

## I TIMOTHY 2:11-15: MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE

DOUGLAS J. MOO  
TRINITY EVANGELICAL DIVINITY SCHOOL

The contemporary debate over the role of women in Christian ministry has generated studies in a broad spectrum of disciplines, most of them discussing at some point the relevant NT passages. Sometimes these discussions are based upon adequate study of the crucial texts, but all too often a superficial and arbitrary exegesis is found which, not surprisingly, serves only to confirm conclusions which have been arrived at on other grounds. But, whether erudite or simplistic, these studies have at least one factor in common: a failure to agree on the conclusions to be drawn from the NT evidence. This disagreement is all the more serious when it is recognized that it exists even (perhaps one should say especially!) among scholars who hold a similar view of Scripture and hermeneutical procedure.

Interpretations of 1 Tim 2:11-15 exhibit this lack of consensus to a remarkable degree. Moreover, despite the fact that the text is one of the few which touches directly upon the question at issue, a systematic exegesis of the passage is difficult to find. Thus it is not inappropriate to attempt an interpretation of these important verses in order to illuminate their significance for the issue of women's ministry.

As an organizing method, the study will be divided into two general stages. In the first, I will attempt to determine the "meaning" of the text; that which Paul sought to communicate to Timothy in the setting of First Century Ephesus. In the second stage, the crucial question of "significance" will be investigated: to what extent is Paul's instruction applicable to the contemporary church? While these two questions are distinguishable, they must not be regarded as separate: the exegetical conclusions directly and importantly influence the question of normativeness.

### I. The Meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

The first part of 1 Timothy 2 focuses on the subject of prayer, almost certainly with reference to the conduct of the congregational worship service.<sup>1</sup> After expressing his desire that men (*τοὺς ἄνδρας*) pray "in every place" (v 8),<sup>2</sup> Paul turns to the women. The transition is made with the word *ὡσαύτως*,

<sup>1</sup>So most commentators.

<sup>2</sup>*ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ* in v 8 probably has reference to the several house churches in Ephesus, although it may extend beyond that ("wherever Christians gather"). Cf C. Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales* (EBib; 4th ed.; Paris: Gabalda, 1969) 1, 372.

which may suggest that Paul desires the women to pray “in like manner” to the men<sup>3</sup> or that, just as he wishes the men to pray (βούλομαι . . . προσεύχεσθαι), so he wishes the women to “adorn themselves” (βούλομαι . . . κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς).<sup>4</sup> While the former cannot be definitely excluded,<sup>5</sup> the latter finds some support in the manner in which ὡσαύτως is employed in the Pastoral epistles as a rather loose transitional word, linking together series of regulations.<sup>6</sup> In either case, it is likely that the context of public worship is retained: in the assembly, women are to avoid ostentatious dress and should clothe themselves<sup>7</sup> “with modesty and sobriety” (σωφροσύνη; a virtue often praised in the Pastorals) and with good works.<sup>8</sup> Further, inasmuch as vv 11-15 seem to include a description of these “good works,”<sup>9</sup> and the learning and teaching activities described there are obviously communal, it is almost certain that Paul’s instructions in these verses must be taken as directed to this same context: the congregational worship service.<sup>10</sup>

The subject of verses 11-15 is γυναῖκα, a word which can be translated either “wife” or “woman.” It is argued that the former translation should be accepted here, since the qualification in v 15 is clearly limited to mothers and, it is claimed, Paul consistently relates wives to husbands, not women to men.<sup>11</sup> But it is not at all obvious that Paul confines his teaching to marital as opposed to sexual roles, and the context of the passage before us strongly supports the broader meaning. Leaving aside v 15 for the moment, which will be treated later and which is a problem however the present question is answered, we observe that vv 8-9 are clearly directed respectively to men and women, not husbands and wives; unless, indeed, Paul commands only husbands to pray and

<sup>3</sup>Walter Kaiser, “Paul, Women and the Church,” *Worldwide Challenge*, (Sept., 1976) 10. In 1 Cor 11:5, the praying of women in the assembly is assumed, on which cf. *infra*.

<sup>4</sup>BAG, 907.

<sup>5</sup>Charles Ryrie’s contention that Paul clearly limits praying in the assembly to men only in this passage cannot be sustained (*The Place of Women in the Church* [New York: MacMillan, 1958] 76).

<sup>6</sup>1 Tim 3:8, 3:11, 5:25; Titus 2:3, 2:6. Cf. Newport J. D. Whyte, “The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus” *The Expositor’s Greek Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, Vol. IV (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1920) 108.

<sup>7</sup>καταστολή involves general “deportment” as well as dress (BAG, 420; K. Rengstorf, “καταστολή,” *TDNT* 7 [1971] 596).

<sup>8</sup>δα of “attendant circumstances” (cf. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* [2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959] 57).

<sup>9</sup>Pace Spicq (*Épîtres Pastorales*, 379), the asyndeton need not indicate a transition to another “plan” or topic. Note 1 Tim 1:12, 15, 2:3.

<sup>10</sup>John Ed. Huther, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus* (Meyerk; 4th ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1881) 131; Patrick Fairbairn, *Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1874) 127; Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Herm; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 47.

<sup>11</sup>Russell C. Prohl, *Woman in the Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 31-32; Joyce Baldwin, *Women Likewise* (London: Falcon, 1973) 21-22; N. J. Hommes, “Let Women be Silent in the Church: A Message Concerning the Worship Service and the Decorum to be Observed by Women,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 4 (1969) 13.

only wives to adorn themselves modestly.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the context to which vv 11-15 are directed makes it likely that believers are being addressed as worshippers, not as family members.<sup>13</sup> Finally, one might have expected the article or perhaps a possessive pronoun before *ἄνδρός* in v 12 had Paul wanted to make clear that he was speaking of husband-wife relationships.

The command that the women learn is qualified by two *ἐν* phrases, expressing the manner in which the woman is to learn.<sup>14</sup> *ἡσυχία* can denote either “silence” (cf. Acts 22:2) or “quietness” (2 Thess 3:12), but in a context having to do with teaching and learning, the former is more likely.<sup>15</sup> Additional support for this translation might be found in the context if Paul intended the two prohibitions of v 12 to be counterparts of the two qualifications in v 11 (*ἐν ὑποταγῇ* = *οὐδὲ ἀθρευτεῖν*; *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ* = [*οὐ*] *διδάσκειν*). In addition to the need for “silence” as women learn is the need for submissiveness. But submissiveness to whom or what? The several Pauline texts in which wives are commanded to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22; Col 3:18; Titus 2:5; perhaps 1 Cor 14:34), the focus of v 12 and the close parallel between 1 Tim 2:11-14 and 1 Cor 14:33b-35 (silence in the church - submission - OT) would suggest that *ἄνδρός* should be inferred as the object. On the other hand, the situation at Ephesus, in which false teachers were leading many astray (including some women; cf. 1 Tim 5:13 and 2 Tim 3:6-7), and in light of which there was great need for attentive and obedient learning, argues for a broader reference: women were to submit “to the constituted authority, i.e. the officials and regulations of the church.”<sup>16</sup> Perhaps, however, we are not forced to choose between these alternatives. *ὑποταγή* could very well have application both to the learning process, in which submission to “sound teaching” is commanded, and to the prohibitions of v 12, where submission to men is the issue. Again, support for this dual reference may be found in the structure of vv 11-12, which appears to be chiasmic:

A γυνή ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ  
 B μανθανέτω  
 C ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ  
 B διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ ἀθρευτεῖν ἄνδρός  
 A ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ

*ὑποταγή* is then found at the focal point of the verses.

<sup>12</sup>George W. Knight III, *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977) 30-31.

<sup>13</sup>Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 462 n. 107.

<sup>14</sup>On the use of *ἐν* to indicate manner, sometimes called the adverbial usage, see BDF, para. 198.

<sup>15</sup>So BAG, 350; *pace* Kaiser, “Paul, Women,” 10. For a discussion of the term in Hellenistic philosophy, see Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 389-390 note 4. The meanings “silence” and “quietness” or “rest” are found, with roughly the same frequency, in LXX, Josephus and Philo.

<sup>16</sup>Walter Lock, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1924) 32; Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 47; cf. K. H. Rengstorf, “μανθάνω,” *TDNT* 4 (1967) 410.

A mildly adversative  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  introduces the corollary of v 11: If a woman is to learn in silence and submission, she is forbidden the contrary, to teach or to exercise authority over a man. Paul's counsel is introduced with the verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ , which Paul elsewhere uses with God as the subject (1 Cor 16:7) and which thus can hardly be weakened to indicate a personal preference and no more.<sup>17</sup> Nor does the present tense justify restricting the advice only to Paul's day or to peculiar circumstances in a given period:<sup>18</sup> the first person singular formulation renders the present tense necessary and can have almost a gnomic timeless force (cf. also 2:1 and 2:8). This, of course, does not prove that it *does* here, but any limitation will have to be inferred from the context and not on the basis of tense alone.

