinguished. In both cases the reference is to "not instigating" sin. The ones "not instigating" still did sin, and ecclesial action may be taken, but judgment of a different kind is required because those who sinned were swept along with the crowd and were not the ringleaders.

41. A. Adler, ed., *Svidae Lexicon*, part 1 (repr., Stuttgart: Tübingen, 1971), A4426.

42. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, chap. 9.

43. See BDAG, ad loc.

44. A similar parallel of προϊστημι and αὐθεντέω is found in Hesychius at the entry for αὐτάντας. There we read ὁ προστάς τινος πράγματος, καὶ αὐθεντῶν, "the one who is in charge and in command of some matter." See entry A8367.

45. See note 27.

46. Huttar, "AYΘENTEIN," 625.

47. This is what we will go on to argue is the case in 1 Tim. 2:12. The meaning "to exercise authority over, to control" is not negative, but the whole phrase "a woman to exercise authority over a man" is seen as something undesirable by Paul.

48. The present tense of θεραπεύω recalls the content of the Pharisees' direct speech. Maximilian Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 4th ed. (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1996), 194.

49. Perhaps a more apt English analog to αὐθεντέω would be the word "beat," which has both positive and negative denotations. But surely it would be a mistake to take a context such as "the father beat his son at basketball before an audience of the boy's peers" as warrant for a denotation for "beat" such as "to humiliate in sporting competition." The caution required in separating transferable meaning from the context is the flip side of D. A. Carson's "illegitimate totality transfer." See D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 60–61.

50. This important point is emphasized by Wolters ("Semantic Study," 170–71). Belleville's assertion that "the one meaning that does not seem to be in evidence during this period is the simple exercise of authority" is highly problematic (Belleville, *Women Leaders*, 175). Apart from the uncertainty of what is meant by "simple exercise of authority," the translations of the texts she cites are quite unsatisfactory. The actual texts in which the verb appears are these: Philodemus (first century BC), BGU 1208 (27 BC), and Aristonicus (ca. first century BC–first century AD). The texts and translational is-

Source	Text	Translation
Philodemus, <i>Rhetorica</i> , 133.14 <sup>a</sup>	Ἀλλὰ εἰ δεῖ ταλινθὴ καὶ γινόμενα λέγειν, οἱ ῥήτορες καὶ μεγάλα βλάπτουσι πολλοὺς καὶ μεγάλους καὶ περὶ τῶν "δεινοῖς ἔρωσι τοῖς ἐξουσιάζουσιν" πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιθανέστατους ἐκάστοτε διαμάχονται καὶ "σὺν αὐθεντοῦσιν ἀν[αξί]ν" ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁμοίων ὡσάντως. <sup>b</sup>	To tell the truth the rhetors do a great deal of harm to many people, and incur the enmity of powerful rulers, whereas philosophers gain the friendship of public men by helping them out of their trouble. Ought we not to consider that men who incur the enmity of the ones in authority are villains, and hated by both gods and men? <sup>c</sup>
BGU 1208, line 38 <sup>d</sup>	καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐθεντηκότος πρὸς αὐτὸν περιποιησά Καλατύτι τῷ ναυτικῷ ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ φόρῳ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπεχώρησεν. τὴν δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξηκολουθηκῶν ὕβριν μεταπειμῆθεις ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ὁ [Καλατύτις] ἐξηγίσατό μοι ἄκεραῖως. <sup>f</sup>	And when I compelled him [prob. Antiochus] to lay by funds for Calatytis the boatman upon the same payment at that time, he acquiesced. But Calatytis, when he was summoned by me, showed to me pure hubris which followed after these things. <sup>g</sup>
Aristonicus Alexandrinus, <i>De signis Iliadis</i> , 9.694	ὅτι ἐκ ἄλλων τόπων ἐστὶν ὁ στίχος· νῦν γὰρ οὕς ἀρμόζει· τότε γὰρ εἰώθεν ἐπιφωνεῖσθαι, ὅταν ὁ αὐθεντῶν τοῦ λόγου καταπληκτικὰ τινα προενέγκηται. <sup>h</sup>	This line is from another place. For now it does not fit properly. For then it was wont to be mentioned when the one doing the speech had set forth something astounding. <sup>i</sup>

a. This text is taken from a serious treatise in seven books concerning the nature and effect of rhetoric. This particular section of Philodemus deals with the negative effects of rhetors and their rhetoric. The use of our verb (participle) here is clearly positive, "those exercising authority" (i.e., people in proper leadership positions). Though the text is the reconstruction of Sudhaus, C. J. Vooy (Lexicon Philodemum, Pars Prior [Purmerend, Neth.: Muusses, 1934], 53) accepts Sudhaus's reconstruction and gives the Latin equivalent for our Greek verb as *dominor*, "to be lord and master." Similarly, DGE lists this passage with the meaning "ejercer la autoridad" (= "exercise authority over").

b. S. Sudhaus, ed., *Philodemi: Volumina Rhetorica*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1896), 133.

c. H. H. Hubbell, "The Rhetorica of Philodemus," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 23 (1920): 306.

d. This is a letter from a certain Tryphon, a farmer/landowner along the Nile, to his brother. In the letter Tryphon acknowledges receipt of a letter from his brother in which his brother inquired about the "deceit" of a certain Calatytis, who we find out later is a sailor/boatman. Tryphon's response to this deceit was to appeal to the magistrate, presumably against Calatytis. There is some discussion of contracts, then line 29 says the worst

"the contract [presumably, for the transportation] for the sheep." The key element of our interest is the perfect genitive participle of αὐθεντέω. As an adverbial participle, it should be "when I had exercised authority" (over), but it is granted that this is the sole known instance of πρὸς following αὐθεντέω. It may well be that "compel" is too strong here. Tryphon is simply ordering somebody to make payment to the boatman—a legitimate act of his authority as landowner—and for his trouble this Calatytis fellow gave him a hard time, cheating him in some way. This necessitated recourse to the magistrate. It is important to note that in previous translations of this passage Tryphon's actions were seen as compelling an unwilling boatman to do something. It is now evident that this is not the case. Tryphon is compelling (i.e., exercising his authority over) someone to make a payment from Tryphon's own funds for services rendered by Calatytis. This payment should have been adequate, but when Calatytis insults and acts scandalously, Tryphon feels justified to seek out the magistrate.

e. I have emended the uncertain text from οὐ to ἐμ here. As given by the editors, it is μεταπειμῆθεις ὑπὸ ὧσιν, which makes little sense.

f. F. Schubart et al., eds., BGU (1912), 4:351.

g. The translation is mine.

h. L. Friedländer, ed., *Aristonici περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquae emendatiores*, 9.694.

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 (ἄλλά + 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 οὐθεντεῖν 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 οὐθεντεῖν or exactly how the ἄλλά 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 ἐπεροδιδοῦσκαλεῖν 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.