## **New Testament Studies**

http://journals.cambridge.org/NTS

Additional services for **New Testament Studies**:

Email alerts: <u>Click here</u>
Subscriptions: <u>Click here</u>
Commercial reprints: <u>Click here</u>
Terms of use: <u>Click here</u>



# AΘenteΩ in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12

George W. Knight

New Testament Studies / Volume 30 / Issue 01 / January 1984, pp 143 - 157 DOI: 10.1017/S0028688500007049, Published online: 05 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract S0028688500007049

#### How to cite this article:

George W. Knight (1984). AΘenteΩ in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12. New Testament Studies, 30, pp 143-157 doi:10.1017/S0028688500007049

**Request Permissions: Click here** 

# AYΘENTEΩ IN REFERENCE TO WOMEN IN 1 TIMOTHY 2.12

At the heart of 1 Timothy 2. 11-14, the passage prohibiting certain activities to women in the life of the church, is the verb  $a\dot{v}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$ . It and  $\delta\iota$ - $\delta\dot{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$  constitute the key terms and the focal point of v. 12. This makes the understanding of this term crucial for the exegete. Two interlocked problems have beset the interpreter. The first was the paucity of occurrences of the term. The second, because of such paucity, was to ascertain its basic meaning and its various nuances.

The first problem is illustrated by the remark in the Grimm-Thayer lexicon which had indicated that this was a 'a bibl, and eccl. word'. The second, that of meaning, is complicated by the fact that the etymology suggested by Thayer and others as 'fr. αὐθέντης contr. fr. αὐτοέντης, and this fr. αὐτός and ἔντεα arms [al. ἔντης . . .]' places the primary emphasis on the related word αὐθέντης as 'acc. to earlier usage, one who with his own hand kills either others or himself' and then only later and in a derived sense as 'one who does a thing himself, the author . . . one who acts on his own authority'. The second and most basic problem, that of meaning, is illustrated by two translations, the K.J. V. and the N.E.B., in the words these translations selected to render  $\alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$  in English. The K.J.V. rendered αὐθεντέω by the words 'usurp authority' which seems to imply that  $a \dot{\theta} e \nu r \dot{e} \omega$  has within its meaning the concept of wrongful assumption of authority rather than the exercise of authority; similarly but in a different way the rendering of the N.E.B. 'domineer' suggests a harsh and negative overtone to the word in contrast to a legitimate and positive exercise of authority.

The discovery, since Thayer's day, of the use of  $\alpha \dot{\nu}\theta \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon}\omega$  in extrabiblical writers both before and during the NT period has clarified the understanding of the term. At the same time another etymological solution has been proposed which removes the word from its association with the above mentioned negative concept of Thayer and which fits in with its usage elsewhere where this negative overtone is not implied. Can the usage elsewhere as well as the contextual considerations of 1 Timothy 2. 12 enable one to decide between the two meanings offered in BAGD, 'have authority' or 'domineer'? Is the concept in view in 1 Timothy 2. 12 that of a negative and overbearing rule, 'domineer', or is it that of a positive and appropriate exercise of authority, 'have authority'? This study will seek to answer that question.

Downloaded: 20 Dec 2012

IP address: 129 67 172 214

#### I. LINGUISTIC DATA

The data now cited in the Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker lexicon<sup>2</sup> show that the word is not 'a bibl. and eccl. word' as Thayer had thought in view of his not having this evidence. With this data now available, it will be helpful to review and analyze this evidence so that the exegete may know the usage of the documents cited and the basis for the lexicographer's judgment. The data will be presented by giving first a portion of the text within which the term is found, then a translation by someone other than the present writer,<sup>3</sup> if available, and, finally, then the evaluation of a lexicographer if available. If no English translation is known to be available, none will be given, so that the linguistic evidence provided by a translator or lexicographer will always be that of someone other than the author of this article. This will help ensure impartiality and objectivity.

The first occurrence that we shall consider in the list of BAGD is that found in a 'scholarly note', Scholia Vetera on Aeschylus' Eumenides 42a:  $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\zeta} \sigma \nu \tau a$ ]  $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi a \nu \tau \nu \kappa \dot{\omega} \varsigma < \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} > \tau o \dot{\nu} \tau \sigma \upsilon < \tau \dot{\sigma} \upsilon > \nu \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau \iota$   $\eta \dot{\upsilon} \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \tau \kappa \dot{\sigma} \tau a$  is given as a variant]  $\pi a \rho \dot{\iota} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \upsilon$ , M.<sup>4</sup> This occurrence is earliest in terms of the document on which the notes are based (V BC<sup>5</sup>), but not in terms of the notes themselves. 'The extant scholia (or, rather, sets of scholia) on . . . Aeschylus . . . are all indebted ultimately to Didymus [I B.C.]; but in every instance there are probably several intermediate stages between him and them.' The date is considerably later and reflects the vocabulary of the scholar making the note rather than of the author. Smith, the editor of the critical edition, dates this line from M as 'saec. X'. Since, however, the usage in this MSS is different from the others, it is good to take it first.

The passage to which the note is attached speaks of one whose hands were dripping with blood ( $a\ddot{\iota}\mu a\tau\iota \ \sigma\tau\dot{a}\dot{\zeta}o\nu\tau a \ \chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\rho a\varsigma$ ). The note attached indicates that this key word  $\sigma\tau\dot{a}\dot{\zeta}o\nu\tau a$  indicates vividly or forcefully that the person had just murdered ( $\eta\dot{\upsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\sigma}\tau a$ )<sup>8</sup> his parents. This occurrence helps little with the 1 Timothy 2. 12 passage, but does raise the puzzle of the use of this word in connection with murder. It will therefore be set to one side in the tabulation of and evaluation of the data which will follow.

The remaining occurrences will be considered in terms of their dates, beginning with the oldest and proceeding to the most recent.