Two distinct, yet related, activities are prohibited women in this verse—both of which require elucidation. Teaching is ranked by Paul as one of the preeminent gifts given to the church (1 Cor 12:28-29; Eph 4:11; Rom 12:7); a gift which he himself possessed (1 Cor 4:17; 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11) and which Timothy also had been granted and was not to neglect (1 Tim 4:11-16).<sup>19</sup> While the evidence is not clear-cut, the teaching gift seems to have been restricted to definite individuals.<sup>20</sup> The teacher was above all a transmitter of the tradition about Christ (cf. Gal 1:12), which tradition was received by the churches and to which they must remain true (Rom 16:17, Eph 4:21, Col 2:7, 2 Thess 2:15).<sup>21</sup> This latter emphasis is particularly strong in the Pastorals, where destructive and demonic teaching ( $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\chi\lambda\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\nu}\omega\nu$ —1 Tim 4:1) necessitated particular attention to “sound teaching” ( $\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\mu\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$ ).<sup>22</sup> The authority inherent in the teaching, and thus in the teacher, is indicated by the fact that the teaching ministry was restricted to particular individuals (the elder-overseer in the Pastorals [1 Tim 3:2, 5:17; Titus 1:9]) and by the combinations in which one finds the word: thus, Paul who was appointed a “herald, apostle and teacher of the nations” (1 Tim 2:7; cf 2 Tim 1:11) “proclaims, admonishing and teaching” (Col 1:28), and Timothy is

<sup>17</sup>Rightly Knight, *Role Relationship*, 31 n. 4; contra J. Massyngberde Ford, “Biblical Material Relevant to the Ordination of Women,” *JES* 10 (1973) 682; Grant R. Osborne, “Hermeneutics and Women in the Church,” *JETS* 20 (1977) 347; Kaiser, “Paul, Women,” 11. It may be that a rabbinic formula of prohibition is reproduced with this word (Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales*, 379). Cf. 1 Cor 14:34, where the passive is used in a parallel formulation.

<sup>18</sup>Pace Don Williams, *The Apostle Paul and Women in the Church* (Van Nuys, Calif.: BIM, 1977) 112.

<sup>19</sup>The gift ( $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ ) which had been given to Timothy is not specifically designated in 1 Tim 4:14, but in light of the conclusion of v 13 ( $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$ ) and the command in v 16 ( $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\chi\epsilon\ \sigma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$ ), teaching was almost certainly at least one component.

<sup>20</sup>Only 1 Cor 14:26 and Col 3:16 suggest otherwise. The former, however, should not be pressed to mean that everyone who gathered exercised the gift of teaching; “. . . it does mean that any of them might be expected to take part in the service.” (Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* [Tyndale New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958] 199). On the latter text, Greeven is probably correct: “Vielmehr ist jeder zu seiner Gabe aufgerufen. In ihren Lehrern lehrt ‘sich’ in ihren Ermahnenden ermahnt ‘sich’ die Gemeinde zu Kolossae” (H. Greeven, “Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus,” *ZNW* 44 [1952-53] 17).

<sup>21</sup>Greeven, “Propheten,” 19-23.

<sup>22</sup>K. Wegenast, “Teach, *et al.*” *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. C. Brown (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-78) 3.765.

encouraged to “command and teach” (1 Tim 4:11), to “teach and exhort” (1 Tim 6:2) and to “preach the Word . . . in teaching” (2 Tim 4:1). In sum, “teaching” according to Paul involves the careful transmission of the tradition concerning Jesus Christ and His significance and the authoritative proclamation of God’s will to believers in light of that tradition.<sup>23</sup> This description corresponds closely to that activity designated in later Judaism by the absolute *διδάσκω*, and the corresponding Hebrew *limēd*. According to Rengstorf, these words denote “the manner in which, by exposition of the Law as the sum of the revealed will of God, instruction is given for the ordering of the relationship between the individual and God on the one side, and the neighbor on the other, according to the divine will.”<sup>24</sup>

With the word *ἀθροεῖν*, denoting the second activity prohibited women, we come to a major *crux interpretum*. Translations of this Biblical Greek *hapax* range from the simple “have authority” (NIV; NASB) to the more nuanced “dictate” (Moffat) to the remarkably dissimilar “engage in fertility practices.”<sup>25</sup> This divergence is a factor of the obscurity of the word: it is rare before the third century and its cognates, while more numerous, do not present the lexicographer with a clear picture. The noun *ἀθροεῖτης* is employed in the fifth-third centuries B.C. with the meaning “murderer,”<sup>26</sup> a meaning preserved in Wis 12:6.<sup>27</sup> An apparently later meaning is “author,” “perpetrator”<sup>28</sup> while later still *ἀθροεῖτης* is used to mean “master.”<sup>29</sup> The noun *ἀθροεῖα* and the adjective *ἀθροεῖτικός* are attested beginning in the first century A.D., signifying, respectively, “authority” or “restriction” and “original” or “authoritative.”<sup>30</sup> In Patristic Greek, the verb *ἀθροεῖω* is widely used, with the sense “hold sovereign authority,” “act with authority,” “possess authority,” etc.,<sup>31</sup> and this is the meaning suggested for one of the two extant pre-Christian

<sup>23</sup>Floyd V. Filson, “The Christian Teacher in the First Century,” *JBL* 60 (1941) 323; Ridderbos, *Paul*, 453. Ford unduly restricts the meaning of the verb in 1 Tim 2:12 to the episcopal formulation of doctrine (“Biblical Material,” 683).

<sup>24</sup>K. H. Rengstorf, “*διδάσκω*” *TDNT* 2 (1964) 137.

In light of all this, it is difficult to understand how Hommes can assert that the function teaching in 1 Tim 2 is “very far removed” from the office of minister (“Let women be silent,” 12).

<sup>25</sup>Catherine C. Kroeger, “Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb,” *The Reformed Journal* 29(3), (March, 1979) 13.

<sup>26</sup>Euripides, *Andro*, 172, *Rhesus* 873, *Herc. Fur.*, 1359; Thucydides 3:58; Herodotus 1:117; Apollonius Rhodius 2:754.

<sup>27</sup>*ἀθροεῖτης γονεῖς ψυγῶν ἀβοηθήτων* “parents who murder helpless lives” - RSV. (Contra Kroeger [“Ancient Heresies,” 13], this is almost certainly the correct translation (cf. David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* [AB; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1979] 240).

<sup>28</sup>Polybius, *Hist.* 22. 14. 2; Josephus, *J. W.* 2. 12. 5; Diodorus Siculus 16.61.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. BAG, 120. If Euripides, *Suppl.* 442 is not emended, the noun appears as early as the fifth century B.C. with this meaning (Cf. LSJ, 275; BAG, 120).

<sup>30</sup>Cf. LSJ, 275; BAG, 120. For the adjective see particularly P. Oxy - 260.20 (*ἀθροεῖτικῆ χωρογραφία* [“authentic deed”]) and II Clement 14:3 (*τὸ ἀθροεῖτικόν* [“the reality”]).

<sup>31</sup>G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961) 262.

occurrences, in the *Rhetoric* of Philodemus.<sup>32</sup> The other pre-Christian occurrence comes in a papyrus letter dated 27 B.C., where *αἰθνετέω* apparently means “self-assured, firm.”<sup>33</sup> In the second century A.D. Ptolemy uses the verb to mean, clearly, “have authority over” or “dominate.”<sup>34</sup> It is sometimes suggested that the verb is of vulgar origin because it is condemned by the lexicographer Moeris (as is the noun by Phrynichus).<sup>35</sup> But such condemnation, coming from Atticists, proves only that the word was part of the vernacular.<sup>36</sup>

While the evidence is not extensive, the information outlined above allows for the fairly certain conclusion that *αἰθνετέω* in 1 Tim 2:12 must mean “have authority.” This is the meaning of the verb in one of the two pre-Christian occurrences, in the second century, and in the Church Fathers. Furthermore, whatever the etymology of the noun *βε*,<sup>37</sup> it is clear that its meaning in the Hellenistic period was most often “master, authority.”<sup>38</sup> The connotation of sexual involvement, suggested by Kroeger, is nowhere attested in the Classical or Hellenistic period; her argument depends entirely upon later sources and on the dubious use of terms coordinate with the verb. Furthermore, while the nuance “usurped authority” or of arbitrary of dictatorial rule is often posited,<sup>39</sup> there is nothing inherent in the word that suggests it; only a clear contextual feature would allow such a connotation.

Having sought to determine the significance of each of the prohibitions of v 12, it is now necessary to investigate their relationship with each other. We may begin by noting that, since Paul elsewhere encourages older women to teach younger women (Titus 2:3-4), his prohibition of teaching here must be in some way restricted. The focus on *ἁποραγή* in vv 11-12 and the parallel passage in 1 Cor 13:33b-34, where Paul forbids women from speaking because they are

<sup>32</sup>BAG, 120.

<sup>33</sup>BGU IV 1208.37-38. Cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 47. This papyrus letter and the Philodemus passage were unavailable to me.

<sup>34</sup>Tetrabiblos 157: ὁ μὲν οὖν τοῦ κρόνου ἄστυρ μόνος τὴν οἰκοεσπολίαν τῆς ψυχῆς λαβῶν καὶ ἀθνετήσας τοῦ τε Ἑρμοῦ καὶ τῆς σελήνης . . . (“If Saturn alone is ruler of the soul and *dominates* Mercury and the moon . . .”). Note particularly the parallel with *οἰκοεσπορία*.

<sup>35</sup>Moeris, (ed. J. Pierson) 58; Phrynichus 96.

<sup>36</sup>James Hope Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol II: *Accidence and Word Formation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1929) 278.

<sup>37</sup>J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan (*The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other non-Literary Sources* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963] 91) suggest that two separate roots are involved, one from *ἐνρη*, “to thrust,” the other from *θελω*, “to die.” But this is disputed by Hjalmer Frisk (*Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* [2 vols; 2nd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1973] 1.185) and Pierre Chantraine (*Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque: Histoire des Mots* [Paris: Klincksieck, 1968] 1.138).

<sup>38</sup>W. Gunion Rutherford (*The New Phrynichus* [London: Macmillan, 1881] 201) thinks it probable that the meaning “master” for *αἰθνετής* came from one of the older dialects.

<sup>39</sup>Baldwin, *Women Likewise* 22; Williams, *Apostle Paul* 112-113; Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation* (Waco, Texas: Word, 1974) 71; Ford, “Biblical Material,” 683; Hommes, “Let Women be Silent,” 19.

to be in submission, suggest that it is particularly the proper relationship of men and women with which Paul is concerned. If this is so, the second prohibition can be regarded as the basis for the first: women are not to teach in the assembly because such activity would constitute “wielding authority” over men and, hence, violate the principle of submission.<sup>40</sup> But while the second prohibition explains and qualifies the first, it is necessary to maintain that two *separate* prohibitions are given: the construction with *οὐδέ* admits of no other explanation.<sup>41</sup> Thus, it is illegitimate to view v 12 as forbidding only “the kind of teaching in which women dictate to men;” such a restriction of *διδασκευ* ignores the fact, as indicated earlier, that teaching by its nature involves authority and limits the meaning of *αὐθεντεῖν* without warrant.

Paul’s commands with respect to the woman’s role in the learning-teaching activities of the assembly are given their rationale (*γάρ*) in vv 13-14. These verses offer assertions about both the creation and the fall, but it is not clear how they support the commands in vv 11-12. The relevance of these statements was presumably evident to Paul and Timothy and it is our task to define this relevance.

With obvious reference to the Genesis 2 creation account, Paul first of all asserts, without further explanation, that man was “formed”<sup>42</sup> first. Clearly, his emphasis is on chronological priority (*πρῶτος . . . εἶτα*) and it may be that he is suggesting, in accordance with the view popular among both Jews and Greeks, that priority in time necessarily involves superiority.<sup>43</sup> But if, as seems necessary in a statement so brief, elucidation of Paul’s intention is sought from parallel texts, a different picture emerges. In 1 Cor 11:8-9, Paul substantiating his claim that “woman is the glory of man” (v 7) argues: “for man did not come from (*ἐκ*) woman, but woman from man; neither was man created for woman but woman for man.” These two assertions encompass both derivation and subordination; according to Genesis 2, woman was made by God from man’s rib, and she was to be a “helper corresponding to him.”<sup>44</sup> If this line of reasoning is assumed to lie behind Paul’s statement in v 13, his point would appear to be that the role of women in the worship service should be in accord with the subordinate, helping role envisaged for them in creation.

<sup>40</sup>Spicq, *Epîtres Pastorales* 379-380; Robert L. Saucy, “The Negative Case Against the Ordination of Women,” *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology: Papers from the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society* (ed. K. S. Kantzer and S. N. Gundry; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 278. Spicq (*Epîtres Pastorales*, 380) and J. N. D. Kelly (*A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* [HNTC; London: Black, 1963] 68) discern an additional reference to the Genesis context, specifically to 3:16: “he will rule over (LXX *κυριεῖσει*) you,” but there is little to suggest that this context is already in the Apostle’s mind.

<sup>41</sup>While it is tempting to suggest a kind of hendiadys (*διδασκευ . . . οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν* = “to teach authoritatively”), an examination of Paul’s use of *οὐδέ* in similar constructions shows that two separate provisions are always envisaged.

<sup>42</sup>*πλάσσω*, used also in Gen 2:7-8, 2:15 and 2:19, establishes a verbal link between 1 Tim 2:13 and the second creation account.

<sup>43</sup>Spicq, *Epîtres Pastorales* 380; cf. Str-B 3.256,626.

<sup>44</sup>Knight, *Role Relationship* 40-41.

Whereas it is possible to suggest a plausible interpretation of v 13 by means of parallel texts, such a recourse is not open to us in v 14. The assertion that Eve alone was “deceived”<sup>45</sup> finds no parallel in the NT; nor is the fall elsewhere introduced into a discussion of sexual roles. The situation is different in contemporary Judaism: it became popular to lay virtually sole blame for human sin and death on Eve’s shoulders, as the well-known statement in Sirach demonstrates: “Women is the origin of sin, and it is through her that we all die” (25:24).<sup>46</sup> But in light of Paul’s very clear assertions about Adam’s responsibility for sin and death in Romans 5 and elsewhere, it is most unlikely that he is attempting to exempt man from blame and to picture Eve as the sole culprit.

A second view of v 14 holds that Paul is making reference to the fact that it was the woman, according to Genesis 3, who convinced man to eat the forbidden fruit, so that, in Chrysostom’s words, “The woman taught once, and ruined all.”<sup>47</sup> But if Paul had meant this, he could hardly have chosen a less obvious way of saying it; the use of the verb ἀπατάω clearly suggests that the focus is upon Eve’s relationship to the serpent, not on her influence over Adam. Thirdly, others suppose that the domination of man over woman, part of the judgment pronounced upon the woman in Gen 3:16, is evoked by Paul.<sup>48</sup> While this idea probably cannot be excluded, again it must be asked whether such a view does justice to the emphasis upon deception; the Gen 3 narrative nowhere attributes the judgment upon the woman to her being deceived.

What does seem clear is that Paul pays close attention to the actual wording of Genesis 3, where he would note that only the woman confesses to have been deceived (Gen 3:13; LXX – ἀπατάω): it is this deception upon which he focuses.<sup>49</sup> An acceptable interpretation of this verse must do justice to this fact, and to the emphasis on the contrast at this point between Adam and Eve; moreover, it must show how the assertion about the historical experience of

<sup>45</sup>ἐξαπατάω may have a perfective sense, “completely deceived” (Spicq, *Epistles Pastorales* 381; cf. Alfred Plummer on 2 Cor 11:3 (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1915] 295), but this is not certain since Hellenistic Greek is known for the blunting of such emphases. (Whyte, “The First and Second Epistles to Timothy,” 109).

<sup>46</sup>For the same idea, see also *Adam and Eve* (before A.D. 70) 18:1, 35:2-3, 44:2; *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* 30:17-28; Midr. Gen XVII.8; and the discussions in Leonard Swidler, *Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism* (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow, 1976) 47; E. E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975) 1.421; Bruce J. Malina, “Some Observations on the Origin of Sin in Judaism and St. Paul,” *CBO* 31 (1969) 24.

Several of the Church Fathers express a similar view (e.g. Tertullian, *de Cult. Fem.*, I. 1; Augustine, *Civ Deo*, XIV 11).

<sup>47</sup>*Hom.* IX on 1 Tim 2:11-14, NPNF, XIII. 436.

<sup>48</sup>Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles* 68. Fritz Zerbst views v 14 as a counter to an argument that the fall obliterated created distinctions (*The Office of Women in the Church* [St. Louis: Concordia, 1955] 54). But it is unlikely that such a view would have had any prominence.

<sup>49</sup>Huther, *Timothy and Titus* 132; E. F. Scott, *The Pastoral Epistles* (MNTC; London: Harper, n.d.) 27. Philo noted the same fact: *Leg. All.* III. 61.