The next occurrence is contained in a fragment of the papyrus document, the *Rhetorica* of Philodemus, an Epicurean philosopher, (I BC):

Άλλ' εἰ δε[ῖ τάληθῆ κα[ὶ γι]νόμενα [λέγειν, οἱ ρ[ήτ]ορες καὶ μ[εγάλα βλάπτ[ουσι] πολλοὺς [καὶ μεγάλους καὶ περὶ τῶν ["δεινοῖς ἔρωσι το[ξ]ευομένων" πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιφαν[εστάτους ἐκάστοτε διαμάχονται καὶ "σὺν αὐθεντ[οῦσιν ἄν[αξιν]" ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁμοίων ὼσ[αὐτως. 9

Hubbell<sup>10</sup> paraphrases the section in which this line is found as follows:

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 those in authority are villains, and hated by both gods and men.

The key term is  $a\dot{v}\theta \epsilon v\tau [ov-]\sigma w$  and the rendition offered by Hubbell is that of 'those in authority'. Here we have the word used to speak of authority in reference to those who rule and in a positive and commendable sense.

Perhaps the most important document is the papyrus number 1208<sup>11</sup> (dated by the editor, Schubart, at 27/26 BC) with the occurrence of the word in line 38.<sup>12</sup> The document is tentatively titled by the editor as a Letter from Trypon (?) to Asklepiodes (?) concerning the matter of ferrying and related payments. Column III, the last column, contains the sentence with the word αὐθεντηκότος as follows:

Κάμοῦ αὐθεντηκότος πρὸς αὐτὸν περιποιήσαι Καλατύτει τῶι ναυτικῶι ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῶι φόρωι ἐν τῆι ὥραι ἐπεχώρησεν.

### Werner<sup>13</sup> renders this sentence as follows:

I exercised authority over him, and he consented to provide for Calatytis the Boatman on terms of the full fare, within the hour.

Preisigke gives as the meanings for the word in this passage "Herr sein, fest auftreten". Liddell-Scott-Jones in their lexicon give the meaning of 'to have full power or authority over' and group it with 1 Timothy 2. 12. 15

From this point onwards the documents are after the time of 1 Timothy 2. 12 but still are worthy of consideration to show the ongoing use of the term. The next reference in the list of Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker is one from Ptolemy (II AD), the mathematician, and it is cited as 'Ptolem., *Apotel.* 3, 14, 10 Boll-B' using the critical edition. <sup>16</sup> The same passage and word is located in the Loeb edition in Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* III. 13, p. 338 f. <sup>17</sup> The passage reads as follows:

'Ο μέν οὖν τοῦ κρόνου ἀστὴρ μόνος τὴν οἰκοδεσποτίαν τῆς ψυχῆς λαβών καὶ αὐθεντήσας τοῦ τε Ἑρμοῦ καὶ τῆς σελήνης, ἐὰν μὲν ἐνδόξως ἔχῃ πρός τε τὶ κοσμικὸν καὶ τὰ κέντρα, ποιεῖ φιλοσωμάτους . . . ἐναντίως δὲ καὶ ἀδόξως κείμενος ρυπαρούς . . .

Robbins renders this in the Loeb edition as follows:

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 the angels, he makes his subjects lovers of the body . . . but if his position is the opposite and without dignity, he makes them sordid . . .

Robbins has understood  $a\dot{v}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$  in the sense of dominate in connection with Saturn's relationship to Mercury and the moon. The term used in parallel with  $a\dot{v}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$  is  $olko\delta eomo\tau\dot{e}a\nu$  in the clause which expresses the thought of Saturn as ruler of the soul. The following parallel clause speaks of such an  $a\dot{v}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$  and rule as a position of dignity. The lexicon of E. A. Sophocles puts this passage under the meaning of 'to be in power, to have authority over'. <sup>18</sup>

Our term is used by Johannes Laurentius Lydus, a historian (VI AD) in his work de Magistratibus populi Romani in book 3, section 42 as follows:

νόμον γὰρ ἀντιγράφειν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀνεπείσθη πάσης ἀφαιρούμενον ἐξουσίας τὴν ἐπαρχότητα· ἡ γὰρ ἄρτι καὶ κουφίσαι φόρους καὶ σιτήσεις καὶ φῶτα καὶ θέας καὶ ἀνανεώσεις ἔργων αὐθεντοῦσα ταῖς πόλεσω ἐπιδοῦναι οὐκ ἤρκεσε τὸ λοιπὸν οὐδὲ ἐτόλμησε μικρᾶς γοῦν τινος παραψυχῆς ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων μεταδοῦναί τινι. 19

#### This has been translated as follows:

For the emperor was prevailed upon to write with his own hand a law that stripped the prefecture of all authority. For the magistracy which but recently of its own initiative both lightened tribute and made additional grants to the cities for foodstuffs, lighting, shows and renovations of public works, was not capable hereafter (and did not dare to do so) of making anyone a grant of at least some tiny recompense.<sup>20</sup>

Carney renders  $a\dot{v}\theta \epsilon \nu \tau o \bar{v}\sigma a$  as 'initiative' indicating thereby the source and authority of the action; Liddell-Scott-Jones group it with BGU 1208.37 and 1 Timothy 2. 12 under the meaning 'to have full power or authority over'.

A Christian papyrus letter from the Berlin collection, Number 103, (VI/VII AD)<sup>21</sup> written to an abbot,  $\tau \tilde{\phi} \dot{a} \gamma \iota \omega \tau(\dot{a}) \tau(\dot{\omega}) \pi a \tau \rho(\dot{i}) d\beta \beta a \Sigma \epsilon \rho \tilde{\iota} \nu o \varsigma d\rho \chi \iota \mu a \nu \delta \rho(\dot{\iota} \tau \eta) A \beta a \dot{a} \mu \dots$ , contains the term in lines 3 and 8.