Eve can lend support for the instructions to Christian women in general in vv 11-12. If these requirements are to be met, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Paul cites Eve's failure as exemplary and perhaps causative of the nature of women in general and that this susceptibility to deception bars them from engaging in public teaching.<sup>50</sup> In addition to the obvious need to link v 14 to its context, this general application finds support in the use of ἡ γυνή, "the woman," which may imply a broader reference<sup>51</sup> and in the perfect participle γεγόνει, which suggest the continuing effects of the deception.<sup>52</sup> While ambiguities remain, it is arguable that only this interpretation adequately accounts for the data given above: the stress on Eve's deception, the indication of the lasting effects of the action, and the fact that v 14 functions as support for the teaching in vv 11-12. It should be noted that, in attributing blame to the woman here, Paul in no way seeks to exonerate man and obviate his responsibility for sin: he concentrates upon the woman because it is her role which is being discussed. Elsewhere, Adam comes in for severe criticism, indeed more severe perhaps than Eve's: to disobey (Rom 5:19), is less excusable than to be deceived.<sup>53</sup>

While less explicit, it may be that Paul intends to make a further point by juxtaposing v 13 and v 14: the woman, created to be man's helper and subordinate to him (Genesis 2), acts independently when confronted with temptation, to the downfall of both (Genesis 3). It may be that Paul views the teaching/ruling activity of women in the church as just such an improper reversal of intended roles.<sup>54</sup>

In vv 13-14, then, Paul substantiates his teaching in vv 11-12 by arguing that the created order establishes a relationship of subordination of woman to man, which order, if bypassed, leads to disaster,<sup>55</sup> and by suggesting that there are some activities for which women are by nature not suited. That Paul's argument from Genesis supports his prohibition of particular functions as well as the general need for submission<sup>56</sup> is made clear by the nature of his

<sup>50</sup>Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 77; H. P. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy* (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1978 [=1897]) 19.

<sup>51</sup>The article with γυνή is almost certainly anaphoric, yet the shift from the proper name earlier in the verse implies a broadened reference. (Whyte, "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy," 109).

<sup>52</sup>γεγόνει ἐν denotes entrance into a given situation, the perfect stressing "les effects permanents de l'acte initial." (Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales* 381-382).

<sup>53</sup>Contrast Milton: "Against his better judgment, not deceived, But fondly overcome with female charms." (*Paradise Lost* X. 998).

<sup>54</sup>Fairbairn, *Pastoral Epistles* 129; Peter Brunner, *The Ministry and the Ministry of Women* (Contemporary Theology Series; St. Louis: Concordia, 1971) 27-28; Knight, *Role Relationship* 31. For the sake of completeness, the view of Scanzoni and Hardesty should be mentioned. They argue that the "primary concern here is not so much the role of women as the possibility of false teaching;" and that Paul warns all his readers to avoid becoming deceived as Eve was. (*All We're Meant to Be* 70-71, 37). Such an interpretation does violence both to the contrast in v 14 (not Adam, but Eve) and to the context.

<sup>55</sup>J. I. Packer, "Postscript: I Believe in Women's Ministry," *Why Not? Priesthood and the Ordination of Women*, (ed. Michael Bruce and G. E. Duffield; rev. ed.; R. T. Beckwith; Appleford Abingdon, Berks: Marchem Manor, n.d.) 170.

<sup>56</sup>Pace Osbourne, "Hermeneutics," 348.

argument in v 14: the verse simply does not make sense as a substantiation of the need for submission *only*.

Virtually all commentaries understand v 15 as a qualification added to lessen the impact of vv 13-14, but there is little argument as to what precisely this qualification is. The following views can be found:

1) Despite the judgment pronounced upon woman (Gen 3:16), Christian women will be safely preserved through the experience of childbirth.<sup>57</sup>

2) Christian women will experience salvation even though they must bear children (Gen 3:16).<sup>58</sup>

3) By observing her proper role (*τεκνογονία*) and maintaining Christian virtues, the woman will be kept from the error just mentioned (lording it over the husband and being deceived).<sup>59</sup>

4) Christian women are saved through good works, figuratively represented by *τεκνογονία*.<sup>60</sup>

5) Despite the disastrous results of Eve's deception, Christian women will be saved through *the* childbirth, the coming of the Messiah, just as was promised in the *protoevangelium* (Gen 3:15).<sup>61</sup>

6) It is not through active teaching and ruling activities that Christian women will be saved, but through faithfulness to their proper role, exemplified in motherhood.<sup>62</sup>

Options two, three and four can be quickly eliminated because they fail to do justice to the sense of the words: two gives an unnatural meaning to *διὰ*; three to *σώζω* and four to *τεκνογονία*. Option one can probably be excluded also; *σώζω* consistently indicates salvation from sin in Paul,<sup>63</sup> and the conditional clause is hard to explain in this reading. It is more difficult to decide between five and six. In favor of the former is the context of Genesis 3, clearly in Paul's mind in v 14, the natural meaning given *σώζω* and *διὰ* and the article with *τεκνογονία*. Despite this, however, option six should probably be preferred. While *τεκνογονία* could possibly denote the birth of Christ, it is certainly not the most natural explanation;<sup>64</sup> and Paul uses the verbal form of this word in 1 Tim 5:14 to mean the rearing of children. The article need not be specifying, but may be generic.<sup>65</sup>

Positively, the view that regards v 15 as a specification of the role through

<sup>57</sup>Moffat's translation: "get safely through childbirth;" cf. also NASB: "Preserved through the bearing of children;" Moule, *Idiom Book* 56.

<sup>58</sup>Scott, *Pastoral Epistles* 28.

<sup>59</sup>S. Jebb, "A Suggested Interpretation of 1 Tim 2<sup>15</sup>," *ExpTim* 81 (1969-70) 221.

<sup>60</sup>A view mentioned by Spicq (*Épîtres Pastorales* 383).

<sup>61</sup>Liddon, *First Timothy* 20; Ellicott, *Pastoral Epistles* 38-39; Lock, *Pastoral Epistles* 33; Williams, *Apostle Paul* 113. Pace Williams, it is impossible to view v 15 as "erasing" the priority of Adam in creation.

<sup>62</sup>Robert Falconer, "1 Timothy 2:14,15. Interpretative Notes," *JBL* 66 (1941) 376-378; Huther, *Timothy and Titus* 133; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles* 69; Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales* 382-83; Ridderbos, *Paul* 309 n. 140.

<sup>63</sup>Cf. BAG 805-806; only 2 Tim 4:18 is questionable.

<sup>64</sup>As Guthrie says, "... if that were the writer's interpretation, he could hardly have chosen a more obscure or ambiguous way of saying it" (*Pastoral Epistles* 78).

<sup>65</sup>Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles* 77.

which women experience salvation admirably suits the context of vv 9-14, where the issue is obviously the proper sphere of women's activities. Moreover, such an interpretation finds support in the larger context, for a frequently recurring motif in the Pastoral Epistles is the need for Christian women to devote themselves to the care of homes and the raising of children (1 Tim 5:9-10, 5:14; Titus 3:4-5). Such advice was clearly needed as an antidote to the false teachers, who counseled abstention from marriage (1 Tim 4:3) and generally, it seems, sought to denigrate those virtues and activities which Paul regarded as fitting for Christian women.<sup>66</sup>

Finally, this view satisfies the linguistic evidence better than any other. *σώζω* retains its natural Pauline sense, deliverance from sin and its condemning power, perhaps especially here in the ultimate, eschatological sense. *διὰ* will indicate not the ultimate cause, but the efficient cause: *τεκνογονία* is one of those "good works" (v 10) through which the Christian woman preserves her place in the salvific scheme,<sup>67</sup> in contrast to those women who have hearkened to the false teaching, and who have "turned away to follow Satan" (1 Tim 5:13). Similarly, Paul admonishes Timothy in 4:16 to watch his life and doctrine closely and to persevere in them, "because if you do, you will save (*σώσεις*) both yourself and your hearers."

A serious difficulty with this view still has to be faced, however. Does v 15 imply that women experience ultimate salvation only insofar as they beget children? Clearly such a conclusion is incompatible with clear Pauline teaching,<sup>68</sup> but an explanation can be found which blunts the force of this objection. *τεκνογονία*, which may indicate child-rearing as well as child-bearing,<sup>69</sup> may represent, by *synecdoche*, the general scope of activities in which Christian women should be involved.<sup>70</sup> That this is a legitimate interpretation is suggested by the text in 1 Tim 5:14, in which Paul expresses his wish that young women "marry" and "beget children" (*τεκνογονούν*) where, again, it can hardly be the case that Paul wants *all* young women to marry. Finally, to remove any possibility of an *ex opera operato* understanding, Paul adds the

<sup>66</sup>Falconer, "1 Timothy 2:14,15" 376-378. And note b Ber. 17a: "Whereby do women earn merit? By making their children go to the synagogue to learn Scripture. . . ."

<sup>67</sup>On the use of *διὰ* to denote "efficient cause," see M. J. Harris, "Prepositions and New Testament Theology," *New International Dictionary* 3. 1182.

Most who hold the view outlined above interpret *διὰ* as denoting "attendant circumstances" (Falconer, "1 Timothy 2:14,15," 376; Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales* 383. Ridderbos translates: ". . . the way in which this salvation takes place." [Paul, 309 n. 140]). But the connection between *σώζω* and *τεκνογονία* would appear to be closer than this; "good works," after all, are not a means of salvation, but are essential components of the continued experience of salvation.

<sup>68</sup>E.g., 1 Tim 5:3-10; 1 Cor 7:8-9, 26-27, 34-35.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day* (2nd ed.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.) 170-175 and Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales* 383-384, n. 5; contrast Moulton - Milligan, *Vocabulary* 628.

<sup>70</sup>That Christian women are the subject of *μείωσω*, rather than their children (Joachim Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* [NTD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968] 19) or husbands and wives (Whyte, "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy," 110) seems clear from the context and represents a natural shift from singular to plural, perhaps thereby stressing the paranaetic quality of the condition. (Spicq, *Épîtres Pastorales* 383; Lock, *Pastoral Epistles* 33).

condition that women must also maintain essential Christian virtues; legitimate activities, by themselves, are insufficient.

Thus, v 15 ends on the note with which the passage has begun in v 9: the need for *σωφροσύνη*. This quality is advanced by Paul as a chief virtue of Christian women, in contrast both to the example of some who have been led astray by false teachers and to the mother of the human race:

Eve, par son manque de discernement du bien et du mal, a pris une initiative audacieuse et elle a été 'trompée.' Les chrétiennes corrigeront cette déficience atarique par une sôphrosunê 'acquise' . . . .<sup>71</sup>

In this respect, vv 11-12 can be viewed as an example of the kind of propriety expected of Christian women in the context of the worship service. Their learning in silence and submission and declining to take the initiative in teaching and wielding authority is a good work which is in accordance with the relationship of man and woman as established in creation and with the nature of woman as exhibited in the fall. Maintaining their proper role will also, finally, insure their participation in the eschatological salvation.

## II. The Significance of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

It must now be asked to what extent Paul's instructions to Timothy can be made normative for the conduct of Christian worship in other eras. This question, the hermeneutical one, cannot be ignored in view of the fact that every passage of Scripture is written against a particular and to some extent unique cultural and historical background.<sup>72</sup> On the other hand, however, it is not legitimate to limit the scope of 1 Tim 2:11-15 simply by mentioning cultural or historical factors which *could* have been operative; the presence of such a factor must be adequately demonstrated. While the passage we are considering seems at first sight to surmount cultural barriers with appeals to creation and the fall, other factors which might serve to limit the scope of Paul's instructions must be considered. We will now attempt to enumerate and evaluate such limiting factors as have been suggested.

Perhaps the most significant of such circumstances would be teaching in the NT that contradicts the evident meaning of 1 Tim 2:11-15.<sup>73</sup> Scripture must always be read in the light of Scripture, and if such contradictory evidence were to be found, we would have to question the accuracy of our exegesis or assume that Paul's advice to Timothy was limited to a particular time and place.

Two crucial texts are found in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians: 11:2-16 and 14:33-34. The former passage makes mention of women who

<sup>71</sup>Spicq, *Epîtres Pastorales* 384.

<sup>72</sup>Robert Johnson properly stresses the cruciality of the hermeneutical issue ("The Role of Women in the Church and Home: An Evangelical Testcase in Hermeneutics," *Scripture, Tradition and Interpretation* [ed. W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford Lasor; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978] 234-259).

<sup>73</sup>John Reumann claims that this is the "acid test" for determining whether 1 Tim 2 forbade the teaching office to women ("What in Scripture Speaks to the Ordination of Women?", *CTM* 44 [1973] 22).

“pray and prophesy” (v 5) while the latter forbids women to speak in the assembly. If 1 Cor 14:33-36 is not omitted as a later interpolation, for which there is insufficient evidence,<sup>74</sup> one must seek to reconcile Paul’s prohibitions in chap. 14 with his approval in chap. 11. Indeed, it has been argued that Paul does *not* give approval to women speaking in the assembly in chap. 11, but merely cites current practice.<sup>75</sup> But it is hard to believe that Paul would have given such extensive instructions for a practice of which he did not approve. Others suggest that chap. 11 involves a private gathering and chap. 14 a public meeting,<sup>76</sup> but it is best to view the different instructions as directed to different activities. In 1 Cor 14:29-33a, Paul encourages worshippers to evaluate the messages of the prophets, and in vv 33bff. it is probably this questioning of the validity of the prophetic word that is forbidden women. Such an activity would, it seems, have constituted a transgression of the commandment that the woman should be submissive (v 34b - ἀλλὰ ὑποτασσέσθωσαν)<sup>77</sup> which commandment finds support in “the law.” Because no OT text prohibits women from speaking, it has sometimes been argued that Paul refers here to a rabbinic commandment as to current social practice,<sup>78</sup> but such a meaning for νόμος is unexampled in Paul,<sup>79</sup> and it is overlooked that Paul uses the Law to justify not the silence, but the submission. While Gen 3:15 is usually thought to be the passage which Paul has in mind, Feuillet, noting the parallel in 1 Corinthians 11, makes a very strong case for Genesis 2.<sup>80</sup>

If Paul, then, is most concerned with the need for women to maintain submissive behavior, his permission to “pray and prophecy” might suggest that such activities do not constitute a violation of that principle. That such is indeed the case can be shown when the relation between prophesying and

<sup>74</sup>See especially A. Feuillet, “La Dignité et le Rôle de la Femme d’après quelques textes Pauliniens: comparaison avec l’Ancien Testament,” *NTS* 21 (1975) 162-164.

For the view that these verses have been interpolated, perhaps in dependence on 1 Tim 2:12-14, see Johannes Leipoldt, *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1954) 190-191; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1968) 331-333 (weakly). Wm. O. Walker holds the view that 1 Cor 11:2-16 is an interpolation! (“1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul’s views regarding women,” *JBL* 94 [1975] 94-110).

<sup>75</sup>E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul Première Épître aux Corinthiens* (EBib; 2nd ed.; Paris: Gabalda, 1956) 372-373; Ryrie, *The Place of Woman* 77; W. J. Martin, “1 Corinthians 11:2-16: an Interpolation,” *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (ed. W. W. Gasque and Ralph P. Martin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970) 240.

<sup>76</sup>Prohl, *Women in the Church* 32-33; Scanzoni-Hardesty, *All We’re Meant to Be* 68.

<sup>77</sup>Cf. especially James B. Hurley, “Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of 1 Cor 11:2-16 and 1 Cor 14:33b-36,” *WTJ*, 35 (1972-73) 216-218; and Feuillet, “La Dignité,” 167-168; and also John P. Meier, “On the Veiling of Hermeneutics (1 Cor 11:2-16),” *CBQ* 40 (1978) 218; Hans-Dieter Wendland, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 131-132.

<sup>78</sup>Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, *Women, Men and the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1977) 96; Kaiser, “Paul, Women,” 10.

<sup>79</sup>While Mosaic Law is not always meant by Paul where he uses νόμος (cf. Rom 7:21) nor even ὁ νόμος (Rom 8:2), the clear contextual basis must be found for any other meaning.

<sup>80</sup>“La Dignité,” 164-166.

teaching is discerned.

“Teaching,” as we have seen, involves the careful transmission of the Christian tradition and the authoritative proclamation of God’s will, based on that tradition and study of the Scriptures. While no clear and fast demarcation line can be drawn, “prophecy,” in distinction to teaching, appears to involve a more directly revelatory experience and consequently involves to a lesser degree the preparation and consciousness of the individual. Friedrich succinctly states this difference:

“Whereas teachers expound Scripture, cherish the tradition about Jesus and explain the fundamentals of the catechism, the prophets, not bound by Scripture or tradition, speak to the congregation on the basis of revelations.”<sup>81</sup> Paul’s teaching to the Church at Corinth thus offers no contradiction to his advice to Timothy in Ephesus: women are allowed to pray and prophesy, but not to participate in activities, such as teaching and the questioning of prophets, which would place them in a position of authority over men.<sup>82</sup>

A different kind of contradiction is found by those who employ “indirect” NT evidence as a means of demonstrating the important role played by women in the early church.<sup>83</sup> Margaret Howe asserts: “The overwhelming impression communicated by the Pauline writings is that the Pauline communities affirmed the leadership role of women as being both theologically viable and practically effective.”<sup>84</sup> And, indeed, these texts must not be overlooked. Jesus’ attitude to and involvement with women represented a revolutionary shift from the tradition of Jewish society, and there is evidence that this new attitude was maintained in the early church. Philip’s seven daughters have the gift of prophecy (Acts 21:9); Priscilla, with her husband, “explains the way to God” to Apollos (Acts 18:26). Paul himself refers to women as “working hard in the Lord” (Rom 16:6,12); and as his “co-laborers” (Rom 16:3; Phil 4:2-3); and (perhaps) assumes that they will be appointed as deacons (1 Tim 3:11). Phoebe is certainly commended as a *διάκονος* who has a prominent position in

<sup>81</sup>Gerhard Friedrich, “προφήτης,” *TDNT* 6 (1968) 854; cf. also Rengstorf, “διδάσκω,” 158; Greeven, “Propheten,” 29-30; David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (New Foundations Theological Library; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979) 108-122, especially 132-133.