The document itself is as follows:

Έπιδη οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ μακαρίου 'Ενὼχ ήλθαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγοντες ὅτι δικασθῖνε θέλωμεν μετὰ τῆς γυνεκὸς ἐαυτοῦ, καταξήωσον οὖν ἡ ὑμετέρα θεωφελία, ἐὰν αὐθεντίσεις τὼ πρᾶγμα καὶ λαβις αὐτοὺς ἐν τῆ πόλει, καὶ ἀπαλλαξουσιν πρὸς ἀλλίλους, εἰ δὲ μή γε καταξήωσον τούτους παρασκευάσε ἀμφοτέρους ἐλθῆν ἐνταῦθ[a] καὶ τούτους παρασκευάσωμεν αὐτοὺς ἀπαλλαγῖνε κατὰ τῶν τοῦ δικκέου καὶ κατὰ τὼ ἔθος τοῦ κτίματος. 'Αλλὰ μὴ ὑπερθῖ ἡ ὑμετέρα εὐλαβία πατρὶ διὰ θέσιν τούτους ἐκπέμψε, εἰ δὲ πάλιν αὐθεντῖς καὶ λαμβάνις αὐτοὺς ἐν τῆ πόλει, καλός, ὅτι γὰρ μετριήσειν καὶ δημόσια συντελοῦσιν ἀγιωτατωι πατρί.

The editor, Fr. Krebs, suggests reading  $a\dot{\theta}e\nu\tau\dot{\eta}\sigma\eta\varsigma$  for  $a\dot{\theta}e\nu\tau\dot{\sigma}e\iota\varsigma$  in line 3 and  $a\dot{\theta}e\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}i\varsigma$  for  $a\dot{\theta}e\nu\tau\dot{i}\varsigma$  in line 8 along with other suggestions for reading the document's phonetic writing according to the conventional spellings. Werner<sup>22</sup> renders this document through line 8 as follows:

Since the brothers of the blessed Enoch have come to us saying 'We want to go to law with his wife', please be so good, Your (pl.) Godhelp, if you will assume authority over the matter and receive them in the city, and they will come to terms with each other; but if not, please be so good as to have both sides come here and we shall have them come to terms in accordance with justice and in accordance with the custom of Creation. But do not defer, Your (pl.) Piety-to-the-Father, because of a deposit, to send them forth; but if, again, you assume authority and receive them in the city, fine, . . .

F. Preisigke gives 'beherrschen' as the meaning here and offers for the phrase  $a \dot{\nu} \theta e \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta s$   $\tau \dot{\sigma} \pi \rho \tilde{a} \gamma \mu a$  in line 3 the translation 'falls die Sache zu deinem Geschäftskreise gehört'. Deissmann says that 'the precise meaning is not completely clear, but the general idea of "being master" seems to me to be decisive in this passage also. '23 Liddell-Scott-Jones take the verb in line 3 to be from  $a \dot{\nu} \theta e \nu \tau \dot{\nu} \zeta \omega$  and give as its meaning 'take in hand'.

Preisigke in his Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden gives two papyri documents not listed in BAGD and categorizes both of them under the second of his three meanings for the verb, namely, 'verfügungsberechtigt sein'. The first is from the 'Testament de Fl. Phoibammôn, médecin en chef d'Antinoé', Masp 151, 174 (VI AD), 24 which Preisigke renders in abbreviated form retaining the main items as αὐθεντῆσαι ἀποσπάσασθαι οἷον δήποτε πρᾶγμα and which he translates as 'noch soll er berechtigt sein, irgend ein Vermögensstuck an sich zu reiszen.'25 The second is Lond 1708, 38 (VI AD), 26 a document which is an arbitration in a family dispute concerning an inheritance, written by Dioscorus who may well have been the arbitrator. The section where our word is found, line 38, is in a context giving the case of the plaintiff, the sisters of the defendant and their husbands, against the elder brother. They say that he deprived them of the inheritance, and took to his own uses all the rent and πρόστεγα. 28 In this context the relevant portion of the text reads:

σαν[τα] . . . αλλα και αυθεντησαι εκμισθ[ω] τας γονικας ημων οικιας και ενοικολογησαι ταυτας και οικειωσασθαι εαυτω τα προστεγα . . .

The editor renders the key words  $av\theta \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \sigma a\iota \epsilon \kappa \mu \iota \sigma \theta \omega \sigma a \nu \tau a$  as 'took under his authority and leased'.<sup>29</sup>

Returning to the documents listed in BAGD, we have an occurrence in the same category as the occurrence in Ptolemy in Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum VIII I p. 177,  $7^{30}$  but from a later date (XV AD). This account speaks about the various positions of the planets, e.g. Mercury, Mars and finally Saturn, and relates what this will signify (the operative verb presumed in the last clause and stated in those preceding is  $\sigma\eta\mu\alpha\dot{\nu}\nu$ ). Within this context the passage speaks of  $\tau\dot{\nu}\nu$   $\pi\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$   $\alpha\dot{\nu}\theta\nu$  $\nu$ 0  $\nu$ 1. The relevant clause, which is the last line of the document, reads as follows:

έὰν δὲ ἐν ὀρίοις Κρόνου, ἀπὸ κλοπῆς ἡ παρύγρων φροντιστήν, ἀγαθοποιῶν δὲ τετραγωνιζόντων, τὸν πάντων αὐθεντοῦντα ἐν τῆ τέχνη καὶ μηδὲν κτώμενον.

Werner<sup>32</sup> renders this clause, with clarifying additions indicated by the context, as follows:

But if [Mercury is] in the regions of Saturn, [that signifies that the newborn baby will be] one who lives by his wits with theft or waterside activities. But if the Beneficent Ones are in quartile aspect, [that signifies that the newborn will be] the one who exercises authority over all [others who are] in the trade and pays no consequences (or, acquires nothing).

To this evidence of the documents themselves should be added the evaluation of the linguistic experts of earlier and later periods.

The Attic Grammarian Moeris [II AD] in his lexicon writes Αὐτοδίκην, ἀττικῶς. αὐθέντην, Ἑλληνικῶς. A critical note suggests that the two words may read αὐτοδικεῖν and αὐθεντεῖν. <sup>33</sup> If this is correct, these readings provide two pieces of evidence. First, that the word is a known 'Hellenic' word. Second, an indication of the meaning of the word is provided by its connection with the Attic αὐτοδικεῖν which LSJ define as 'to be αὐτόδικος'. Αὐτόδικος they define as meaning 'with independent jurisdiction, with one's own courts', the former probably being the more general meaning and the one most likely to be in view.

The Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon gives an entry as follows: 'N.T.\* αὐθεντεῖν · ἐξουσιάζειν (I Tim. 2:12) AS'. <sup>34</sup> Here the meaning of αὐθεντεῖν is provided by its connection with ἐξουσιάζειν which LSJ indicate to mean 'exercise authority' or 'exercise authority over' and which BAGD indicate to mean 'have the right or power for someth. or over someone' both lexicons referring to Paul's usage in 1 Cor. 7. 4 which demands that the husband or the wife has authority over the other's body in fulfilling his or her own sexual needs. The value of this lexicographical guidance is lessened by the fact that although Hesychius the lexicographer is placed in about the 5th century AD, the lexicon itself is known only in a 15th century MS badly preserved, and in many places interpolated by expansion and other notes made by the first editor, Marcus Musurus (1514). Bentley has shown that the biblical glosses in Hesychius are interpolations. <sup>35</sup>

Another grammatician Thomas Magister, (XIII/XIV A.D.), also makes the connection between  $a\dot{v}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$  and  $a\dot{v}\tau\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$  that Moeris did:  $A\dot{v}\tau\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$  [ $\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon$ ],  $o\dot{v}\kappa$   $a\dot{v}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ :  $\kappa\omega\iota\nu\dot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$   $\gamma\dot{a}\rho$ . As in the case of Moeris he testifies to its being a common or koine word and to its having a basic meaning in the realm of authority.

BAGD give two other items relating to the meaning and usage of the term and concept (Mich. Glykas 270, 10 I Bekker [1836] and Diod. S. 1, 27. 2).

The first named is of considerable import for three reasons: first, because it has the same component elements as we find in 1 Tim. 2. 12 in the form at  $\gamma \nu \nu a \tilde{\iota} \kappa \epsilon \varsigma$  at  $\theta \epsilon \nu \tau o \tilde{\iota} \sigma \iota \tau \tilde{\iota} \nu \nu d \nu \delta \rho \tilde{\iota} \omega \nu$ , second, because the significance of

this statement is developed, and third, because it has a Latin translation attached. The disadvantage is the date. The work is the Annals of one Michael Glycas a Byzantine author, called a grammaticus in some manuscripts, of the 12th century.<sup>37</sup> The document itself is available in the Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.<sup>38</sup> The statement is presented in the midst of certain aberrations which Glycas is listing, particularly those involving men and women. The Greek text with the Latin translation reads as follows:

παρ' Άγιλαίοις αὶ γυναϊκες αὐθεντοῦσι τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ πορνεύουσιν ὡς βούλονται, μὴ ζηλοτυπούμεναι παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν, γεωργίαν δὲ καὶ οἰκοδομίαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀνδρῷα πράττουσιν.

apud Agilaeos feminae sua viros in potestate habent, proque lubite Venerem exercent citra ullam maritorum aemulationem. eaedem agros colunt, aedes exstruunt, omnes operas viriles obeunt.

Two facts emerge. The first is that  $a\dot{v}\theta e \nu \tau o \bar{v}\sigma i$  is rendered in the Latin by 'sua... in potestate habent', which Latin may be rendered in English as '... have in their own power (authority)'. <sup>39</sup> The second is that the outcome of such is said to be that  $a\dot{i} \gamma \nu \nu a \bar{i} \kappa \epsilon \varsigma$ , to use the final summary phrase of the document itself,  $\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau a \ \dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \bar{\omega} a \ \pi \rho \dot{a} \tau \tau \nu \sigma \nu \sigma \nu$ . Although late and therefore inadequate as a primary source for usage and meaning for 1 Tim. 2. 12, it does reflect a continued understanding of  $a\dot{v}\theta e \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon}\omega$  in terms of having authority and particularly in terms of the man/woman or woman/man relationship. It is the only passage aside from 1 Tim. 2. 12 itself which has the term in this exact same relationship and thus has a value because of this.

Lastly there is the passage in the historian Diodorus of Sicily (I B.C.) which utilizes the word  $\kappa\nu\rho\iota\epsilon\dot{\nu}\epsilon\nu$ , rather than  $a\dot{\nu}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\bar{\nu}$  as in 1 Tim. 2. 12, but with a nearly identical form both as to construction and content. The statement says the Egyptians have made a law 'contrary to the general custom of mankind', giving the reasons why this was done, with the result that  $\kappa\nu\rho\iota\epsilon\dot{\nu}\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\dot{\eta}\nu$   $\gamma\nu\nu\alpha\bar{\iota}\kappa\alpha$   $\tau d\nu\delta\rho\dot{\sigma}\varsigma$ . These words and those that follow in the document are rendered by Oldfather as follows: 'the wife should enjoy authority over her husband, the husbands agreeing in the marriage contract that they will be obedient in all things to their wives.'

#### II. EVALUATION OF THE DATA

The evidence is now before us. Whenever possible the author has sought to give someone else's translation (or none at all where someone else's translation was not available) and the opinion of at least one lexicographer, where possible, for each document or source. This has been done to provide an independent check on the meaning at each occurrence. The data in summary form are as follows:

| Source (date)                                 | Rendering of Translator  | Meaning given by<br>Lexicographer   |
|---|--|---|
| Philodemus, Rhetorica (I BC)                  | those in authority (Hubbell)                                       | _   |
| BGU 1208 (27 BC)                              | exercise authority over (Werner)                                   | -Herr sein, fest auf-<br>treten (Preisigke) -To have full power or<br>authority over (LSJ) -Avoir pleine autorité<br>sur (Chantraine) |
| Ptolemy, Apotelesmatica (Tetrabiblos) (II AD) | dominates<br>(Robbins)   | -To be in power, to have authority (Sophocles)  |
| Lydus, Magistratibus<br>(VI AD)               | of its own initiative (Carney)                                     | -To have full power or authority over (LSJ)   |
| BGU 103 (VI, VII AD)                          | assume authority<br>(Werner)                                       | -Beherrschen; falls die Sache zu deinem Geschäftskreise gehort (Preisigke) -Take in hand (LSJ) -Being master (Deissmann)              |
| Maspero 151 (VI AD)                           | -  | Verfügungsberechtigt; noch<br>soller berechtigt sein, irgend<br>ein Vermögensstuck an sich<br>zu reiszen (Preisigke)                  |
| Lond 1708 (VI AD)                             | took under his authority (Bell, editor)                            | Verfügungsberechtigt (Preisigke)  |
| Cat. Cod. Astr. Gr.<br>VIII I, p. 177 (XV AD) | exercise authority<br>(Werner)                                     | -   |
| Moeris (II AD)                                | -  | αὐτοδικεῖν: to be with independent jurisdiction (LSJ)   |
| Hesychii Alexandrini<br>Lexicon (XV AD)       | -  | èξουσιάζεω: execute authority over (LSJ); have the right or power for someth. or over someone (BAGD)                                  |
| Thomas Magister (XIII/XIV AD)                 | -  | αὐτοδικεῖν  |
| Michaelis Glycae (XII AD) Annales             | sua in potestate<br>habent: have in their<br>own power (authority) | -   |

An analysis of this evidence is now in order. From the perspective of an overview, seeking to ascertain any common element that may be found in the meanings provided by the translators and lexicographers, we notice that the broad concept of 'authority' is virtually present everywhere, even when that word itself is not used. Furthermore, the word 'authority' itself is utilized by most of the translators and lexicographers. The 'authority' in view in the documents is understood to be a positive concept and is in no

way regarded as having any overtone of misuse of position or power, i.e. to 'domineer'.

In addition to an overview, distinctive usages within this broad concept of authority must also be noticed. The most distinctive is that of the astrological piece of Ptolemy in which, as in the case of the Cat. Cod. Astr. Gr., the author is speaking of the relationship between planets whereas all the other documents speak of the human realm. But even the translation 'dominates' does not have to be understood in a pejorative sense, as the meaning offered by Sophocles, 'to be in power, to have authority over', indicates. At any rate, if this is a distinctive usage it should be recognized as such. Also in the case of BGU 103 the usage is more specific with the rendering of 'take in hand' given by LSJ (cf. Preisigke and Deissmann). If however the verb in line 3 of this document is from αὐθεντίζω rather than  $\alpha \dot{\theta} \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ , then this meaning serves our inquiry indirectly rather than directly and must be recognized as such. The word chosen by both Moeris and Thomas Magister for  $a\dot{\theta}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$  is  $a\dot{\theta}\tau o\delta\omega\dot{e}\bar{\nu}\nu$ . The nuance that this introduces is to speak of authority in terms of jurisdiction. The unique contribution of Michael Glycas in his Annales is to use the term αὐθεντέω with the same relationship in view as in 1 Timothy 2. 12, namely that between man and woman.

The different nuances of meaning within the larger whole which we have observed in these documents are also recognized in the modern lexicographers and their analysis and grouping of documents. Preisigke has three categories for the use within the papyrus documents: 1) beherrschen, BGU 103, 3, 8; 2) verfügungsberechtigt, Masp. 151, 174: Lond 1708, 38: and 3) Herr sein, fest auftreten, BGU 1208, 38. Liddell-Scott-Jones in a similar way distinguishes between the meaning 'take in hand' for BGU 103, and the meaning 'to have full power or authority over' in 1 Tim. 2. 12; BGU 1208, 37; Lydus, Mag. This latter analysis is also that of both Chantraine<sup>41</sup> and Frish.<sup>42</sup>

The result of this recognition of the nuances inherent in the overall concept of authority is that the more specialized nuances may be treated as such, leaving the usage grouping in which 1 Tim. 2. 12 is found as a unit of its own with its own nuance. The astrological documents (Ptolemy, Cat. Cod. Astr. Gr.) can be treated separately and carry a nuance not found elsewhere and which should not therefore be introduced from the sphere of planets to that of humans, namely, the meaning 'dominate'. The usage of  $a b \theta e \nu \tau i \zeta \omega$  in BGU 103, 3, 8, 'take in hand', although similar in its basic concept and therefore helpful in ascertaining the general meaning of  $a b \theta e \nu \tau i \zeta \omega$  itself, should however be distinguished from this verb, so that  $a b \theta e \nu \tau i \zeta \omega$  is recognized as another branch of the  $a b \theta e \nu \tau$ -root system. Similarly the nuance that Preisigke and Bell give to the 6th century AD papyri Masp. 151, 174 and Lond 1708, 38, i.e., 'to take under authority'

should also be observed, although again helpful in ascertaining the basic stress on authority in the verb seen as a whole.

This analysis then leaves as a sub-cluster Philodemus, BGU 1208, 38, 1 Tim. 2, 12 and Lydus, Mag., all but the last also within the first century BC or AD. For these documents the meaning that is recognized by almost all (Preisigke: LSJ; Chantraine: BAGD; Hubbell for Philodemus)43 is 'to have full power or authority over' (LSJ), or 'to have authority over someone' (BAGD).44 Should Carney's rendering of Lydus, Mag., 'of its own initiative', prove to be accurate, it might indicate that this 6th century document is using the word with an emphasis on this nuance not emphasized in the earlier documents or it may be that the translator Carney is emphasizing the etymology himself in the freedom and choice which is associated with a paraphrase and which sometimes exceeds the restraint of a more precise translation. In either case, the recognized meaning for the first century BC and AD documents would remain, and that recognized meaning is 'to have authority over'. The nuance is positive, or at least neutral, but in any case there is no inherent negative overtone such as is suggested by the word 'domineer'.