In light of this, it is difficult to understand how it can be asserted that 1 Corinthians 11 permits women to teach (*pace* C. E. Cerling, Jr., “Women Ministers in the New Testament Church?” *JETS* 17 [1976] 213).

<sup>82</sup>George H. Gilbert, “Women in Public Worship in the Churches of Paul,” *The Biblical World*, n.s. 2 (1893) 46. Albrecht Oepke, “γυνή,” *TDNT* 1 (1964) 787; Knight, *Role Relationship* 46.

Other culturally-limiting factors, whether it be involvement with idolatry (M. E. Thrall, *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Study of the Biblical Evidence* [Studies in Ministry and Worship; London: SCM, 1958] 75-76) or the possible impact on unbelievers and proselytes cannot be clearly established. Nor can *λαλεῖν* mean “idle chatter” (*pace* Scanzoni-Hardesty, *All We’re Meant to Be* 68-69) in light of the usage of the term in this chapter.

<sup>83</sup>See, e.g., the survey of T. B. Allworthy, *Women in the Apostolic Church: A Critical Study of the Evidence in the New Testament for the Prominence of Women in Early Christianity* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1917).

<sup>84</sup>E. Margaret Howe, “The Positive Case for the Ordination of Women,” *Perspective on Evangelical Theology* 276; cf. also Scanzoni-Hardesty, *All We’re Meant to Be* 61; Cerling, “Women Ministers,” 209-215; Osborne, “Hermeneutics,” 346.

the church at Cenchræe (Rom 16:1-2); in the same chapter (16:7), there may be a reference to a female apostle.

While these references certainly demonstrate that women fulfilled important ministries in the Apostolic church, the claims made on the basis of them by Howe and others are far too great. As a matter of fact, none of the texts clearly portrays a woman in the role of a leader or teacher of the church. Jesus, in a contrast to his Jewish culture, certainly accorded a status to women equal with men, but he stopped short of appointing them to any position of authority. That Paul recognized the significant ministry of a number of women can hardly allow conclusions as to the type of ministry in which they were involved. Priscilla's work with Apollos was clearly a matter of private instruction, carried out in the home of her and her husband, and it should be noted that *διάσκω* is not used to describe her work. Phoebe, whether she was an official "deacon" or not,<sup>85</sup> was probably involved in lending financial or legal support to indigent believers, rather than leading the church.<sup>86</sup> If *Ἰουνιᾶν* in Rom 16:7 is from the name Junia, a female apostle may be attested, but it is perhaps more likely that *Ἰουνιαν* is a shortened form of Judianus, a masculine name.<sup>87</sup>

Blum exactly describes the situation as determined by these "indirect" references:

The examination of all the references in the Pauline Epistles and in Acts therefore shows that women definitely played an active part in the life of the community, without, however, exercising a missionary or teaching office of any kind. Women, whether in official or quasi-official positions, are only found as *διάκονοι*.<sup>88</sup>

Thus the NT evidence presents no conflict with the exegetical conclusions

<sup>85</sup>It is debated whether *διάκονος* has a technical sense in Rom 16:1.

<sup>86</sup>*προστατής* (Fem. *προστάτις* in 16:2) was "used, like the Latin *patronus* for the legal representative of the foreigner" (William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [5th ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902] 417; cf. Matthew Black, *Romans* [NCB: London: Oliphants, 1973] 178).

It is difficult to give *προστάτις* the sense of "presiding" here because Paul himself is one of the objects of this activity (John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968] 227 n. 1).

<sup>87</sup>Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Meyerk; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 379; Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, 442-23 (who note that a number of abbreviated names are found in Romans 16). It is possible, if *Ἰουνιᾶν* is feminine, that Andronicus' wife is meant (M. J. Lagrange, *Saint Paul Epître aux Romains* [EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1916] 366).

It is hard to understand how scholars can be accused of "bias" in these cases as does, e.g. Howe ("Positive Case," 269-270), when there is legitimate question about the proper translation.

<sup>88</sup>Georg Gunter Blum, "The Office of Women in the New Testament," *Why Not? Priesthood and the Ordination of Women* (ET of "Das Amt der Frau im NT," *NovT* 7 [1964] 66. For a similar conclusion, see also Zerbst, *The Office of Women* 62-63; Knight, *Role Relationship* 47-52; Neil R. Lightfoot, "The Role of Women in Religious Services," *Restoration Quarterly* 19 (1976) 129-136.

It is worth mentioning that the practice of the early church is in close conformity with this evidence (Jean Daniélou, *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church* [London: Faith, 1968] 7-31; R. Gryson, *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church* (Collegeville, Minn.: Lit. Press, 1976) 112. Zerbst maintains that it has only been in situations where there has been an over-emphasis on the eschatological and charismatic that such practice has been varied (*Office of Women*, 100).

reached in our study of 1 Timothy 2; indeed, a view remarkably similar to that maintained in this passage has been everywhere found.<sup>89</sup>

A second approach which restricts Paul's teaching in 1 Timothy 2 to a limited situation begins with an alleged inconsistency observable in Paul's attitude toward women. Arguing that Paul's essential attitude is found in Gal 3:28 ("There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus;"), exponents of this approach argue either that Paul restricted women's sphere of activities elsewhere only for local, cultural reasons<sup>90</sup> or that he failed to carry through the implications of this insight consistently.<sup>91</sup> Two primary criticisms can be levelled against this approach.

First, the picture presented to us of Paul, "the man in conflict," initiating a veritable revolution in sexual relationships at one point and lapsing back into restrictive "Judaistic" attitudes at another, is hardly believable. That Paul did, in keeping with Jesus' attitude and teaching, move far beyond the teaching of Judaism with respect to women's role in the religious community, is clear. In contrast to the synagogue, where women were, perhaps, seated in a separate location,<sup>92</sup> and were not allowed to take an active part in the service,<sup>93</sup> Paul gave women the right to pray and prophesy (1 Cor 11:5). Paul likewise encouraged women to learn (1 Tim 2:11), in violation of the Talmudic advice: "May the words of the Torah be burned, they should not be handed over to

<sup>89</sup>Two more minor difficulties, not alluded to in the text, should be mentioned. It is asserted that the NT attitude toward women should be viewed as comparable to the view on slavery: deeper insight should cause a change in Christian perception. But as Waltke points out, "Paul never grounded his instructions concerning the behavioral relationship of master and slave to the abiding order of Creation." ("1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *BSac* 135 [1978] 56).

The other objection is that if women are not to teach, they are also to wear veils since the arguments adduced for both are the same (which is Waltke's conclusion: "1 Corinthians 11:2-16," 46-57; Meier, "On the veiling of Hermeneutics," 224). But there is a fundamental distinction between the veil and teaching: the former by nature represents a transitory form of dress; the latter is an activity grounded in Scripture and at the heart of the continuing life of the Christian church.

<sup>90</sup>Scanzoni-Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be* 70-71; Eugenie Andrus Leonard, "St. Paul and the Status of Women," *CBQ* 12 [1950] 317-318.

<sup>91</sup>Krister Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics* (Facet Books; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 40-41; Paul K. Jewett, *Man as Male and Female* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 112-147; Haye van der Meer, *Women Priests in the Catholic Church? A Theological-Historical Investigation* (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1973) 44-45; Reumann, "What in Scripture," 11; Thomas R. Longstaff, "The Ordination of Women: A Biblical Perspective," *ATR* 57 (1975) 316-327; George H. Tavard, *Women in Christian Tradition* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame, 1973) 27-35; Evelyn and Frank Stagg, *Women in the World of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978) 165; Reginald H. Fuller, "Pro and Con: The Ordination of Women in the New Testament," *Toward a New Theology of Ordination: Essays on the Ordination of Women* (ed. Marianne H. Micks and Charles P. Price; Summerville, Mass.: Greeno, Hadden, 1976) 9-10; Mollenkott, *Women, Men and the Bible* 96-97.

<sup>92</sup>Whether such a separate section for women existed in Paul's day is a subject of debate. Joachim Jeremias (*Jerusalem in the time of Jesus* [London: SCM, 1969] 374) and Swidler (*Women in Judaism* 89-90) affirm the fact of some segregation; S. Safrai questions it ("The Synagogue," *The Jewish People in the First Century* [Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974, 1976] 2. 939).

<sup>93</sup>Safrai, "Synagogue," 920-921; Oepke, "ἄνθρωποι," 787; Swidler, *Women in Judaism* 93.



women.”<sup>94</sup> With respect to 1 Tim 2:11-15, the point is this: Is it likely that Paul, within the space of a few words, would both decisively transcend his Jewish background by encouraging women to learn, and then fall prey to its clutches again, by forbidding them to teach? Certainly Paul said a number of things about women that can be paralleled in Jewish teaching, but such statements can be regarded as sub-Christian only if a) *all* opinions held by Jews are sub-Christian; or b) Paul can be shown to be in conflict with his own teaching. Could it not be that the so-called conflict in Paul is in reality a conflict only in the mind of modern man?<sup>95</sup> Such a suggestion leads us back to Gal 3:28, which must now be considered with respect to our second objection.

It has become popular to view Gal 3:28 as an expression of the most basic and authentic Pauline attitude toward women and to interpret it as establishing an equality between man and woman that annuls any gender-based distinctions within the church. Three objections to this view may be offered. First, Paul in this text is making an assertion about the equality of all people before God, probably with a view to the Jewish prayer in which the man expressed his thanks to God that he had not been created a woman, a slave or a Gentile.<sup>96</sup> Although it is frequently pointed out, it must be reiterated again: equality in status before God does not require the abolition of all hierarchical relationships.<sup>97</sup> Secondly, then, it is false to view Gal 3:28 as the central Pauline text on women, since that is not the basic topic.<sup>98</sup> Thirdly, it is methodologically objectionable to exalt one text to programmatic status and dismiss or interpret in a forced manner all others. Much more acceptable is the approach which seeks to allow each text to speak and then determine where assimilation into a consistent outlook is possible. In this case it is. In essence and in terms of means and ability in approaching God all are equal; in relationships with one another, distinctions, sometimes involving submission and obedience, are maintained. In this light, the frequently noted parallel to the Trinity is apt: Jesus, though one with the Father, also does all that His father commands him.

A third factor which is said to limit the applicability of 1 Tim 2:11-15 is Paul's use of the Genesis narratives. Thus, it has become customary to fault the Apostle's interpretation of the creation accounts and to reject his conclusions

<sup>94</sup>y. Sota 10a. Another passage cautions against teaching a daughter the Torah (b. Sota 21b). Cf. Oepke, “*γυνή*” 782; Jeremias, *Jerusalem* 372; Swidler, *Women in Judaism* 83-88, 93-97.

<sup>95</sup>Madeleine Boucher, “Some unexplored parallels to 1 Cor 11, 11-12 on Gal 3, 28: The NT on the Role of Women,” *CBQ* 31 (1969) 57; Zerbst, *Office of Woman* 59-61. Elaine H. Pagels offers some trenchant criticisms of more extreme “man in conflict” positions (“Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion,” *JAAR* 42 [1974] 538-539).

<sup>96</sup>Leonard Swidler, *Biblical Affirmations of Woman* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979) 322-323.

<sup>97</sup>John Jefferson Davis, “Some Reflections on Galatians 3:28 Sexual Roles and Biblical Hermeneutics,” *JETS* 19 (1976) 202-204. In this light, Barth's conclusions, that Paul in Ephesians 5 bases the subordination of the wife to the husband on the new order of being initiated by Christ, should be mentioned (*Ephesians* [AB; 2 vols.; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974] 2. 708-715).

<sup>98</sup>Saucy, “Negative Case,” 281-284.

for this reason. Representative is the assertion of the Catholic Biblical Association of America's Task Force on the Role of Women in Early Christianity: "The presuppositions of Paul's patriarchal culture have influenced his interpretation of Genesis."<sup>99</sup> Such a conclusion is unacceptable to those who, like myself, would maintain the inerrancy of Scripture, and it must be noted that this is precisely what is involved: Scripture errs if any part presents false teaching through faulty exegesis and argumentation.<sup>100</sup> But, to assert the position is not to justify it and it must be asked whether Paul's understanding of the Genesis passages can be justified.

While the majority of modern commentators deny the presence of any subordinationism in the second creation narrative and rightly criticize some of the excesses found in older works,<sup>101</sup> there are two points at which some degree of subordination seems to be implied. The first is found in the purpose for which woman is created, to be a "helper corresponding to man" (*'ezer kěnegdōr* Gen 2:18). The fundamental correspondence between man and woman, in contrast to man and the beasts, is clearly affirmed (2:23),<sup>102</sup> but this "likeness" in no way diminishes the fact that woman is created as a "helper." Nor does the fact that *'ezer* is commonly used of God in the OT necessarily remove the sense of subordination in Genesis 2.<sup>103</sup> For when God is portrayed as the "helper" of his people, it is a manifestation of His grace. Once again, it is crucial that the distinction between *essence* and *relationship* be maintained: *essentially*, of course, God is not inferior to man nor is woman to man, but in the sphere of *relationship* (God-man at certain points; female-male at every point), a sustaining, helping role can exist which has as its purpose the welfare of the other. The man's "naming" of the woman is the second point at which some degree of subordination can be discerned. In Hebrew culture, to name something is to express its fundamental characteristics,<sup>104</sup> but also generally implies the authority of the one giving the name.<sup>105</sup> While it is asserted that no sense of authority can be inferred in the "naming" activity in Gen 2:23,<sup>106</sup> the niphāl imperfect form of *qr* suggests

<sup>99</sup>"Women and Priestly Ministry: The New Testament Evidence," *CBQ* 41 (1979) 612; cf. also Karen W. Hoover, "Creative Tension in 1 Timothy 2:11-15," *Brethren Life and Thought* 22 (1977) 163-165; van der Meer, *Women Priests* 29; Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Pastoral Letters* (The Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: University Press, 1966) 38; Jewett, *Male and Female* 119-126.

<sup>100</sup>Robert K. Johnson, "The Role of Women," 234-259.

<sup>101</sup>Phyllis Trible, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," *JAAR* 41 (1973) 36; Tvard, *Women in Christian Tradition* 7-8; Marie de Merode, "Une aide qui lui correspond" L'exégèse de Gen 2, 18-24 dans les écrits de l'Ancien Testament, du judaïsme et du Nouveau Testament," *RTL* 8 (1977) 329-338; Swidler, *Women in Judaism* 25-27; Claus Westermann, *Genesis* (BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1966-) 311-316; Ernst Haag, *Der Mensch am Anfang: Die alttestamentliche Paradiesvorstellung nach Gen 2-3* (Trierer Theologische Studien 24; Trier: Paulinus, 1970) 176-77; Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 171-172.

<sup>102</sup>Haag, *Der Mensch am Anfang* 176-177; Trible, "Depatriarchalizing," 36.

<sup>103</sup>Pace Trible, "Depatriarchalizing," 36; Scanzoni-Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be* 26.

<sup>104</sup>de Merode, "L'exégèse de Gen 2, 18-24," 333.

<sup>105</sup>V. Cassuto asserts: "The naming of something or someone is a token of lordship" (*A Commentary of the Book of Genesis* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961] 130).

<sup>106</sup>Trible, "Depatriarchalizing," 38; Haag, *Der Mensch am Anfang* 47.

otherwise: it is employed most often in prophetic speech, where the destiny or character of a person or thing is to be characterized in the name. So, for instance, Gen 17:5: "No longer shall you be *named* Abram," and Isaiah 56:7: "My house *shall be called* a house of prayer. . .".<sup>107</sup> The element of authority inherent in such semi-imperative predictions is clear. Adam, *ish*, names Eve, *isha*, and expresses thereby both her essential equality with him and his right to predict determinately her character.<sup>108</sup>

In addition to an alleged incorrect understanding of Genesis 2, Paul has been accused of misusing the creation accounts by employing Genesis 2, where female subordination might be implied, in isolation from Genesis 1, which affirms the full equality of the sexes.<sup>109</sup> However, Genesis 2 is certainly to be understood as an expansion of the brief account of Genesis 1, the second narrative focusing particularly on the relationship between man and woman.<sup>110</sup> Thus the second account, which is more specific on the matter of relationship; is more important for that question and is naturally employed when that is the subject of discussion.

A fourth attempt to deny the continuing validity of the teaching prohibition in 1 Timothy 2 focuses upon the "new creature" situation in the redemptive economy. According to this view, the original creation situation (Genesis 1 or Genesis 1-2), in distinction from the post-lapsarian age (Genesis 3 or Genesis 2-3) is held to be re-established, at least potentially, in the church.<sup>111</sup> But such a view must overlook the fact that Paul appeals to creation, as well as to the fall, for substantiation of women's subordination; according to him, there exists in this point a "harmony between the order of creation and the order of redemption."<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, the assumption that in the redemptive economy sin is overcome to the extent that hierarchal patterns are no longer necessary, lacks exegetical support and is theologically questionable.<sup>113</sup>

A number of cultural circumstances which may prevent a direct appropriation of Paul's teaching in 1 Timothy 2 are linked to the status of women in the ancient world. We have already sketched and rejected the view

<sup>107</sup>Of the thirty occurrences of the niphil imperfect of *qr'* in the Heb. Bible, eighteen clearly possess this connotation. The others are not really parallel to the Gen 2:23 text.