This recognized understanding of  $\alpha \dot{\nu} \theta e \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$  fits in the 1 Tim. 2. 12 passage with the verb with which it is joined there, namely  $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ .  $\Delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$  speaks objectively of a position or activity of teaching without any negative implication on the content or the manner. It would seem likely that the following verb,  $\alpha \dot{\nu} \theta e \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ , would be used in the same way in that context as it has been found to be used in the documents of that era. Furthermore, the converse of  $\alpha \dot{\nu} \theta e \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$  seems to be referred to in the context of 1 Tim. 2 in verse 11 in the phrase  $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \dot{\nu} \pi \sigma \tau \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta}$ . That concept as used in the NT is not regarded as cringing servility under a domineering person but as a willing submission to a recognized authority. It would seem that just as  $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$  is related to  $\mu \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$  (2. 11), both being considered in an objective and positive sense, so also the nuance of  $\alpha \dot{\nu} \theta e \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$  in an objective and positive sense would be most likely in view of its relation to  $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \dot{\nu} \pi \sigma \tau \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta}$ .

Let us now turn from the documents themselves to the analysis of the earlier lexicographers, Moeris, Hesychius' Lexicon and Thomas Magister. The word suggested in the lexicon which goes back to Hesychius, i.e.,  $\dot{\epsilon}\xi ovoid\xi ev$ , in both the definition given by LSJ, 'exercise authority or exercise authority over', and BAGD, 'have the right or power for someth. or over someone', fits in with a now evident and emerging pattern as to the general meaning for  $a\dot{v}\theta ev r\dot{e}\omega$ . The correlation with  $a\dot{v}ro\delta u\kappa e\tilde{\iota}v$  by both Moeris and Thomas Magister, which LSJ gives as 'to be with independent jurisdiction', also fits this pattern if we recognize that the concept of jurisdiction is used in the general rather than the particular sense, as the grammarian A. T. Robertson suggests. 47 So these lexicographers as well as

the documents themselves place  $a\dot{v}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$  in the category of authority, in the objective and positive sense.

One riddle remains in this study of the meaning of  $a\dot{v}\theta \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon}\omega$ . The various editions of Bauer's lexicon, including the 4th (1952) and 5th (1958), give the same meaning for  $a\dot{\theta}e\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ , namely the one expression 'herrschen' τινός über jmdn.' and nothing more. The 1957 English translation and edition of the 1952 4th ed. of Bauer by Arndt and Gingrich faithfully renders this German word by the English equivalent 'have authority . . . τινός over someone' as does the newest English edition by Gingrich and Danker (1979). The riddle appears with the insertion of the word 'domineer' between 'authority' and 'τινός' in both the 1957 and 1979 English editions. When one considers that 'domineer', although once meaning generally to rule or to have domination, a meaning now obsolete, has for some time meant to rule or govern arbitrarily, imperiously or despotically or to tyrannize, 48 the riddle becomes a very great concern in terms of meaning and understanding. This concern is highlighted by the fact that none of the documents cited demand that meaning and that none of the other lexicographers or translators either offer or utilize that meaning. So BAG and BAGD seem to stand alone and seem even to do so over against the German Bauer editions themselves. Furthermore 'domineer' is also contrary to the nuance suggested in 1 Tim. 2. 12 by the verb διδάσκω with which it is joined and the phrase  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu \pi \dot{\alpha}\sigma\eta \dot{\nu}\pi\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\tilde{\eta}$  with which it is tacitly contrasted (see above).

The usage and meaning in the papyri documents and other extra-biblical documents and in 1 Tim. 2. 12 is evidenced also in the patristic occurrences. A Patristic Greek Lexicon, edited by G. W. H. Lampe, lists four nuances of the one overarching concept of authority: 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.<sup>49</sup>

The lexicon of Sophocles for the Roman and Byzantine periods reflects a similar understanding of  $a\dot{v}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$  as our study does. As the first and basic meaning for  $a\dot{v}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$  the lexicon gives 'to be in power, to have authority' citing in addition to 1 Timothy and Ptolemy five other works from the 4th century through the 9th giving 'to exercise authority' as another meaning.<sup>50</sup>

#### III. ETYMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The question still remains in the midst of this general consensus on the objective and positive sense of authority why it is that there is another usage which has the meaning of murder (Scholia Aeschylus' Eumenides 42). This problem is also present in the related noun  $a\dot{v}\theta\dot{e}\nu\tau\eta s$  which bears

the meaning of murderer but also the meaning of perpetrator or more generally, doer or master (see LSJ).

Basically two solutions have been proposed to this problem. The one is to propose that  $a\dot{v}\theta\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$  moves from the general sense of 'perpetrator' to that of the perpetrator of the deed, i.e., the murder, and thus stands for murderer as a euphemism, or by an association of  $\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$  with  $\theta\epsilon\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$ , to strike. The other view, seen as possible but doubtful by Chantraine and Frish, but more favourably received, and indeed adopted, by certain NT scholars, is that of Paul Kretschmer. He proposes that  $a\dot{\nu}\theta\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$  is by haplology, which is the utterance of one syllable instead of two, used for  $a\dot{\nu}\tau\theta\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$  from  $\theta\epsilon\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$  'to strike', while  $a\dot{\nu}\theta\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$  in the sense of the one in authority is from  $a\dot{\nu}\tau$ -  $\ddot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ . This solution says that two quite different words have by similar pronunciation and spelling come to have an identical form. The possibility of some such shift in pronunciation and spelling is interestingly enough borne out in the fact that the Modern Greek produces our noun as  $\dot{a}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ .

Whichever solution may prove to be more correct, their service to our study is to indicate that the odious idea of murder is not integral to the basic meaning of the word and they also give some indication of how that meaning may have arisen.

### IV. CONCLUSION

The lines of evidence may now be drawn together. The overall evaluation of all the documents surveyed places the meaning of the word  $a\dot{v}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$  in the area of authority and places it there as a quite neutral concept, without any necessary negative connotation. This evaluation can be seen in the words or terms suggested to render it by the translators and also in the meaning given by the lexicographers. The most commonly suggested meaning is that of 'have authority over'.