<sup>108</sup>Feuillet, "La Dignité," 168; Bruce Vawter, *On Genesis: A New Reading* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977) 75; Alan Richardson, *Genesis I-XI: Introduction and Commentary* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM, 1953) 68; Knight, *Role Relationship* 41-42. It is probable that simple priority does not require superiority, although against the assertion that such an idea is impossible in Genesis 1, since the beasts are created first (Trible, "Depatriarchalizing," 36; Scanzoni-Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be* 28) one should note b.Sanh. 38a, where, it is said, if man becomes proud, he is to be reminded "that the gnats preceded him in the order of creation."

<sup>109</sup>Jewett, *Male and Female* 119; Stagg, *Woman in the World of Jesus* 16-17.

<sup>110</sup>H. Cavallin, "Demythologizing the Liberal Allusion," *Why Not? Priesthood and the Ordination of Women* 84-85; Davis, "Reflections on Galatians 3:28," 204.

<sup>111</sup>Thrall, *Ordination of Women* 20-59; Reumann, "What in Scripture," 11; William E. Hull, "Woman in her Place: Biblical Perspectives," *RevExp* 72 (1975) 15-17; Williams, *Apostle Paul* 114.

<sup>112</sup>Zerbst, *Office of Woman* 61; Brunner, *Ministry of Women* 28.

<sup>113</sup>Davis, "Reflections on Galatians 3:28," 203-204.

that in several passages, including 1 Timothy 2, Paul was influenced by his Jewish heritage in such a way that he contradicted himself. A related and more acceptable approach holds that Paul issued the restrictions he did in a desire to avoid contravening the societal mores of his time. Several varieties of this viewpoint require consideration.

Quickly discarded can be the idea that Paul was accommodating himself to the practice of the synagogue. While, to be sure, women were forbidden to teach in the Jewish service,<sup>114</sup> they were also, as we have seen, prohibited from learning. Were the sensibilities of Jewish brethren at issue, it is inconceivable that Paul would have allowed the one and forbidden the other.

If, however, the scruples of Jewish brethren cannot be the reason for Paul's advice, it may be that his limitation is given with a view to the attitudes of pagans, who would have looked askance at women teaching in meetings.<sup>115</sup> But, in fact, it is difficult to envisage such objections from pagans in light of the attitude toward women in the Hellenistic world. As Swidler points out, this attitude must be distinguished from the Jewish view, which was considerably more conservative, and from the outlook characteristic of fifth and fourth century Athens. In the Hellenistic period, the status of women had improved "... so vigorously and continually that one must speak of a women's liberation movement which had a massive and manifold liberating impact on the lot of women..."<sup>116</sup> Women played a prominent role in many of the mystery religions<sup>117</sup> and, to cite evidence more directly relevant for the text under discussion, the cult of Artemis in Ephesus was well-known for the many priestesses who officiated at the great Temple.<sup>118</sup> As Barth notes, "The cult of the Great Mother in the Artemis Temple stamped the city more than others as a bastion and bulwark of women's rights."<sup>119</sup> Thus, there is little that can be discerned in the atmosphere of Hellenistic Ephesus which would have caused anyone to take a critical view of women teaching or officiating in Christian worship services.

A third suggestion relating to the status of women is that lack of educational opportunities prevented women from achieving the level of

<sup>114</sup>Qidd, 4:13. Cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem* 374.

<sup>115</sup>Prohl, *Woman in the Church* 48-65; Hull, "Woman in her Place," 15. Katherine C. Bushnell (*God's Word to Women* [n.p., n.d.] par. 313-326) and Kaiser ("Paul, Women," 11) further suggest that the prominence of Christian women at a time when Nero was strongly influenced by the Jewess Poppaea had led to persecution. For this there is no evidence, and it assumes a date for 1 Timothy rather later than probable.

<sup>116</sup>Swidler, *Women in Judaism* 18-24 (24); Barth, *Ephesians* 2. 656.

<sup>117</sup>Swidler, *Women in Judaism* 21, 66-67; K. Thraede, "Frau," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 8 (1972) cols. 207-208.

<sup>118</sup>E. Beurlier, "Diane," *Dictionnaire de la Bible* 2 (1926) col. 408; Lilly Ross Taylor, "Artemis of Ephesus," *The Acts of the Apostles, Part I of Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake), 5 (1933) 253-254; W. M. Ramsey, "Diana of the Ephesians," *A Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. James Hastings; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898) 1. 605.

<sup>119</sup>*Ephesians* 2. 661.

competence demanded of the Christian teacher.<sup>120</sup> Again, though, while Jewish women were not normally educated,<sup>121</sup> many more opportunities were available to Greek women; the Stoics believed in educating men and women equally and in Hellenistic Egypt there were more women than men who could sign their names.<sup>122</sup>

One final local factor must be evaluated: Could Paul have prohibited women from teaching because of their involvement in the heresy at Ephesus?<sup>123</sup> Two observations suggest not. First, there is nothing in the Pastorals to indicate that women were any more susceptible to the false teaching than were men; the two texts which mention women in this connection (1 Tim 3:14-15; 2 Tim 3:6) must be balanced against many more that relate to all or to men in particular (1 Tim 1:10, 2 Tim 2:17-18). Second, even if women *were* particularly prone to the views of the heretics, nothing suggests that they were *teaching* it,<sup>124</sup> and in light of the Jewish element in the heresy, this is most unlikely.<sup>125</sup>

#### Conclusion

The results of the investigation carried out in Part II can be succinctly stated: nothing which would have effect of restricting the application of Paul's advice in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 to a particular time and place has been discovered. Indeed, the very structure of the passage must point to the inherent improbability of such restrictions, for Paul roots his teaching deeply in the culture-transcending events of the creation and fall of man and woman. There is absolutely nothing in the passage which would suggest that Paul issued his instructions because of a local situation of societal pressure. This being the case, it can only be concluded that the results of the exegetical investigation carried out in Part I must stand as valid for the church in every age and place: Women are not to teach men nor to have authority over men because such activity would violate the structure of created sexual relationships and would involve the woman in something for which she is not suited.<sup>126</sup>

Finally, it might not be amiss to suggest that the background against which Paul wrote is remarkably similar in many respects to the situation in which the

<sup>120</sup>Ronald A. Ward, *Commentary on 1 & 2 Timothy & Titus* (Waco, Texas: Word, 1974) 52; Richard and Joyce Boldrey, *Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976) 62-64; Williams, *The Apostle Paul* 112.

<sup>121</sup>S. Safrai, "Education and the Study of the Torah," *The Jewish People in the First Century* 2. 955.

<sup>122</sup>Swidler, *Women in Judaism* 19-20.

<sup>123</sup>As asserted by Scanzoni-Hardesty (*All We're Meant to Be* 37), Aida Dina Besancon Spencer ("Eve at Ephesus [Should women be ordained as pastors according to the First Letter to Timothy 2:11-15?]" *JETS* 17 [1974] 21b-22) and Fuller ("Pro and Con" 9-10).

<sup>124</sup>If the heresy was a form of proto-montanism (J. Massingberd Ford, "A Note on Proto-Montanism in the Pastoral Epistles," *NTS* 17 [1970-71] 238-246), some evidence for women as teachers could be adduced from the later history of the movement, but it is most improbable that such a connection can be made.

<sup>125</sup>Cf. especially Tit 1:10. Kelly calls the heresy "a Gnosticizing form of Jewish Christianity" (*Pastoral Epistles* 12). (Cf. also Spicq, *Epîtres Pastorales* 88-115).

<sup>126</sup>In agreement with this, cf. especially the conclusion of Zerbst (*Office of Woman* 80-81) and Brunner (*Ministry of Women* 32-35).

church finds itself today. In both cases, one finds teaching which denigrates marriage and the family and encourages women to pursue involvement in all spheres of activity.<sup>127</sup> To both situations Paul's advice would appear to be the same. While many of these pursuits are proper, and should be sanctioned by the church ("let the women learn"), women must not engage in activities which have the effect of disruption created sexual role relationships and should never regard tasks such as raising children and managing homes as second-rate. Indeed, it is in devoting herself to such activities consonant with her created role that the Christian woman experiences the salvation to which she has been called. Far from being degrading or unsatisfying, this role, inasmuch as it accords with the purpose of the Creator, constitutes "the dignity" of the woman.<sup>128</sup>

<sup>127</sup>Cf. Falconer ("1 Timothy 2:14,15," 378) and Barth (Ephesians 2. 661) for the situation in first century Ephesus.

<sup>128</sup>The term represents one of the themes in the important article by André Feuillet ("La Dignité").