When one considers the sub-grouping in which 1 Timothy 2. 12 falls as suggested by Preisigke, LSJ, Chantraine and Frish, particularly that of the documents of the first centuries B.C. and A.D., the meaning 'have authority over' from the point of view of these lexicographers is completely agreed upon (Hubbell as a translator gives the phrase 'those in authority'). The word is not regarded as having any negative or pejorative overtone inherent within it such as is inherent in the rendering 'domineer'. Removing Philodemus *Rhetorica* provides the smallest sub-grouping, namely the papyrus *BGU* 1208 and the NT 1 Tim. 2. 12, and gives the same outcome, without Hubbell's slight variation.

The earlier lexicographers Moeris, Hesychius' *Lexicon*, and Thomas Magister also place the word in the realm of authority, in the objective and neutral sense.

IF 2000ESS 17.7 07 177 7.14

HILL // ROHLHAIS CALIFFRINGE CRY

This understanding of the term continues in the patristic evidence.

Internal considerations within 1 Timothy 2. 12 favour the meaning 'have authority over' rather than 'domineer'. The conclusion would seem to be that  $a\dot{v}\theta e\nu\tau\dot{e}\omega$  is best rendered into English in 1 Timothy 2. 12 by the use of the term 'authority' in verbal form and specifically by the phrase 'to have authority' rather than by the word 'domineer'.

When one examines the English translations made by committees the following emerges. The R.V. and the A.S.V. have the phrase 'to have dominion', a conceivable rendering, but one which has a possible misunderstanding in its overtone and is therefore properly changed to 'exercise authority' in the N.A.S.V. The N.E.B. and the Berkeley Version with their 'domineer' seem to introduce a negative nuance which is not found in any of the documents nor in any meanings suggested and therefore come close to retrogressing, albeit in a different way, to the now evidently erroneous usage of the K.J.V., 'to usurp authority'. The R.S.V., N.A.B., N.I.V. and The Translator's Testament<sup>54</sup> have caught the essence of the meaning of  $a\dot{v}\theta e \nu r \dot{e}\omega$  and present probably the most satisfactory rendering with their phrase 'to have authority'. The R.S. V. KNIGHT III

#### NOTES

- [1] A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament being Grimm's Wilke's Clavus Novi Testamenti translated, revised and enlarged by J. H. Thayer (Edinburgh, 4th ed. 1901) s.v.
- [2] W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, F. W. Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago, new revised edition, 1979); cf. also the data provided by Th. Naegeli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus (Göttingen, 1905), p. 49 f., who said that αὐθεντεῖν πνος = κρατεῖν πνος.
- [3] The translation is either that of the Loeb edition or, if not in Loeb, the translation available. No attempt has been made to select a translation favourable or unfavourable to a particular rendering or meaning and no alternative translation has been excluded.
- [4] O. L. Smith, editor, Scholia Graeca In Aeschylum Quae Exstant Omnia Pars I (Leipzig, 1976), p. 45.
- [5] The dates are those of standard Greek lexicons, BAGD and LSJ, except in those cases where dates are not supplied by the lexicons and then the dates given in the critical editions are those used.
- [6] J. F. Mountford, 'Scholia', The Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1970), p. 961.
- [7] Op. cit., p. xviii.
- [8] H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones, R. McKenzie, A Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford, 9th ed., 1940), Vol. I, s.v.
- [9] S. Sudhaus, editor, Philodemi: Volumina Rhetorica, Vol. III (Leipzig, 1896), p. 133 line 14.
- [10] For an appraisal of Philodemus and of the document, as well as for a paraphrase of the whole, see H. H. Hubbell, 'The Rhetorica of Philodemus', Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. 23, 1920, pp. 243 ff. The paraphrase quoted is found on p. 306.
- [11] Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden (= BGU) (Berlin, 1912, Vol. IV), p. 351. A brief description of the papyrus is given and notes are provided.
- [12] LSJ give the line as 37 which is where the sentence begins.
- [13] Dr. John R. Werner, International Consultant in Translation, Wycliffe Bible Translators at the International Linguistic Center, Dallas, Texas, has graciously provided this and several other translations for this document and others which to my knowledge have not been translated into English. This particular translation was provided in a letter dated March 18, 1980.

- [14] F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyruskunden (Berlin, 1925) Vol. 1, s.v.
- [15] Cf., similarly, P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque (Paris, 1968), Vol. 1, s.v. 'αὐθεντέω "avoir pleine autorité sur" (NT, Pap.)'.
- [16] F. Boll and A. E. Boer, editors, Claudi Ptolemaei, Vol. III, 1 Apotelesmatica (Leipzig, 1954), p. 158.
- [17] See the Loeb combined volume of W. G. Waddell, Manetho, and E. E. Robbins, Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos (London, 1964).
- [18] E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100) (New York, 1900), p. 276.
- [19] R. Wuensch, editor, *Ioannis Lydi, De Magistratibus Populi Romani*, Libri Tres (Leipzig, 1903), p. 131.
- [20] T. F. Carney, Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano Byzantine bureaucracies viewed from within, 3 vols. in 1, No. 3 John the Lydian, On the magistracies of the Roman constitution (Lawrence, Kansas, 1971).
- [21] BGU, Vol. I (1895), p. 122.
- [22] See footnote 13. This translation was provided in a letter dated March 18, 1980.
- [23] A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (London, 4th ed., 1927) p. 89 note 3.
- [24] J. Maspero, Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine (Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Vol. II, 1913), the title p. 85, the word and its text p. 95. Since the initial thousands and ten thousands are not given in Preisigke the actual number of the document in the volume itself is 67151.
- [25] The full version of that same section is μητε μην αὐθεντησαι... καιθ [note: καιθ: sic pour καθ] οιον δηποτε τροπον ἀποσπασασθαι παντελως οιον δηποτε πραγμα...
- [26] H. I. Bell, Greek Papyri in the British Museum (1917), Vol. V, p. 119.
- [27] Ibid., p. 114.
- [28] Op. cit., p. 119 note 40, 'possibly a single payment on taking up the lease? But the point may simply be that Psates [the defendant] not only collected the rent (ενοικολογῆσαι) but, when collected, appropriated it to his own use (οἰκειώσασθαι ἐαυτῷ τὰ πρόστεγα).'
- [29] Op. cit., p. 119, note 38.
- [30] F. Cumont, editor, Codicum Parisinorum (Cat. Cod. Astr. Graec., Bruxellis, 1929).
- [31] Op. cit., p. 120 ff., which indicates that our text is found in fragment 21 of Codex Paris gr 2419 which is of the 15th century.
- [32] See footnote 13. This translation was provided in a letter dated April 8, 1980.
- [33] Moeridis Atticistae, Lexicon Atticum edited by Joannes Piersonus (1831 edition), p. 43 (BAGD utilize the 1759 edition of Pierson and therefore refer to p. 58).
- [34] Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte (Hauniae, MCMLIII), Vol. I, p. 279, entry 8259.
- [35] For this and other information about Hesychius and his lexicon see P. B. R. Forbes and R. Browning, 'Hesychius', *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 2nd ed. with corrections, 1972), p. 512.
- [36] Thomas Magistri sive Theoduli Monachi Ecloga Vocum Atticarum edited by F. Ritschel (Halle, 1832), p. 18 line 8.
- [37] Encyclopedia Britannica (London, 1970), Vol. 10, p. 499.
- [38] Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, edited by B. G. Niebulus, Part 16, Michaelis Glycae Annales edited by I. Bekker (Bonn, 1836). The word occurs on p. 270, line 10. Bekker has basically used the earlier edition (1659) of Philippus Labbeus which included a Latin translation of Iohanne Leunclavio.
- [39] I am greatly indebted to Dr. Simon Kistemaker of Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, Mississippi for his assistance with this document.
- [40] Diodorus of Sicily edited with an English translation by C. H. Oldfather (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), Book I, section 27, especially sentence 2, pages 86-87.
- [41] P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque (Paris, 1968), Vol. 1, p. 138,

IP address: 129 67 172 214

- 'Deux verbes dénominatifs: αὐθεντέςω 'avoir pleine autorité sur' (NT, Pap.) . . . et αὐθεντίζω 'prendre en main, commander à' (BGU 103, 3)'.
- [42] H. Frish, Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1960), Band I, p. 185, '1. αὐθεντέω "Herr sein über etwas, zu etw. berechtigt sein' (Pap., NT) . . . 2. αὐθεντίζω trans. 'etw. in seinem Machtbereich haben' (BGU 103, 3)'.
- [43] The apparent exception would be the rendering 'of its own initiative' offered in Carney's paraphrastic rendering of Lydus, Mag. But even this rendering can be understood to fit into the category of the others and thus only be an apparent exception.
- [44] This analysis of BAGD understands their second meaning, 'to domineer' as having reference to the astrological documents they cite immediately after this. Even if that was not intended by BAGD, it would seem to be suggested by the evidence itself as the proper evaluation which should be rendered, as 'domineer' is not appropriate to the other documents (see for a further reflection on 'domineer' in BAGD the text below; even 'domineer' for the planets is questionable).
- [45] It is this cumulative evidence which causes me to reject the suggestion by C. C. Kroeger in the Reformed Journal, Vol. 29, 1979, pp. 12-15, that the word means to 'engage in fertility practice' (p. 14). It would also seem that the contextual considerations of 1 Tim. 2. 12, which I offer in the body of the text, would indicate that this suggestion does not fit the meaning in that verse in its context. For a detailed demonstration of the erroneousness of Catherine Kroeger's suggestion, by means of an analysis of the texts she cites for evidence, see the thorough article by Armin J. Panning, 'ATOENTEIN A Word Study', Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Vol. 78, 1981, pp. 185-91.
- [46] See the  $\vartheta\pi\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\dot{\eta}$ ,  $\vartheta\pi\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$  entries in BAGD and G. Delling, TDNT 8, 46 and note especially the usage of  $\vartheta\pi\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\dot{\eta}$  in the following 1 Tim. 3. 4 and the use of  $\vartheta\pi\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$  in the sense of voluntary subordination (TDNT 8, 42 f.) in connection with women in Eph. 5. 21, 22, 24; Col. 3. 18; 1 Pet. 3. 1, 5.
- [47] A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament (New York, 1931), Vol. IV, p. 570.
- [48] See for example The Oxford English Dictionary.
- [49] G. W. H. Lampe, editor, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1961), p. 262. Only as a subcategory under 3 is a more negative usage proposed in two homilies of Chrysostom on Colossians, 10. 1 and 11. 2, and in both of these places the more positive usage of the category is not out of the question. In Chrysostom's homily 9 on 1 Timothy he is completely silent on  $a\dot{\nu}\theta e\nu r\dot{e}\omega$  and does not treat it in a negative way.
- [50] E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100) (New York, 1900), p. 276. Two other nuances are given for the active voice, 'to be the originator of anything' and 'to compel' but only one example is cited for each, for the first from the 8th century and for the second from the 6th century.
- [51] See P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire Étymologique, Vol. 1, p. 138 f., and H. Frish, Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, p. 185, and their presentation of this position and the literature referred to, especially the work of Fraenkel.
- [52] J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London, 1930), p. 91, 'The history of this word has been satisfactorily cleared up by P. Kretschmer in Glotta iii (1912) p. 289 ff.'; J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1929), II, 278; A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, Vol. IV (New York, 1931), p. 570: 'The word authenteō is now cleared up by Kretschmer (Glotta, 1912, pp. 289ff.).'
- [53] P. Kretschmer, 'Griechisches: 6. αὐθέντης', Glotta, Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache, Vol. iii (1912), pp. 289-93.
- [54] The British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1973.
- [55] The meaning given in Bauer's lexicon and the first meaning given in BAG and BAGD. For a sampling of non-English translations compare La Sainte Bible (translated by L. Segond, nouvelle edition revue, 1965) and the Bonnes Nouvelles Aujourd'hui (1971) 'de prendre de l'autorité sur l'homme'; Bijbel (van het-Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap, 1977 'gezag over de man heeft'; Die Bibel (nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers, Revidierten Text 1975) 'dass sie den Mann zurechtweist'; The Jerusalem Bible (English translation, 1966) renders the αὐθεντέω phrase by 'to tell a man what to do'.

Downloaded: 20 Dec 2012